

www.cristoraul.org

**HISTORY
OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH
FROM
THE APOSTOLIC AGE
TO
THE REFORMATION**

A.D. 64-1517



JAMES CRAIGIE ROBERTSON

CONTENTS

BOOK I	
FROM THE PERSECUTION OF THE CHURCH BY NERO TO CONSTANTINE'S EDICT OF TOLERATION. A.D. 64-313	6
I. THE APOSTOLIC AGE	
II. THE REIGNS OF TRAJAN AND ADRIAN, A.D. 98-138	
III. THE REIGNS OF THE ANTONINES, A.D. 138-180	
IV. THE EARLY HERETICS	
V. FROM THE ACCESSION OF COMMODUS TO THE DEATH OF ELAGABALUS, A.D. 180-222	
VI. FROM ALEXANDER SEVERUS TO VALERIAN, A.D. 222-260	
VII. FROM THE ACCESSION OF GALLIENUS TO THE EDICT OF TOLERATION BY CONSTANTINE, A.D. 261-313	
VIII. SUPPLEMENTARY	
BOOK II	
FROM CONSTANTINE TO GREGORY THE GREAT. A.D. 313-590	90
I. CONSTANTINE. DONATISM. ARIANISM. A.D. 313-337.	
II. THE SONS OF CONSTANTINE. A.D. 337-361.	
III. JULIAN. A.D. 361-363	
IV. FROM THE DEATH OF JULIAN TO THE END OF THE SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL. A.D. 363-381.	
V. FROM THE END OF THE SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE DEATH OF THEODOSIUS. A.D. 381-395.	
VI. SUPPLEMENTARY	
BOOK III	
FROM THE DEATH OF THE EMPEROR THEODOSIUS I TO THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY THE GREAT. A.D. 395-590	178
I. ARCADIUS AND HONORIUS. ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSY. ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM	
II. ST. AUGUSTINE. DONATISM. PELAGIANISM	
III. NESTORIANISM	
IV. EUTYCHIANISM. THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON. ADVANCE OF THE ROMAN SEE	
V. FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE. CONVERSION OF THE BARBARIANS. VANDAL PERSECUTION IN AFRICA	
VI. MONOPHYSITISM. JUSTINIAN. THE THREE ARTICLES. A.D. 451-566	
VII. SEMIPELAGIANISM. MISSIONS. DECLINE OF ARIANISM IN THE WEST	
VIII. SUPPLEMENTARY	

BOOK IV

FROM THE ELECTION OF GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE. A.D. 590-814 279

- I. GREGORY THE GREAT, A.D. 590-604. COLUMBAN, A.D. 589-615
- II. MAHOMET. THE MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY. A.D. 610-718
- III. THE WESTERN CHURCH FROM THE DEATH OF GREGORY I TO THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY II. A.D. 604-715
- IV. ICONOCLASM. A.D. 717-775
- V. SAINT BONIFACE A.D. 715-755
- VI. PIPIN AND CHARLEMAGNE. A.D. 741-814
- VII. THE EASTERN CHURCH. CONTROVERSIES OF CHARLEMAGNE'S AGE, A.D. 775-814
- VIII. THE ORIENTAL SECTS.
- IX. SUPPLEMENTARY

BOOK V

FROM THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE TO THE DEPOSITION OF POPE GREGORY VI. A.D. 814-1046. 398

- I. LOUIS THE PIOUS (A.D. 814-840). END OF THE CONTROVERSY OF THE IMAGES (A.D. 813-842). THE FALSE DECRETALS
- II. THE FRANKISH CHURCH AND THE PAPACY. FROM THE DEATH OF LEWIS THE PIOUS TO THE DEPOSITION OF CHARLES THE FAT. A.D. 840-887
- III. THE GREEK CHURCH. PHOTIUS. AD. 843-898
- IV. SPAIN. ENGLAND. MISSIONS OF THE NINTH CENTURY.
- V. FROM THE DEPOSITION OF CHARLES THE FAT TO THE DEATH OF POPE SYLVESTER II. A.D. 887-1003
- VI. FROM THE DEATH OF POPE SYLVESTER II TO THE DEPOSITION OF GREGORY VI A.D. 1003-1046.
- VII THE BRITISH CHURCHES - MISSIONS OF THE TENTH AND ELEVENTH CENTURIES.
- VIII. HERESIES. A.D. 1000-1052.
- IX. SUPPLEMENTARY.

BOOK VI

FROM THE DEPOSITION OF POPE GREGORY VI TO THE DEATH OF POPE CELESTINE III. A.D. 1046-1198 541

- I. THE PONTIFICATES OF CLEMENT II, DAMASUS II, LEO IX, VICTOR II, STEPHEN IX, NICOLAS II, AND ALEXANDER II. A.D. 1046-1073
- II. GREGORY VII
- III. BERENGAR. A.D. 1045-1088
- IV. FROM THE DEATH OF GREGORY VII TO THAT OF THE EMPEROR HENRY IV. THE FIRST CRUSADE. A.D. 1085-1106
- V. ENGLAND FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST TO THE DEATH OF ST. ANSELM. A.D. 1066-1108
- VI. FROM THE DEATH OF THE EMPEROR HENRY IV TO THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS. A.D. 1106-1122
- VII. MONASTICISM. NEW ORDERS. THE TEMPLARS AND HOSPITALLERS

- VIII. FROM THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS TO THE DEATH OF POPE ADRIAN IV. A.D. 1122-1159
- IX. ALEXANDER III. A.D. 1159-1181
- X. FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE LUCIUS III TO THE DEATH OF CELESTINE III. A.D. 1181-1198
- XI. THE GREEK CHURCH. SPAIN. BRITISH CHURCHES. THE NORTH. MISSIONS.
- XII. SECTARIES. VISIONARIES
- XIII. SUPPLEMENTARY

BOOK VII

- FROM THE ELECTION OF INNOCENT III TO THE DEATH OF BONIFACE VIII. A.D. 1198-1303 774

- I. INNOCENT III. A.D. 1198-1216
- II. FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE HONORIUS III TO THE DEATH OF INNOCENT IV. A.D. 1216-1254
- III. FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE ALEXANDER IV TO THE DEATH OF LEWIS IX OF FRANCE. A.D. 1254-1270
- IV. FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE GREGORY X TO THE DEATH OF NICOLAS IV. A.D. 1271-1292
- V. CELESTINE V AND BONIFACE VIII, A.D. 1292-1303
- VI. PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL
- VII. SECTARIES
- VIII. SUPPLEMENTARY.

BOOK VIII

- FROM THE DEATH OF POPE BONIFACE VIII TO THE END OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE. A.D. 1303-1418. 935

- I. BENEDIC XI AND CLEMENT V. A.D. 1303-1313
- II. FROM THE DEATH OF POPE CLEMENT V TO THAT OF THE EMPEROR LEWIS IV. A.D. 1313-1343
- III. JOANNA OF NAPLES. RIENZI. LAST YEARS OF CLEMENT VI. A.D. 1343-1352
- IV. FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE INNOCENT VI TO THE DEATH OF GREGORY XI. A.D. 1352-1378
- V. THE GREAT SCHISM OF THE WEST TO THE END OF THE COUNCIL OF PISA. A.D. 1378-1409
- IV. FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE INNOCENT VII TO THE DEATH OF GREGORY XI. A.D. 1352-1378
- V. THE GREAT SCHISM OF THE WEST TO THE END OF THE COUNCIL OF PISA, A.D. 1378-1409
- VI. WYCLIF
- VII. BOHEMIA
- VIII. FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE ALEXANDER V TO THE END OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE. A.D. 1409-18
- IX. THE GREEK CHURCH. CHRISTIANITY IN ASIA. CONVERSIONS
- X. SECTARIES. MYSTICS
- XI. SUPPLEMENTARY

BOOK IX
FROM THE END OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE TO THE END OF THE FIFTH
COUNCIL OF THE LATERAN, A.D. 1418-1517 1095

- I. MARTIN V. BOHEMIAN WAR. A.D. 1418-1431
- II. EUGENIUS IV. COUNCIL OF BASEL AND FLORENCE. A.D. 1431-1447
- III. FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE NICHOLAS V TO THE DEATH OF PAUL II.
A.D. 1447-1471.
- IV. SIXTUS IV AND INNOCENT VIII . A.D. 1471-1492
- V. ALEXANDER THE SIXTH. A.D. 1492-1503
- VI. FROM THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER VI TO THE END OF THE COUNCIL OF
THE LATERAN. A.D. 1503-1517
- VII. PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL. MEASURES AGAINST THE JEWS AND
MAGI IN SPAIN. WITCHCRAFT. SECTARIES. FORERUNNERS OF THE
REFORMATION
- VIII. SUPPLEMENTARY

BOOK I

FROM THE PERSECUTION OF THE CHURCH BY NERO TO CONSTANTINE'S
EDICT OF TOLERATION. A.D. 64-313.

CHAPTER I.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

THE fullness of the time was come was proclaimed on earth. The way had been prepared for it, not only by that long system of manifest and special training which God had bestowed on his chosen people, but by the works of Gentile thought, employing the highest powers in the search after truth, yet unable to satisfy man's natural cravings by revealing to him with certainty his origin and destiny, or by offering relief from the burdens of his soul. The Jews were looking eagerly for the speedy accomplishment of the promises made to their fathers; even among the Gentiles, vague prophecies and expectations of some great appearance in the East were widely current. The affairs of the world had been ordered for the furtherance of the Gospel; it was aided in its progress by the dispersion of the Jews, and by the vast extent of the Roman dominion. From its birthplace, Jerusalem, it might be carried by pilgrims to the widely scattered settlements in which their race had found a home; and in these Jewish settlements its preachers found an audience to which they might address their first announcements with the reasonable hope of being understood. From Rome, where it early took root, it might be diffused by means of the continual intercourse which all the provinces of the empire maintained with the capital. It might accompany the course of merchandise and the movements of the legions.

We learn from the books of the New Testament, that within a few years from the day of Pentecost the knowledge of the faith was spread, by the preaching, the miracles, and the life of the apostles and their associates, through most of the countries which border on the Mediterranean sea. At Rome, before the city had been visited by any apostle, the number of Christians was already so great as to form several congregations in the different quarters. Clement of Rome states that St. Paul himself, in the last period of his life, visited "the extremity of the West"—an expression which may be more probably interpreted of Spain (in accordance with the intention expressed in the Epistle to the Romans) than of our own island, for which many have wished to claim the honoUr of a visit from the great teacher of the Gentiles. The early introduction of Christianity into Britain, however, appears more certain than the agency by which it was effected; and the same remark will apply in other cases.

While St. Paul was engaged in the works which are related in the Acts of the Apostles, his brethren were doubtless active in their several spheres, although no certain record of their exertions has been preserved. St. Peter is said to have founded the church of Antioch, and, after having presided over it for seven years, to have left Enodius as his successor, while he himself penetrated into Parthia and other countries of the East, and it would seem more reasonable to understand the date of Babylon in his First Epistle (v. 13) as meaning the eastern city of that name than as a mystical designation of pagan Rome. Yet notwithstanding this, and although we need not scruple to reject the idea of his having held, as a settled bishop, that see which claims universal supremacy as an inheritance from him, it is not so much a spirit of sound criticism as a religious prejudice which has led some Protestant writers to deny that the

apostle was ever at Rome, where all ancient testimony represents him to have suffered, together with St. Paul, in the reign of Nero.

St. Bartholomew is said to have preached in India and Arabia; St. Andrew in Scythia; St. Matthew and St. Matthias in Ethiopia. St. Philip (whether the deacon or the apostle is uncertain) is supposed to have settled at Hierapolis in Phrygia. The church of Alexandria traced itself to St. Mark; that of Milan, but with less warrant, to St. Barnabas. The church of Edessa is said to have been founded by St. Thaddeus; and this might perhaps be more readily believed if the story were not connected with a manifestly spurious correspondence between our Saviour and Abgarus, king of that region. St. Thomas is reported to have preached in Parthia and in India; the Persian church claimed him for its founder, and the native church of Malabar advances a similar claim. But the name of India was so vaguely used that little can be safely inferred from the ancient notices which connect it with the works of St. Thomas; and the more probable opinion appears to be that the Christianity of Malabar owes its origin to the Nestorian missionaries of the fifth century, who, by carrying with them from Persia the name of the apostle of that country, laid the foundation of the local tradition. The African church, which afterwards became so prominent in history, has been fabulously traced to St. Peter, and to St. Simon Zelotes; but nothing is known of it with certainty until the last years of the second century, and the Christianity of Africa was most probably derived from Rome by means of teachers whose memory has perished.

There may be too much hardness in rejecting traditions, as well as too great easiness in receiving them. Where it is found that a church existed, and that it referred its origin to a certain person, the mere fact that the person in question was as likely as any other to have been the founder, or perhaps more likely than any other, can surely be no good reason for denying the claim. We have before us, on the one hand, remarkable works, and on the other, distinguished names; and although tradition may be wrong in connecting the names with the works, it is an unreasonable skepticism to insist on separating them without examination and without exception.

The persecution by Nero is one of the circumstances in our early history which are attested by the independent evidence of heathen writers. It has been supposed that Christianity had once before attracted the notice of the imperial government; for it is inferred from a passage in Suetonius that disturbances among the Roman Jews on the subject of Christ had been the occasion of the edict by which Claudius banished them from Rome. But the persecution under Nero was more distinctly directed against the Christians, on whom the emperor affected to lay the guilt of having set fire to the city. Some were sewn up in the skins of wild beasts, and exposed to be torn by dogs; some were crucified; others were covered with a dress which had been smeared with pitch, and was then set on fire, so that the victims served as torches to illuminate the emperor's gardens, while he regaled the populace with the exhibition of chariot-races, in which he himself took part. Tacitus, in relating these atrocities, states that, although the charge of incendiarism was disbelieved, the Christians were unpopular as followers of an unsocial superstition; but that the infliction of such tortures on them raised a general feeling of pity. As to the extent of this persecution (which has been a subject of dispute) the most probable opinion appears to be that it had no official sanction beyond the immediate neighbourhood of the capital; but the display of Nero's enmity against the Christian name must doubtless have affected the condition of the obnoxious community throughout the provinces of the empire.

Until the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, the capital of God's ancient people, the birthplace of the church, had naturally been regarded by Christians as a religious centre. It was the scene of the apostolic council, held under the presidency of its bishop, St. James "the Just". And, as the embracing of the Gospel was not considered to detach converts of Hebrew race from the temple-worship and other Mosaic observances, Jerusalem had continued to be a resort for such converts, including the apostles themselves, at the seasons of the great Jewish

festivals. But the destruction of the temple and of the holy city put an end to this connection. It was the final proof that God was no longer with the Israel after the flesh; that the Mosaic system had fulfilled its work, and had passed away. At the approach of the besieging army, the Christian community, seeing in this the accomplishment of their Master's warning, had withdrawn beyond the Jordan to the mountain town of Pella. The main body of them returned after the siege, and established themselves among the ruins, under Simeon, who had been raised to the bishopric on the martyrdom of St. James, some years before; but the church of Jerusalem no longer stood in its former relation of superiority to other churches.

Christianity, as it was not the faith of any nation, had not, in the eyes of Roman statesmen, a claim to admission among the religions allowed by law (*religiones licitae*); it must, indeed, have refused such a position, if it were required to exist contentedly and without aggression by the side of systems which it denounced as false and ruinous; and thus its professors were always exposed to the capricious enmity of rulers who might think fit to proceed against them. Thirty years after the time of Nero, a new persecution of the church, wider in its reach, although of less severity than the former, was instituted by Domitian. The banishment of St. John to Patmos, where he saw the visions recorded in the last book of Holy Scripture, has generally been referred to this persecution. Nor does there appear to be any good reason for disbelieving the story that the emperor, having been informed that some descendants of the house of David were living in Judaea, ordered them to be brought before him, as he apprehended a renewal of the attempts at rebellion which had been so frequent among their nation. They were two grandchildren of St. Jude—the “brother” of our Lord, as he is called. They showed their hands, rough and horny from labour, and gave such answers as proved them to be simple countrymen, not likely to engage in any plots against the state; whereupon they were dismissed. The persecution did not last long. Domitian, before his assassination, had given orders that it should cease, and that the Christians who had been banished should be permitted to return to their homes; and the reign of his successor, Nerva (A.D. 96-8), who restored their confiscated property, was a season of rest for the church.

St. John alone of the apostles survived to the reign of Trajan. Of his last years, which were spent in the superintendence of the Ephesian church, some traditions have been preserved, which, if they cannot absolutely demand our belief, have at least a sufficient air of credibility to deserve a respectful consideration. One of these is a pleasing story of his recovering to the way of righteousness a young man who, after having been distinguished by the apostle's notice and interest, had fallen into vicious courses, and had become captain of a band of robbers. Another tradition relates that, when too feeble to enter the church without assistance, or to utter many words, he continually addressed his flock with the charge—“Little children, love one another”; and that when some of them ventured to ask the reason of a repetition which they found wearisome, he answered, “Because it is the Lord's commandment, and, if this only be performed, it is enough”. And it is surely a very incomplete view of the apostle's character which would reject as inconsistent with it the story of his having rushed out of a public bath in horror and indignation on finding it to be polluted by the presence of the heretic Cerinthus.

Of the writings ascribed to this age, but which have not been admitted into the canon of the New Testament, the First Epistle of St. Clement is the only one which is generally received as genuine. The author, who was anciently supposed to be the Clement mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Philippians (IV. 3), was bishop of Rome towards the end of the century. His epistle, of which the chief object is to recommend humility and peace, was written in consequence of some dissensions in the Corinthian church, of which no other record is preserved, but which were probably later than Domitian's persecution. The Second Epistle ascribed to Clement, and two letters “To Virgins”, which exist in a Syriac version, are rejected by most critics; and the other writings with which Clement's name is connected are undoubtedly spurious. The Epistle which bears the name of St. Barnabas (although it does not

claim him for its author), and the “Shepherd” of Hermas, are probably works of the earlier half of the second century.

Before leaving the apostolic age a few words must be said on the subject of church-government, while some other matters of this time may be better reserved for notice at such points of the later history as may afford us a view of their bearings and consequences.

With respect, then, to the government of the earliest church, the most important consideration appears to be, that the Christian ministry was developed, not from below, but from above. We do not find that the first members of it raised some from among their number to a position higher than the equality on which they had all originally stood; but, on the contrary, that the apostles, having been at first the sole depositaries of their Lord’s commission, with all the powers which it conferred, afterwards delegated to others, as their substitutes, assistants, or successors, such portions of their powers as were capable of being transmitted, and as were necessary for the continuance of the church. In this way were appointed, first, the order of deacons, for the discharge of secular administrations and of the lower spiritual functions; next, that of presbyters, elders, or bishops, for the ordinary care of congregations; and, lastly, the highest powers of ordination and government were in like manner imparted, as the apostles began to find that their own body was, from its smallness, unequal to the local superintendence of the growing church, and as the advance of age warned them to provide for the coming times. An advocate of the episcopal theory of apostolic succession is under no necessity of arguing that there must have been three orders in the ministry, or that there need have been more than one. It is enough to say that those to whom the apostles conveyed the full powers of the Christian ministry were not the deacons, nor the presbyters, but (in the later meaning of the word) the bishops; and the existence of the inferior orders, as subject to these, is a simple matter of history.

Resting on the fact that the apostles were, during their lives on Earth, the supreme regulating authorities of the church, we may disregard a multitude of questions which have been made to tell against the theories of an episcopal polity, of a triple ministry, or of any ministry whatever as distinguished from the great body of Christians. We need not here inquire at what time and by what steps the title of bishop, which had originally been common to the highest and the second orders, came to be applied exclusively to the former, nor whether functions originally open to all Christian men were afterwards restricted to a particular class; nor in how far the inferior orders of the clergy, or the whole body of the faithful, may have at first shared in the administration of government and discipline; nor whether the commissions given by St. Paul to Timothy and to Titus were permanent or only occasional; nor at what time the system of fixed diocesan bishops was introduced. We do not refuse to acknowledge that the organization of the church was gradual; we are only concerned to maintain that it was directed by the apostles (probably acting on instructions committed to them by their Master during the interval between his resurrection and his ascension), and that in all essential points it was completed before their departure.

It is evident that the ministers of the church, beginning with St. Matthias, were usually chosen by the body of believers; but it seems equally clear that it was the apostolical ordination which gave them their commission—that commission being derived from the Head of the church, who had bestowed it on the apostles, that they might become the channels for conveying it to others.

Of the universal supremacy of the bishop of Rome it is unnecessary here to speak. In this stage of church-history it is a matter not for the narrator but for the controversialist; if, indeed, the theories as to the “development” of Christianity, which have lately been devised in the interest of the Papacy, may not be regarded as dispensing even the controversial opponents of Rome from the necessity of proving that, in the earliest times of the church, no such supremacy was known or imagined

CHAPTER II

THE REIGNS OF TRAJAN AND HADRIAN
A.D. 98-138

Christianity was no longer to be confounded with Judaism. The great majority of the converts were of Gentile race; and the difference of manners and observances between the followers of the two religions was such as could not be overlooked when exhibited in large bodies of persons. But still the newer system was regarded as an offshoot of the older; its adherents were exposed to all the odium of a Jewish sect. Indeed, the Christian religion must have appeared the more objectionable of the two, since it not only was exclusive, but instead of being merely or chiefly national, it claimed the allegiance of all mankind.

Strange and horrible charges began to be current against the Christians. The secrecy of their meetings for worship was ascribed, not to its true cause, the fear of persecution, but to a consciousness of abominations which could not bear the light. “Thyestean banquets”, promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, and magical rites were popularly imputed to them. The Jews were especially industrious in inventing and propagating such stories, while some of the heretical parties, which now began to vex the church, both brought discredit on the Christian name by their own practices, and were forward to join in the work of slander and persecution against the faithful. And, no doubt, among the orthodox themselves there must have been some by whom the Gospel had been so misconceived that their behaviour towards those without the church was repulsive and irritating, so as to give countenance to the prejudices which regarded the faith of Christ as a gloomy and unsocial superstition.

It is a question whether at this time there were any laws of the Roman empire against Christianity. On the one hand, it has been maintained that those of Nero and Domitian had been repealed; on the other hand, Tertullian states that, although all the other acts of Nero were abrogated, those against the Christians still remained; and the records of the period convey the idea that the profession of the Gospel was legally punishable. Even if it was no longer condemned by any special statute, it fell under the general law which prohibited all such religions as had not been formally sanctioned by the state. And this law, although it might usually be allowed to slumber, could at any time have been enforced; not to speak of the constant danger from popular tumults, often incited by persons who felt that their calling was at stake—priests, soothsayers, statuaries, players, gladiators, and others who depended for a livelihood on the worship of the heathen gods, or on spectacles which the Christians abhorred.

Trajan, the successor of Nerva, although not free from serious personal vices, was long regarded by the Romans as the ideal of an excellent prince; centuries after his death, the highest wish that could be framed for the salutation of a new emperor was a prayer that he might be “more fortunate than Augustus, and better than Trajan”. In the history of the church, however, Trajan appears to less advantage. Early in his reign he issued an edict against guilds or clubs, apprehending that they might become dangerous to the state; and it is easy to imagine how this edict might be turned against the Christians—a vast brotherhood, extending through all known countries both within and beyond the empire, bound together by intimate

ties, maintaining a lively intercourse and communication with each other, and having much that seemed to be mysterious both in their opinions and in their practice.

In this reign falls the martyrdom of the venerable Simeon, the kinsman of our Lord, brother (or perhaps cousin) of James the Just, and his successor in the see of Jerusalem. It is said that some heretics denounced him to the proconsul Atticus as a Christian and a descendant of David. During several days the aged bishop endured a variety of tortures with a constancy which astonished the beholders; and at last he was crucified at the age of a hundred and twenty.

A curious and interesting contribution to the church-history of the time is furnished by the correspondence of the younger Pliny. Pliny had been sent as proconsul into Pontus and Bithynia, a region of mixed population, partly Asiatic and partly Greek, with a considerable infusion of Jews. That the Gospel had early found an entrance into those countries appears from the address of St. Peter's First Epistle; and its prevalence there in the second century is confirmed by the testimony of the heathen Lucian. The circumstances of Pliny's government forced on him the consideration of a subject which had not before engaged his attention. Perhaps, as has been conjectured, the first occasion which brought the new religion under his notice may have been the celebration of Trajan's Quindecennalia—the fifteenth anniversary of his adoption as the heir of the empire; for solemnities of this kind were accompanied by pagan rites, in which it was unlawful for Christians to share.

The proconsul was perplexed by the novelty of the circumstances with which he had to deal. He found that the temples of the national religion were almost deserted : that the persons accused of Christianity were very numerous; that they were of every age, of both sexes, of all ranks, and were found not only in the towns, but in villages and country places. Pliny was uncertain as to the state of the laws, and in his difficulty he applied to the emperor for instructions. He states the course which he had pursued : he had questioned the accused repeatedly; of those who persisted in avowing themselves Christians, he had ordered some to be put to death, and had reserved others, who were entitled to the privileges of Roman citizens, with the intention of sending them to the capital. "I had no doubt", he says, "that, whatever they might confess, willfulness and inflexible obstinacy ought to be punished". Many who were anonymously accused had cleared themselves by invoking the gods, by offering incense to the statues of these and of the emperor, and by cursing the name of Christ. Some, who had at first admitted the charge, afterwards declared that they had abandoned Christianity three, or even twenty, years before; yet the governor was unable to extract from these anything to the discredit of the faith which they professed to have forsaken. They stated that they had been in the habit of meeting before dawn on certain days; that they sang alternately a hymn to Christ as God. Instead of the expected disclosures as to seditious engagements, licentious orgies, and unnatural feasts, Pliny could only find that they bound themselves by an oath to abstain from theft, adultery, and breach of promise or trust; and that at a second meeting, later in the day, they partook in common of a simple and innocent meal (the agape or love-feast, which was connected with the Eucharist). He put two deaconesses to the torture; but even this cruelty failed to draw forth evidence of anything more criminal than a "perverse and immoderate superstition". In these circumstances Pliny asks the emperor with what penalties Christianity shall be visited; whether it shall be punished as in itself a crime, or only when found in combination with other offences; whether any difference shall be made between the treatment of the young and tender, and that of the more robust culprits; and whether a recantation shall be admitted as a title to pardon. He concludes by stating that the measures already taken had recovered many worshippers for the lately deserted temples, and by expressing the belief that a wise and moderate policy would produce far more numerous reconversions.

Trajan, in his answer, approves of the measures which Pliny had reported to him. He prefers entrusting the governor with a large discretionary power to laying down a rigid and

uniform rule for all cases. The Christians, he says, are not to be sought out; if detected and convicted, they are to be punished; but a denial of Christ is to be admitted as clearing the accused, and no anonymous information are to be received against them.

The policy indicated in these letters has been assailed by the sarcasm of Tertullian, and his words have often been echoed and quoted with approbation by later writers—forgetful that the conduct of Trajan and his minister ought to be estimated, not by the standard either of true religion or of strict and consistent reasoning, but as that of heathen statesmen. We may deplore the insensibility which led these eminent men to set down our faith as a wretched fanaticism, instead of being drawn by the moral beauty of the little which they were able to ascertain into a deeper inquiry, which might have ended in their own conversion. We may dislike the merely political view which, without taking any cognizance of religious truth, regarded religion only as an affair of state, and punished dissent from the legal system as a crime against the civil authority. We may pity the blindness which was unable to discern the inward and spiritual strength of Christianity, and supposed that a judicious mixture of indulgence and severity would in no long time extinguish it. But if we fairly consider the position from which Trajan and Pliny were obliged to regard the question, instead of joining in the apologist's complaints against the logical inconsistency of their measures, we shall be unable to refuse the praise of wise liberality to the system of conniving at the existence of the new religion, unless when it should be so forced on the notice of the government as to compel the execution of the laws.

Under Trajan took place the martyrdom of Ignatius—one of the most celebrated facts in early church-history, not only on its own account, but because of the interest attached to the epistles which bear the name of the venerable bishop. The birthplace of Ignatius is matter of conjecture, and his early history is unknown. He is described as a hearer of St. John; and he was raised to the bishopric of Antioch, as the successor of Enodius, about the year 70. For nearly half a century he had governed that church, seated in the capital of Syria, a city which numbered 200,000 inhabitants; and to the authority of his position was added that of a wise and saintly character.

It is uncertain to which of the visits which Trajan paid to Antioch the fate of Ignatius ought to be referred. The Acts of his martyrdom relate that he “was voluntarily led” before the emperor—an expression which may mean either that he was led as a criminal, without attempting resistance or escape; or that he himself desired to be conducted into Trajan’s presence, with a view of setting forth the case of the Christians, and with the resolution, if his words should fail of success, to sacrifice himself for his faith and for his people. The details of the scene with the emperor are suspicious, as the speeches attributed to Trajan appear to be too much in the vein of a theatrical tyrant; his sentence was, that Ignatius should be carried to Rome, and there exposed to wild beasts. Perhaps the emperor may have hoped to overcome the constancy of the aged bishop by the fatigues of the long journey, and by the terrors of the death which awaited him. At least we may suppose him to have reckoned on striking fear into other Christians, by the spectacle of a man so venerable in character and so eminent in place hurried over sea and land to a dreadful and degrading death—the punishment of the lowest criminals, and especially of persons convicted of those magical practices which were commonly imputed to the Christians. Perhaps he may even have thought that the exemplary punishment of one conspicuous leader would operate as a mercy to the multitude, by deterring them from the forbidden religion; and we find in fact that, while the victim was on his way to Rome, his church, which he had left to the charge of God as its *Pastor*, was allowed to remain in peace.

Ignatius, who had welcomed his condemnation, and had willingly submitted to be bound, was committed to the charge of ten soldiers, who treated him with great harshness. They conducted him to Seleucia, and thence by sea to Smyrna, where he was received by the bishop, Polycarp—like himself a disciple of St. John, and destined to be a martyr for the

Gospel. The report of his sentence and of his intended route had reached the churches of Asia; and from several of these deputations of bishops and clergy had been sent to Smyrna, with the hope of mingling with him in Christian consolation, and perhaps of receiving some spiritual gift from him. He charged the bishops of Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles, with letters addressed to their respective churches; and, as some members of the Ephesian church were proceeding to Rome by a more direct way than that which he was himself about to take, he seized the opportunity of writing by them to his brethren in the capital. At Troas he was met by the bishop of Philadelphia; and thence he wrote to that church, as also to the Smyrnaeans, and to their bishop, Polycarp.

The epistles to the churches are in general full of solemn and affectionate exhortation. The venerable writer recalls to the minds of his readers the great truths of the Gospel—dwelling with especial force on the reality of our Lord's manhood, and of the circumstances of His history, by way of warning against the docetic errors which had begun to infest the Asiatic churches even during the lifetime of St. John. A tendency to Judaism (or rather to heresies of a judaizing character) is also repeatedly denounced. Submission to the episcopal authority is strongly inculcated throughout. Ignatius charges the churches to do nothing without their bishops; he compares the relation of presbyters to bishops with that of the strings to the harp; he exhorts that obedience given to the bishops as to Christ himself and to the Almighty Father. The frequent occurrence of such exhortations, and the terms in which the episcopal office is extolled, have been, in later times, the chief inducements to question the genuineness of the epistles altogether, or to suppose that they have been largely interpolated with the view of serving a hierarchical interests. It must, however, be remembered that the question is not whether a ministry of three orders was by this time organized, but merely whether Ignatius' estimation of the episcopal dignity were somewhat higher or lower; and it has been truly remarked that the intention of the passages in question is not to exalt the hierarchy, but to persuade to Christian unity, of which the episcopate was the visible keystone.

The Epistle to the Romans is written in a more ardent strain than the others. In it Ignatius bears witness to the faith and the good deeds of the Church of Rome. He expresses an eager desire for the crown of martyrdom, and entreats that the Romans will not, through mistaken kindness, attempt to prevent his fate. "I am", he says, "the wheat of God; let me be ground by the teeth of beasts, that I may be found the pure bread of Christ. Rather do you encourage the beasts that they may become my tomb, and may leave nothing of my body, so that when dead I may not be troublesome to any one". He declares that he wishes the lions to exercise all their fierceness on him; that if, as in some other cases, they should show any unwillingness, he will himself provoke them to attack him.

It has been asked whether these expressions were agreeable to the spirit of the Gospel. Surely we need not hesitate to answer. The aspirations of a tried and matured saint are not to be classed with that headstrong spirit which at a later time led some persons to provoke persecution and death, so that the church saw fit to restrain it by refusing the honours of martyrdom to those who should suffer in consequence of their own violence. Rather they are to be regarded as a repetition of St. Paul's "readiness to be offered up"; of his desire "to depart and to be with Christ". To a man like Ignatius, such a death might reasonably seem as a token of the acceptance of his labours; while it afforded him an opportunity of signally witnessing to the Gospel, and of becoming an offering for his flock.

From Troas he took ship for Neapolis in Macedonia; thence he crossed the continent to Epidamnus, where he again embarked; and, after sailing round the south of Italy, he landed at Portus (Porto), near Ostia. His keepers hurried him towards Rome—fearing lest they should not arrive in time for the games at which it was intended to expose him. On the way he was met by some brethren from the city, whom he entreated, even more earnestly than in his letter, that they would do nothing to avert his death and, after having prayed in concert with them for the peace of the church, and for the continuance of love among the faithful, he was carried to

the amphitheater, where he suffered in the sight of the crowds assembled on the last day of the Sigillaria—a festival annexed to the Saturnalia. It is related that, agreeably to the wish which he had expressed, no part of his body was left, except a few of the larger and harder bones; and that these were collected by his brethren, and reverently conveyed to Antioch, being received with honour by the churches on the way.

Within a few months after the martyrdom of Ignatius (if the late date of it be correct), Trajan was succeeded by Hadrian. The new emperor—able, energetic, inquisitive and versatile, but capricious, paradoxical, and a slave to a restless vanity—was not likely to appreciate Christianity rightly. It is, however, altogether unjust to class him (as was once usual) among the persecutors of the church; for there is no ground for supposing him to have been personally concerned in the persecutions which took place during the earlier years of his reign, and under him the condition of the Christians was greatly improved.

The rescript of Trajan to Pliny had both its favourable and its unfavourable side : while it discouraged anonymous and false information, it distinctly marked the profession of the Gospel as a crime to be punished on conviction; and very soon a way was found to deprive the Christians of such protection as they might have hoped to derive from the hazardous nature of the informer's office. They were no longer attacked by individual accusers; but at public festivals the multitudes assembled in the amphitheatres learnt to call for a sacrifice of the Christians, as wretches whose impiety was the cause of floods and earthquakes, of plagues, famines, and defeats; and it was seldom that a governor dared to refuse such a demand.

A visit of Hadrian to Athens, when he was initiated into the mysteries of Eleusis, excited the heathen inhabitants with the hope of gratifying their hatred of the Christians; and the occasion induced two of these—Quadratus, who had been an “evangelist”, or missionary, and Aristides, a converted philosopher—to address the emperor in written arguments for their religion. The “Apologies” appear to have been well received; and they became the first in a series of works which powerfully and effectively set forth the truth of the Gospel, in contrast with the fables and the vices of heathenism. About the same time a plea for justice and toleration was offered by a heathen magistrate. Serennius Granianus, when about to leave the proconsulship of Asia, represented to Hadrian the atrocities which were committed in compliance with the popular clamours against the Christians; and the emperor, in consequence, addressed letters to Minucius Fundanus, the successor of Granianus, and to other provincial governors. He orders that the Christians should no longer be given up to the outcries of the multitude; if convicted of any offence, they are to be sentenced according to their deserts; but the forms of law must be duly observed, and the authors of unfounded charges are to be severely punished. This rescript was valuable, as affording protection against a new form of persecution; but it was still far from establishing a complete toleration, since it omitted to define whether Christianity were in itself a crime, and thus left the matter to the discretion or caprice of the local magistrates.

The reign of Hadrian was very calamitous for the Jews. In the last years of Trajan there had been Jewish insurrections in Egypt, Cyprus, Mesopotamia, and elsewhere, which had been put down with great severity, and had drawn fresh oppressions on the whole people. By these, and especially by the insult which Hadrian offered to their religion, in settling a Roman colony on the site of the holy city, the Jews of Palestine were excited to a formidable revolt, under a leader who assumed the name of Barcochab, and was believed by his followers to be the Messiah. After a protracted and very bloody war, the revolt was suppressed. Many Jews were put to death, some were sold at the price of horses, others were transported from the land of their fathers; and no Jew was allowed to approach Jerusalem except on one day in the year—the anniversary of the capture by Titus, when, for a heavy payment, they were admitted to mourn over the seat of their fallen greatness. The Roman city of Aelia Capitolina was built on the foundations of Jerusalem; a temple of Jupiter defiled Mount Zion; and it is said that

profanations of a like kind were committed in the places hallowed by the birth, the death, and the burial of our Lord.

While the revolt was as yet successful, the Christians of Palestine suffered severely for refusing to acknowledge Barcochab. The measures of Hadrian, after its suppression, led to an important change in the church of Jerusalem. Wishing to disconnect themselves visibly from the Jews, the majority of its members abandoned the Mosaic usages which they had until then retained; they chose for the first time a bishop of Gentile race, and conformed to the practice of Gentile churches. On these conditions they were allowed to reside in Aelia, while such of their brethren as still adhered to the distinctively Jewish Christianity retired to Pella and other places beyond the Jordan, where their fathers had found a refuge during the siege of Jerusalem by Titus.

CHAPTER III.

THE REIGNS OF THE ANTONINES
A.D. 138-180.

The rescripts of the last two emperors had done much protection of the Christians; and their condition was yet further improved during the peaceful reign of the elder Antoninus. Finding that the provincial governors in general refused to punish the profession of the Gospel as in itself criminal, its enemies now had recourse to charges of atheism—an imputation which seems to have originated in the circumstance that the Christians were without the usual externals of worship—temples and altars, images and sacrifices. The custom of ascribing all public calamities to them, and of calling for their blood as an atonement to the offended gods, still continued; and the magistrates of several cities in Greece requested the emperor's directions as to the course which should be taken in consequence. Antoninus wrote in reply, confirming the edict of Hadrian, that the Christians should not be punished, unless for crimes against the state. Another document, however, in which he is represented as instructing the council of Asia to put to death all who should molest the Christians on account of their religion, is now generally regarded as spurious.

The cause of the persecuted body was pleaded by Justin, usually styled the Martyr, in an apology addressed to the emperor, his adopted sons, the senate, and the people of Rome. Justin was a native of Flavia Neapolis, a town of Greek population and language, on the site of the ancient Sychem, in Samaria. He has himself, in his Dialogue with the Jew Trypho, related the progress of his religious opinions : how—induced, as it would seem, rather by a desire to discover some solid foundation of belief than by any speculative turn of minds—he tried in succession the most popular forms of Greek philosophy; how in one after another he was disgusted, either by the defectiveness of the doctrine or by the character of the teacher; how, after having taken up the profession of Platonism, he was walking on the sea-shore in deep meditation, when he was accosted by an old man of mild and reverend appearance, who told him that his studies were unpractical and useless, directed him to the Prophets and the New Testament, and exhorted him to pray “that the gates of light might be opened” to him. The convictions which arose in Justin’s mind from the course of reading thus suggested were strengthened by his observation of the constancy with which Christians endured persecution and death for the sake of their faith—a spectacle by which he had even before been persuaded that the popular charges against their morals must be unfounded. With a fullness of belief such as he had never felt in any of the systems through which he had passed, he embraced the Christian faith, and he devoted himself to the defense and propagation of it. He travelled in Egypt, Asia, and elsewhere, retaining the garb of a philosopher, which invested him with an air of authority, and was serviceable in procuring a hearing for his doctrines; but his usual residence was at Rome, where he established a school of Christian philosophy.

Justin’s First *Apology* contains a bold remonstrance against the iniquity of persecuting Christians for their religion, while all other parties were allowed to believe and to worship according to their conscience. In this and in the other writings by which he maintained the cause of the Gospel against its various adversaries— heathens, Jews, and heretics—he refutes the usual calumnies, the charges of atheism and immorality, of political disaffection and

sedition. He appeals to the evidence of prophecy and miracles, to the purity of the New Testament morality, to the lives of his brethren, their love even for their enemies, their disinterestedness, their firmness in confessing the faith, their patience in suffering for it. No one, he says, had ever believed Socrates in such a manner as to die for his philosophy; but multitudes, even in the lowest ranks, had braved danger and death in the cause of Christ. He dwells on the chief points of Christian doctrine, and elaborately discusses the resurrection of the body, an article which was especially difficult to the apprehension of the heathens. He vindicates the character and the miracles of our Lord; he rebuts the arguments drawn from the novelty of his religion, and from the depressed condition of its professors, which their enemies regarded as a disproof of their pretensions to the favor of the Almighty; he argues from the progress which the Gospel had already made, although unaided by earthly advantages. Nor is he content with defending his own creed; he attacks the corruptions and absurdities of Paganism, not only in its popular and poetical form, but as it appeared in the more refined interpretations of the philosophers; he exposes the foul abominations of heathen morals, and tells his opponents that the crimes which they slanderously imputed to the Christians might more truly be charged on themselves.

Justin often insists on the analogies which are to be found between the doctrines of Plato and those of Holy Scripture. He derives the wisdom of the Greeks from the Jews, through the medium of Egypt, and ascribes the corruptions of it to demons, who, according to him, had worked by such means to raise a prejudice against the reception of Christian doctrine. He held that the good men of antiquity, such as Socrates and Heraclitus, had been guided by a partial illumination of the Divine Logos, and that, because they strove to live by this light, the demons had raised persecutions against them. Justin therefore urges his heathen readers to embrace that wisdom which had been imperfectly vouchsafed to the sages of their religion, but was now offered in fullness to all men. While, however, he thus referred to heathen philosophy by way of illustration, and represented it as a preparation for Christianity, he was careful not to admit it as supplementary to the Gospel or as an element of adulteration.

Although it is a mistake to suppose that the apologies of the early writers were mere exercises, composed without any intention of presenting them to the princes who are addressed, there is no evidence that Justin's First Apology produced any effect on Antoninus, or contributed to suggest the emperor's measures in favor of the Christians. The Roman political view of religion was, indeed, not to be disturbed by argument. All that the magistrate had to care for was a conformity to the established rites— a conformity which was considered to be a duty towards the state, but was not supposed to imply any inward conviction. The refusal of compliance by the Christians, therefore, was an unintelligible scruple, which statesmen could only regard, with Pliny, as a criminal obstinacy.

The elder Antoninus was succeeded in 161 by his adopted son Marcus Aurelius. Under this emperor—celebrated as he is for benevolence, justice, intelligence, and philosophic culture—the state of the Christians was worse than in any former reign, except that of Nero; if, indeed, even this exception ought to be made, since Nero's persecution was probably limited to Rome. The gradual advance towards toleration, which had continued ever since the death of Domitian, is now succeeded by a sudden retrograde movement. The enmity against Christians is no longer peculiar to the populace, but local governors and judges are found to take spontaneously an active part in persecution. Now, for the first time, they seek out the victims, in contravention of the principle laid down by Trajan instead of discouraging information, they invite or instigate them; they apply torture with the view of forcing a recantation; in order to obtain evidence, they not only violate the ancient law which forbade the admission of slaves as witnesses against their masters, but even wring out the testimony of reluctant slaves by torture.

In explanation of the contrast between the general character of Marcus and his policy towards the church, it has been suggested that, in his devotion to philosophical studies, he

may have neglected to bestow due care on the direction and superintendence of the officers by whom the government of the empire was administered; that he may have shared no further in the persecutions of his reign than by carelessly allowing them to be carried on. But this supposition would appear to be inconsistent with facts; for, although no express law of this date against the Christians is extant, it is almost certain that the persecuting measures were sanctioned by new and severe edicts proceeding from the emperor himself; and we are not without the materials for a more satisfactory solution of the seeming contradiction.

The reign was a period of great public disasters and calamities. A fearful pestilence ravaged the countries from Ethiopia to Gaul; the Tiber rose in flood, destroying among other buildings the public granaries, and causing a famine in the capital; the empire was harassed by long wars on the eastern and northern frontiers, and by the revolt of its most distinguished general in Syria. All such troubles were ascribed to the wrath of the gods, which the Christians were supposed to have provoked. The old tales of atheism and abominable practices, however often refuted, continued to keep their ground in the popular belief; and it appears on investigation that the fiercest renewals of persecution coincided in time with the chief calamities of the reign. The heathen, high as well as low, were terrified into a feeling that the chastisements of Heaven demanded a revival of their sunken religion; they restored its neglected solemnities, they offered sacrifices of unusual costliness, they anxiously endeavored to remove whatever might be supposed offensive to the gods.

The emperor, as a sincerely religious heathen, shared in the general feeling; nor were his private opinions such as to dispose him favorably towards the Christians, whom it would appear that he knew only through the representations of their enemies the philosophers. The form of philosophy to which he was himself addicted—the Stoic—was very opposite in tone to the Gospel. It may be described as aristocratic—a system for the elevated few; it would naturally lead its followers to scorn as vulgar a doctrine which professed to be for all ranks of society and for every class of minds. The firmness of the Stoic was to be the result of correct reasoning; the emperor himself, in his “Meditations”, illustrates the true philosophical calmness by saying that it must not be like the demeanor of the Christians in death, which he regards as enthusiastic and theatrical. And the enthusiasm was infectious; the sect extended throughout, and even beyond, the empire; already its advocates began to boast of the wonderful progress of their doctrines; and the circumstances thus alleged in its favor might suggest to the mind of an unfriendly statesman a fear of dangerous combinations and movements. If, too, the prosperity of a nation depended on its gods, the triumph over paganism which the Christians anticipated must, it was thought, imply the ruin of the empire. A “kingdom not of this world” was an idea which the heathen could not understand; nor was their alarm without countenance from the language of many Christians, for not only was the Apocalypse interpreted as foretelling the downfall of pagan Rome, but pretended prophecies, such as the Sibylline verses, spoke of it openly, and in a tone of exultation.

It was long believed that Marcus, in the latter years of his reign, changed his policy towards the Christians, in consequence of a miraculous deliverance which he had experienced in one of his campaigns against the Quadi. His army was hemmed in by the barbarians; the soldiers were exhausted by wounds and fatigue, and parched by the rays of a burning sun. In this distress (it is said) a legion composed of Christians stepped forward and knelt down in prayer; on which the sky was suddenly overspread with clouds, and a copious shower descended for the refreshment of the Romans, who took off their helmets to catch the rain. While they were thus partly unarmed, and intent only on quenching their thirst, the enemy attacked them; but a violent storm of lightning and hail arose, which drove full against the barbarians, and enabled the imperial forces to gain an easy victory. It is added that the interposition of the God of Christians was acknowledged; that the emperor bestowed the name of Fulminatrix on the legion whose prayers had been so effectual; and that he issued an edict in favor of their religion.

In refutation of this story it has been shown that, while the deliverance is attested by heathen as well as Christian writers, by coins, and by a representation on the Antonine column at Rome, it is ascribed by the heathens to Jupiter or Mercury, and is said to have been procured either by the arts of an Egyptian magician or by the prayers of the emperor himself; that the idea of a legion consisting exclusively of Christians is absurd; that the title of Fulminatrix was as old as the time of Augustus; and that the worst persecutions of the reign were later than the date of the supposed edict of toleration. But, although the miracle of 44 the Thundering Legion is now generally abandoned, the story may have arisen without any intentional deceit. For the deliverance of the army in the Quadian war is certain; and we may safely assume that there were Christian soldiers in the imperial force, that they prayed in their distress, and that they rightly ascribed their relief to the mercy of God. We have then only to suppose, further, that some Christian, ignorant of military antiquities, connected this event with the name of the Legio Fulminatrix; and the other circumstances are such as might have easily been added to the tale in the course of its transmission.

The most eminent persons who suffered death under Marcus Aurelius were Justin and Polycarp. Early in the reign Justin was induced by the martyrdom of some Christians at Rome to compose a second Apology, in which he expressed an expectation that he himself might soon fall a victim to the arts of his enemies, and especially of one Crescens, a Cynic, who is described as a very vile member of his repulsive sect. The apprehension was speedily verified; and Justin, after having borne himself in his examination with firmness and dignity, was beheaded at Rome, and earned the glorious title which usually accompanies his name.

The martyrdom of Justin was followed by that of Polycarp—a man whose connection with the apostolic age invested him with an altogether peculiar title to reverence in the time to which he had survived. He had been a disciple of St. John, who is supposed to have placed him in the see of Smyrna. It was perhaps Polycarp who was addressed as the “angel” of that church in the Apocalypse; and we have already noticed his correspondence with the martyr Ignatius. Towards the end of the reign of Pius, Polycarp had visited Rome—partly, although not exclusively, for the purpose of discussing a question which had arisen between the churches of Asia and those of other countries as to the time of keeping Easter. It had been the practice of the Asiatics to celebrate the paschal supper on the fourteenth day of the first Jewish month—the same day on which the Jews ate the Passover; and three days later, without regard to the day of the week, they kept the feast of the resurrection. Other churches, on the contrary, held it unlawful to interrupt the fast of the holy week, or to celebrate the resurrection on any other day than the first; their Easter, consequently, was always on a Sunday, and their paschal supper was on its eve. The Asiatic or quartodeciman practice was traced to St. John and St. Philip; that of other churches, to St. Peter and St. Paul.

Polycarp was received at Rome by the bishop, Anicetus, with the respect due to his personal character, to his near connection with the apostles, to his advanced age, and to his long tenure of the episcopal office—for Anicetus was the seventh bishop of Rome since his guest had been set over the church of Smyrna. The discussion of the paschal question was carried on with moderation; it was agreed that on such a matter a difference of practice might be allowed; and Anicetus, in token of fellowship and regard, allowed the Asiatic bishop to consecrate the Eucharist in his presence.

During his residence at Rome, Polycarp succeeded in recovering many persons who had been perverted to heresy by Valentinus, Marcion, and Marcellina, a female professor of Gnosticism. It is said also that he had a personal encounter with Marcion, and that when the heresiarch (probably with reference to some former acquaintance in Asia) asked him for a sign of recognition, his answer was, “I know thee for the firstborn of Satan”.

The martyrdom of Polycarp is related in a letter composed in the name of his church. Persecution had begun to rage in Asia, and many of the Smyrnaean Christians had suffered with admirable constancy; but one who had at first been forward in exposing himself was

afterwards persuaded to sacrifice, and from his case the writers of the letter take occasion to discourage the practice of voluntarily courting persecution. The multitude was enraged at the sight of the fortitude which the martyrs displayed, and a cry arose, "Away with the atheists! Seek out Polycarp!". The behavior of the venerable bishop, when thus demanded as a victim, was worthy of his character for Christian prudence and sincerity. At the persuasion of his friends he withdrew to a neighboring village, from which he afterwards removed to another; and, on being discovered in his second retreat, he calmly said, "God's will be done!" He ordered food to be set before his captors, and spent in fervent prayer the time which was allowed him before he was carried off to the city. As he entered the arena, he is said to have heard a voice from heaven—"Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man!", and it is added that many of his brethren also heard it. On his appearance the spectators were greatly excited, and broke out into loud clamours. The proconsul exhorted him to purchase liberty by renouncing his faith; but he replied, "Fourscore and six years have I served Christ, and he hath done me no wrong; how can I now blaspheme my King and Saviour", nor could the proconsul shake his resolution either by renewed solicitations, or by threatening him with the beasts and with fire. The multitude cried out for the bishop's death, and he was condemned to be burnt—a sentence of which he is said to have before received an intimation by a vision of a fiery pillow. A quantity of wood was soon collected, and it is noted by the narrator that the Jews, "as was their custom", showed themselves especially zealous in the work. In compliance with his own request that he might not be fastened with the usual iron cramps, as he trusted that God would enable him steadfastly to endure the flames, Polycarp was tied to the stake with cords, and in that position he uttered a thanksgiving for the privilege of glorifying God by his death. The pile was then kindled, but the flame, instead of touching him, swept around him "like the sail of a ship filled with wind", while his body appeared in the midst, "not like flesh that is burnt, but like bread that is baked, or like gold and silver glowing in a furnace and a perfume as of frankincense or spices filled the air". As the fire seemingly refused to do its office, one of the executioners stabbed the martyr with a sword, whereupon there issued forth a profusion of blood sufficient to quench the flames. The heathens and the Jews then burnt the body—out of fear, as they said, lest the Christians should worship Polycarp instead of "the Crucified",—an apprehension by which, as the church of Smyrna remarks, they manifested an utter ignorance of Christian doctrine. The brethren were therefore obliged to content themselves with collecting some of the bones, and bestowing on them an honorable burial. As in the case of Ignatius, the death of the bishop procured a respite for his flock.

At a later time in the reign of Marcus Aurelius a violent persecution took place in the south of Gaul. The church of Lyons and Vienne was of eastern, and comparatively recent, origin; it was still under the care of Pothinus, the head of the mission by which the Gospel had been introduced. In the year 177 when the empire was alarmed by renewed apprehensions of the German war, the Christians of these cities found themselves the objects of outrage; they were insulted and attacked in the streets, their houses were entered and plundered. The eagerness of the authorities to second the popular feeling on this occasion appears in striking contrast with the practice of earlier times. Orders were given to search out the Christians; by the illegal application of torture, some heathen slaves were brought to charge their masters with the abominations of Oedipus and Thyestes; and the victims were then tortured in various ways, and were imprisoned in dungeons where noisomeness and privation were fatal to many. The bishop, a man upwards of ninety years old, and infirm both from age and from sickness, was dragged before the governor, who asked him, "Who is the God of Christians?". "If thou art worthy", answered Pothinus, "thou shalt know". He was scourged without mercy by the officers of the court, and was beaten, kicked, and pelted by the crowd; after which he was carried almost lifeless to a prison, where he died within two days. A distinction was made as to the manner of death between persons of different conditions: slaves were crucified, provincials were exposed to beasts, and the emperor, on being consulted as to the manner of

dealing with those who claimed the privilege of Roman citizenship, ordered that such of them as adhered to their faith should be beheaded. Yet notwithstanding this, an Asiatic named Attalus, although a citizen of Rome, was tortured and was exposed to beasts. When placed in a heated iron chair, he calmly remarked, as the smell of his burning flesh arose, that his persecutors were guilty of the cannibalism which they falsely imputed to the Christians.

The behavior of the sufferers was throughout marked by composure and sobriety. They succeeded by their prayers and by their arguments in persuading some of their brethren, who had at first yielded to the fear of death, to confess their Lord, and to give themselves for him. A slave, named Blandina, was distinguished above all the other martyrs for the variety of tortures which she endured. Her mistress, a Christian, had feared that the constancy of a slave might give way in time of trial; but Blandina's character had been formed, not by her condition, but by the faith which she professed. Her patience wearied out the inventive cruelty of her tormentors, and amidst her greatest agonies she found strength and relief in repeating, "I am a Christian, and no wickedness is done among us".

The malice of the heathen did not end with the death of their victims. They cast their bodies to the dogs; they burnt such fragments as were left uneaten, and threw the ashes into the Rhone, in mockery of the doctrine of a resurrection.

In this reign began the controversial opposition on the side of Paganism. The leader in it, Celsus, a man of a showy but shallow cleverness, who is generally supposed to have been an Epicurean, although in his attack he affected the character of a Platonist, reflected on Christianity for its barbarous" origin, and charged it with having borrowed from the Egyptians, from Plato, and from other heathen sources. He assailed the scriptural narrative—sometimes confounding Christianity with Judaism, at another time laboring to prove the Old Testament inconsistent with the New, at another introducing a Jew as the mouthpiece for his objections against the Gospel. The lowness of the Saviour's early birth, the poverty of the first disciples, the humble station, the simplicity, the credulity, of Christians in his own day, furnished Celsus with ample matter for merriment, which was sometimes of a very ribald character. He ascribed the miracles of Scripture to magic, and taxed the Christians with addiction to practices of the same kind. He freely censured both the doctrines and the morality of the Gospel, nor was he ashamed even to denounce its professors as neglectful of their duties to society, and as dangerous to the government of the empire. Utterly futile and worthless as the work of Celsus appears to have been, it continued for a century to be regarded as the chief of those written against Christianity. It was at length honored with a full and elaborate confutation by Origen; but in the meantime the Gospel did not want able advocates, who maintained its cause both in apologies and in treatises of other kinds. Among the apologists were Melito, bishop of Sardis; Theophilus, bishop of Antioch; Athenagoras, an Athenian philosopher, who is said to have been converted by a perusal of the Scriptures, which he had undertaken with the view of refuting Christianity; Claudius Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis; Miltiades; and Tatian, an Assyrian by birth, who had been a pupil of Justin Martyr. Tatian afterwards gained a more unhappy celebrity as the founder of the sect of Encratites. His tenets and those of his contemporary Bardesanes of Edessa (whose hymns found their way even into the congregations of the orthodox), need not be further described than by saying that they both belonged to the gnostic family. A sect of a different character—that of Montanus—had also its rise in the reign of Marcus; but a notice of it may be more fitly given at a somewhat later date, and we must now turn back to survey the heresies which had already disturbed the church.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EARLY HERETICS.

Hegesippus and Clement of Alexandria have been derided by the greatest of English historians as having stated that the church was not polluted by schism or heresy until the reign of Trajan, or that of Hadrian; and it is added, "We may observe, with much more propriety, that during [the earlier] period the disciples of the Messiah were indulged in a freer latitude, both of faith and practice, than has ever been allowed in succeeding ages". In reality, however, the fathers who are cited make no such assertion as is here supposed; their words relate, not to the appearance of the first symptoms of error, but to the distinct formation of bodies which at once claimed the Christian name and held doctrines different from those of the church. Nor has the remark which is offered by way of correction any other truth than this,—that the measures of the church for the protection of her members against erroneous teaching were taken only as the development of evil made them necessary. The New Testament itself bears ample witness both to the existence of false doctrine during the lifetime of the apostles, and to the earnestness with which they endeavored to counteract it. Among the persons who are there censured by name, some appear to be taxed with faults of practice only; but of others the opinions are condemned. Thus it is said of Hymenaeus that he had "made shipwreck concerning the faith"; that he had "erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already"; and Alexander and Philetus are included in the same charges. In St. Paul's Epistles, besides those passages which bear a controversial character on their surface, there are many in which a comparison with the language of early heresy may lead us to discern such a character. And the same may be observed of other apostolical writings; those of St. John especially are throughout marked by a reference to prevailing errors, and to the language in which these were clothed. And long before the probable date of any Christian scripture, we meet with him who has always been regarded as the father of heresy—the magician Simon of Samaria.

In reading of the ancient heretics we must remember that the accounts of them come from their enemies; and our own experience will show us how easily misunderstanding or misrepresentation of an opponent may creep in even where there is no unfair intention. We must not be too ready to believe evil; we must beware of confounding the opinions of heresiarchs with those of their followers; and especially we must beware of too easily supposing that the founders of sects were unprincipled or profligate men, since by so doing we should not only, in many cases, be wrong as to the fact, but should forego an important lesson. The "fruits" by which "false prophets" shall be known are not to be sought in their own personal conduct (which may be inconsistent, either for the worse or for the better, with their teaching), but in the results which follow from their principles,—in their developed doctrines and maxims, and in those of their disciples.

But, on the other hand, if the ancients, and those who have implicitly followed them in treating such subjects, must be read with caution, it is no less necessary to be on our guard against the theories and statements of some moderns, who are ready to sympathize with every reputed heretic, to represent him as only too far elevated by genius and piety above the church of his own day, and conjecturally to fill up the gaps of his system, to explain away its absurdities, and to harmonize its contradictions. A writer who endeavors to enter into the mind

of a heresiarch, and to trace the course of his ideas, is, indeed, more likely to help us towards an understanding of the matter than one who sets out with the presumption that the man's deliberate purpose was to vent detestable blasphemies, and to ruin the souls of his followers; and we may often draw instruction or warning from Beausobre or Neander, where the orthodox vehemence of Epiphanius or Baronius would only tempt us to question whether opinions so extravagant as those which are imputed to heretical parties could ever have been really held by any one. Yet we must not assume that things cannot have been because the idea of them appears monstrous; we must remember that even the most ingenious conjecture may be mistaken; and, if the conclusions of a system as to faith or morals are abominable, we may not speak of such a system with admiration or indulgence on account of any poetical beauty or philosophical depth which may appear to be mixed up with its errors.

The systems of the earliest heretical teachers were for the most part of the class called Gnostic,—a name which implies pretensions to more than ordinary knowledge. It is disputed whether St. Paul intended to refer to this sense of the word in his warning against “knowledge falsely so called”; but although it seems most likely that the peculiar use of the term did not begin until later, the thing itself certainly existed in the time of the apostles. The Gnostics were for the most part so remote in their tenets from the Christian belief that they would now be classed rather with utter aliens from the Gospel than with heretics; but in early times the title of heretic was given to all who in any way whatever introduced the name of Christ into their systems, so that, as has been remarked, if Mahomet had appeared in the second century, Justin Martyr or Irenaeus would have spoken of him as an heretic. On looking at the strange opinions which are thus brought before us, we may wonder how they could ever have been adopted by any to whom the Christian faith had been made known. But a consideration of the circumstances will lessen our surprise; Gnosticism is in truth not to be regarded as a corruption of Christianity, but as an adoption of some Christian elements into a system of different origin.

At the time when the Gospel appeared, a remarkable mixture had taken place in the existing systems of religion and philosophy. The Jews had during their captivity become acquainted with the Chaldaean and Persian doctrines : many of them had remained in the east, and a constant communication was kept up between the descendants of these and their brethren of the Holy Land. Thus the belief of the later Jews had been much tinged with oriental ideas, especially as to angels and spiritual beings. The prevailing form of Greek philosophy—the Platonic—had, from the first, contained elements of eastern origin; and in later days the intercourse of nations had led to a large adoption of foreign additions. The great city of Alexandria, in particular, which was afterwards to be the cradle of Gnosticism, became a centre of philosophical speculations. In its schools were represented the doctrines of Egypt, of Greece, of Palestine, and indirectly those of Persia and Chaldea—themselves affected by the systems of India and the further east. The prevailing tone of mind was eclectic; all religions were regarded as having in them something divine, while no one was supposed to possess a full and sufficient revelation. Hence ideas were borrowed from one to fill up the deficiency of another. Hence systems became so intermingled, and were so modified by each other, that learned men have differed as to the origin of Gnosticism—some referring it chiefly to Platonism, while others trace it to oriental sources. Hence, too, we can understand how Christianity came to be combined with notions so strangely unlike itself. The same eclectic principle which had produced the fusion of other systems, led speculative minds to adopt something from the Gospel; they took only so much as was suitable for their purpose, and they interpreted this at will. The substance of each system is Platonic, or oriental, or derived from the later Judaism; the Scriptural terms which are introduced are used in senses altogether different from that which they bear in Christian theology.

The especial characteristic of the Gnostics was (as has been stated) a pretension to superior knowledge. By this the more elevated spirits were to be distinguished from the

vulgar, for whom faith and traditional opinion were said to be sufficient; the Gnostics sometimes complained of it as an injustice that they were excluded from the communion of the church, whereas they were willing to leave the multitude in possession of the common creed, and only claimed for themselves the privilege of understanding doctrine in an inner and more refined sense. On such a principle the Old Testament had been interpreted by Philo of Alexandria, the type of a Platonizing Jew; and now the principle was applied to the New Testament, from which texts were produced by way of sanction for it. As for the older Scriptures, the Gnostics either rejected them altogether, or perverted them by an unlimited license of allegorical explanation.

We find, as common to all the Gnostic systems, a belief in one supreme God, dwelling from eternity in the *pleroma*, or fullness of light. From him proceed forth successive generations of *aeons*, or spiritual beings, the chief of which appear from their names to be impersonated attributes of the Deity; and in proportion as these emanations are more remote from the primal source, the likeness of his perfections in them becomes continually fainter. Matter is regarded as eternal, and as essentially evil. Out of it the world was formed, not by the supreme God, but by the Demiurge—a being who is represented by some heresiarchs as merely a subordinate and unconscious instrument of the divine will, but by others as positively malignant, and hostile to the Supreme. This Demiurge (or creator) was the national God of the Jews—the God of the Old Testament; according, therefore, as he is viewed in each system, the Mosaic economy is either acknowledged as preparatory to a higher dispensation or rejected as evil. Christ was sent into the world to deliver man from the tyranny of the Demiurge. But the Christ of Gnosticism was neither very God nor very man; his spiritual nature, as being an emanation from the supreme God, was necessarily inferior to its original; and, on the other hand, an emanation from God could not dwell in a material, and consequently evil, body. Either, therefore, Jesus was a mere man, on whom the aeon Christ descended at his baptism, to forsake him again before his crucifixion; or the body with which Christ seemed to be clothed was a phantom, and all his actions were only in appearance.

Since matter was evil, the Gnostic was required to overcome it; but here arose an important practical difference among the sectaries; for while some of them sought the victory by a high ascetic abstraction from the things of sense, the baser kind professed to show their knowledge by wallowing in impurity and excess. The same view as to the evil nature of matter led to a denial of the resurrection of the body. The Gnostic could admit no other than a spiritual resurrection; the object of his philosophy was to emancipate the spirit from its gross and material prison; at death, the soul of the perfect Gnostic, having already risen in baptism, was to be gathered into the bosom of God, while such souls as yet lacked their full perfection were to work it out in a course of transmigrations. The contest of good with evil (it was taught) is to end in the victory of good. Every spark of life which originally came from God will be purified and restored, will return to its source, and will dwell with him for ever in the *pleroma*.

After this general sketch of the Gnostic doctrines, we may proceed to notice in detail a few of the most prominent among the early heretical systems.

First among the precursors of Gnosticism stands Simon, usually styled Magus or the Sorcerer, a native of the Samaritan village of Gittum, as to whom our information is partly derived from Scripture itself. He is supposed to have studied at Alexandria and, on returning to his native country, he advanced high spiritual pretensions, “giving out that himself was some great one”, and being generally acknowledged by the Samaritans as “the great power of God”. Simon belonged to a class of adventurers not uncommon in his day, who addressed themselves especially to that desire of intercourse with a higher world which was then widely felt. Their doctrines were a medley of Jewish, Greek, and Oriental notions; they affected mysteries and revelations; they practiced the arts of conjuration and divination; and it would seem that in many of them there was a mixture of conscious imposture with self-delusion and

superstitious credulity. Simon's reception of baptism, and his attempt to buy the privilege of conferring the Holy Ghost, may be interpreted as tokens of a belief that the apostles, through a knowledge of higher secrets or a connection with superior intelligences, possessed in a greater degree the same theurgic power to which he himself pretended. The feeling of awe with which he was struck by St. Peter's reproof and exhortation would seem to have been of very short continuance.

It is said that he afterwards roved through various countries, choosing especially those which the Gospel had not yet reached, and endeavoring to preoccupy the ground by his own system, into which the name of Christ was now introduced; that he bought at Tyre a beautiful prostitute, named Helena, who became the companion of his wanderings; that in the reign of Claudius he went to Rome, where he acquired great celebrity, and was honored with a statue in the island of the Tiber; that he there disputed with St. Peter and St. Paul (a circumstance which, if true, must be referred to a later visit, in the reign of Nero); that he attempted to fly in the air, and was borne up by his familiar demons, until at the prayer of St. Peter he fell to the earth; and that he died soon after, partly of the hurt which he had received, and partly of vexation at his discomfiture. Fabulous as parts of this story evidently are, it is yet possible that they may have had some foundation. There is no apparent reason for denying that Simon may have visited Rome, and may there have had contests with the two great apostles; and even the story of his flying may have arisen from an attempt which was really made by a Greek adventurer in the reign of Nero.

Simon is said to have taught that God existed from eternity in the depth of inaccessible light; that from him proceeded the Thought or Conception of his mind (*Ennoia*); that from God and the *Ennoia* emanated by successive generations pairs of male and female *aeons*. The *Ennoia*, issuing forth from the *pleroma*, produced a host of angels, by whom the world was made; and these angels, being ignorant of God and unwilling to acknowledge any author of their being, rose against their female parent, subjected her to various indignities, and imprisoned her in a succession of material bodies. Thus at one time she had animated the form of the beautiful wife of Menelaus; and at last she had taken up her abode in that of the Tyrian Helena, the companion of Simon. The *Ennoia* herself remained throughout a pure spiritual essence as at the first; the pollutions and degradations of the persons in whom she had dwelt attached only to their material bodies, and were a part of the oppressions inflicted on the divine *aeon*.

There are various statements as to the character which Simon claimed for himself. It has been said that he professed to be the supreme God, who (according to Simon) had revealed himself to the Samaritans as the Father, to the Jews as the Son, and to the Gentiles as the Holy Ghost; but it would seem rather that by professing to be the "great power of God" he meant to identify himself with the chief male *aeon* of his system.

He taught that man was held in subjection by the angels who created the world; that not only were the Mosaic dispensation and the Old Testament prophecies to be referred to these, but the received distinctions of right and wrong were invented by them for the purpose of enslaving mankind and consequently that those who should trust in Simon and Helena need not concern themselves with the observance of any moral rules, since they were to be saved, not by works of righteousness, but by grace. Simon professed that he himself had descended from the highest heaven for the purpose of rescuing the *Ennoia*—"the lost sheep", as he termed her—from the defilement of her fleshly prison, of revealing himself to men, and delivering them from the yoke of the angels. In passing through the spheres, he had in each assumed a suitable form; and thus on earth he appeared as a man. He was the same *aeon* who had been known as Jesus, the Messiah. The history of our Lord's life and death he explained on the docetic principle. The resurrection of the body was denied; but as the soul, when set free, must pass through several spheres on its way to the *pleroma*, and as the angels of those

spheres had the power of impeding its flight, it was necessary to propitiate them, evil as they were in themselves, by sacrifices.

According to St. Epiphanius, Simon said that Helena was the Holy Spirit. As, then, that Person of the Godhead was held by him to have enlightened the Gentiles— (not, however, in the Christian sense, but by means of the Greek philosophy)—Helena was thus identified with the Greek goddess of wisdom, and was represented and worshipped in the character of Minerva, while Simon received like honors under the form of Jupiter.

The followers of Simon were divided into various sects, which are said to have been addicted to necromancy and other magical arts, and to have carried out in practice his doctrine of the indifference of actions. Justin Martyr states that in his day (about A.D. 140) Simon was worshipped as the chief God by almost all the Samaritans, and had adherents in other countries; but the heresy declined so rapidly that Origen, about a century later, questions whether it had in the whole world so many as thirty adherents.

Passing over Menander, (whose doctrines were not so unlike those of his master, Simon, as to require a separate detail), and the Nicolaitans (as to whom nothing is known with certainty, beyond the denunciation of them in the Apocalypses), the next considerable name which we meet with is that of Cerinthus, who rose into notoriety in the reign of Domitian.

Cerinthus was a native of Judaea, and, after having studied at Alexandria, established himself as a teacher in his own country; but at a later time he removed to Ephesus, as being a more favorable scene for the diffusion of his opinions. St. John, who had been confronted with the father of heresy in the earliest days of the Gospel, was reserved for a contest with Cerinthus in the church over which he had long presided; both in his Gospel and in his Epistles a reference to the errors of this heresiarch appears to be strongly marked. Unlike his predecessors, Cerinthus was content to be a teacher, without claiming for himself any place in his scheme. This was a link between the opposite systems of Judaism and Gnosticism, and would seem to have been in itself inconsistent, although we have no means of judging how the inventor attempted to reconcile its elements. He taught that the world was made by an angel, remote from the supreme God, limited in capacity and in knowledge, ignorant of the Supreme, and yet unconsciously serving him. To this angel, and others of the same order, Cerinthus referred the Law and the Prophets; the Old Testament, therefore, was not in the Cerinthian system regarded as evil, but as imperfect and subordinate. The nature of the Demiurge fixed a level above which the mass of the Jewish people could not rise; but the elect among them had attained to a higher knowledge. Jesus was represented as a real man, born in the usual way of Joseph and Mary, and chosen by God to be the Messiah on account of his eminent righteousness; the *aeon* Christ descended on him at his baptism, revealing the Most High to him, and enduing him with the power of miracles, to be exercised for the confirmation of his doctrine. The Demiurge, jealous of finding his power thus invaded, stirred up the Jewish rulers to persecute Jesus; but before the crucifixion the *aeon* Christ returned to the *pleroma*. By some it is said that Cerinthus admitted the resurrection of Jesus; by others, that he expected it to take place at the commencement of the millennium, when the human body was to be reunited with the Christ from heaven.¹¹ As it appears certain that Cerinthus allowed the resurrection of the body, he cannot have shared in the Gnostic views as to the inherently evil nature of matter.

Although Christ had revealed the true spiritual Judaism, it was said that the outward preparatory system was to be retained in part during the present imperfect state of things; Cerinthus, therefore, required the observance of such Jewish usages as Jesus had sanctioned by Himself submitting to them. The only part of the New Testament which he received was a mutilated Gospel of St. Matthew.

The doctrine of an earthly reign of Christ with his saints for a thousand years has been referred to Cerinthus as its author; and it has been said that his conceptions of the millennial happiness were grossly sensual. These assertions, however (which rest on the authority of

Caius, a Roman presbyter, who wrote about the year 210), have been much questioned. It seems clear that the millenarian opinions which soon after prevailed in the church were not derived from Cerinthus, and that it was a controversial artifice to throw odium on them by tracing them to so discreditable a source. Nor, even if the morality of Cerinthus were as bad as his opponents represent it, can we well suppose him to have connected the notion of licentious indulgence with a state of bliss which was to have Christ for its sovereign.

While the Gnostics, imbued with the ideas of vastness and complexity which are characteristic of oriental religions, looked down on Christianity as too simple, it had also to contend with enemies of an opposite kind. We very early find traces of a Judaizing tendency; and although the middle course adopted by the council of Jerusalem, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, was calculated to allay the differences which had arisen as to the obligation of the Mosaic law on those who had embraced the faith of Christ, oppositions on the side of Judaism often recur in the books of the New Testament.

This Judaism at length issued in the formation of distinct sects. The name of Nazarenes, which had originally been applied to all Christians, became appropriated to the party which maintained that the law was binding on Christians of Jewish race, but did not wish to enforce it on Gentiles; while those who insisted on its obligation as universal were styled Ebionites. The Nazarenes are generally supposed to have been orthodox, and to have been acknowledged as such by the church; the Ebionites were unquestionably heretical.

The name of the latter party has been variously derived from that of a supposed founder, and from a Hebrew word which signifies *poor*. The existence of Ebion is now generally disbelieved; but there remains the question how the title of *poor* came to be attached to the sect,—whether it was given by opponents, with a reference to the meagreness and beggarly character of their doctrines; or whether it was assumed by themselves, as significant of their voluntary poverty, and with an allusion to the beatitude of the “poor in spirit”. The formation of the sect, as such, is dated by some in the reign of Domitian, or earlier. By others it is supposed that the separation of both Ebionites and Nazarenes from the church took place as late as A.D. 136-8, and that it was caused by the adoption of Gentile usages in the church of Jerusalem; while a third view connects the schism of the Ebionites with the statement of Hegesippus, that having been disappointed in aspiring to the bishopric of Jerusalem, began to corrupt the church—a supposition by which the origin of Ebionism would be fixed about the year 107.

In opposition to the Gnostics, the Ebionites held that the world was the work of God himself. As to the person of Christ, although some of them are said to have admitted his miraculous birth, while they denied his Godhead and his preexistence, they for the most part supposed him to be a mere man, the offspring of Joseph and Mary, and chosen to be the Messiah and Son of God because he alone of men had fulfilled the law. They believed that this high destination was unknown to him, until at his baptism it was revealed by Elijah, in the person of John the Baptist; and that he then received a heavenly influence, which forsook him again before his crucifixion.

It would seem that the Ebionites were divided as to their view of the Old Testament. Some of them supposed Christianity to differ from the law only by the addition of certain features; while the adepts regarded it as a restoration of the genuine Mosaic system, which they supposed to have been corrupted in the Hebrew Scriptures. These more advanced members of the sect considered Moses to be the only true prophet; they rejected, not only the later Jewish traditions, but the whole of the Old Testament except the Pentateuch; and even they did not admit it as the work of Moses himself, but, by ascribing it to reporters, who were supposed to have willfully or ignorantly corrupted his words, they found a pretext for rejecting so much of it as did not fall in with their principles. Of the New Testament they admitted no part, except a Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew, in which the account of our Lord's

birth was omitted. They relied much on apocryphal scriptures, and were especially hostile to St. Paul.

Although some corruptions of morals are attributed to the later Ebionites, the practice of the sect in its earlier days was undoubtedly strict. Some parties among them renounced all property, and abstained not only from the flesh of animals, but from their produce, such as eggs and milk. In their worship and polity they affected Jewish usages and terms; they practiced circumcision and ceremonial ablutions; they rigidly observed the Jewish Sabbath; they had synagogues, rulers, and the like. They celebrated the Eucharist with unleavened bread, and used only water in the cup. Like the Cerinthians, they held the doctrine of an earthly reign of Christ, who was to make Jerusalem the seat of his power, to subdue all enemies, and to raise the Jewish kingdom to a splendor before unknown.

Ebionism continued to exist in Syria and Peraea as late as the end of the fourth century.

Menander, who has been mentioned as the successor of Simon Magus, is said to have been the master of two noted heretics, who may be considered as the founders respectively of the Syrian and of the Alexandrian Gnosticism—Saturninus and Basilides.

Saturninus, who was born at Antioch, and there established his school, taught that the supreme God, or “Unknown Father”, produced a multitude of spiritual beings; that in the lowest gradation of the spiritual world, close on the borders which separate the realm of light from the chaos of matter were seven angels, the rulers of the planets; and that these angels took a portion from the material mass and shaped it into a world, the regions of which they divided among themselves—the God of the Jews being their chief. A bright shape, let down for a moment from the distant source of light, and then withdrawn, excited new desires and projects in them: unable as they were to seize and to fix the dazzling image, they endeavored to frame a man after its likeness; but their creature was only able to grovel on the earth like a worm, until the Father in pity sent down to it a spark of his own divine life. But in opposition to the elect race, Satan, the lord of Matter, with whom the angels carried on an unceasing warfare, produced an unholy race, and the elect, while they sojourn in this world, are exposed to assaults from him and from his agents, both human and spiritual. The Old Testament was in part given by the seven angels, especially by the God of the Jews, and in part by Satan. In order to deliver the elect from their enemies, and also from their subjection to the God of the Jews and the other planetary angels, who aimed at establishing an independent kingdom, the Father sent down the *aeon* Nous (Mind), or Christ, clothed with a phantastic body. At the consummation of all things, according to Saturninus, the bodies of the elect were to be resolved into their elements, while the soul was to re-enter into the bosom of the unknown Father, from whom it had been derived.

The precepts of Saturninus were strictly ascetic; he forbade marriage and the propagation of mankind; but it would seem that the more rigid observances were required only of the highest grade among his followers. The sect did not extend beyond Syria, and soon came to an end.

Basilides, who became conspicuous about the year 125, is said to have been, like Saturninus, a Syrian; but it was at Alexandria that he fixed himself, and the leading character of his system was Egyptian. He taught that from the Supreme God were evolved by successive generation seven intelligences (which were, in fact, personified attributes)—Understanding, Word, Thought, Wisdom, Power, Righteousness, and Peace. These gave birth to a second order of spirits; the second to a third; and the course of emanations continued until there were three hundred and sixty-five orders, each consisting of seven spirits, and each with a heaven of its own; while every heaven, with its inhabitants, was an inferior antitype of that immediately above it. The number of the heavens was expressed in the Greek notation by the letters of the word *Abraxas* or *Abrasax*, in which the most approved interpretations derive from the Coptic, and explain as meaning new word or sacred word. The same name was used also to denote the providence which directs the universe—not the supreme God as he is in

himself (since he is represented as “not to be named”), but God in so far as he is manifested, or the collective hierarchy of emanations

The angels of the lowest heaven (which is that which is visible from earth) formed the world and its inhabitants after a pattern shown to them by the aeon Sophia or Wisdom. The chief angel of this order, who is called the Archon, or Ruler, was the God of the Jews, while the other regions of the world were divided by lot among his brother angels; and, in consequence of the Archon’s desire to exalt his own people above the rest of mankind, the other angels had stirred up the Gentiles to enmity against the Jews. The Pentateuch was given by the Archon: the prophecies came from the other angels.

Man received from the creative angels a soul which is the seat of the senses and of the passions; and in addition to this the supreme God bestowed on him a rational and higher soul, which the inferior soul is continually endeavoring to weaken. Although Basilides cannot rightly be described as a dualist, he held that throughout all nature there had been an encroachment of evil on good, “like rust on steel”, and that the object of the present state was to enable the souls of men (which, as they had come from God, could never perish, but must return to him) to disengage themselves from the entanglements of evil. The knowledge of God had become faint among men; the Archon himself, although he had served as an instrument of the Supreme in giving the Law, was yet ignorant of its true character—of its spiritual significance and its preparatory office—which the spiritual among the Jews had alone been able to discern. In order, then, to enlighten mankind, to deliver them from the limited system of the Archon, and enable them to rise towards the Supreme, the first-begotten aeon, Nous or Understanding, descended on Jesus, the holiest of men, at his baptism and by this manifestation the Archon learnt for the first time his own real place in the scale of the universe. The later Basilidians represented him as exasperated by the discovery, so that he instigated the Jews to persecute Jesus; but it is a question whether the founder of the sect shared in this view, or whether he supposed the Archon to have reverently acquiesced in the knowledge of his inferior position.

The doctrine of an atonement was inconsistent with the principles of Basilides. He allowed no other justification than that of advancement in sanctification, and laid it down that everyone suffers for his own sins. God, he said, forgives no sins but such as are done unwillingly or in ignorance; all other sins must be expiated, and, until the expiation be complete, the soul must pass, under the guidance of its guardian angels, through one body after another,—not only human bodies, but also those of the lower creatures. And thus such suffering as cannot be traced to any visible cause is to be regarded as the purgation of sin committed in some former existence, while the death of the innocent may be the punishment of germs of evil which would have grown up if life had been continued. On this principle Basilides even accounted for the sufferings of the man Jesus himself; and by such theories he intended to justify the providential government of the world, as to which he is reported to have declared that he would “rather say anything than find fault with Providence”.

While the Gnostics in general spoke of faith and knowledge as opposites, Basilides taught that faith must run through the whole spiritual progress, and that the degrees of knowledge increase in proportion as faith becomes fitted to receive them. He divided his disciples into several grades; in order to admission among the highest adepts, a silence of five years was required. The authorities on which Basilides chiefly relied were some prophecies which bore the names of Ham, Parchor, Barcobas, and Barcoph, with an esoteric tradition which he professed to derive from St. Matthias, and from Glaucias, an interpreter of St. Peter. He dealt with the New Testament in an arbitrary way; he did not reject St. Paul, but placed him below St. Peter, and declared some of the epistles ascribed to him to be spurious.

This system became more popular than any that had preceded it, and St. Jerome informs us that even in the fifth century Basilidianism continued to exist. The doctrines of the sect, however, were much corrupted in the course of time. The view of Judaism was altered, so that

the Archon came to be regarded as opposed to the supreme God; and consequently the Gnostic was at liberty to trample on all that had proceeded from the inferior power, to disregard all the laws of morality. Instead of the doctrine which Basilides held in common with some other sectaries, that the aeon who descended on Jesus at baptism forsook him before his crucifixion, a strange docetic fancy was introduced—that his body was phantastical, and that he transferred his own form to Simon of Cyrene, who suffered in his stead on the cross, while Jesus in the form of Simon stood by and derided the executioners. The Gnostic, therefore, was not to confess the crucifixion, but those who should own it were still under bondage to the Archon. The later Basilidians made no scruple of eating idol sacrifices, of taking part in heathen rites and festivities; they denied their faith in time of persecution, and mocked at martyrdom as a folly, inasmuch as the person for whose sake it was borne was, according to their doctrine, merely the crucified Simon. They were also addicted to magic; he, it was said, who should master the whole system, who should know the names and origin of all the angels, would become superior, invisible, and incomprehensible to them. Most of the gems which are found inscribed with the mystical Abraxas are supposed to have been used by the sect as amulets or talismans, although it is certain that some of these symbols were purely heathen.

Of all the Gnostic leaders Valentinus was the most eminent for ability; his system was distinguished beyond the rest for its complex and elaborate character, and it surpassed them all in popularity.

Valentinus is supposed to have been of Jewish descent, but was a native of Egypt, and studied at Alexandria. He appears to have been brought up as a Christian, or at least to have professed Christianity in early life; and hence his doctrine, with all its wildness, had a greater infusion of scriptural language and ideas than those of the older Gnostic teachers. Tertullian asserts that he became a heresiarch on being disappointed of a bishopric; but it does not appear in what stage of his career the disappointment occurred, and the truth of the story has been altogether questioned. It was about the year 140 that he visited Rome, where Irenaeus states that he remained from the pontificate of Hyginus to that of Anicetus. At Rome, where the church, in its simple and severe orthodoxy, was less tolerant of novelties than that from which Valentinus had come, he was twice excommunicated; and on his final exclusion he retired to Cyprus, where he wrought out and published his system. His death is supposed to have taken place about 160,—whether in Cyprus or at Rome is uncertain.

In his doctrines Valentinus appears to have borrowed from the religions of Egypt and of Persia, from the Cabala, from Plato, Pythagoras, and the Hesiodic theogony. He supposed a first principle, self-existent and perfect, to whom he gave the name of *Bythos* (*i.e.* unfathomable depth). This being, who from eternity had existed in repose, at length resolved to manifest himself; from him and the *Ennoia* or Conception of his mind, who was also named *Charis* (Grace), or *Sige* (Silence), were produced a pair of aeons,—the male styled *Nous* (Understanding), or *Monogenes* (Only-begotten); the female, *Aletheia* (Truth). From these, by successive generations, emanated two other pairs,—*Logos* (the Word, or Reason) and *Zoe* (Life); *Anthropos* (Man) and *Ecclesia* (the Church). Thus was composed the first grade of beings—the *ogdoad* or octave. Next, from *Logos* and *Zoe* were produced five pairs of aeons,—the *decad*; and then, from *Anthropos* and *Ecclesia*, six pairs, —the *dodecad*; making up in all the number of thirty. In addition to these there was an unwedded aeon, named *Horos* (Boundary), or *Stauros* (the Cross), the offspring of *Bythos* and *Sige*, whose office it was to enforce the principle of limitation, and keep every existence in its proper place.

The first-begotten, *Nous*, alone was capable of comprehending the supreme Father. The other aeons envied his knowledge, and in proportion to their remoteness from the source was the vehemence of their desire to fathom it. *Sophia* (Wisdom), the last of the thirty, filled with an uncontrollable eagerness, issued forth from the pleroma, with the intention of soaring up to

the original of her being; but she was in danger of being absorbed into the infinity of his nature, or of being lost in the boundless void without, when Horos led her back to the sphere which she had so rashly forsaken. Now, by the providence of Bythos, produced a new pair of aeons—Christ and the Holy Spirit. Christ taught the elder aeons that Bythos was incomprehensible—that they could only know him through the Only-begotten, and that the happiness of every being was to rest content with such measure of light as had been allotted to it; the Spirit established equality among them, and taught them to unite in glorifying the Supreme. Harmony was restored, and all the aeons combined to produce Jesus (or Saviour), the flower of the pleroma, endowed by each with the most precious gift which he could contribute. With him were also produced a host of attendant angels.

But while Sophia was on her flight beyond the pleroma, her longings had, without the cooperation of her partner *Theletos* (Will), given birth to an abortive, shapeless, and imperfect being called by the name of *Achamoth*. This being remained shut out from the pleroma, and in utter darkness; when Christ, taking pity on her, bestowed on her a form, and showed her a momentary glimpse of the celestial brightness. Achamoth endeavored to approach the light, but was repelled by Horos. On this she was seized with violent agitations; sometimes she smiled at the remembrance of the glorious vision; sometimes she wept at her exclusion. Her emotions acted on the inert and formless mass of matter; from her turning towards the source of light was produced psychic existence; from her grief at being left in darkness and vacuity, from her fear lest life should be withdrawn from her, as the light had been, was produced material existence. Among the material productions were Satan and his angels; among the psychic was the Demiurge. Achamoth turns in supplication to the Christ, who sends down to her the aeon Jesus, attended by his angels, and equipped with the power of the whole pleroma. Jesus enlightens her and calms her agitation; from the brightness of his angels she conceives, and gives birth to pneumatic or spiritual existence. The Demiurge sets to work on the surrounding chaos, separates the psychic from the material elements, and out of the former builds seven heavens, of which the highest is his own sphere, while each of the others is committed to a superintendent angel. He then makes man, bestowing on him a psychic soul and body; but Achamoth, without the knowledge of the Demiurge, implants in the new creature a spark of spiritual nature; and the creator and his angels stand amazed on discovering that their workmanship has in it the element of something higher than themselves.

The Demiurge becomes jealous of man. He places him under a narrow and oppressive law; and, when man breaks this, he thrusts him down from the third heaven, or paradise, to earth, and envelopes his psychic body in a “coat of skin”—a fleshly prison, subjecting the man to the bonds of matter (for thus Valentinus explained Genesis III. 21). All this, however, happened through the providence of the Supreme, whose design it was that, by entering into the world of matter, the spiritual element should become the means of its destructions

The Demiurge knew of nothing superior to himself; he had acted as the instrument of Bythos, but unconsciously, and, supposing himself to be the original of the universe, he instructed the Jewish prophets to proclaim him as the only God. In the writings of the prophets, accordingly, Valentinus professed to distinguish between the things which they had uttered by the inspiration of the limited Demiurge, and those which, without being themselves aware of it, they had derived from a higher source. The Demiurge taught the prophets to promise a Messiah according to his own conceptions; he framed this Messiah of a psychic soul with a psychic and immaterial body, capable of performing human actions, yet exempt from human feelings; and to these elements, without the knowledge of his maker, was added a pneumatic soul from the world above. This “nether Christ” was born of the Virgin Mary—passing through her “as water through a tube”, without taking anything of her substance; he ate and drank, but derived no nourishment from his earthly food. For thirty years—a period which had reference to the number of inhabitants in the pleromas—he lived as a pattern of ascetic righteousness, until at his baptism the aeon Jesus descended on him, with the design of

fulfilling the most exalted meaning of prophecy, which the Demiurge had not understood; and then the Demiurge became aware of the higher spiritual world, and gladly yielded himself as an instrument for the advancement of the Messiah's kingdom.

Valentinus divided men into three classes, represented by Cain, Abel, and Seth respectively—the material, who could not attain to knowledge, or be saved; the spiritual, who could not be lost; and the psychic, who might be saved or lost, according to their works. Heathenism was said to be material, Judaism and the Christianity of the church to be psychic, and Gnosticism to be spiritual; y but it was not denied that individuals might be either above or below the level of the systems which they professed. Among the Jews, in particular, Valentinus held that there had always been a class of lofty spiritual natures, which rose above the limits of the old dispensation. The Demiurge had discerned the superior virtue of these, and had rewarded them by making them prophets and kings, while he ignorantly imagined that their goodness was derived from himself.

The pure truth was for the first time revealed to mankind by the coming of Christ. To the spiritual his mission was for the purpose of enlightenment; their nature is akin to the pleroma, and they are to enter into it through knowledge, which unites them with Christ. But for the psychic a different redemption was necessary; and this was wrought out by the suffering of the psychic Messiah, who before his crucifixion was abandoned, not only by the aeon Jesus, but by his own spiritual soul. Valentinus, therefore, differed from Basilides and others by allowing a kind of atonement; but his doctrine on this point was very unlike that of the church, inasmuch as he did not truly acknowledge either the divinity or the humanity of the Saviour.

Christ, it was held, enters into connection with all natures, in order that each may rise to a bliss suitable to its capacity. At baptism the psychic class obtain the forgiveness of their sins, with knowledge and power to master the material elements which cleave to them; while the spiritual are set free from the dominion of the Demiurge, are incorporated into the pleroma, and each enters into fellowship with a corresponding angelic being in the world above. The courses of the two classes were to be throughout distinct. For the psychics, faith was necessary, and, in order to produce it, miracles were requisite; but the spiritual were above the need of such assistances : they were to be saved, not by faith but by knowledge—a doctrine which among the later Valentinians became the warrant for all manner of licentiousness. The literal sense of Scripture was for the psychics, who were unable to penetrate beyond it; but the spiritual were admitted to the understanding of a higher meaning—"the wisdom of the perfect".

At the final consummation, when the spiritual shall all have been perfected in knowledge—when all the seeds of divine life among mankind shall have been delivered from the bondage of matter—Achamoth, whose place is now in a middle region, between the pleroma and the highest heaven of the Demiurge, will enter into the pleroma, and be united with the heavenly bridegroom Jesus. The matured spiritual natures, shaking off all that is lower, and restoring their psychic souls to the Demiurge who gave them, will follow into the pleroma—each to be united with its angelic partner. The Demiurge will rise from his own heaven to the middle region, where he will reign over the psychic righteous. Then the fire which is now latent in the frame of the world will burst forth, and will annihilate all that is materials

The Valentinian system was plausible in the eyes of Christians, inasmuch as it not only used a language which was in great part scriptural, but professed to receive all the books of Scripture, while it was able to set their meaning aside by the most violent misinterpretations. The Gospel of St. John was regarded by the sect as the highest in authority; but the key to the true doctrine was said to be derived by secret tradition from St. Matthias, and from one Theodas, who was described as a disciple of St. Paul. The initiation into the mysteries of the sect was gradual; Irenaeus tells us that they were disclosed to such persons only as would pay largely, and Tertullian describes with sarcastic humour the manner in which the sectaries

baffled the curiosity of any who attempted to penetrate beyond the degree of knowledge with which it was considered that they might safely be entrusted. After the death of their founder the Valentinians underwent the usual processes of division and corruption; Epiphanius states that there were as many as ten varieties of them. A remnant of the sect survived in the beginning of the fifth century

While the system of Valentinus was the most imaginative form of Gnosticism, that of his contemporary Marcion was the most prosaic and practical; and whereas in the other systems knowledge was all in all, the tendency of Marcionism was mainly religious. The chief principle which its author had in common with other Gnostics was the idea of an opposition between Christianity and Judaism; and this he carried to an extreme.

Marcion was born at Sinope, on the Euxine, about the beginning of the second century. His father was eventually bishop of that city; and there is no apparent reason for doubting that Marcion himself was trained as a Christian from infancy. He rose to be a presbyter in the church of Sinope, and professed an ascetic life until (according to a very doubtful story, which rests on the authority of Epiphanius) he was excommunicated by his father for the seduction of a virgin. After having sought in vain to be restored, he left Asia, and arrived at Rome while the see was vacant through the death of Hyginus. He applied for admission into the communion of the Roman church, but was told by the presbyters that the principle of unity in faith and discipline forbade it unless with the consent of the bishop by whom he had been excommunicated. Before leaving his own country Marcion had become notorious for peculiar opinions, which indeed were probably the real cause of his excommunication; and he began to vent these at Rome by asking the presbyters to explain our Lord's declaration that old bottles are unfit to receive new wine. He disputed the correctness of their answer; and, although his own interpretation of the words is not reported, it would seem, from what is known of his doctrines, that he supposed the "old bottles" to mean the Law, and the "new wine" to be the Gospel.

Having failed in his attempts to gain readmittance into the church, Marcion attached himself to Cerdon, a Syrian, who had for some years sojourned at Rome, alternately making proselytes in secret, and seeking reconciliation with the church by a profession of penitence. The fame of the master was soon lost in that of the disciple, so that it is impossible to distinguish their respective shares in the formation of their system. Marcion is said to have travelled in Egypt and the East for the purpose of spreading his heresy, and is supposed to have died at Rome in the episcopate of Eleutherius. (*i.e.* between 177 and 190). Tertullian states that he had been repeatedly excluded from the church; that on the last occasion the bishop of Rome restored to him a large sum of money which he had offered "in the first ardour of his faith"; that he obtained a promise of being once more received into communion, on condition of bringing back those whom he had perverted; but that death overtook him before he could fulfill the task.

Unlike the other Gnostics, Marcion professed to be purely Christian in his doctrines; he borrowed nothing from Greece, Egypt, or Persia, and acknowledged no other source of truth but the Holy Scriptures. He was an enemy to allegorical interpretation; while he rejected the tradition of the church, he did not pretend to have any secret tradition of his own; and he denied the opposition between faith and knowledge. But with Scripture itself he dealt very violently. He rejected the whole Old Testament; of the New, he acknowledged only the Gospel of St. Luke and ten of St. Paul's Epistles, and from these he expunged all that disagreed with his own theories. He did not question the authorship of the other books, but supposed that the writers were themselves blinded by Judaism, and, moreover, that their works had been corrupted in the course of time.

Marcion held the existence of three principles—the supreme God, perfectly good; the devil, or lord of matter, eternal and evil; and between these the Demiurge, a being of limited power and knowledge, whose chief characteristic was a justice unmixed with love or mercy. It

is not certain whether the Demiurge was supposed to be an independent existence, or (as in most gnostic systems) an emanation from the supreme God; but the latter opinion is the more probable. It was taught that the creation of the Supreme was immaterial and invisible; that the Demiurge formed this world and its inhabitants out of substance which he had taken from the material chaos without the consent or knowledge of its ruler. The soul of man was not (as in other systems) supposed to be implanted by the supreme God, but to be the work of the Demiurge, and of a quality corresponding to the limited nature of its author; it had no power to withstand the attacks of the material principle, which was represented as always striving to reclaim the portion abstracted from its own domain. Man fell through disobedience to the laws of the Demiurge, and his original nature was changed for the worse. The Demiurge chose for himself one nation—the Jews; to these he gave a law which was not in itself evil, but was fitted only for lower natures, being imperfect in its morality, and destitute of inward spirit. His system was rigorously just; the disobedient he made over to torments, while he rewarded the righteous with rest in “Abraham's bosom”.

The Demiurge promised a Messiah, his son, and of a nature like his own, who was to come, not for the purpose of mediation and forgiveness, but in order to destroy heathenism and to establish the empire of the Jews. But the supreme God, in pity for mankind, of whom the vast majority, without any fault of their own, were excluded from all knowledge of the Demiurge, and were liable to his condemnation, resolved to send down a higher Messiah, his own son. The world had not been prepared for this by any previous revelations; for no such preparation was necessary, as the Messiah's works were of themselves sufficient evidence of his mission. He appeared suddenly in the synagogue of Capernaum, “in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar”; but in order to obtain a hearing from the Jews, he accommodated himself to their notions, and professed to be that Messiah whom the Demiurge's prophets had taught them to expect. Then, for the first time, the true God was revealed, and forgiveness of sins was bestowed on men, with endowments of knowledge and strength which might enable them to overcome the enmity of matter.

The Demiurge, ignorant of the Messiah's real nature, but jealous of a power superior to his own, stirred up the Jews against him; the God of matter urged on the Gentiles to join in the persecution, and the Saviour was crucified. Yet, according to Marcion's view, his body could not really suffer, inasmuch as it was spiritual and ethereal; his submission to the cross was meant to teach that the sufferings of the worthless body are not to be avoided as evils.

Marcion admitted the Saviour's descent into hell, and with this doctrine was connected one of his strangest fancies—that the heathens, and the reprobates of the Old Testament (such as Cain, Esau, and the men of Sodom), suffering from the vengeance of the Demiurge, gladly hailed the offer of salvation, and were delivered; while the Old Testament saints, being satisfied with the happiness of Abraham's bosom, and suspecting the Saviour's call as a temptation, refused to listen to him, and were left as before. This, however, was not to be their final condition. The Demiurge's Messiah was after all to come; he was to gather the dispersed of Israel out of all lands, to establish an universal empire of the Jews, and to bless the adherents of his father with an earthly happiness; while such of the heathen and of the disobedient as had not been exempted from his power by laying hold on the higher salvation were to be consigned to torments. For the people of the supreme God, it was taught that the soul will be released from the flesh, and will rise to dwell with him in a spiritual body.

The fundamental difficulty with Marcion was the supposed impossibility of reconciling love with punitive justice; hence his distinction between the supreme God, all love, and the Demiurge, all severity. In order to carry out this view he wrote a book called *Antitheses* in which, with the intention of showing an essential difference between the Old and New Testament, he insisted on all such principles and narratives in the older Scriptures as appeared to be inconsistent with the character of love, and made the most of all the instances in which our Lord had (as Marcion supposed) declared himself against the Jewish system.

Marcion is described as a man of grave disposition and manners. The character of his sect was ascetic; he allowed no animal food except fish; he forbade marriage, and required a profession of continence as a condition of baptism. Baptism, however, might be deferred; the catechumens were (contrary to the practice of the church) admitted to witness the celebration of the highest mysteries; and if a person died in the state of a catechumen, there was a vicarious baptism for the dead. It is said that Marcion allowed baptism to be administered thrice, in the belief that at each repetition the sins committed since the preceding baptism were remitted; that he celebrated the Eucharist with water; and that, as a mark of opposition to Judaism, he enjoined the observance of the seventh day of the week (or Sabbath) as a fast.

The bold rejection of all Jewish and heathen elements, the arbitrary treatment of Holy Scripture, and the apparent severity of the sect, drew many converts. Marcion affected to address his followers as “companions in hatred and tribulation”; they rather courted than shunned persecution; many of them suffered with great constancy for the name of Christ, and the sect boasted of its martyrs. Marcionism is described by Epiphanius as prevailing widely in his own time (about A.D. 400), nor did it become extinct until the sixth century.

Strange and essentially unchristian as Gnosticism was, we must yet not overlook the benefits which Christianity eventually derived from it. Like other heresies, it did good service by engaging the champions of orthodoxy in the investigation and defense of the doctrines which it assailed; but this was not all. In the various forms of Gnosticism, the chief ideas and influences of earlier religions and philosophies were brought into contact with the Gospel—pressing, as it were, for entrance into the Christian system. Thus the church was forced to consider how much in those older systems was true, and how much was false; and, while steadfastly rejecting the falsehood, to appropriate the truth, to hallow it by a combination with the Christian principle, and so to rescue all that was precious from the wreck of a world which was passing away. “It was”, says a late writer, “through the Gnostics that studies, literature, and art were introduced into the church”; and when Gnosticism had accomplished its task of thus influencing the church, its various forms either ceased to exist, or lingered only as the obsolete creeds of an obscure and diminishing remnant.

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF COMMODUS TO THE DEATH OF ELAGABALUS
A.D. 180-222.

Although the writings of the apologists had failed to obtain a legal toleration for the church, they were not without effect. The cause which could find men of ability and learning to advocate it with their pens, took by degrees a new position. The old vulgar calumnies died away : the more enlightened of the heathen began to feel that, if their religion were to withstand the Gospel, it must be reformed, not only in practice, but in doctrine. Hence we find in this period attempts, on the part of the philosophers, to claim for their own system some truths to which Christianity had first given prominence, approximations to the Gospel in various ways, and endeavors after a combination of doctrines.

Of the princes who occupied the imperial throne, some reigned but a short time, and have left no traces in the history of the church. Commodus, the unworthy son of Marcus Aurelius, is said to have been influenced by his favorite concubine, Marcia, to spare the Christians, and to recall many of them from banishment. But although this reign was generally a time of repose for the church, it produced one remarkable martyrdom—that of Apollonius, a Roman senator who was accused of being a Christian by one of his slaves. The informer was put to death by having his legs broken; Apollonius, after having read a defense of his faith before the senate, was beheaded; and the case is celebrated as illustrating the supposed condition of the Christians—legally liable to the punishment of death for their belief, yet protected by a law which appointed the same penalty for their accusers. It works, however, under several difficulties : even if the circumstances be admitted as true, there remains a question whether the informer was punished for molesting a Christian, or for violating the duty of slave to master.

Severus, in the beginning of his reign, favored the church, and shielded its members against the fury of the populace—in consequence, it is said, of a cure which he himself had experienced from having been anointed with oil by a Christian named Proculus Torpacion; he kept his deliverer near him, and allowed some persons of rank and authority to profess the Gospel. But the laws were still in an unsatisfactory state; the treatment of the Christians still depended on the will of individual governors, and even those governors who were favorably disposed found it impossible to protect them when accused. Before any new edict had appeared, severe persecutions were carried on in various parts of the empire. The rescript of Trajan, which forbade inquiry to be made after the Christians, was neglected; the mob still called for their blood in the amphitheatres; many were tortured to make them avow their faith; some were burnt; some condemned to the mines or to banishment; even the graves of the dead were violated. In these times a custom of purchasing toleration arose. It was sanctioned by many bishops, who alleged the scriptural example of Jason; and the money was paid, not only by way of occasional bribes to accusers or soldiers, but as a rent or tax, like that levied on the followers of some disreputable callings for license to carry on their business. The effect was, on the whole, unfavorable to the quiet of the church, as unscrupulous governors soon learnt the expedient of putting to death a few of the poorer Christians within their jurisdictions, by way of alarming the richer brethren and extorting money from them. The severe Marcionites and the enthusiastic Montanists disdained the compromise to which believers in general submitted; they classed together the practice of paying for safety, and that of flight in persecution, as alike unworthy of their profession.

In the year 202, Severus issued an edict, forbidding, under heavy penalties, that any of his subjects should embrace Judaism or Christianity. Perhaps the extravagances of Montanism may have contributed to provoke this edict, as well as the cause which is more commonly assigned for it—the refusal of the Christians to share in the rejoicings which welcomed the emperor’s triumphant return to Rome. That refusal was really grounded, not on any political disaffection, but on a religious objection to the heathen rites and indecencies which were mixed with such celebrations; for, whatever might have been the private feelings of Christians during the late contest for the empire, they had abstained from taking part with any of the competitors, nor is it recorded that there were any Christians among those adherents of Niger and Albinus who suffered from the vengeance of Severus.

Although the new edict did not expressly forbid Christians to exercise their religion, but only to increase their numbers by proselytism, it had the effect of stimulating their enemies to persecution, which was carried on with great severity in Egypt and proconsular Africa, although it does not appear to have extended to other provinces.

Of the African martyrs, the most celebrated are Perpetua and her companions, whose sufferings are related in a narrative partly written by Perpetua herself. She was a catechumen, noble and wealthy, of the age of twenty-two, married or lately left a widow, and with an infant at her breast. After her arrest she was visited by her father, a heathen, who urged her to disavow her faith. She asked him whether a vessel which stood near could be called by any other than its proper name and on his answering that it could not, “Neither”, said she, “can I call myself other than what I am—a Christian”. The father was violently enraged, and it seemed as if he would have done her some bodily harm; he departed, however, and did not return for some days.

During the interval Perpetua was baptized, with her companions Revocatus, Felicitas, Saturninus, and Secundinus; the Spirit, she says, moved her to pray at her baptism for the power of endurance. They were then removed to a place of stricter confinement than that to which they had at first been committed; and Perpetua suffered from the heat, the darkness, the crowd, and the insults of the soldiers, but most of all from anxiety for her infant. Two deacons, by giving money to the gaolers, procured leave for the Christians to spend some hours of each day in a more open part of the prison. There Perpetua's child was brought to her by her mother and brother, and after a time she was able to keep him wholly with her; whereupon she felt herself relieved from all uneasiness, so that, she says, “the prison all at once became like a palace to me, and I would rather have been there than anywhere else”.

Her brother, a catechumen, now told her that she might venture to pray for a vision, in the hope of ascertaining how the imprisonment was to end. She prayed accordingly, and saw a ladder of gold, reaching up to heaven, and so narrow that only one person at a time could ascend its steps. Around it were swords, lances, and hooks, ready to pierce and tear the flesh of such as should attempt to climb without due caution; while a great dragon lay at the foot, endeavoring to deter from the ascent. Saturus—an eminent Christian, who afterwards surrendered himself, and became the companion of the sufferers—was seen as the first to go up the ladder, and, on reaching the top, invited Perpetua to follow. By the name of Christ she quelled the dragon, and when she had put her foot on the first step of the ladder, she trod on the monster's head. Above, she found herself in a spacious garden, where she saw a shepherd, with white hair, milking his ewes, with thousands of forms in white garments around him. He welcomed her, and gave her a morsel of cheese, which she received with joined hands and ate, while the white-robed company said Amen. At this sound she awoke, but a sweet taste still remained in her mouth. The vision was interpreted as a warning that the prisoners must no longer have hope in this world.

Hearing that they were about to be examined, Perpetua’s father again visited her. Instead of daughter he called her lady; he kissed her hands, threw himself at her feet, and implored her—by the remembrance of his long care for her, and of the preference which he had shown

her above his other children, by the grief of her family, by pity for her child, who could not live without her—to spare him and all her kindred the sorrow and shame which would follow from her persisting in her profession. But Perpetua, although she was deeply affected by the old man’s agitation, could only reply that all was in God’s hands.

On the day of trial, the prisoners were conveyed to the forum, and, as Perpetua was brought forward, her father appeared immediately below her, with her infant in his arms, beseeching her to have compassion on the child. The procurator endeavored to move her by consideration for her offspring, and for her parent’s grey hairs; but she steadfastly refused to sacrifice. The procurator then ordered her father (who probably disturbed the proceedings by his importunities) to be dislodged from the place where he stood and to be beaten with rods; and while this order was carried into effect, Perpetua declared that she felt the blows as if they had been inflicted on herself. The trial ended in the condemnation of the accused to the beasts, but, undaunted by the sentence, they returned to their prison rejoicing.

A few days later, as Perpetua was praying, she found herself naming her brother Dinocrates, who had died at the age of seven; and as she had not thought of him, she felt this as a Divine intimation that she should pray for him. The boy appeared as if coming forth from a dark place,—pale, dirty, showing in his face the cancer which had caused his death, thirsty, but unable to reach some water which he wished to drink. His sister persevered in prayer for him, and at length was comforted by a vision in which the place around him was light, his person and flesh clean, the sore in his face healed into a scar, and the water within his reach. He drank and went away as if to play; “then”, says Perpetua, “I understood that he was translated from punishment”.

The narrative goes on to relate another visit of the agonized father, and visions of triumph by which Perpetua was animated for the endurance of her sufferings. Satorius also had a vision of the heavenly glory, moulded on the representations of the Apocalypse; and this was made the means of conveying some admonitions to the bishop, Optatus.

The martyrs were kept for the birthday of Geta, who had been associated by his father as a colleague in the empire, and in the meantime Secundulus died in prison. Felicitas, a married woman of servile condition, was in the eighth month of her pregnancy, and both she and her companions feared that her death might be deferred on this account. They therefore joined in prayer; and three days before the festival Felicitas gave birth to a child. The cries which she uttered in the pangs of travail induced an attendant of the prison to ask her, “If you cannot bear this, what will you do when exposed to the beasts?”. “It is I”, she answered, “that bear my present sufferings; but then there will be One within me to suffer for me, because I too shall suffer for him”. The child was adopted by a Christian woman.

The gaoler, Pudens, was converted by the behavior of his prisoners. On the eve of their suffering they were regaled according to custom with the “free supper”—a meal at which condemned persons were allowed to behave with all manner of license; but, instead of indulging in the usual disorders, they converted it into the likeness of a Christian love-feast. Satorius sternly rebuked the people who pressed to look at them: “Mark our faces well”, he said, “that you may know us again in the day of judgment”.

When led forth into the amphitheatre, the martyrs wore a joyful look. According to a custom which seems to have been peculiar to Carthage, and derived from the times when human sacrifices were offered under its old Phoenician religion, the men were required to put on scarlet dresses, like the priests of Saturn, and the women yellow, like the priestesses of Ceres; but they refused to submit, saying that they suffered in order to be exempt from such compliances, and the justice of the objection was admitted. Perpetua sang psalms; Satorius and others denounced God’s vengeance on the procurator and the crowd.

The male victims were exposed to lions, bears, and leopards; the women were tossed by a furious cow. Perpetua appeared as if in a trance, insensible to the pain; on recovering her consciousness, she asked when the beasts would come, and could hardly be convinced that

that part of her sufferings was over. Instead of allowing the victims to be privately dispatched, as was usual, the spectators demanded that they should be led forth to death; they bade farewell to each other with the kiss of peace, and walked into the midst of the amphitheatre, where their earthly trials were soon ended. The gladiator who was to kill Perpetua was an inexperienced youth, and misdirected his sword, on which, observing his agitation, she with her own hand guided it to a mortal part. "Perhaps", says the writer of the Acts of the Martyrdom, "so great a woman—one who was feared by the unclean spirit—could not have been put to death except by her own will".

The document which has been here abridged bears throughout the stamp of circumstantial truth. Grounds have been found, both in the incidents and in the tone of the narrative, for an opinion that the martyrs and their historian were Montanists; while the reception of the Acts by the ancient church tells strongly on the other side. We may therefore either suppose that the Montanistic opinions had not produced a formal rupture in the church of Carthage at the time when the Acts were written; or we may refer the peculiarities of the story, not to Montanistic principles, but to that natural temperament which rendered Africa a soil especially favorable for the reception of Montanism.

Under Caracalla and Elagabalus, the Christians were exempt from persecution. It is said that Elagabalus, in his desire to make all the old national religions subservient to the Syrian worship of which he had been priest, intended to combine the symbols of Judaism and Christianity (which he probably regarded the more favorably on account of their eastern origin) with the gods of Greece and Rome, in the temple which he erected to the sun; but his career of insane depravity was cut short before he could attempt to carry out this design.

The first subject to be noticed in the internal history of the church is a violent dispute which arose from a revival of the paschal question. The difference of observance as to the time of Easter between the churches of Asia Minor and those of other countries has already been mentioned, as also the compromise which was agreed on between Polycarp, as representative of the Asiatics, and Anicetus, bishop of Rome. It would seem that, for some time after that agreement, Asiatics sojourning at Rome were allowed to follow the usage of their own country, until Soter, who held the see from 168 to 176, required them to conform to the local custom, but without considering quartodecimanism as a bar to communion with other churches. His second successor, Victor, adopted a different policy. One Blastus, an Asiatic, who had repaired to Rome, insisted on the observance of the quartodeciman practice; and about the same time it became suspicious as a token of Montanism, with which, indeed, Blastus appears to have been infected. These circumstances might very reasonably have induced Victor to use his influence for the establishment of uniformity throughout the whole church; but he erred grievously in the manner of his attempt. Councils were held, apparently by his desire, in countries widely distant from each other—in Palestine, Pontus, Osrhoene, Greece, and Gaul: all these gave evidence that the custom of their own churches agreed with that of the Roman, and were favorable to the wishes of Victor. The Asiatics, however, in their council, refused to depart from their traditional rule. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, a man of eminent place and high personal authority, wrote to Victor in behalf of his brethren: he refers to the apostles St. Philip and St. John, with other venerable personages who had adorned the church of Asia, as having sanctioned the quartodeciman usage; and he declares himself resolved to abide by it, as being apostolical in its origin, and nowhere condemned in Scripture, without fearing Victor's threats of breaking off communion with him. Victor then, in an imperious letter, cut off the Asiatics from the communion of Rome; and he endeavored to procure a like condemnation of them from the other branches of the church. In this, however, he was disappointed. The idea of excluding so large a body from Christian communion shocked the general feeling; many bishops sharply remonstrated with Victor, and exhorted him to desist.

Of those who attempted to mediate in the dispute, the most prominent was Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons. Irenaeus was a native of Asia Minor, and in his youth had known the revered St. Polycarp, of whom in one of his writings he has preserved some interesting recollections. Having joined the missionary church of Lyons, he was chosen by the martyrs under Marcus Aurelius to be the bearer of a letter to the bishop of Rome, in which they endeavored to allay the heats of the Montanistic controversy; and it appears that during his absence he was elected bishop in the room of Pothinus. During the early years of his episcopate, his reputation for learning and ability had been established by the great work which is our chief source of information as to the gnostic heresies; and, connected as he was with both the east and the west,— a quartodeciman by early association, but a follower of the Roman usage in his own church—he was well qualified to exert himself with effect in the character of a peacemaker. The bishop of Lyons wrote in the name of his church, exhorting Victor to moderation, referring to the example of Anicetus and his predecessors in the see of Rome, and urging that such a question ought not to be made a ground for a breach of communion, inasmuch as a diversity of usages had always been allowed, and such variations in indifferent things served to confirm the argument which might be drawn from the agreement of all churches as to the essentials of the faith.

Through the mediation of Irenaeus and others, peace was at length restored. The Asiatics, in a circular letter, cleared themselves from all suspicion of heretical tendencies; and they were allowed to retain their usage until the time of the council of Nicaea.

It is hardly necessary to observe that the attempt y to press this affair into the service of the later papal claims is singularly unfortunate. Victor's behavior, indeed, may be considered as foreshadowing that of his successors in the fullness of their pride; but his pretensions were far short of theirs; the assembling of the councils, although it took place at his request, was the free act of the local bishops; he was unceremoniously rebuked for his measures, there is no token of deference to him as a superior, and his designs were utterly foiled.

On proceeding to examine the heresies of the period, we find them different in character from those which we have hitherto met with. The fundamental question of Gnosticism was that as to the origin of evil, and the error of the sectaries consisted in attempting to solve this by theories which were chiefly derived from some other source than the Christian revelation. But the newer heresies come more within the sphere of Christian ideas. On the one hand, there is the practical, ascetic, enthusiastic sect of Montanus; on the other hand, speculation takes the form of an endeavor to investigate and define the scriptural doctrines as to the Saviour and the Godhead.

The origin of Montanism was earlier than the time at which we have arrived. By Epiphanius it is in one place dated as far back as the year 126, while in another passage he refers it to the year 157; by Eusebius, in 173; by others, about 150. The founder, a native of Mysia, had been a heathen, and probably a priest of Cybele. Soon after his conversion to Christianity, he began to fall into fits of ecstasy, and to utter ravings which were dignified with the name of prophecy; and his enthusiasm speedily infected two women of wealth and station—Maximilla and Priscilla—who forsook their husbands, and became prophetesses in connection with him. The utterances of Montanus and his companions aimed at the introduction of a more rigid system than that which had before prevailed in the church. They added to the established fasts both in number and in severity; they classed second marriages as equal in guilt with adultery; they proscribed military service and secular life in general; they denounced alike profane learning, the vanities of female dress, and amusements of every kind; they laid down rigorous precepts as to penance—declaring that the church had no power to remit sin after baptism, although they claimed such power for the Montanistic prophets; and that some sins must exclude for ever from the communion of the saints on earth, although it was not denied that the mercy of God might possibly be extended to them hereafter.

The progress of the sect did not depend on the character or abilities of its founder, who seems to have been a man of weak and disordered mind. In the region of its birth it was congenial to the character of the people, as appears from the prevalence of the wild worship of Bacchus and Cybele among the Phrygians in earlier times. Persecution tended to stimulate the imagination of the prophets, to exasperate them to fierceness, and to win a ready reception for their oracles. And on penetrating into other countries, Montanism found multitudes already prepared for it by their tempers of mind, so that its work was nothing more than to draw these out into exercise. It held out attractions to the more rigid feelings by setting forth the idea of a life stricter than that of ordinary Christians; to weakness, by offering the guidance of precise rules where the gospel had contented itself with laying down general principles; to enthusiasm and the love of excitement, by its pretensions to prophetic gifts; to pride, by professing to realize the pure and spotless mystical church in an exactly defined visible communion, and by encouraging its proselytes to regard themselves as spiritual, and to despise or abhor all other Christians as carnal and “psychic”.

Montanus has been charged with styling himself the Paraclete, and even with claiming to be the Almighty Father. The latter charge is a mistake, founded on the circumstance that he delivered his oracles in the name of the Father, whereas he did not in reality pretend to be more than his organ. Nor did he really assert himself to be the Holy Ghost, or Paraclete; but he taught that the promise of the Comforter was not limited to the apostles, and that, having been imperfectly performed in them, it was now more entirely fulfilled in himself and his associates. The progress of revelation was illustrated by the development of man; it was said that Judaism had been as infancy; the dispensation of the New Testament as youth; and that the dispensation of the Paraclete was maturity. The new revelation, however, was limited to the advancement of institutions and discipline; it did not interfere with the traditional faith of Christians, but confirmed it.

The Montanists held that the mind, under the prophetic influence, was to be merely passive, while the Spirit swept over it “as the plectrum over the lyre”. This comparison had been applied by Justin Martyr to the inspiration of the Hebrew prophets; but the idea, when taken up by the Montanists, was combated by the opponents of their system, some of whom maintained that the prophets of Scripture not only retained their human consciousness, but clearly understood the fulfillment of what they foretold. Soon after the origin of the sect, some bishops wished to try the effect of exorcism on the prophetesses; but the Montanists would not allow the experiment.

On his ejection from the church, Montanus organized a body of preachers, who were maintained by the oblations of his followers, and, notwithstanding the professed austerity of the sect, are broadly charged by its opponents with hypocrisy, covetousness, and luxury. The order of bishops was only the third in the Montanistic hierarchy—patriarchs and *cenones* being superior to it. The patriarch resided at Pepuza, a small town or village in Phrygia, to which the sectaries gave the mystical name of Jerusalem, as believing that it would be the seat of the millennial kingdom, which was a chief subject of their hopes. Hence they derived the names of Pepuzians and Cataphrygians.

It is said, although not without doubt, by one ancient writer, that both Montanus and Maximilla ended their lives by hanging themselves, about forty years after the origin of their sect; a story which, if it were true, would rather prove that they were the victims of a diseased melancholy than warrant the conclusions against their morality which have been drawn from it. Maximilla had declared that no prophetess would arise after her, but that the end of all things would immediately come; yet we find that other women of excitable temperament pretended to the prophetic character among the Montanists. The case of one, who is spoken of by Tertullian as falling into trances, in which she was consulted for revelations as to the unseen world and for medical prescriptions, bears a remarkable likeness to some narratives of our own day.

In the west, Montanism was at first well received. It engaged the attention of the Lyonese martyrs during their imprisonment, and they wrote both to the Asiatic churches, and to Eleutherius, bishop of Rome,—not sanctioning the pretensions of the sect, but advising that it should be gently dealt with. It benefited by the extravagance of some opponents, who in their zeal to oppose the inferences drawn from St. John's writings, both as to the promise of the Comforter and as to the millennial kingdom, denied the authority of those writings, and ascribed them to the heretic Cerinthus; and the circumstance that the Asiatic church, at the very time when it was embroiled with the Roman church as to the paschal controversy, condemned the Montanists, was regarded in the west as a token of their orthodoxy. Victor was on the point of formally acknowledging them, when an Asiatic named Praxeas, armed with the authority which was attached to the character of a confessor, arrived at Rome, and, by his reports as to the nature of the party, induced the bishop to change his opinion, and to excommunicate them.

The Montanists loudly complained of it as a wrong that they were excluded from the church while they wished to remain in communion with it. This complaint, however, is only an instance of the usual inability of partisans to view their own case fairly. By the rigor of its discipline, by the contempt with which its professors looked down on the great body of Christians, by enforcing its peculiarities under the sanction of a pretended revelation, Montanism had before virtually excommunicated the church; and we cannot doubt that, if tolerated, it would not have been content with anything short of supremacy. Moreover, its spirit was strongly opposed to the regular authority of the church. The ordinary offices it disparaged as merely psychic : bishops were declared to be inferior to prophets; and prophets were distinguished, not by outward ordination, but by spiritual gifts and graces, so that they might belong to any class. Nor can we wonder if the attitude which the Montanists assumed towards the state had a share in inducing the more peaceable Christians to disconnect themselves from them ; for their prophecies in great part consisted of matter which by the Roman law amounted to treason,—denunciations of calamity, and exultation over the approaching downfall of the persecuting empire.

The stern spirit of the sect animated its members to court persecution. Their zeal for martyrdom was nourished by the doctrine that the souls of martyrs would enter at once into the enjoyment of their full blessedness, whereas those of other righteous men would not receive their consummation until the end of the world. The Montanists were, however, preserved by their rigid views on the subject of penance from admitting the abuses which arose elsewhere as to the privilege of martyrs in granting indulgences.

Although the sect and its subdivisions continued to flourish for a time, and some remains of it existed in the sixth century, or even later, the chief success of Montanism was gained in a different way—by infusing much of its character into the church. It is probably to its congeniality with the spirit which afterwards became dominant in the west that Montanism owes the privilege which it alone, of the early heresies, possesses—that of being allowed to descend to us in the unmutated representations of one of its own champions.

Tertullian was perhaps the most eminent man whom the church had seen since the days of the apostles. Of his character we have a full and distinct impression from his works; but the facts of his life are very obscure. He was a native of Carthage, the son of a centurion, and is supposed to have been born about the year 160. We learn from himself that he was originally a heathen, and that as such he partook in the prevailing vices of his countrymen. That he had followed the profession of an advocate appears probable, no less from his style of argument than from his acquaintance with law, and from his use of forensic terms. In addition to his legal learning, he shows a knowledge of physic and of natural philosophy, with extensive reading in poetry and general literature; and he was master of the Greek language to such a degree as to compose treatises in it.

After his conversion he became a presbyter of the church, and in that character resided both at Carthage and at Rome. His lapse into Montanism, which took place in middle life, is ascribed by St. Jerome to the jealousy and slights which he met with at the hands of the Roman clergy; but, although it is very possible that Tertullian may have been treated by these in a manner which exasperated his impatient temper, the assigned motive has been generally discredited, and is indeed needless in order to account for his having joined a party whose opinions and practice accorded so well with his natural bent. We must be prepared to see frequently in the course of our history men of high gifts forsake the orthodox communion—led astray either by a restless spirit of speculation, or by a desire to realize the vision of a faultless church in a manner which Holy Scripture appears to represent as unattainable.

Not only are the dates of the events in Tertullian's life and of his writings uncertain, but it is impossible to decide whether certain of his treatises were written before or after his defection. On the one hand, the subject of a work belonging to his Montanistic period may be such as to allow no room for displaying the peculiarities of his sect: on the other hand, a severity of tone, which seems like a token of Montanism, may be merely the result of the writer's temperament, or characteristic of the more rigid party within the church. The genius of Tertullian is gloomy and saturnine; the spirit of the gospel appears in him strongly tinged by the nature of the man. He has a remarkable power of forcible argument and condensed expression; subtlety, acuteness, and depth; a wit alike pungent and delicate; an ardor which carries him over all obstacles, and almost hurries the reader along with him; but his mind is merely that of an advocate, and is wholly wanting in calmness, solidity, and the power of dispassionate judgment. His language is rude and uncouth, obscured by antiquated and newly-coined words, by harsh constructions and perplexing allusions; his style, both of thought and of expression, is marked by tumour and exaggeration. In another respect Tertullian's diction is very remarkable and important, as being the earliest specimen of ecclesiastical Latin. Hitherto the language of the western churches, not only in the Greek colonies of Gaul, but at Rome itself, had been Greek—the general medium of communication, and the tongue in which the oracles of Christianity were written. If Minucius Felix was (as some have supposed) older than Tertullian, the subject of his treatise was not such as to require the use of any especially theological terms; it is therefore to the great African writer that the creation of a technical Christian Latinity is to be ascribed.

Tertullian's "Apology" was almost certainly composed before his lapse, and is the masterpiece of the class to which it belongs. In it he urges with his characteristic force, and with all the freshness of novelty, most of the topics which had been advanced by the earlier apologists; he adds many new arguments, both in favor of the gospel and in refutation of paganism; and he supplies to readers of later times much curious information as to the history and circumstances of the church. He felt himself entitled to insist on the progress of Christianity as an argument in its favor:—"We are a people of yesterday", he says, "and yet we have filled every place belonging to you—cities, islands, castles, towns, assemblies, your very camp, your tribes, companies, palace, senate, forum. We leave you your temples only. We can count your armies; our numbers in a single province will be greater". The manner in which he meets the charges of disloyalty against his brethren is especially remarkable; he appeals to the fact (already noticed) that no Christians had been found among the partisans of the emperor's defeated rivals; and he states as a reason why Christians were bound to pray for the continuance of the empire, a belief that it was the obstacle which St. Paul had spoken of as "letting" the appearance of Antichrist. In a later apologetic writing, the "Address to Scapula", Tertullian again insists on the loyalty of Christians; but he declares that the blood of the saints cannot be shed without drawing down vengeance. His tone is full of scorn and defiance; he exults in the calamities and portents of the time, as signs and foretastes of the ruin which was about to fall on the persecutors.

On joining the Montanists, Tertullian embraced their doctrine in its full rigor. The contempt of a *spiritalis* for the psychic church is uttered with all the vehemence of his character, and with all his power of expression. Although he himself was, or had been, married, he is violent against matrimony; to marry two wives in succession he regards as no less an offence than marriage with two at once; he would exclude bigamists from the church, without hope of reconciliation, although he does not deny that God may possibly accept their sincere repentance. His views as to penance are of the severest kind; he denies that the church can remit deadly sin after baptism, but asserts the power of absolution for the prophets of his own sect. He altogether condemns military service, as inconsistent with Christian duty, and inseparably mixed up with heathen observances. One of his treatises was written in justification of a soldier who had been put to death for refusing to wear a garland on the occasion of a donative distributed in honor of the emperor. Tertullian argues that such use of flowers is a sinful vanity, inasmuch as it is not only heathenish, but contrary to nature. In the tract “De Spectaculis”, he proscribes all attendance at public amusements, and fortifies his denunciations with tales of judgments inflicted on persons who had been present at them. He regards flight in time of danger as a sin worse than the abjuration of Christ in the midst of tortures, and thinks that a Christian ought even to provoke persecution.

Bitter as Tertullian became in his tone towards the communion which he had forsaken, he yet did not, like too many in similar circumstances, devote himself exclusively to the work of injuring it. He continued to be the champion of the gospel against paganism and Judaism; in treatises against Marcion, Valentinus, Hermogenes, Praxeas, and other heretics, he maintained the common cause of his sect and of the church. St. Augustine states that in his last years he became the head of a distinct party of “Tertullianists”, the remnant of which was recovered to the church in Augustine's own time, and probably through his exertions.

A dislike of the theories which have lately been vented in connection with the term *development* must not be allowed to prejudice us against admitting that the doctrine of the church on the highest subjects has undergone a process for which perhaps no more appropriate name could be found. This development was rendered necessary by the circumstances of the case; its effect was to bring out into a distinct and scientific form truths which had before been not the less really held, although the minds of men had not been exercised in precisely defining them. Thus we can imagine, for example, that the cardinal verities of our Blessed Lord's Godhead and manhood may have been believed by Christians from the beginning, but that it may have been the work of a later time to attain to the full consciousness of such a belief, to investigate what is the proper meaning of Godhead and what of manhood, and what are the conditions of their union in the one person of the Saviour. Where principles of truth have been given, it is a legitimate task for the mind enlightened and sanctified by the promised gifts of the Comforter to draw the proper inferences from them. When an opinion new in expression was proposed, it was for Christians to ask themselves more distinctly than before what their belief on the subject had been—whether it agreed or disagreed with that which was now presented to them; to compare their impressions with those of their brethren; and in concert with these either to admit the doctrine as sound, or to reject it as contrary to the faith in which they had been trained.

Thus it was that truth was drawn forth in its fullness by the assaults of error; that that which had been a feeling and a conviction came by degrees to be stated in exact and formal dogmas. Hence we can understand that the early Christian writers might use much loose and imperfect language on the highest points; that they might even have a defective apprehension as to the details of doctrine; that they might employ terms which the church afterwards condemned, and might scruple at terms which the church afterwards sanctioned; and yet that their belief was sound in itself, faithfully preserving the tradition of the apostles, and identical with the creed of the later church. Nor is it any real disparagement to the believers nearest the apostolic age to say that on such matters they were less informed than those who came after

them. Their work was not to investigate, but to act. Their worship and their whole Christian life implied the true faith; their writings are penetrated by the conviction of it: if but as the men who had known the apostles or their immediate disciples passed away, a necessity arose of relying less on apostolic tradition, and having recourse in a greater degree to the apostolic writings. By the help of these the faith was now to be tested, confirmed, and systematized.

In the last years of the second century the difficulty of reconciling the fundamental doctrine of the Divine unity (*monarchia*) with that of the threefold Name gave rise to two different forms of heresy. In the one, the unity was rescued by denying the Godhead of the second and third Persons; in the other, the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were explained as merely denoting three different manifestations or aspects of one and the same Divine Person.

The leader in the former error was Theodotus, a native of Byzantium, who, although by trade a currier, is described as a man of learning and accomplishment. After having denied Christ in a time of persecution, when the brethren who had been arrested with him suffered martyrdom, he repaired to Rome, where at first he was well received; and when the history of his lapse became known, he excused himself by saying that he had denied not God, but man. Thus he was led into his heresy, which seems to have admitted the miraculous conception of our Lord, but regarded him as nothing more than a man guided by a Divine influence. Similar opinions were soon after professed by Artemon, who appears to have been unconnected with Theodotus, but was popularly classed with him. Artemon pretended that his doctrine was not only scriptural but primitive—that it had been held in the church of Rome until the time of Zephyrinus, whose episcopate began in the year 202; but it was not difficult to refute such a pretense by a reference to Scripture, to the hymns and liturgical forms of the church, to the writings of the earlier fathers, and to the fact that on account of a like doctrine Theodotus had been excommunicated by Victor. The Artemonites are described as students of mathematics and of the Aristotelian philosophy rather than of the Scriptures, which they treated in a very arbitrary way, each of their more noted teachers having a copy peculiar to himself.

The other tendency which has been mentioned—that which regarded the names of the three Divine Persons as merely designating various aspects or operations of the one Deity—would appear to have existed as early as the days of Justin Martyr; but it now for the first time found a distinct utterance in Praxeas. This man was an Asiatic, and, unlike Theodotus, had acquired by his constancy in persecution a degree of credit which was perhaps beyond his deserts, and was dangerous to the balance of his mind. We have already seen that he arrived at Rome when Victor or some other bishop was on the point of acknowledging the Montanists, and that by the information which his experience in Asia enabled him to give, backed by his influence as a confessor, he persuaded the bishop to reject them. But this good service to the faith was soon followed by the publication of his heresy, which he professed to ground on a few texts—compelling the rest of Holy Scripture to bend to these. The sequel of his story is somewhat indistinct: it would seem that, after having been refuted at Rome, he passed over to Carthage, and it is said that he was there drawn into a recantation; but perhaps this may have been no more than a disavowal of some tenets or inferences which were wrongly imputed to him. He afterwards again maintained his heresy; when Tertullian, who is supposed to have been its chief opponent in the earlier stages, wrote the work against him which is our principal source of information on the subject.

It now appears that two other teachers of the same kind, who have usually been placed somewhat later, belong to the period embraced in this chapter—Noetus and Sabellius. The common account of Noetus hardly extends beyond the statements that he was of Ephesus or Smyrna; that, on venting his doctrines, he was questioned and excommunicated by the clergy of some Asiatic city; and that he died shortly after. Of Sabellius, personally, nothing was known except that he was a presbyter of the Libyan Pentapolis. But the book which has been published as Origen's "Philosophumena" and which appears to be really the work of St.

Hippolytus, bishop of Portus, at the mouth of the Tiber, makes important additions to our information. It is there stated that Epigonus, a disciple of Noetus, repaired to Rome, and made a proselyte of one Cleomenes, who opened a school of Noetianism; that Cleomenes won over Callistus, who had great influence with the bishop, Zephyrinus (A.D. 202-218); that the bishop, an “illiterate man and greedy of filthy lucre”, was bribed into licensing Cleomenes as a teacher, and at length himself became his convert; that Callistus endeavored, by a crafty policy, to hold the balance between the heretics and the orthodox; that, after succeeding Zephyrinus in the see (A.D. 218), he cast off and excommunicated Sabellius, whom he had before misled; and that he founded a new party of Callistians, which combined laxity of discipline and morals with heretical doctrine. According to this account, then, it appears that both Sabellius and some followers of Noetus were teaching at Rome in the early years of the third century.

The kind of error which was common to Praxeas, Noetus, and Sabellius, was capable of various forms. Thus, it might be held that the one Godhead dwelt in the man Jesus in such a way as to justify the name Patripassian, given to Praxeas by his opponents, who argued that, if there were no distinction of persons, the Father must be the same who suffered on the cross; or that the names of the three Persons denote so many energies, emanating from the one Monad, and again to be absorbed into him after the fulfillment of their work. Noetus was more refined than Praxeas, and Sabellius than Noetus. Sabellius maintained that God is in himself the Monad; that when revealed, he is “extended” into the Trinity. He acknowledged three “persons”, but used the word in a sense which may be termed merely dramatic—as meaning characters, assumed or represented. He illustrated his idea by comparison with the three elements of man—body, soul, and spirit; and with the threefold combination in the sun, of shape or substance, light, and heat.

It does not appear that Praxeas was able to found a sect. Theodoret mentions Callistus as the successor of Noetus; and this teacher, of whose earlier life a very discreditable account is given in the *Philosophumena*, is now, by means of that work, identified with a canonized bishop of Rome. But although the heresy, thus supported, flourished for a time, the Noetians or Callistians soon became extinct. The sect of Sabellians is said to have lasted into the fifth century. It was, however, never numerous; and the significance of Sabellius’ name is not as the founder of a separate body, but as indicating one of the tendencies into which speculation has run when exercised on the mystery of the Godhead.

In this period we find that Christianity and heathen philosophy, in preparing for a continuation of their struggle, adopt something of each other’s armour; and Alexandria—a city of which the intellectual character has been already sketched in connection with the origin of Gnosticism—becomes the chief seat, both of philosophical Christianity and of the reformed paganism. If the gospel were to make its way on such ground, it was necessary that it should be presented in a shape attractive to men of learning and cultivation. The catechetical school of Alexandria is said by some writers to have existed even from the time of St. Mark; if so, it was probably at first nothing more than an institution for the teaching of catechumens—the name given to proselytes who were preparing for baptism. But about the middle of the second century it assumed a different character, and became a seminary for the training of clergy, and for completing the instruction of the most highly educated converts. The mastership was held by a succession of eminent men, of whom the first that can be named with certainty was Pantaenus, a convert from the stoic philosophy. Pantaenus is described by his pupil Clement as superior to all his contemporaries; St. Jerome tells us that he composed many commentaries on Scripture, but did still greater service to the church by his oral teaching. He is also celebrated as having undertaken a missionary journey into India—a name which has in this case been variously interpreted as meaning Hindostan, Arabia, and Ethiopia or Abyssinia. Although the order of events in his life is uncertain, it has been generally supposed that

Pantaenus presided over the catechetical school before this expedition, and that he resumed the mastership on his return.

His successor was Clement—usually styled after the place of his residence, although he was probably a native of Athens. Clement had been converted to the faith after reaching manhood, and had then travelled through various countries in search of wisdom, until at length he found satisfaction in the teaching of Pantaenus. After having presided over the school for some years, he was driven from his post by the persecution of Severus. Of his afterlife it is only known that he sojourned in Cappadocia and at Jerusalem; but he is supposed to have returned to Alexandria, and to have died there about the year 220.

By these men a new system of thought was introduced into the church. The earlier Christians, for the most part, had viewed all heathen philosophy through the medium of the dislike occasioned by its opposition to the gospel; a large party of them had referred its origin to the devil, or to the angels who fell through their love for the “daughters of men”. Clement, however, claims for philosophy a far different source. It is, he says, “the gift of God”, “a work of Divine providence”; it had been given to the Greeks, even as the law was to the Jews, and for like purposes; it had been necessary for their justification before Christ came, and was still to be regarded as a preparative for the gospel; and, if rightly understood, was compatible with it. And by philosophy, he declares, was not here meant the system of any sect in particular, but “the eclectic, which embodies whatsoever is well said by each of the sects in teaching righteousness and religious knowledge”; while he would distinguish the truth thus conveyed from the human reasonings with which it is adulterated. He maintains that all learning may be sanctified and turned to good; that the cultivation of it is necessary in order to confute the sophistries of false philosophy. He works to vindicate the claim of the “barbarians” to philosophical knowledge, to identify the doctrines of philosophy with those of Scripture, and to derive the wisdom of the Greeks from the sacred oracles of the Hebrews.

In these opinions there was much that savoured of Gnosticism; but the more orthodox Alexandrian school differed from the Gnostics by denying the alleged opposition between faith and knowledge, and maintaining that faith must lie under all Christian knowledge, in every stage of the spiritual and intellectual progress. They held that the work of Christian philosophy was to unfold to knowledge the meaning of the truths which had been embraced by faith : that while faith receives its doctrines from tradition, knowledge must be able to prove them from Scripture. The term gnostic was adopted by the Alexandrians to denote the highest Christian character. Of Clement’s three chief extant works, which form a series rising one above another, while the first (the “Exhortation to the Gentiles”) is addressed to persons without the church, and the second (the “Pedagogue”) contains moral instruction for converts, the third, which from its miscellaneous character has the title of “Stromata” (Tapestry-work), is intended to portray the character of the perfect gnostic, and, by supplying instruction which might satisfy the highest desires of the intellect, to preserve from the “knowledge falsely so called” of such teachers as Basilides and Valentinus.

The combination of philosophy with the gospel led, however, to some very questionable results. In Clement’s own hands — especially if we may trust the accounts which are given of a lost work entitled “Hypotyposes” —it appears to have sometimes gone beyond the bounds of orthodoxy; and, when taken up by Origen and others, it became yet more decidedly dangerous.

The most lasting of the evils which this school introduced into the church was its license of figurative interpretation in explaining Holy Scripture. For this Alexandria was a congenial soil; there it had been employed on the Old Testament to an immoderate extent by the Jew Philo: and the epistle which is ascribed to St. Barnabas, and in which this method is perhaps carried as far as in any Christian writing, was probably the work of an Alexandrian convert from Judaism. But whereas the figurative interpretation had hitherto been an unregulated practice, it was now reduced to method. Scripture, it was said, has three senses—the

historical, the moral, and the mystical; and the first of these was treated as if it were merely subservient to the others. There was something in the system attractive at once to ingenuity of speculation and to a pious feeling of the depth of God's word; but the effect too commonly was that, instead of seeking for the real meaning of each passage, men set themselves to discover some fanciful analogy to ideas which they had derived from other parts of Scripture, or from altogether different sources. The historical sense was left out of sight, or even denied; the moral sense was often perverted; nor can an unprejudiced reader open any work in which this kind of interpretation is followed without feeling how utterly unlike it is, in its general character, to those scriptural instances of figurative interpretation which its advocates allege as precedents for it. The facilities which it afforded for pretending to prove anything whatever from Scripture must no doubt have contributed to render it popular, both in the church and among sectaries. In our own time, while an unhappy attempt has been made to revive it in the English church, it has been turned to a very different account by the German school which would resolve the Scripture narrative into a series of fables. These writers claim Origen and his brother allegorists as their own forerunners; for why (they ask) should such violence have been done to Scripture in the way of allegorical interpretation, but that the fathers felt its literal sense to be absurd, incredible, and revolting?

In common with some heathen sects, with the school of Philo, and with the Gnostics, the Alexandrians professed to possess a higher and more mysterious knowledge of religious things, derived from tradition, and hidden from those who were not worthy to receive it. By the system which in later times has been styled the "discipline of the secret" was not meant that concealment of the higher doctrines and rites which was practiced towards the heathen, and was in part continued towards the converts who were in training for baptism; y but, as appears from the hints given by Clement, the matters which it held in reserve were philosophical explanations of Christian doctrine, and precepts for the formation of the perfect Gnostic. He compares the discipline to withholding a knife from children out of fear lest they should cut themselves. This method is supposed to have originated not long before the time of Clement, and it was impossible that it should last. While we admit a legitimate use of discretion in communicating religious knowledge, we cannot but see that in this kind of reserve there were great dangers; and in the hands of the Alexandrians it undoubtedly led to a system of equivocation towards the uninitiated which was injurious to truth and to morality.

The opposition on the side of heathen philosophy which has been mentioned was carried on by the Neo-platonic school—founded at Alexandria in the reign of Severus, by Ammonius, who, from having been a porter in early life, was styled *Saccas*, or the Sack-carrier. Although his doctrine professed to be a continuation of Platonism, it was not only mixed with tenets from other Grecian systems, but also contained a strong Egyptian element; and it was especially remarkable for the new views which it opened on the subject of heathen religion. Hitherto Platonists had been content to maintain the popular system outwardly, while they taught a more refined doctrine to their disciples; but now paganism was to be itself reformed; it was to be explained as a scheme of purer and deeper character, so that either the way might be paved for a combination with the gospel, or a position might be gained for effectively resisting its advances. The Neoplatonists admitted that Christianity contained great truths, but asserted that in it these were obscured by barbarism, and that the old traditionary religion, if freed from popular corruptions and rightly understood, would be found to exhibit them in a purer form. Christ himself was classed with sages of the first rank; it was said that his object had been to reform religion; that his own views had agreed with those of the Neoplatonists, but that his followers had corrupted his system by spurious additions—among which were the doctrines of his Godhead and mediation, and the prohibition of worshipping the gods. Neoplatonism had much in common with some forms of Gnosticism; it aimed at uniting the wisdom of all ages and of all nations in one comprehensive scheme; and in order to effect the union it had recourse to many strange evasions and forced constructions. It laid down the

doctrine of one supreme God, and acknowledged the Platonic Trinity, consisting of the One, his Intelligence, and his Soul. In subordination to these, it held the existence of many inferior gods and demons, the ministers of the Supreme; and it represented the vulgar polytheism as a corruption of this truth. With the loftier doctrines of the sect were combined much fanciful superstition and a devotion to theurgical practices. Its practical precepts were severe; an ascetic life was required in order to emancipation from the bonds of sense, to the acquisition of power over spirits, and to union with the Deity.

Ammonius was originally a Christian, and it has been maintained by some that, notwithstanding the character of his oral and secret teaching, he remained to the end in outward communion with the church. It is, however, more commonly believed that he openly lapsed into heathenism. Among his pupils were both Christians and pagans; of the former, Origen was the most eminent; from among the latter he may be said to have founded a dynasty of teachers, which included Plotinus, Porphyry, and Iamblichus. It may be easily understood that a system so comprehensive as Neoplatonism had strong attractions for persons perplexed by the controversies of Christians with pagans, of orthodox with heterodox, and of philosophical sects with each other. It soon almost superseded every other form of heathen philosophy; it lasted until the sixth century; and in it the gospel found the most subtle and the most formidable of its adversaries. But the very refinement of the system unfitted it for obtaining a hold on the mass of mankind; and the living conviction of the truth of the old religions was gone for ever.

CHAPTER VI

FROM ALEXANDER SEVERUS TO VALERIAN
A.D. 222-260.

Elagabalus was succeeded in 222 by his cousin Alexander Severus, a boy of sixteen. The young emperor was inclined to favor the Christians, partly through the influence of his mother, Mammaea, who, notwithstanding her acknowledged vices of avarice and ambition, is described both by heathen writers and by Eusebius as a “very devout woman”. Alexander had many Christians in his household. In appointing to civil offices he adopted a rule observed by the church in ordinations—that the names of candidates should be publicly exhibited, and that an opportunity of objecting to them should be allowed. He frequently used the evangelical maxim of “doing to others as we would that they should do to us”, and caused it to be inscribed on the walls of his palace, and of other public buildings. When a piece of land, which had been regarded as common, was taken by a Christian congregation as a site for a church, and the company of victuallers at Rome set up a rival claim, he adjudged it to the Christians, on the ground that any kind of religious use would be better than the conversion of it into a tavern. Nay, it is said that he thought of enrolling Christ among the gods, and erecting a temple to him.

It is, however, a mistake to suppose either the emperor or his mother to have been a Christian. Mammaea’s interest in the gospel appears to have really not extended beyond a slight inquiry into its doctrines and a favorable opinion of its professors. Alexander’s religion was eclectic: he had in his oratory images, not only of Roman gods, including such of his predecessors as had been deified, but of Isis and Serapis, of Orpheus, Abraham, and Apollonius of Tyana; and with these was associated the image of the Saviour. It is evident, therefore, that the emperor did not regard Christianity as the one true religion, but as one of many forms, all acceptable to the Deity, all containing somewhat of truth, and differing only in outward circumstances; that he revered its Founder, not as Divine, but as one worthy to be ranked among the chief of the sages who have enlightened and benefited mankind. Nor, although the Christians were, on the whole, practically tolerated in this reign, was anything done towards the establishment of a formal and legal toleration; indeed there were some instances of persecution and martyrdom, and it was probably under Alexander that the celebrated lawyer Ulpian, in his book “On the duties of a Proconsul”, made an elaborate digest of the laws against the profession of the gospel.

The estimable but somewhat weak Alexander was murdered in 235; and the Christians suffered at the hands of his successor, Maximin the Thracian, for the favour which they had lately enjoyed. The barbarian emperor’s motives for persecution were wholly independent of religion; for of that, in any form, he was utterly regardless—melting down for his own use the gold and silver ornaments of heathen temples, and even the images of the gods. His rage was directed against such Christians only as had been connected with the court, among whom Origen was especially noted. But about the same time earthquakes in several provinces afforded a pretext for popular risings; and in these tumultuary outbreaks churches were burnt and many Christians were put to death.

The reign of Gordian (A.D. 238-244) and that of Philip the Arabian (A.D. 244-249) were friendly to the church. Origen, writing under the latter, says that God had given the Christians the free exercise of their religion, and anticipates the conversion of the empire;—a new idea, remarkably opposed to the tone of the earlier Christian writers, who had always regarded the

Roman power as incurably hostile and persecuting,—as an oppression from which there could be no hope of deliverance except through the coming of the end. Under Philip, Rome completed the thousandth year from its foundation; and it has been dwelt on by many writers as a remarkable circumstance, that this event took place under an emperor whom they supposed to have been a Christian. The games and rites with which it was celebrated, however, were purely heathen in character; and, although it seems to be true that both Philip and his wife received letters from the great Christian teacher Origen, there is little reason for supposing that the emperor's guilty life was combined with a belief in the gospel. Towards the end of the reign there was a persecution at Alexandria.

Decius is memorable as the first emperor who attempted to extirpate the Christian religion by a general persecution of its professors. His edicts are lost; but the records of the time exhibit a departure from the system which had been usually observed by enemies of the church since the days of Trajan. The authorities now sought out Christians; the legal order as to accusations was neglected; accusers ran no risk; and popular clamor was admitted instead of formal information.

The long enjoyment of peace had told unfavorably on the church. Cyprian in the west and Origen in the east speak of the secular spirit which had crept in among its members—of the pride, the luxury, the covetousness of the higher clergy; of the careless and irreligious lives of the people. And when, as Origen had foretold, a new season of trial came, the effects of the general relaxation were sadly displayed. On being summoned, in obedience to the emperor's edict, to appear and offer sacrifice, multitudes of Christians in every city rushed to the forum—some induced by fear of confiscation, some by a wish to retain offices in the public service, some by dread of tortures, some by the entreaties of friends and kindred: it seemed, says St. Cyprian, as if they had long been eager to find an opportunity for disowning their faith. The persecution was especially directed against the bishops and clergy. Among its victims were Fabian of Rome, Babylas of Antioch, and Alexander of Jerusalem; while in the lives of other eminent men (as Cyprian, Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Dionysius of Alexandria) the period is marked by exile or other sufferings. The chief object, however, was not to inflict death on the Christians, but to force them to recantation. With this view they were subjected to tortures, imprisonment, and want of food; and under such trials the constancy of many gave way. Many withdrew into voluntary banishment; among these was Paul, a young man of Alexandria, who took up his abode in the desert of the Thebaid, and is celebrated as the first Christian hermit. The violence of the persecution did not last above a year; for in the end of 251 Decius was killed in battle with the Goths, and the short reign of Gallus passed away without injury to the Christians, except that in some provinces they suffered from the outrages of the populace, who charged them with having caused a plague which for fifteen years afflicted the empire.

Valerian, the successor of Gallus, is described by Dionysius of Alexandria as having for a time been more favorable to the church than even those among his predecessors who had been reputed Christians—words which are supposed to designate Alexander, and either Philip or Mammaea. But in his fifth year the emperor changed his policy, at the instigation of Macrianus, his chief adviser, who is said to have been connected with Egyptian magicians. At first it was thought that the gospel might be suppressed by removing the teachers of the church, and forbidding its members to hold assemblies for worship, or to resort to the cemeteries. Finding, however, that these measures had no decided effect, Valerian issued a second edict, by which it was ordered that the clergy should be put to death; that senators and knights should be deprived of their dignities and property, and, if they persisted in the faith, should be capitally punished; that women of rank should suffer confiscation of property and be sent into banishment. But even this edict did not enact any penalty against persons of inferior condition, so that the great mass of Christians would seem to have been unmolested by its operation. Valerian's attempt to check the progress of the gospel was utterly ineffectual.

The church had been purified and strengthened by her late calamities, so that there were now few instances of apostasy such as those which had been so common under Decius. The faith and patience of the martyrs animated their surviving brethren, and impressed many of the heathen; bishops, when driven from their flocks, were followed by multitudes of believers; and in the places of their exile they found opportunities for spreading the doctrine of Christ among people to whom it was before unknown.

Dionysius applies to Valerian the Apocalyptic description of the beast to whom was given “a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies”, with “power to continue forty and two months”. After having lasted three years and a half the persecution was ended by the capture and death of the emperor in Persia— a calamity and disgrace without example in the Roman annals. Among the martyrs under Valerian were Xystus, bishop of Rome, with his deacon, Laurence; and Cyprian, bishop of Carthage.

Of the eminent men of this period, those who most especially claim our notice are Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Cyprian.

Origen was born at Alexandria about the year 185, and from his childhood was carefully trained, both in literature and in religion, by his father, Leonides, who was a Christian, and by profession a teacher of rhetoric. He daily learnt by heart a portion of the Scriptures, and thus laid the foundation of his extraordinary biblical knowledge, and also of that reverence for the sacred writings which controlled him in all the wanderings of his speculations. The tendency of his mind was early shown by the questions which he put to his father as to the meaning of Scripture—endeavoring to discover a sense beyond that which lay on the surface. Leonides, although himself no enemy to the deeper system of interpretation, discouraged such inquiries as unsuitable to his son's years; but his heart was filled with joy and thankfulness on account of the rare gifts which appeared in the boy. While his father was yet alive, Origen studied at the catechetical school, under the mastership of Clement, and there formed a friendship with Alexander, afterwards bishop of Jerusalem, which had an important influence on his later career.

The persecution of Severus was especially violent at Alexandria, and Leonides was one of the victims. Origen was eager for martyrdom, and was saved only through the care of his mother, who, after having vainly endeavored to dissuade him from exposing himself to danger, compelled him to remain at home by hiding his clothes. Being thus prevented from sharing his father's sufferings, the youth displayed his zeal by a fervent letter to Leonides while in prison, exhorting him not to be shaken in his constancy by a regard for those whom he was to leave behind him. As the death of Leonides was accompanied by the seizure of his property, the widow with her seven children fell into deep distress. Origen, who was the eldest of the seven, was compassionately received into the house of a wealthy Christian lady; but in this asylum he was annoyed by the presence of a gnostic teacher, Paul of Antioch, whom his benefactress had adopted and intended to make her heir. The eloquence of Paul was such as even to attract many of the orthodox to his teaching; but Origen, although he could not altogether avoid intercourse with him, steadily refused to attend any of his lectures.

The catechetical school had been broken up by the persecution. Clement, as we have seen, had left Alexandria—not out of any unworthy regard for his personal safety, but in compliance with his view of Christian duty. In these circumstances, Origen, whose extraordinary abilities and precocious learning were already noted, received applications from some educated heathens who wished to be instructed in Christian doctrine; and having thus, at the age of eighteen, found himself drawn into assuming the office of a public teacher, he was soon after formally appointed by the bishop, Demetrius, to the mastership of the catechetical school. Among his earliest pupils were two brothers, Heraclas, eventually bishop of Alexandria, and Plutarch. The persecution was renewed with increased violence on the arrival of a new governor, and Plutarch and others of Origen's scholars were martyred. Their master

stood by them to encourage them in their sufferings; nor did he himself escape without having been severely treated by the populace.

Wishing to be exempt from the necessity of taking any payment for his lessons, in obedience (as he supposed) to the text, “Freely ye have received, freely give”, Origen sold a valuable collection of manuscripts for an allowance of four oboli a-day, and on this scanty income he contrived to live. He endeavored to realize to the letter the gospel precepts of poverty. He had but one coat, which was too thin to protect him against the cold of winter; he walked barefoot; he contented himself with such food as was absolutely necessary, abstaining from flesh and wine; he spent the greater part of the night in study; and when he slept, it was on the bare floor. By these austerities were sown the seeds of ailments which afflicted him throughout his life.

Among those who resorted to his lectures were many young women. The intercourse with such pupils exposed him both to temptations and to the risk of slander; and from a wish to avoid these evils he acted literally on our Lord's words, that some “have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake”. Although he endeavored to conceal the act, it came to the knowledge of Demetrius; and the bishop, at the time, far from showing any disapproval of it, commended his zeal, and encouraged him to continue his labors in the catechetical school. His fame as a teacher increased. In addition to his theological instructions, he lectured in grammar—a term which then included most of the branches of general literature; his school was frequented by Jews, heathens, and gnostics, and many of these were led through the pursuit of secular learning to embrace the faith of the gospel. The requirements of his position induced him to seek after a fuller acquaintance with heathen philosophy than that which he had gained from Clement; and for this purpose he became a hearer of Ammonius Saccas. It has been inferred, from the circumstances which have been mentioned as to Origen's conduct in early life, that he was then addicted to an extremely literal interpretation of the Scriptures—a system very opposite to that which he pursued in maturer years; and the supposed change has been ascribed to the influence of Ammonius. But the truth would rather appear to be, that both in his earlier and in his later phases he was animated by the same spirit. The actions which his judgment afterwards condemned as carnal were prompted by a desire to emancipate himself from the flesh; and that which he really derived from Ammonius was not a reversal of his former principles, but a development and enlargement of his views.

The peace which the Christians enjoyed during the reign of Caracalla induced Origen to visit Rome where the church was then under the government of Zephyrinus. After a short stay in the imperial city he returned to Alexandria, and resumed his catechetical office, devolving the instruction of the less advanced students on Heraclas, while he reserved his own works for those who were to be led into the full depths of his system of interpretation. It appears to have been about this time that he entered on the study of Hebrew—a language then commonly neglected by the learned men of the Alexandrian school, but attractive to Origen, not only as being generally useful towards the understanding of the Old Testament, but especially on account of the mysteries involved in scriptural names. A massacre which took place at Alexandria under Caracalla, although unconnected with any question of religion drove Origen for a time from the city. He visited the Holy Land, where he was received with honor by his old fellow-student, Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and by Theoctistus, bishop of Caesarea; and, although a layman, he was desired by them to preach in their churches. On hearing of this, Demetrius of Alexandria remonstrated, but Theoctistus and Alexander justified themselves by precedents which showed that laymen had been permitted to preach in the presence of bishops, and with their sanction. Demetrius, however, was offended; he summoned Origen to return to his duties in the catechetical school, and the deacons who conveyed the letter were charged to conduct him back.

Among Origen's chief friends and admirers was a man of fortune named Ambrose, who had been converted by him from some form of gnostic heresy, and afterwards became a deacon. Ambrose urged his teacher to engage in the illustration of Scripture, and supplied him with the funds necessary for forming a collection of manuscripts, and employing a large body of amanuenses and transcribers. Among the results of this munificence were the first regular commentaries on the sacred books (for the earlier expositions had been confined to particular texts or sections); and besides these, a work which entitles Origen to rank as the father of biblical criticism. The original object of this great undertaking was controversial,—to ascertain the true text of the Septuagint, and to vindicate that version against the Jews, who, since the adoption and general use of it by Christians, had made it their policy to disparage it as inferior to later translations. For this purpose Origen exhibited in parallel columns,— (1) the original Hebrew text; (2) the same in Greek letters; (3) the version by Aquila; (4) the version of Symmachus; (5) the Septuagint, edited from an elaborate collection of MSS.; and (6) the version of Theodotus. From its six columns the whole work was called *Hexapla*, and, from the addition of two imperfect versions in certain parts, it had also the name of *Odapla*. This gigantic work appears to have been begun at Alexandria; it extended over eight-and-twenty years, and was completed only a short time before Origen's death. The original manuscript, which was preserved at Caesarea, is supposed to have perished at the destruction of the Caesarean library by the Arabs, in the year 653. It had never been transcribed as a whole; but separate copies of the various columns had been made, and that of the Septuagint became a standard text of that version.

In consequence of the reputation which Origen had attained, applications for instruction and advice were made to him from distant quarters. Thus, before his first visit to Palestine, he had been invited by a person of authority in Arabia—most probably a Roman governor, although some writers suppose him to have been the head of a native tribe—to teach his people the Christian faith, and had complied with the invitation. At a later time Mammaea, the mother of Alexander Severus, summoned him to Antioch, and conferred with him on religious subjects. In like manner he was requested, in the year 228, to visit Greece, for the confutation of some heresies which were disturbing the church of that country. He set out, bearing with him letters of commendation from his bishop, according to the practice of the time, and took his way through Palestine, where, at the age of forty-three, he was ordained presbyter by his friends Theoctistus and Alexander. In explanation of this it has been supposed that the bishops wished him to address their flocks, as on his former visit that Origen reminded them of the objections then made by Demetrius; that, by way of guarding against further complaints, they offered to ordain him; and that he accepted the offer, in the belief that Demetrius, although determined not to raise him to the presbyterate like his predecessors Pantaenus and Clement, would allow him to rank among the Alexandrian presbyters, if the order were conferred on him elsewhere by bishops of eminent station and character. After having successfully accomplished his business in Greece, Origen returned to Alexandria in 230 but in the meantime his ordination had given rise to much dispute. Demetrius, on being informed of it, vehemently expostulated with Alexander and Theoctistus, apprising them of the rash act of Origen's youthful zeal, which, by one of the canons which claim the title of Apostolical, is pronounced a bar to ordination. This information was new to the bishops; for Origen had said nothing of the impediment. If the canon existed at so early a time, it is yet possible that he may have been unacquainted with it; or he may have reasonably supposed himself to be exempt from its operation, since the object of it unquestionably was to check the fanatical spirit which prompted such acts, whereas he had long passed through the stage at which he had anything in common with that spirits. But, although the proceedings of Demetrius have been attributed by St. Jerome to envy of Origen's genius and fame, and although his conduct was certainly marked by an unjustifiable violence and harshness, it is not impossible that he

may have acted from sincerely conscientious motives. He had been glad to retain Origen's services as a teacher, but refused to acknowledge him as a presbyter.

In addition to the irregularity of his ordination, Origen had given offence by some of his speculations. Finding his position at Alexandria uneasy, he withdrew to Caesarea, and after his departure Demetrius assembled two synods, by which Origen was deprived of his office in the catechetical school, his orders were annulled and he was excommunicated as a heretic. The result of these synods was made generally known to the bishops of other countries. By the rules of catholic communion, the decisions of one church in such matters were usually received by the rest, without inquiry into the merits of the case: and thus the sentence against Origen was ratified at Rome and elsewhere, while it was disregarded in those countries which had especially felt his personal influence,—in Palestine, Phoenicia, Arabia, and Achaia. Demetrius died soon after, and was succeeded in the see by Heraclas: but it is remarkable that no attempt was made by the new bishop to rescind the condemnation of his former teacher and colleague.

At Caesarea, under the patronage of Theoctistus and Alexander, Origen found not only a refuge, but the opportunity for active and conspicuous work. As there was no institution like the Alexandrian school, he took the position of an independent philosophical teacher, and his instructions were sought, not only by Christians, but by many heathens. Among these the most celebrated were two brothers, natives of Pontus, named Theodore and Athenodore, who, having been led to visit Palestine by family circumstances, became hearers of Origen in philosophy and literature, and were gradually guided by him to the Christian faith. Both eventually became bishops. It is said that Theodore, who at his baptism had taken the name of Gregory, at entering on his diocese of Neocaesarea, in Pontus, found in it only seventeen Christians, and that at his death he left in it only seventeen heathens—a statement which may be taken as expressing in an exaggerated form a really signal course of successful labor. He afterwards became the subject of many marvelous tales, from which he received the name of Thaumaturgus, or miracle-worker.

After a residence of five or six years at Caesarea, Origen was compelled by the persecution of Maximin to take refuge at the Cappadocian city of the same name under the protection of the bishop, Firmilian, who had been one of his pupils; and when the persecution reached Cappadocia, he was sheltered in the house of Juliana, a wealthy Christian virgin, where he discovered an important addition to his materials for the Hexapla—his protectress having inherited the library of Symmachus, an Ebionite translator of the Old Testament. On the death of Maximin he returned to Caesarea in Palestine. It was probably after this that he was invited to be present at a synod held in Arabia on account of Beryllus, bishop of Bostra, who, although seemingly unconnected with the schools of Praxeas and Noetus, had arrived at a doctrine similar to theirs—that in the unity of the Godhead there is no distinction of Persons; that the Son had no personality before his incarnation. The synod condemned the doctrine, but could not convince Beryllus; Origen, however, succeeded in proving to him the unsoundness of his view, and received the thanks of both parties. On another occasion he was summoned to combat the opinion of an Arabian sect, which held that the soul as well as the body is dissolved at death, and will be restored to being at the resurrection.

In the persecution under Decius, Origen lost his steadfast friend Alexander of Jerusalem. He was himself imprisoned and cruelly tortured; and the effect of this treatment on a frame worn out by age, study, and sickness, hastened his death, which took place at Tyre about the year 255.

The great object of this eminent teacher was to harmonize Christianity with philosophy. He sought to combine in a Christian scheme the fragmentary truths scattered throughout other systems; to establish the gospel in a form which should not present obstacles to the conversion of Jews, of Gnostics, and of cultivated heathens; and his errors arose from a too eager pursuit of this idea.

Origen's principles of interpreting Scripture have been already mentioned by anticipation. It was from him that the Alexandrian method received its completion. He distinguished in Scripture a threefold sense—the literal, the moral, and the mystical—answering respectively to the body, soul, and spirit in man. As at the marriage of Cana some waterpots contained two firkins and some three, so (he taught) Scripture in “every jot and tittle” has the moral and the mystical senses, and in most parts it has the literal sense also. The Holy Spirit, it was said, made use of the literal history where it was suitable for conveying the mystical sense; where this was not the case, He invented the story with a view to that purpose; and in the Law, while He laid down some things to be literally observed, other precepts were in their letter impossible or absurd. By this principle much of the letter of Scripture was rejected; but such passages, both in the Old and in the New Testament, were, according to Origen, set by the Holy Spirit as stumbling-blocks in the way, that the discerning reader, by seeing the insufficiency of the letter, might be incited to seek after the understanding of the spiritual meaning. Such portions of Scripture were not the less Divine for their “mean and despicable” form; it was the fault of human weakness if men would not penetrate through this veil to the treasure which was hidden below. As, therefore, Origen denounced the gnostic impiety of supposing the various parts of the Bible to have come from different sources, so he held it no less necessary to guard against the error of many Christians, who while they acknowledged the same God in the Old and in the New Testament, yet ascribed to Him actions unworthy of the most cruel and unjust of men. It was (he said) through a carnal understanding of the letter that the Jews were led to crucify our Lord, and still to continue in their unbelief. Those who would insist on the letter were like the Philistines who filled up with earth the wells which Abraham's servants had digged; the mystical interpreter was, like Isaac, to open the wells. In justice to Origen, we must remember that the literal system of interpretation, as understood in his day, was something very different from the grammatical and historical exposition of modern times. It made no attempt to overcome difficulties or to harmonize seeming discrepancies; and when applied to the explanation of prophecy, it embarrassed the advocates of orthodox Christianity and gave great advantages to their opponents. To get rid of it was, therefore, desirable with a view to the controversies with the Jews and Montanists.

Whereas (it was said) the heathen philosophers addressed themselves exclusively to the more educated, Holy Scripture condescends to persons of every kind, according to their capacities; its narrative was “most wisely ordained”, with a view both to the mass of simpler believers, and to the comparatively small number who should be desirous or able to inquire more deeply with understanding. The letter, therefore, was allowed to be sufficient for the unlearned; but, although in this opinion Origen resembled some of the Gnostic teachers, he was utterly opposed to their contempt for the less instructed brethren, and to their representation of whole classes of men as hopelessly shut out from the higher grades of understanding. Every one, he held, was bound to advance according to his means and opportunities. The literal sense might be understood by any attentive reader; the moral required higher intelligence; the mystical was to be apprehended only through the grace of the Holy Spirit, which was to be obtained by prayer; nor did Origen himself pretend to possess this grace in such a degree as would entitle him to claim any authority for his comments. Whereas Clement had spoken with fear of divulging his mystical interpretations, and had given them as traditional, Origen's are offered merely as the offspring of his own mind, and his only fear is lest they should be wrong. Of the mystical sense, he held that there were two kinds—the allegorical, where the Old Testament prefigured the history of Christ and his church; and the anagogical, where the narrative typified the things of a higher world. For, as St. Paul speaks of a “Jerusalem which is above”, Origen held the existence of a spiritual world in which everything of this earth has its antitype. And thus passages of Scripture, which in

their letter he supposed to be fictitious, were to be regarded as shadowing forth realities of the higher world which earthly things could not sufficiently typify.

These principles of exposition were not laid down without cautions and safeguards as to their application; and in Origen himself they were controlled by a faithful, devout, and dutiful spirit. But it is evident that they tend to no less an evil than the subversion of all belief in the historical truth of Scripture.

There is a difficulty in ascertaining Origen's opinions on many points—not only from the obscurity of the subjects which he treats, but also because his remaining writings are in great part preserved only in translations which are known to be unfaithful. Even in his own lifetime he had to complain of falsifications by heretics, and of misrepresentation by indiscreet admirers, while he was conscious that prejudiced readers might be likely to misapprehend him as heretical. His soundness as to the highest of Christian doctrines had been much questioned; indeed, the Arians claimed him as a forerunner of their heresy. But St. Athanasius spoke of him with respect, explained his language, and vindicated him from misconstruction. Bishop Bull, too, defends his orthodoxy; but even after the somewhat large postulate that he may be judged only by his treatise against Celsus—as being the most matured offspring of his mind, and the only one of his works which is not probably corrupted—our great theologian finds much exercise for his learning and ingenuity in drawing forth a catholic sense from passages of questionable appearance.

To Origen is due the invention of a term which, as happily expressing the traditional belief, has been adopted into the language of the church—the “eternal generation” of God the Son. He illustrated the mode of this by a comparison with the emission of brightness from light. It was not, he said, a thing which had taken place once for all, but is ever continued in the “everlasting now” of the Divine existence.

His doctrines as to the creation were very singular. Rejecting the gnostic view, which supposed matter independent of God, he maintained that, as God is omnipotent and Lord, he must always have had something over which to exercise his power and dominion; and consequently that the work of creation from nothing must have been eternal. The object of this theory was to reconcile the Mosaic narrative with the Platonic notion that the world had eternally emanated from God. There had (he taught) been multitudes of worlds before the present, and there would yet be multitudes after its end—the nearness of which he supposed to be indicated by the fact of our Lord's having already appeared in the flesh. The number of souls originally created was final; there had been no additions to it, but the same souls continually reappeared in an endless variety of forms. All were at first perfect, and were endued with freedom of will. By abuse of this they contracted a guilt which required purgation; hence the worlds were created that the beings who had sinned might be awakened to a sense of their estrangement from God and to a craving after blessedness—that they might be purified through conflict for restoration to their first estates. The disobedient souls were treated according to the measure of their offence. Those which had least sinned became angels, living in the planets, and occupied in works of ministry for men; the worst of all became devils; while, for such as were confined in bodies of flesh, the whole complication of their being and circumstances was arranged in proportion as they had sinned more or less grievously. Some, however, were plunged deeper than the degree of their guilt had deserved, in order that they might help in the instruction and deliverance of their fellows; and thus Origen supposes that the death of a righteous man may have a redeeming effect for others. He divided mankind into carnal, psychical, and spiritual, but instead of supposing, like the Gnostics, that each man was immovably fixed in a particular class, he maintained that all were originally alike, that the differences between them arose from the exercise of their free will, and that none were unchangeably good or bad. He allowed Adam to be a historical person—the first of the sinful spirits who was embodied in flesh; but, like Philo, he regarded the history of the fall as an allegory. One soul only there was which had not sinned. This, by

continual contemplation of the Divine Logos, had adhered to him or been absorbed in him; and thus it had made the way for that union of Godhead with a material body which but for such a medium would have been impossible. As the gospel was adapted to men of every kind, so Origen, in accordance (as he professed) with tradition, supposed that our Lord's appearance while on earth varied according to the characters of those who beheld him.

Origen's views as to the mediatorial work of the Saviour are difficult to understand, and no less so to reconcile with orthodox belief. He considers the death on the cross as representing something which is spiritually repeated in the higher world, and which has its effect towards the deliverance of the angels. He allows that, in order to become or to remain good, grace is necessary as well as free-will; but he appears to have erred in allowing too much to the ordinary powers with which he supposed our nature to be endowed.

All punishment, he holds, is merely corrective and remedial, being ordained in order that all creatures may be restored to their original perfection. At the resurrection all mankind will have to pass through a fire: the purged spirits will enter into paradise, a place of training for the consummation; the wicked will remain in the "fire", which, however, is not described as material, but as a mental and spiritual misery. The matter and food of it, he says, are our sins, which, when swollen to the height, are inflamed to become our punishment; and the "outer darkness" is the darkness of ignorance. But the condition of these spirits is not without hope, although thousands of years may elapse before their suffering shall have wrought its due effect on them. On the other hand, those who are admitted into paradise may abuse their free-will, as in the beginning, and may consequently be doomed to a renewal of their sojourn in the flesh. Every reasonable creature—even Satan himself—may be turned from evil to good, so as not to be excluded from salvation. At the final consummation the soul will dwell in a glorified organ, of which the germ is in the present body. Its pleasures will be purely spiritual; the saints will understand all the mysteries of the Divine providence and of the ordinances given by God to Israel. Love, which "never faileth", will preserve the whole creation from the possibility of any further fall; and "God will be all in all".

The reputation of Origen has had vehement assailants and no less zealous defenders. Certain propositions ascribed to him were condemned, and an anathema was attached to his name, by a synod held at Constantinople in the sixth century; and it may perhaps be thought that the mischief of any particular errors in doctrine is far exceeded by that of the perverse method of interpreting Scripture which owed to him its completeness and much of its popularity. But, with whatever abatements on the ground of his errors—however strong may be our sense of the evil which his system produced, or was fitted to produce, in the hands of others—we must think of Origen himself as a man who not only devoted all the energies of his mind during a long life to what he conceived to be the truth, but believed his views of truth to be consistent with the traditional faith of the church. His peculiar opinions arose (as has been already said) from a wish to overcome the supposed incompatibility of philosophy with the gospel; he desired in all things to hold fast the foundation of essential Christian doctrine; he proposed his own speculations with modesty, and claimed for them no higher character than that of probable conjectures.

His piety is as unquestioned as the greatness of his genius and the depth of his learning; he suffered much for the gospel, and may, indeed, almost be reckoned as a martyr. While he lived he was the chief opponent of heresy in all its varieties; the multitude of converts whom he brought over to the church from heathenism, Judaism, and corrupted forms of Christianity, is a noble testimony to his earnestness and love no less than to his controversial ability. We may, therefore, well say with the candid Tillemont, that, although such a man might hold heretical opinions, he could not be a heretic, since he was utterly free from that spirit which constitutes the guilt of heresy.

Among the most distinguished of Origen's pupils was Dionysius, who succeeded Heraclas, first in the catechetical school (A.D. 232), and afterwards in the see of Alexandria

(A.D. 248). This eminent man, after having been brought up as a heathen, was led to embrace Christianity by a perusal of St. Paul's epistles. As he continued after his ordination to read the works of heathens and heretics, a presbyter remonstrated with him on the dangerous nature of such studies, and Dionysius was impressed by the remonstrance; but he was reassured by a vision or dream, in which he heard a voice saying to him, "Read whatsoever may fall into thy hands; for thou art able to read with discernment, and to reject what is worthless, since even thus it was that thou wert first brought to the faith".

Dionysius was not more admirable for his learning than for his wisdom and moderation. His name will repeatedly come before us in connection with the affairs of the church; but two controversies in which he took part may be here particularly mentioned.

(1.) About the year 257, the Libyan Pentapolis, the native country of Sabellius, was greatly disturbed by his heresy, and the matter came under the official notice of the Egyptian primate. Dionysius combated the Sabellian errors both in conference and by writing; but unhappily he used some expressions which gave a pretext for charging him with opinions resembling those afterwards broached by Arius, as if he had denied the eternal Sonship. His language was reported to the bishop of Rome as heretical—not that any jurisdiction over Alexandria was supposed to belong to Rome, but because the matter was one of common concern; because, in proportion to the eminence of a bishop's see, it was his duty to investigate and to act in such cases; and because the first of bishops was the person to whom complaints against the second were most naturally carried. On this the bishop of Rome, who was also named Dionysius, held a council, and requested an explanation; and Dionysius of Alexandria, disregarding for the sake of peace and unity all that might have excited his jealousy in such an interference, replied by a satisfactory vindication of his orthodoxy.

(2.) The doctrine of Chiliasm or Millenarianism is styled in the first Articles of the reformed English church "a Jewish dotage"; but, although no doubt derived from Judaism, it must not be considered as indicative of a Jewish tendency. There was, indeed, in common with Judaism, the belief that the Messiah would reign personally on earth, that his kingdom would have Jerusalem for its seat, and that it would last a thousand years; but (besides other important differences,—as that the Jewish millennium was expected to follow immediately on the Messiah's first appearance, whereas the Christians looked to his second coming) the Christian chiliasm showed no favor to the fleshly Israel, nor even to its holy city; for the new Jerusalem was to come down from heaven, and to take the place of the earthly, which was to perish.

The chiliastic opinions were very early professed. Among their advocates is said to have been Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who is commonly described as a hearer of the apostle St. John; and by the end of the second century they appear to have become general in the church, recommended as they were by their offering a ground of opposition to pagan Rome, and affording a near consolation to the faithful in persecutions and trials. The doctrine was embraced by the Montanists with great ardor; but the very circumstance that it became a characteristic of this enthusiastic sect tended to bring it into discredit with the orthodox, and other causes contributed to its decline. The idealizing and spiritualizing tendencies of the Alexandrian school, which came into vigor about the same time, were strongly opposed to the literalism on which the chiliastic opinions rested; and, moreover, the doctrine was found a hindrance to the conversion of Greeks and Romans, as being offensive to their national feelings. For such reasons it had for many years been sinking until the persecution of Decius may have tended to revive its popularity among those who felt the approach of suffering for the faith.

Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, had written a chiliastic book entitled a "Refutation of the Allegorists"; and about the year 255—Nepos himself being then dead—it was reported that his opinions had found many converts in the district of Arsinoe. Dionysius, on hearing of the matter, behaved with his characteristic prudence; he went to the spot, requested a conference

with the millenarian party, and spent three days in discussing with them the book of Nepos, of whom he was careful to speak with great respect and affection. The result was, that, whereas a less considerate course of dealing with them might have driven the followers of Nepos into schism, Dionysius succeeded in convincing them, and was warmly thanked by their leader, Coracion; and from this time chiliasm, although it still had adherents, and in the next century found a champion in Apollinarius of Laodicea, was little heard of in the eastern church.

As the name of Origen is famous in the history of doctrine, that of his contemporary Cyprian¹ is no less so in connection with the government and discipline of the church. Thascius Cyprianus was born at Carthage or in its neighborhood about the year 200, and, after having been distinguished as a teacher of rhetoric, he embraced Christianity in mature age. His earlier life had not been free from the usual impurities of heathen morals, although perhaps the abhorrence with which he spoke of it, when viewing it by the light of the gospel, may give an exaggerated idea of the degree in which he had been stained by them. On his conversion, and probably while yet a catechumen, he displayed his zeal by selling a villa and gardens which he possessed near Carthage, and devoting the price, with a large portion of his other property, to the relief of the poor. His deacon and biographer, Pontius, however, tells us that these gardens were afterwards restored to Cyprian “by the indulgence of God”—most probably through the instrumentality of friends who combined to repurchase them and present them to him. At his baptism, Cyprian added to his old name, Thascius, that of Caecilius, in remembrance of a presbyter who had influenced his conversion. He was rapidly promoted to the offices of deacon and presbyter; and on a vacancy in the see of Carthage, within three years after his conversion, he was elected bishop by the general desire of the people—his signal merit being regarded as a warrant for dispensing with the apostolical warning against the promotion of recent converts, as well as for overruling his own unwillingness to undertake the responsibility of such a charge. Five presbyters, however, were opposed to his election; and, notwithstanding his attempts to conciliate them, they continued to regard him with an implacable feeling of enmity.

Cyprian entered on his episcopate with an earnest resolution to correct the abuses and disorders which he found prevailing among his flock; but after two years his labors for this purpose were interrupted by the persecution under Decius. At Carthage, as elsewhere in that persecution, the bishop was especially aimed at; the heathen populace clamored that he should be thrown to the lions and Cyprian—not from fear, but in consequence (as he states) of a heavenly warning, and from a conviction that such a course was most for the benefit of his church—withdrew to a retreat at no great distance, where he remained about fourteen months. His property was confiscated on his disappearance.

The unworthy behavior of Christians in this persecution has been already mentioned. Besides those who actually sacrificed to the heathen gods, multitudes, by a payment to the magistrates, obtained certificates of having obeyed the emperor’s commands; and many of these, who were called *libellatics*, persuaded themselves, by an ignorant sort of casuistry, that they had done nothing wrong. The troubles of the Carthaginian church were increased by a practice which originated in the high regard entertained for martyrs and confessors. From a natural feeling of respect for those who shed their blood for the faith, martyrs had been allowed, perhaps as early as the middle of the second century, to recommend for favorable consideration the cases of persons who were under ecclesiastical censure. This was originally the extent of their privilege, and it had been customary that the deacons should visit the martyrs in prison, for the purpose of suggesting caution in the distribution of their favors. But abuses had grown up in the course of years, and some daring novelties of this kind were now introduced at Carthage. One Lucian, inflated by the reputation which he had gained as a confessor, professed that a martyr named Paul had, in right of his martyrdom, bequeathed to him the power of granting readmission to the communion of the church. Tickets were made out in such a form as to be available, not only for the person named in them, but for an

indefinite number of others; indulgences of this kind were distributed without limit, and even became a matter of traffic. The holders noisily insisted on immediate restoration to full communion; some bishops yielded to their importunity; and Lucian, in the name of all the confessors, wrote an insolent letter to Cyprian, announcing that they had granted reconciliation to all the lapsed, and desiring the bishop to convey the information to his episcopal brethren.

Cyprian from his retreat kept up a constant communication with his church, and endeavored to check these disorders, while at the same time he showed an anxious desire to avoid interference with such privileges as might reasonably be supposed to belong to martyrs and confessors. He allowed that those among the lapsed who had received letters from the sufferers for the faith might be admitted to reconciliation, if in danger of death; but he directed that the rest should be reserved for an examination of their cases after his return to Carthage, and that in the meantime they should be exhorted to patience.

A short time after Easter 251, the bishop returned to his city, and held a council for the consideration of the questions as to the lapsed. It was agreed that such libellatics as had manifested repentance for their weakness should be forthwith admitted to communion, and that those who had sacrificed should be allowed to hope for admission after a longer period of penance. The latter class received a further indulgence in the following year, when, in the prospect of a renewed persecution, a synod under Cyprian resolved to grant immediate reconciliation to all who had shown themselves duly penitent.

Fresh commotions were excited at Carthage by a presbyter named Novatus. It is uncertain whether this man was one of the five presbyters who had objected to Cyprian's promotion; but he had become noted for his insubordination and irregularities. Cyprian tells us that he had robbed widows and orphans, and had embezzled the funds of the church; that he had kicked his wife while pregnant, so as to cause the death of the child; that he had allowed his father to starve in the street, and had refused even to bury him; and that for these and other offences he was about to be brought to trial, when the outbreak of persecution under Decius put a stop to the proceedings. Novatus entered into a connection with Felicissimus, a man of wealth, but of indifferent character, and, either by usurping the episcopal power of ordination, or (as is more likely) by procuring the ministration of some bishop, advanced him to the order of deacon. These two, with others of the clergy, engaged in a course of strong opposition to Cyprian; they incited the lapsed against him; they disputed with his commissioners as to the distribution of the church funds; and about a year after the bishop's return, Felicissimus proceeded to set up one of the malcontent presbyters, Fortunatus, as a rival in the see of Carthage—the consecration being performed by five bishops, who had all been deprived for heresy or lapse. Novatus, the founder of the schism, had in the meantime crossed the Mediterranean to Rome.

Fabian, bishop of Rome, was martyred in January, 250, and the see remained vacant until June in the following year, when Cornelius was elected. During this interval some letters were exchanged between Cyprian and the Roman clergy, who had been led by reports to think unfavorably of his withdrawal from his city, but afterwards came to understand him better, and agreed with him as to the course which should be pursued towards the lapsed. Among these clergy Novatian was eminent for eloquence and learning. He had received a philosophical education, although it is perhaps a mistake to infer from some of Cyprian's expressions that he was ever professedly a stoic. His temper was morose and gloomy; he had at one time been vexed by a devil—for so the early Christians accounted for appearances which were probably like those of diseased melancholy. After this he had received clinical baptism,¹ and on his recovery had neglected to seek the completion of the baptismal gift by imposition of the bishop's hands; yet, notwithstanding these irregularities, Fabian, from a wish to secure for the church the services of so able a man, had admitted him to the priesthood—having with difficulty overcome the reluctance which was shown by all the clergy and by a

large portion of the laity; for both clergy and people had then a voice in the selection of persons to be ordained. In the time of the persecution, when urged to take a share in ministering to his suffering brethren, Novatian is said to have answered that he had no mind to be any longer a presbyter, and was attached to a different philosophy—words which seem to indicate that he preferred a recluse ascetic life to the active labours of his office.

During the vacancy of the see Novatian had great influence at Rome. Cyprian states that he was the writer of a letter in which the Roman clergy allowed that the lapsed might be reconciled to the church, if in danger of death; but after the election of Cornelius he became the leader of a schismatical party on principles incompatible with any such concession. He held that, although the penitent lapsed might be admitted to the Divine mercy, and therefore ought to be exhorted to repentance, yet the church had no power to grant them absolution, and must for ever exclude them from communion; that a church which communicated with such offenders forfeited its Christian character and privileges. Novatian had before protested that he did not desire the bishopric of Rome, and we need not suppose his protest insincere, as his severe and unsocial temperament inclined him to a life of seclusion. When, however, the schism was formed, he allowed himself to be set up as its head, and was consecrated by three bishops of obscure sees, who had been drawn to Rome under false pretenses, and laid their hands on him in the evening, after a meal. The moving spirit in these proceedings was the Carthaginian Novatus. Possibly he may have disagreed with his old ally Felicissimus as to the treatment of the lapsed; or he may have taken the part of laxity at Carthage, and that of severity at Rome, from no better motive than a wish by either means to oppose the authority of the regular bishops.

Novatian sent notice of his consecration to the great churches of Alexandria, Antioch, and Carthage. Fabius of Antioch was inclined to acknowledge him, but died soon after, without having taken any decided measures. The letter to Dionysius of Alexandria appears to have been apologetic, representing that Novatian had been forced into the course which he had taken; to which Dionysius replied that, if it were so, he ought to show his sincerity by withdrawing from his rivalry to Cornelius, and endeavoring to heal the breach in the Roman church. At Carthage the schismatical envoys were repelled by a council which was sitting at the time of their arrival. One Maximus was afterwards set up as Novatianist bishop of Carthage, and intruders of the same kind were planted in other African dioceses.

A large number of the Roman confessors had at first been engaged in the schism. These soon discovered their error; they formally acknowledged Cornelius as bishop, and returned to the unity of the church, while Novatian endeavored to secure the allegiance of his followers by requiring them, at the reception of the Eucharist, to swear that they would never forsake him or join Cornelius.

Novatianism found many proselytes in the west, and its principles became even more rigid than at first. The sentence of lifelong exclusion from communion, which had originally been applied to those only who had denied the faith, was afterwards extended to all who, after baptism, committed the greater sins. The Novatianists assumed the name of *Cathari*, or *Puritans*. They rebaptized proselytes from the church, considering its communion to be impure, and its ministrations to be consequently void. Some of them condemned digamy (or second marriage) as equally sinful with adultery. As to the chief doctrines of the gospel, however, the Novatianists were and continued steadily orthodox, and many of them suffered, even to death, for the faith. The council of Nicaea attempted to heal the schism by conciliatory measures; but the Novatianists still regarded the laxity of the church's discipline as a bar to a reunion with it, although they were drawn into more friendly relations with the Catholics by a community of danger during the ascendancy of Arianism. The sect long continued to exist. In Phrygia, it combined with the remnant of the Montanists; and at Alexandria, a patriarch found occasion to write against it so late as the end of the sixth century.

The opposite movement at Carthage was altogether a failure. It was in vain that Felicissimus endeavored to get his bishop acknowledged at Rome. Most of the lapsed, who had adhered to him in the hope of gaining easy readmission in a body to the church, were shocked at the establishment of a formal schism, and sued for reconciliation on Cyprian's terms; after which we hear nothing further of Felicissimus.

The great plague which has been already mentioned drew forth a signal display of Cyprian's charity and practical energy, and of those fruits of Christian zeal and love, which, wherever they appeared, were found perhaps the most effective popular evidence in behalf of the faith which prompted them. While the heathen population of Carthage left their sick untended, and cast out the bodies of the dead into the streets—while all seemed to be hardened in selfishness, and wretches even invaded the houses of the dying for the purpose of plunder—and while the multitude reviled the Christians as having drawn down the visitation by their impiety towards the gods—Cyprian called his flock together, exhorted them by precepts and examples from Scripture, and appointed to each his special work. The rich gave their money and the poor gave their labor towards the common object; the dead bodies which tainted the air were buried; and the sick, whether Christian or pagan, were nursed at the expense and by the care of the Christians.

A fresh controversy soon arose to engage the attention of Cyprian. Cornelius died or was martyred in September, 252; and, after the Roman see had been held for less than eight months by Lucius, Stephen was chosen to fill it. Stephen, a man of violent and arrogant character, speedily embroiled himself with some Asiatic bishops on a question as to the manner of admitting converts from heresy and schism into the church. The question was one which had not practically occurred in the apostolic age; and, having been consequently left open by Scripture, it had been variously determined by different churches. At Rome, proselytes were admitted by imposition of hands; in Asia, rebaptism had been practised; and for each method apostolical authority was pretended—in other words, each could plead immemorial local usage. Synods held at Iconium and at Synnada, apparently in the reign of Alexander Severus, had established the rule of rebaptism throughout most churches of Asia Minor. In Africa the same practice had been sanctioned by a synod held under Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, early in the third century; but—chiefly perhaps because conversions from sectarianism were rare—it seems to have fallen into disuse in the interval between Agrippinus and Cyprian.

The origin of the disagreement between Stephen and the Asiatics is unknown, but it may possibly have been that some orientals, residing at Rome, wished to introduce there the practice of their native churches. Neither is it exactly known what Stephen's own opinion was; whether his words—that converts “from whatsoever heresy” should be received by imposition of hands—are to be understood absolutely, or whether (as seems more probable) they ought to be interpreted with limitations agreeable to the church's later judgments. It seems, however, to be certain that he was engaged in controversy with the Asiatics before the difference with Cyprian arose. He wrote to them on the subject of their practice, and they refused to abandon it.

Cyprian was drawn into the controversy by a question of some Numidian and Mauritanian bishops, who had probably been led to suspect the propriety of rebaptism by seeing that the Novatianists used it in the case of proselytes from the church. He replied that converts must be baptized, unless they had received the regular baptism of the church before falling into heresy or schism, in which case imposition of hands would suffice. He argued that there could be only one church, one faith, one baptism; that, as at baptism itself there is required a profession of belief in “life everlasting, and the forgiveness of sins through the holy church”, there can be no forgiveness unless within the church; that the water cannot be sanctified unto cleansing by one who is himself unclean; and—since the claim of prescription could not be advanced for this view in Africa, as it was in the east—he maintained that reason

ought to prevail over custom. The principle of rebaptism was affirmed by three Carthaginian councils, the last of which was held in September, 256; but, although they disclaimed all intention of laying down a rule for other churches, Stephen took violent offence at their proceedings; he refused to see the envoys who had been sent to him after the second council, I charged his flock to withhold all hospitality from them, denounced Cyprian in outrageous language, as a “false Christ, false apostle, and deceitful worker”, and broke off communion with the Africans, as he had before done with the Asiatics. Such a proceeding, however, on the part of a bishop of Rome in the third century, did not, like the excommunications of popes in later times, imply a claim of authority to separate from the body of Christ, or to deprive of the means of grace; it was merely an exercise of the power which every bishop had to suspend religious intercourse with communities or persons whom he supposed to be in error.

Finding himself thus cut off from communion with the great church of the west, Cyprian resolved to open a correspondence with the Asiatics who were in the same condition. He therefore sent a letter with a report of his proceedings to Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia (who has already been mentioned as a friend of Origen). Firmilian in his answer deals very freely with Stephen’s character and conduct—so much so, that the first editors to whom the epistle became known suppressed it on account of its bearing against the later pretensions of Rome, and that other Romanists have since justified the suppression, and have regretted that, through the imprudent candor of less politic editors, such a document had been allowed to see the lights.

The sequel is not distinctly recorded. The death of Stephen, early in the year 257 contributed towards a peaceful settlement of the dispute. Dionysius of Alexandria, whose own opinions probably inclined to the Roman view, exerted himself as a mediator by writing both to Stephen and to his successor, Xystus or Sixtus; and from the terms in which Cyprian’s contemporary biographer speaks of Xystus, as a “good and peacemaking priest”, it is inferred that the controversy was laid to rest for the time by an understanding that every church should be left to its own judgment. The question of rebaptism was afterwards decided against Cyprian’s views, and also against the extreme opinion on the opposite side, by the eighth canon of the council of Aries, which ordered that, if the schismatical baptism had been administered in the name of the Trinity, converts should be admitted to the church by imposition of hands.

When the persecution under Valerian reached Africa, A.D. 257, Cyprian was carried before the proconsul, Paternus. In answer to interrogations, he avowed himself a Christian and a bishop; he added that Christians served only one God, and that they prayed daily for themselves, for all mankind, and for the safety of the emperors. On being questioned as to the names of his clergy, he said that the laws of the state condemned informers; that ecclesiastical discipline forbade the clergy to offer themselves for punishment; but that, if sought for, they might be found in their places. As he steadfastly refused to sacrifice, he was banished to Curubis, a town about forty miles from Carthage, which his deacon Pontius, who accompanied him, describes as a pleasant abode. On the night after his arrival there, a vision announced to him that he was to be put to death next day; the event, however, proved that the delay of a day was to be interpreted as signifying a year. The bishop’s residence at Curubis was cheered by frequent visits from his friends. By the means which were at his disposal, he was enabled to send relief to many of his brethren who had been carried away to labour in the mines of Mauritania and Numidia, and were treated with great barbarity; and with these and other confessors he exchanged letters of sympathy and encouragements

On the arrival of a new proconsul, Galerius, Cyprian was recalled from banishment, and was ordered to remain at his gardens near Carthage. Valerian’s second and more severe edict had now been issued, and the bishop was resolved to endure for his faith the worst that man could inflict on him. Fearing, however, during a temporary absence of the proconsul at Utica, lest he should be carried to that city, instead of being sacrificed in the sight of his own people,

he concealed himself for a time; but, on the return of Galerius to Carthage, he reappeared at his gardens, and withstood all the entreaties of his friends, who urged him to save himself by flight. On the 13th of September 258, he was carried to a place where the proconsul was staying for the recovery of his health, about four miles from Carthage. Here the bishop was treated with great respect, and was allowed to enjoy the society of his friends at supper, while the streets around the proconsular house, in which he was lodged, were thronged by Christians anxious for their pastor's safety. These had flocked from the capital on the news of his arrest; many of them spent the night in the open air, and a vast multitude crowded the place of judgment when on the following day—the anniversary of the death of Cornelius of Rome — Cyprian was led forth for trial. As he arrived, heated with the walk from the proconsul's house, a soldier of the guard, who had formerly been a Christian, offered him some change of dress; but he declined the offer, saying that it was useless to remedy evils which would probably forthwith come to an end. On being required by the proconsul, in the name of the emperors, to offer sacrifice, Cyprian answered by a refusal. The magistrate desired him to consider his safety. "Do as thou art commanded", was the reply; "in so righteous a cause, there is no room for consideration". It was with reluctance and difficulty that Galerius, after a short consultation with his advisers, pronounced the inevitable sentence,—that Thascius Cyprian, as having long been a ringleader in impiety against the gods of Rome, and having resisted the attempts made by the emperors to reclaim him, should be beheaded with the sword, in punishment of his offences, and as a warning to his followers. The bishop received his doom with an expression of thankfulness to God; and a cry arose from the Christians who were present, "Let us go and be beheaded with him!". Cyprian was without delay conducted to the scene of execution—a level space surrounded by thick trees, the branches of which were soon filled by members of his flock, who eagerly climbed up, "like Zacchaeus", that they might witness their bishop's triumph over death. After having knelt for a short time in prayer, he bound his eyes with his own hands, and, having directed that a present should be given to the executioner, submitted himself to the sword. His body was deposited in a neighboring spot, "because of the curiosity of the heathen"; but was afterwards removed by torchlight with great solemnity, and laid in an honorable sepulchre; while his blood, which had been carefully caught in cloths and handkerchiefs as it fell, was treasured up as a precious relic.

It is said that Cyprian daily read some portion of Tertullian's works, and that he was accustomed to ask for the book by saying to his secretary, "Give me my master". The influence of his great countryman on his mind is abundantly evident in his writings; perhaps Tertullian's Montanism may have shared, as well as the African temperament, in producing Cyprian's tendency to a belief in frequent supernatural visitations. But if Cyprian was inferior to the earlier writer in originality and genius, he was free from his exaggeration and irregularity, and possessed talents for practical life of which Tertullian gives no indication. The master was carried into schism; the scholar's great and ruling idea was that of unity in the visible church, and it was on this that his controversies turned. In his treatise on the subject he ransacks Scripture for types and arguments; he concludes that "he who has not the church for his mother, cannot have God for his Father"; that the church is as the ark of Noah, without which there was no deliverance from destruction; that for those who are separate from the visible church neither miracles nor martyrdom can avail as evidences of faith or as grounds of hope.

While we may agree in his principles generally, it can hardly be doubted that he carries them out with a reasoning too precise for the nature of the subject; that he does not sufficiently consider the share which the character and circumstances of each individual, as well as his outward position or profession, have in determining his state before God; or the indications afforded by Scripture, that, besides the main broad system of the Divine government, there is also with the Almighty a merciful regard to exceptions and

peculiarities,—a regard of which man indeed may not presume to forestall the effect, but which we are yet bound reverently, charitably, and thankfully to keep in mind.

It would, however, be an utter misunderstanding of Cyprian to suppose that in his views of unity he was influenced either by want of charity towards those whose schism he condemned, or by a wish to secure for himself, as bishop, a tyrannical domination over the minds of men. It was the tendency of the age to elevate the episcopate, as a power conducive to strength, to union, regularity, and peace; but if Cyprian bore a part in promoting the exaltation of his order, it was the natural effect of his great character, not the object or the result of his ambition. Now that Christianity had long been professed by multitudes as a religion derived by inheritance, not embraced from special conviction—now that time and freedom from persecution had produced a general deterioration in the community, so that the bishop could not reckon on unanimous support in his measures for the regulation of the church—it was necessary for the public good that he should sometimes act by his own authority in a greater degree than the bishops of earlier times. Yet Cyprian was far from any attempt at establishing an autocracy; it was his practice, as well as his desire, to take no important step except in conjunction with his clergy and his people.

On the other hand, the unity which Cyprian contemplated was utterly unlike that of later Rome. In his dealings with the Roman bishops he appears on terms of perfect equality with them. He writes to them and of them as merely his “brethren and colleagues”. Far from acknowledging a superiority in them, he remonstrates with Cornelius for lowering the dignity common to all members of the episcopate. He admonishes Stephen when negligent of his duty in one case; he declares his judgment null, and sets it aside, in another; he treats the idea of a “bishop of bishops” as monstrous—far as Stephen’s understanding of such a title fell short of the more recent Roman pretensions. Even supposing all the passages in which he magnifies the Roman church to be genuine—(and where words of this sort are wanting in some manuscripts there is an almost certain presumption against them, inasmuch as in the times to which the manuscripts belong there was no temptation to omit, but a strong inducement to insert such words)—still the dignity which he assigns to that church, to its supposed apostolic founder and his successors, is only that of precedence among equals; it is rather purely symbolical than in any way practical. He regards St. Peter as the type of apostleship, and the Roman church as the representative of unity; he interprets the promise of “the keys of the kingdom of heaven” as given to the apostle for the whole episcopal order; his language and his actions are alike inconsistent with any idea of subjection to Rome as a higher authority entitled to interfere with other churches or to overrule their determinations.

CHAPTER VII.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF GALLIENUS TO THE GRANT OF TOLERATION BY
CONSTANTINE.

A.D. 261-313.

Gallienus, when left sole emperor by the captivity of his father and colleague, put a stop to the persecution which Valerian had commenced, and issued edicts by which the exiles were recalled, the cemeteries were restored to the Christians, and a free exercise of religion was granted. Thus was Christianity for the first time acknowledged as a lawful religion; a benefit which, in so far as the frivolous and worthless prince was concerned, it probably owed to his indifference rather than to any better motive.

In this reign began a contest as to the see of Antioch, which lasted several years. Paul, a native of Samosata, had been appointed bishop about the year 260. He enjoyed the protection of Zenobia, queen of Palmyra, and was generally admired for his eloquence; but both his opinions and his manners gave scandal to many of the neighboring clergy, and to the more discerning portion of his flock. Through the favour of Zenobia, as is supposed, he obtained a considerable civil office; and he chose to be addressed by the title of *ducenary* rather than by that of bishop. In his public appearances Paul affected the state and pomp of a Roman magistrate; he even introduced much of this display into his ecclesiastical functions. He *erected* a tribunal, and railed off a *secretum* in his church; in preaching he used the gestures of secular orators, while he expected the hearers to receive his words with clapping of hands and waving of handkerchiefs, as if in a theatre; he discarded the old grave music of the church, and introduced female singers into his choir; nay, it is said that he substituted hymns in celebration of himself for those which had been sung in honor of the Saviour, and that he caused himself to be extolled by the preachers of his party as an angel from heaven. He is charged with having enriched himself by taking bribes, not only in the character of *ducenary*, but in his episcopal capacity of arbiter between the brethren. And he is further accused of luxurious living, and of indecent familiarity with young women— two of whom were his constant companions.

It has been supposed that Paul's system of doctrine was framed with a view to the favour of his patroness, who is said by St. Athanasius to have been attached to Judaism. His adversaries describe it as akin to that of Artemon. He maintained that there is no distinction of Persons in the Godhead; that the Logos and the Holy Ghost are in the Father in the same manner as the reason and the spirit are in man; that when the Logos is said to have been from everlasting, nothing more than an ideal existence in the Divine foreknowledge is meant; that His *generation* means only a going forth to act; that Jesus was a mere man (although it was perhaps admitted that his birth was supernatural); that he is called Son of God, as having in a certain sense become such through the influence of the Divine Logos, which dwelt in him, but without any personal union.

In order to the consideration of the charges against Paul, a synod of bishops and clergy from Syria, Asia, and Arabia, assembled at Antioch in 264. Among the members were Firmilian, Gregory of Neocaesarea, and his brother Athenodore; and the venerable Dionysius of Alexandria, although compelled by age and infirmity to excuse himself from attendance, addressed to the assembly a letter in strong condemnation of Paul's opinions. The accused, however, succeeded in throwing a veil over his unsoundness; he satisfied his brethren by expressing himself in plausible terms, and by promising to abstain from everything that could

give offence. The promise was not kept. Two more councils were held; and at the second of these the subtleties which had imposed on less expert theologians were detected by a presbyter named Malchion, who, having formerly been a distinguished sophist or rhetorician, was skilled in the intricacies of such disputation. The bishop was deposed, and Domnus, son of his predecessor, was appointed to succeed him.

Paul still persisted in keeping his position. Relying on the protection of Zenobia, and probably supported by a large party among the Christians of Antioch, he retained the episcopal house, with the church which adjoined it; and the dispute as to the possession of these was referred to the emperor Aurelian, soon after his victory over Zenobia. Aurelian wisely abstained from intermeddling in a question of Christian doctrines and usages. He decided that the buildings should belong to that party which the bishops of Rome and of Italy should acknowledge as being in communion with themselves; and their judgment, pronounced in favor of Domnus, was enforced by the civil power. From this time the followers of Paul became a heretical sect, whose baptism, although administered in the name of the Trinity, was disallowed by the church, on the ground that the orthodox words of administration were used by them in a heterodox meaning.

Aurelian's impartial decision in the case of Paul was not, however, prompted by any favourable disposition towards the gospel. The emperor was deeply devoted to the pagan system, and most especially to the worship of the sun, of which his mother had been a priestess. He regarded the Christians with contempt: and, notwithstanding the restraints imposed on him by the measures of Gallienus, he had issued an order for a persecution, in token of gratitude to the gods for his success in war, when, before the document could be generally circulated, he was assassinated in his camp.

It appears to have been during the reign of Aurelian, and probably about the year 270, that Manes began to publish his opinions in Persia. As to the history of this earlier Mahomet, the Greek and the oriental accounts differ widely from each other. The Greeks trace the heresy to a Saracen merchant named Scythian, who, after having become rich by trading to India, is said to have settled at Alexandria, and to have devised a philosophical system of his own. At his death, which took place in Palestine, his manuscripts, with the rest of his property, fell to his servant Terebinth, who, in order to obtain a more favorable field for the propagation of his doctrines, went into Persia, where he assumed the name of Buddas. He was, however, beaten in disputation by the priests of the national religion; and while engaged in incantations on the roof of his house, he was thrown headlong and killed by an angel or a demon. On this, a widow with whom he had lodged, and who had been his only convert, buried the body and took possession of his wealth; she bought a boy seven years old, named Cubricus, or Corbicius, liberated him, bestowed on him a learned education, and, dying when he had reached the age of twelve, left him heir to all that she possessed. Cubricus assumed the name of Manes, and, after an interval of nearly half a century, as to which no details are given, appeared at the Persian court, carrying with him the books of Scythian, which he had interpolated with *anile fables*, and claimed as his own productions. He undertook to cure a son of king Sapor of a dangerous sickness, and, having failed in the attempt, was cast into prison. While he was in confinement, two of his disciples, whom he had sent out on missions, returned, and reported that they had found Christians the most impracticable class of all with whom they had argued. On this Manes procured the Christian Scriptures, and adopted much from them into his system, styling himself the apostle of Christ, and the Paraclete. He escaped from prison, and opened a communication with Marcellus, an eminent and pious Christian of Cascara, whose influence he was anxious to secure for the recommendation of his doctrine. The bishop of the place, Archelaus, however, won over his envoy, Tyrbo, and from him and others discovered the doctrines of the sect, with the history of its origin. Archelaus vanquished the heresiarch in conferences at Cascara and Diodoris; and Manes soon after again fell into the hands of the Persian king, by whose order he was flayed alive.

According to the oriental statements, on the other hand, Mani was a Persian, of the magian or sacerdotal caste, and possessed an extraordinary variety of accomplishments. He embraced Christianity, and is said by one authority to have been a presbyter in the church before he formed his peculiar scheme of doctrine. Having been imprisoned by Sapor on account of his opinions, he escaped, travelled in India and China, and at length retired into a cave in Turkestan, telling his disciples that he was about to ascend into heaven, and that at the end of a year he would meet them again at a certain place. The interval was employed in elaborating his system, and, on his reappearance, he produced the book of a new revelation, adorned with symbolical pictures by his own hand. After the death of Sapor he returned to the persian Court, where he was well received by Hormisdas, and made a convert of him; but within less than two years he lost his royal patron. The next king, Varanes, at first treated him with favor, but was soon gained over by his enemies; he invited to dispute with the magians, and on their declaring Mani a heretic, caused him to be put to death—whether by flaying, crucifixion, or sawing asunder, is uncertain.

Although Manichaeism in many points resembled some of the gnostic systems, the likeness did not arise from any direct connection, but from the Persian element which it had in common with Gnosticism. Manes was not influenced either by Jewish traditions or by Greek philosophy; but, in addition to the Zoroastrian and the Christian sources from which his scheme was partly derived, it has been supposed that in the completion of it he drew largely from the doctrines of Buddhism, with which (it the account of his eastern travels be rejected) it appears that he might have become acquainted in his native country.

The deliverance of Persia from the Parthian yoke by Artaxerxes had been followed by a reformation of the national religion. The belief in one supreme being, anterior to the opposite powers of light and darkness or of good and evil, had been established, and a persecution had been carried on against those who maintained the original and independent existence of Ormuzd and Ahriman. This system of pure dualism, however, was taken up by Manes. He held that there were two principles, eternally opposed to each other, and presiding respectively over the realms of light and darkness. To the former the name of God properly belonged; the latter, although the Manichees admitted that in some sense he too might be styled God (as St. Paul speaks of the God of this world), was more rightly named Demon or Matter. These powers were independent of each other; but God was the superior. God consisted of pure light, infinitely more subtle than that of our world, and without any definite bodily shape; the demon had a gross material body. Each realm was composed of five elements, which were peopled by beings of kindred natures; and, while the inhabitants of the world of light lived in perfect love and harmony, those of the world of darkness were continually at strife among themselves. In one of their wars, the defeated party fled to the lofty mountains which bounded the two worlds; thence they desecrated the realm of light, whose existence had before been unknown to them; and forthwith all the powers of darkness, laying aside their internal discords, united to invade the newly-discovered region. God then produced from himself a being called *Mother of Life*, and from her one named *Primal Man*, whom he armed with the five good elements, and sent forth to combat against the powers of evil. The invaders, however, were prevailing, when, at the prayer of Primal Man, God sent forth *Living Spirit*, by whom they were driven out, and Primal Man was rescued; although not until the powers of darkness had swallowed a portion of his armour, which is the living soul. To this part, thus enchained in the bondage of matter, was given the name of *Passible Jesus*; and thenceforth it was the object of the spirits of darkness to detain the heavenly particles which they had absorbed, while God was bent on effecting their deliverance.

In order to their gradual emancipation, Living Spirit, by the command of God, framed our world out of materials in which the elements of light and darkness had become commingled during the late struggle. The powers of darkness produced children; their prince, by devouring these, concentrated in himself the particles of heavenly essence which were

diffused through their bodies; and he employed the materials thus obtained in the formation of man, moulded after the image of the heavenly Primal Man. Adam was therefore a microcosm, including in himself all the elements of both kingdoms, having a soul of light and one of darkness, with a body which was material, and therefore necessarily evil. With a view of retaining him in bondage, his maker forbade him to eat of the tree of knowledge; but Christ or an angel, in the form of the serpent, instructed him—he ate and was enlightened. The Demon produced Eve, and, although God put into her a portion of heavenly light, it was not strong enough to master her evil tendencies. She tempted Adam to sensual pleasure; disregarding the commands of God, who had charged him to restrain, by means of his higher soul, the desires of his lower soul and of his body, he yielded and fell; the particles of heavenly light became yet further enthralled to matter; and, as the race of man continued, it deteriorated more and more from generation to generation.

God had produced out of himself two beings of pure light—Christ and the Holy Spirit—whose office it was to help in the deliverance of mankind. Christ dwelt by his power in the sun, and by his wisdom in the moon—which were therefore to be worshipped, not as deities, but as his habitations; the Holy Spirit dwelt in the air. The world was supported by a mighty angel, who from his office was called in Greek *Omophoros* (bearer on shoulders); and the frequent signs of impatience exhibited by this being (whose movements were the cause of earthquakes) hastened the coming of Christ in human form.

As the evil nature of matter rendered it unsuitable that the Saviour should have a material body, his humanity was represented by Manes after the docetic fashion; it was supposed that he appeared suddenly among the Jews (for the narrations as to his birth and early years were rejected), and that his acts and sufferings were only in appearance. The object of his mission was to give enlightenment—to teach men their heavenly origin, and urge them to strive after the recovery of bliss, overcoming their body and their evil soul; to deliver them from the blindness of Judaism and other false religions. No idea of atonement could enter into the system, since the divine soul was incapable of guilt, and the lower soul was incapable of salvation.

The particles of celestial life which had been absorbed by the kingdom of matter—the Passible Jesus—were not in man only, but in the lower animals and in vegetables—“hanging” (it was said) “on every tree”. From their abodes in the sun, the moon, and the air, Christ and the Spirit act in the work of disengaging these particles; it is by their operation that herbs burst forth from the ground, striving towards their kindred light, while the powers of darkness, whom the Living Spirit, after his victory, had crucified in the stars, thence exert baleful influences on the earth.

Animal and even vegetable life was therefore sacred for the Manichaeans, who believed that vegetables had the same feelings of pain as mankind. The elect (the highest class in the community) might not even pluck a leaf or a fruit with their own hands; when about to eat bread, it is said that they thus addressed it:—“It was not I who reaped, or ground, or baked thee; may they who did so be reaped, and ground, and baked in their turn!”. While the elect ate, the particles of divine essence contained in their food were set free: thus, says St. Augustine, did Manes make man the saviour of Christ. But the effect of other men's eating was to confine the heavenly particles in the bonds of matter; and hence it was inferred that, although a Manichaean might relieve a beggar with money, it would be impious to give him food.

It was taught that the natural man, born after the flesh, was not the work of God; but the new man, the believer, who, in St. Paul's words, “after God is created in righteousness and true holiness”. By those who should obey the precepts of Christ and of Manes, the evil elements of their nature would at length be shaken off; but, although penitence atoned for sin, the work of purgation could not be finished in this life. The sun and the moon were *two ships* for the conveyance of the elect souls to bliss. On leaving the body such souls were

transferred to the sun by the revolution of a vast wheel with twelve buckets; the sun, after purging them by his rays, delivered them over to the moon, where they were for fifteen days to undergo a further cleansing by water; and they were then to be received into the primal light. The less sanctified souls were to return to earth in other forms—some of them after undergoing intermediate tortures. Their new forms were to be such as would subject them to retribution for the misdeeds of their past life, so that one who had killed any animal would be changed into a creature of the same kind, while those who had reaped, or ground, or baked, were themselves to become wheat, and to undergo the like operations; and thus the purgation of souls was to be carried on in successive migrations until they should become fitted to enter into the bliss of the elect. When this world should have completed its course, it would be burnt into an inert mass, to which those souls which had chosen the service of evil would be chained, while the powers of darkness would be for ever confined to their own dismal region.

Manes represented the Old Testament as a work of the powers of darkness. He attacked its morality and its representations of God, dwelt on its alleged inconsistency with the New Testament, and denied that it prophesied of Christ. The gospel, it was said, was intended chiefly for gentiles; and on them the Jewish prophets could have no claim, insomuch that it would be more reasonable for gentiles to listen to the oracles of the Sibyl or of Hermes Trismegistus; those who should give heed to the prophets would die eternally. Christ had left his revelation imperfect, promising to send the Paraclete for its completion; and St. Paul had spoken (I Cor. XIII. 4) of the further knowledge which was thus to be given. The promise, according to Manes, was fulfilled in himself; but, in claiming to be the Paraclete, he did not imply the full blasphemy which such a pretension suggests to a Christian mind. He rejected the Acts of the Apostles as opposed to his doctrine on this subject; he declared the Gospels to be the work of unknown persons who lived long after the apostolic times, and also to be much adulterated, so that he might assume the right of correcting them after his own fancy; and he set aside such other portions of the New Testament as were inconsistent with his scheme. The sect relied on some apocryphal Gospels and other forgeries of a like kind, but their chief sources of belief were the writings of the founder; and they claimed the liberty of interpreting the New Testament in accordance with the teaching of their Paraclete, in like manner as the orthodox interpreted the older Scriptures by the light of the Christian revelation. They denounced the idea of symbolism in religion, and made it their especial boast that their opinions were agreeable to reason—that their converts were emancipated from the bondage of authority and faith.

The Manichaeans were divided into elect and hearers. The former class professed a high degree of ascetic sanctity. They were bound by the “three seals”—“of the mouth, of the hand, and of the bosom”; they were to live in poverty, celibacy, and abstinence; they were not allowed even to gather the fruits of the earth for themselves, but were supported and served by the hearers, who were obliged by the fear of the severest punishments after death to supply all their necessities. The hearers were not subject to such rigid rules : although forbidden to kill animals, they were allowed to eat flesh and to drink wine, to marry, and to engage in the usual occupations of life. At a later time, charges of hypocrisy and gross sensuality were freely brought against the Manichaeans, notwithstanding their pale and mortified appearance; nor do these charges appear to have been without substantial foundation.

The Manichaean hierarchy consisted of a chief, twelve masters, and seventy-two bishops, with priests and deacons under them. The worship of the sect, simple and naked, agreeably to its Persian origin, was in many points studiously opposed to that of the church—as in the rejection or disregard of the Christian festivals, and in observing the Lord’s day as a fast. The anniversary of the heresiarch’s death, in the month of March, was the great festival of their year, and was known by the name of *Bema*. In prayer the Manichaeans turned towards the sun. The hearers were allowed to listen to the reading of Manes’ books, but did not receive any explanation of their meaning; the worship of the elect was shrouded in mystery, which

naturally gave rise to rumours of abominable rites. St. Augustine, after having been nine years a hearer, could only state that the Eucharist was celebrated among the elect; of the manner of administration he had been unable to learn anything, although, as the principles of the Manichaeans forbade them to use wine, he taunts them with “acknowledging their God in the grape, and refusing to acknowledge him in the cup”. Baptism is supposed to have been administered with oil; that with water was held indifferent, if it was not forbidden.

Manichaeism soon spread into the west. Its appearance in proconsular Africa, within a few years after the founder's death, is attested by an edict of Diocletian, which condemns the doctrine, not as Christian, but as coming from the hostile kingdom of Persia. This document orders that the teachers and their books should be burnt; that the disciples should be sent to the mines, or, if persons of rank, should be banished; and that in either case their property should be seized. But two centuries later (as we learn from St. Augustine) the sect was numerous in Italy and in Africa, where some of its secret members were even among the clergy of the church. Notwithstanding frequent and severe edicts of the Christian emperors, Manichaeism continued to exist, and we shall have frequent occasion to notice it hereafter among the heresies of the middle ages.

The persecuting edict of Aurelian was revoked by his successor Tacitus; and for many years the church was undisturbed by the secular power. In the reign of Diocletian it had attained a degree of prosperity exceeding that of any former time. Its buildings began to display architectural splendor, and were furnished with sacred vessels of silver and gold. Converts flocked in from all ranks; even the wife of the emperor, and his daughter Valeria, who was married to his colleague Galerius, appear to have been among the number. Christians held high offices in the state and in the imperial household. Provincial governments were entrusted to them, with a privilege of exemption from all such duties as might be inconsistent with their religion. With these advances in temporal well-being, the contemporary historian laments that there had been a decay of faith and love; that hypocrisy and ambition had crept in: that pastors and people alike were distracted by jealousies and dissensions. But it has been well observed that the very offences which now appeared in the church are a token of progress, since it is the strongest proof of the firm hold of a party, whether religious or political, upon the public mind, when it may offend with impunity against its own primary principles. That which at one time is a sign of incurable weakness, or approaching dissolution, at another seems but the excess of healthful energy, and the evidence of unbroken vigour.

It was in the year 284 that Diocletian assumed the purple. In 286 he admitted Maximian to share the empire, as Augustus; and in 292 Galerius and Constantius were associated in the government, with the inferior title of Caesars. Disregarding the republican forms under which the imperial power had hitherto been veiled, Diocletian assumed the state of an eastern monarch, established a new system of administration, with offices and titles of a pomp before unknown among the Romans, and removed his court from Rome to Nicomedia, on the Asiatic shore of the Propontis. The ancient capital ceased to be the centre of government; the senate sank into insignificance and neglect. In the partition of the empire, Diocletian reserved for himself Thrace, the Asiatic provinces, and Egypt; Maximian, whose residence was at Milan, received Italy and Africa; Galerius had Illyria and the countries on the Danube; while Gaul, Spain, and Britain were assigned to Constantius.

The priests and others who were interested in the maintenance of the pagan system began to apprehend that they might lose their hold on the empire. Diocletian was indifferent as to religion, while Constantius openly favoured the Christians; and, although Maximian and Galerius were hostile to Christianity, yet it may have seemed possible that the Caesar might be influenced by his Christian wife. Attempts were therefore made to work on the superstitious feelings of Diocletian by means of omens and oracles. On one occasion, when Apollo was consulted in his presence, the answer was given, not, as was usual, through the priest, but by the god himself, in a hollow voice which issued from the depths of the cave—that, on account

of the righteous who were on the earth, the oracles were restrained from answering truly; and, in reply to Diocletian's inquiries, the priests explained that these words pointed at the Christians.

At another time, when the emperor was with his army in the east, it was announced that the entrails of the victims did not exhibit the usual marks by which the future was signified. The sacrifice was several times repeated without any better result; and at last the chief soothsayer declared that the presence of profane persons—that is to say, of Christians—was the cause of its failure. It was in the army that Christians were most especially liable to be noted, and that the first attempts on their fidelity were made.

The story of the Theban legion, which is referred to the year 286, although extravagantly fabulous in its details, may possibly have some foundation of truth. This legion, it is said, consisting of 6,600 Christians, was summoned from the east for the service of Maximian in Gaul. When near the Alpine town of Agaunum, which takes its modern name from their leader, St. Maurice, the soldiers discovered that they were to be employed in the persecution of their brethren in the faith, and refused to march onward for such a purpose. By order of Maximian, who was in the neighborhood, they were twice decimated. But this cruelty was unable to shake the firmness of the survivors; and Maurice, in the name of his comrades, declared to the emperor that, while ready to obey him in all things consistent with their duty to God, they would rather die than violate that duty. Maximian, exasperated by their obstinacy, ordered the other troops to close around them; whereupon the devoted band laid down their arms and peacefully submitted to martyrdom. There are other and more authentic records of military confessors and martyrs in the early part of Diocletian's reign; but whatever persecutions or annoyances may have then been experienced by Christian soldiers, it does not appear that any general attempt to force their conscience was made before the year 298, when it was ordered that all persons in military service or in public employment of any kind should offer sacrifice to the gods.

Galerius, during a visit which he paid to Diocletian at Nicomedia in the winter of 302-3, endeavored to excite the elder emperor against the Christians. For a time Diocletian withstood his importunity—whether sincerely, or only with a wish to gain credit for a show of reluctance, is doubtful. The advice of some lawyers and military officers was then called in (as is said to have been the emperor's custom when he wished to divert from himself the odium of any unpopular measure), and a persecution was decreed. On the 23rd of February—the great Roman festival of the Terminalia,—an attack was made on the church of Nicomedia, which was situated on a height, and overlooked the palace. The heathen functionaries, on entering, found nothing to seize except the copies of the sacred books, which they burnt. It was then proposed to set fire to the building itself; but Diocletian, out of fear that the flames might spread, preferred to give it over to the soldiery for destruction, and by their exertions the church was in a few hours entirely demolished.

Next day the imperial edict was issued. It ordained that all who should refuse to sacrifice should lose their offices, their property, their rank, and civil privileges; that slaves persisting in the profession of the gospel should be excluded from the hope of liberty; that Christians of all ranks should be liable to torture; that all churches should be razed to the ground; that religious meetings should be suppressed; and that the Scriptures and other service-books should be committed to the flames. No sooner had the edict been publicly displayed, than a Christian, who is described as a man of station, tore it down, uttering at the same time words of insult against the emperors. In punishment of this audacious act, he was roasted at a slow fire, and the stern composure with which he bore his sufferings astonished and mortified his executioners.

Within a fortnight the palace of Nicomedia was twice discovered to be on fire. The cause is unknown but on the second occasion, at least, the guilt was charged on the Christians. Diocletian was greatly alarmed and incensed. He compelled his wife and daughter to sacrifice,

and proceeded to administer the same test to the members of his household and to the inhabitants of the city. Some of the most confidential chamberlains, who were Christians, were put to death, after having endured extreme tortures, and many other Christians, among whom was Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, also suffered martyrdom.

The edict was soon carried into execution throughout the empire. The churches were for the most part demolished; in some cases the furniture was carried out and burnt, and the buildings were shut up, or were converted to profane uses. The attempt to exterminate the Scriptures was a new feature in this persecution. Many Christians suffered death for refusing to deliver them up, while those who complied were branded by their brethren as *traditors*—a term which we shall have occasion to notice hereafter. As the officials were unable to distinguish the sacred books from other Christian writings, there is reason to believe that, through the confusion, a vast number of precious documents perished, to the irreparable loss of ecclesiastical history. In some cases, however, the destruction of these arose from the forbearance of the authorities, who disliked the task imposed on them, and were willing to accept any books that might be offered, without inquiring whether they were those which the Christians regarded as sacred. Thus, when Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, had withdrawn the copies of the Scriptures from his church, and had placed some heretical writings in their room, the proconsul Anulinus, on being informed of the pious fraud, refused to make any further search. In some cases, indeed, the magistrates even hinted to the Christians that a substitution of this kind would be admitted; and such connivance was the more remarkable, if it is correct to suppose that negligence in execution of the edict was punishable even with death. But on the other hand, there were governors who gladly seized the opportunity of venting their enmity against the church, and carried on the work of persecution with a severity which exceeded the imperial orders.

Some troubles in Armenia and Syria, which were falsely charged on the Christians, afforded a pretext for a second edict, by which it was ordered that their teachers should be arrested. In consequence of this, as Eusebius informs us, the prisons were filled with bishops and clergy, so that no room could be found for the malefactors by whom they were commonly occupied. By a third edict, issued in the same year which had witnessed the beginning of the persecution, it was directed that the prisoners should be required to sacrifice, and, in case of refusal, should be tortured; and a fourth edict, in the following year, extended this order to Christians of every class. As it was supposed that the victims would be proof against the usual kinds of torture, the judges were charged to invent new and more excruciating torments. Yet no one of these edicts enacted death as a punishment, although through the zeal of officials, and under various pretexts, that punishment was inflicted on multitudes of believers.

On the 1st of May 305, Diocletian abdicated the empire at Nicomedia, and Maximian, in reluctant submission to the influence of his colleague and benefactor, performed a like ceremony of resignation at Milan. Constantius and Galerius now succeeded to the highest dignity, and two new Caesars, Maximin and Severus, were associated with them. For some years the imperial power was the subject of contentions, changes, and partitions : at one time there were no fewer than six emperors—in the east, Galerius, Maximin, and Licinius; in the west, Maximian, who had resumed his power, his son Maxentius, and his son-in-law Constantine, the son and successor of Constantius. Meanwhile the condition of the Christians throughout the empire varied according to the character of its several rulers.

Constantius, while he held the subordinate dignity of Caesar, destroyed the churches in his dominions, out of deference to the authority of the elder emperors; but he protected Christians, and entertained many of them in his court. On his elevation to the rank of Augustus he befriended them more openly; and in this policy he was followed by Constantine, who succeeded him in 306, and showed himself yet more decidedly favorable to the Christians.

Galerius persecuted with great zeal until, in the year 311, having found his cruelty utterly ineffectual towards the suppression of the gospel, and feeling himself sinking under a loathsome and excruciating disease, he issued, in his own name and in those of Licinius and Constantine, an edict by which Christians were allowed to exercise their religion and to rebuild their churches, provided that they refrained from doing anything against the discipline of the state; and he concluded with the remarkable request that they would offer up prayers for his safety. There can be little doubt that in this change of policy the emperor was influenced by other motives than that pity for the perversity of the Christians, and that regard for the unity of his subjects, which were professed in the edict. Perhaps his bodily sufferings may have been aggravated by remorse for the cruelties which he had committed; or it may have been that, despairing of other relief, he sought to obtain a chance of recovery through the favour of the God of Christians,—regarding him as a power of the same class with the multitude of heathen deities.

In Italy and in Africa the persecution was severe during the reign of Maximian. When his son Maxentius assumed the government of those countries, the Christians, although they suffered from the usurper's tyranny in common with his other subjects, were not molested on account of their religion; indeed, he even pretended to favour them. For it was now felt that they were an important element in the state, and princes who had no regard for their religion might nevertheless be with reason desirous to secure their political support.

The most violent of all the persecutors was Maximin, who in the year 305 received the sovereignty of Syria and Egypt, and on the death of Galerius added Asia Minor to his dominions. Brutal, ferocious, and ignorant, he was a slave to pagan superstition, and a dupe to priests, soothsayers, and professors of magical arts. Galerius did not venture to include his name in the edict for toleration of the gospel; but Maximin, although he declined to publish it in his dominions, gave verbal orders to a like effect. At the same time, however, he took measures for restoring the splendour of the heathen worship, and six months later he issued an edict for a renewal of persecution, professing to do so in compliance with petitions from Antioch and other cities,—petitions which, according to the Christian writers of the age, had been instigated by himself. It was required that all his subjects, even to infants at the breast, should offer sacrifice; that provisions in the markets should be sprinkled with the libations, and that guards should be placed at the doors of the public baths, with a charge to defile in the same manner those who were about to go forth after having performed their ablutions. Calumny too was employed to discredit the Christian religion. Forged *Acts of Pilate* were circulated, and were introduced into schools as lesson-books, so that the very children had their mouths filled with blasphemies against the Saviour. Women of the vilest character were suborned to confess abominations of which they pretended to have partaken among the Christians. The edict was engraved on plates of brass, and set up in every city. In it Maximin boasted of the blessings which had followed on his measures for the revival of paganism—success in war, fruitful seasons, immunity from the plagues of earthquake, storm, and sickness. But soon after the renewal of persecution, this boast was signally falsified by the appearance of famine and pestilence, which fearfully wasted his dominions. And in this time of trial, as before on similar occasions, the power of Christian faith and love was admirably manifested. The believers, while they shared in the common visitation, distinguished themselves from the multitude by their behaviour under it, hazarding their lives in ministering to the sick and in burying the dead who were abandoned by their own nearest kindred.

The varieties of torture exercised during the persecution need not be here detailed. On the whole, the Christians endured their sufferings with a noble constancy and patience, although, in addition to the weakness of the traditors, there were some who denied the faith, and others who provoked their death by violent and fanatical conducts. The pagans who witnessed their sufferings were at length disgusted by such profusion of bloodshed and cruelty; the persecutors themselves became weary of slaying, and resorted to other punishments—such as

mutilation of the limbs, plucking out an eye, employing bishops and other eminent persons in degrading occupations, and sending large numbers of all classes to labour in unwholesome mines.

The persecution altogether lasted ten years, although after the first two it was but little felt in the west. Gibbon, with an evident desire to state as low as possible the number of those who were put to death, reckons them at two thousand; of bodily torments short of death, and of the immense wretchedness of other kinds which must have been experienced by the members of the suffering community during that long period of terror, the historian disdains to take any account whatever.

Among the martyrs, the most celebrated for station or character were—Peter, bishop of Alexandria; Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, who in early life had been connected with Paul of Samosata, but afterwards returned to the orthodox communion, and distinguished himself by his labours on the Scriptures : Pamphilus, the founder of the library of Caesarea, celebrated for his zeal in multiplying and correcting copies of the sacred text, for his writings in defence of Origen, and for his intimate friendship with the historian Eusebius; and Methodius, bishop of Tyre, the opponent of Pamphilus in the Origenistic controversy.

In addition to those whose names are recorded in authentic history, a great number of martyrs enjoying a general or a local celebrity are referred to this period—as St. Sebastian and St. Agnes, who are said to have suffered at Rome, and are commemorated by churches and catacombs without the walls of the city; St. Januarius, of Naples; SS. Cosmus and Damian, two Arabian brothers, who are said to have suffered in Cilicia, and are regarded as patrons of the medical art; St. Vincent of Saragossa; St. Denys (Dionysius) of Paris, St. Clement of Metz, St. Quentin, from whom the capital of the Veromandui takes its modern name, St Victor of Marseilles, and many others in France; St. Gereon and his 318 companions, whose relics are shown in a singular and beautiful church at Cologne; St. George, who is supposed to have suffered at Nicomedia, and is famous as the patron of England. To the earlier part of Diocletian's reign, before the edict of 303, belongs the story of the British protomartyr St. Alban.

After his victory over Maxentius, in the end of October 312, Constantine published an edict in favour of the Christians; and by a second, which he issued in conjunction with Licinius, from Milan, in June 313, he established for them, in common with all other subjects of the empire, complete religious freedom,—ordering that the churches and other property of the community should be restored to them, and inviting persons who might suffer by this restitution to seek compensation from the public purse. In consequence of the overthrow of Maximin by Licinius (April 30, 313), the benefits of this edict were speedily extended to the whole empire. The fury of the defeated tyrant, who had vowed that, if victorious, he would exterminate the Christian name, was now turned into an opposite direction; in his despair he put to death many of the priests and soothsayers on whose counsels he had relied, and he proclaimed an entire toleration of the Christians—laying the blame of his former severities against them on the judges and governors, whom he attempted to represent as having misunderstood his intentions. Maximin died miserably at Tarsus in August 313; and in the contrast between the prosperity of the princes who had befriended them and the calamitous ends of their oppressors, the Christians could not but suppose that they discerned tokens of the Divine judgment.

CHAPTER VIII.
SUPPLEMENTARY

Progress of the Gospel.

There is reason to believe that, by the end of the third century, the gospel had been made known in some degree to almost all the nations with which the Romans had intercourse, although we have very little information as to the details of its progress, or as to the agency by which this was effected. From an early period Christian writers are found appealing triumphantly to the extension of their brotherhood.

“There exists not”, says Justin Martyr, “a people, whether Greek or barbarian, or any other race of men, by whatsoever appellation or manners they may be distinguished, however ignorant of arts or of agriculture, whether they dwell under tents or wander about in covered waggons, among whom prayers [and thanksgivings] are not offered up in the name of a crucified Jesus to the Father and Creator of all things”. Irenaeus declares that in his day many barbarous nations had the traditional faith of the church written in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, without the instrumentality of paper and ink. Tertullian, in reckoning up the nations which had received the gospel, names, in addition to those which were represented at Jerusalem on the great day of Pentecost,—Getulians, Moors, Spaniards, Gauls, Britons beyond the Roman pale, Sarmatians, Dacians, Germans, and Scythians. Origen speaks of it as having won myriads of converts among every nation and kind of men; as having carried its conquests to a large extent over the barbaric world. Arnobius, an eloquent African apologist, who wrote about the year 304, in one passage mentions widely distant nations among which Christians were found, and elsewhere asserts that there was then no nation of barbarians which had not been affected by the softening influence of the gospel. Such passages are not, indeed, free from rhetorical vagueness and exaggeration; but, after all reasonable abatement, they must be admitted as evidence that, in the times when they were written, the faith of Christ had been widely diffused, and in many quarters had penetrated beyond the bounds of civilization.

Although the narrative of the preceding chapters has been for the most part confined to the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, the accounts of Pantaenus and Origen have brought before us notices of Christianity in regions which are vaguely designated by the names of Arabia and India; and the story of Manes has shown the existence of Christian communities in Persia and Mesopotamia. The church of Edessa, whatever may be the value of the statements which ascribe to it an apostolic origin, is known to have been firmly established in the middle of the second century; and shortly after that date the Edessan Bardesanes witnesses to the propagation of the gospel in Parthia, Persia, Media, and Bactria. It was not until towards the end of the period that it was introduced into Armenia; but the apostle of that country, Gregory, styled the Illuminator, made a convert of the king, Tiridates III, and Armenia had the honour of being the first country in which Christianity was adopted as the national religion.

From the time when they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution which arose about Stephen went everywhere preaching the word, the calamities which drove Christians from their homes became the means of spreading the tidings of salvation. We have seen that such consequences followed from the banishment of bishops and clergy under Decius and Valerian; and thus it was that the Goths in Moesia derived their first knowledge of the faith from captives whom they had carried off after inroads on the empire during the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus.

Irenaeus, towards the end of the second century, speaks of churches as existing among the Celts, in Spain, and in Germany. His mention of the last of these countries ought, perhaps, to be understood as referring to the Roman province only—the portion within the Rhine; but it is probable that, in the course of the following century, converts had also been won among the barbarous nations to the eastward of that river.

Of the early history of Christianity in Gaul very little is known. It is hardly to be supposed that Pothinus and his Asiatic companions, the founders of the church of Lyons, were the earliest missionaries who appeared in that country; but they were the first of whom any authentic record is preserved, or whose works had any considerable success. Gregory of Tours, who wrote towards the end of the sixth century, states that in the reign of Decius seven missionaries set out from Rome for the conversion of Gaul, and that among them was Dionysius, bishop of Paris, who is confounded by later legendary writers with the Areopagite of the apostolic age. That there may have been some such mission about the time which is assigned for it, is not improbable; but the story as told by Gregory is inconsistent with unquestionable facts, and the work of the missionaries, if they were really sent into Gaul about the middle of the third century, must have consisted in strengthening and extending the church of that country—not in laying its foundation by the first introduction of the faith.

The origin of the British church is involved in fable. The story of Joseph of Arimathea's preaching, and even the correspondence of an alleged British king Lucius with Eleutherius, bishop of Rome, about the year 167, need not be here discussed. Yet within about thirty years from the supposed date of that correspondence, we meet with the statement already quoted from Tertullian, that the gospel had made its way into parts of this island which the Romans had never reached,—a statement which may be supposed to indicate that, in the end of the second century, even Scotland had not been unvisited by missionaries. Somewhat later than Tertullian, Origen speaks of Britons, "although divided from our world", as united with Mauritians in the worship of the same one God. It seems to be certain that under the government of Constantius and his son, at the end of the period which we have been surveying, the British Christians were numerous; and in the council of Arles, A.D. 314, we find the names of three British bishops—Eborius of York, Restitutus of London, and Adelfius, whose see is generally identified with Lincoln.

The social position of those who embraced the gospel in the earliest times afforded a theme for the ridicule of Celsus; and Gibbon, with evident delight, repeats the taunt that the new sect was almost entirely composed of the dregs of the populace—of peasants and mechanics, of boys and women, of beggars and slaves.

If, as the same writer states, "this very odious imputation seems to be less strenuously denied by the apologists, than it is urged by the adversaries, of the faith", the cause may probably be found in their sense of its irrelevancy to any question as to the truth of the gospel, and in the feeling which forbade them to imitate, even towards the meanest or the most sinful among those for whom the Saviour had died, the contempt with which the philosophers of heathenism were wont to look down on those whom they regarded as inferior to themselves. But, as the historian goes on to admit, the reproach of meanness and vulgarity was far from being universally applicable to the converts. Among those whom we read of even in the New Testament were many persons of wealth and station, including some members of the imperial household. There can be little doubt that Christianity was the "foreign superstition" of which, according to Tacitus, Pomponia Graecina, wife of Aulus Plautius, the conqueror of Britain, became a votary in the reign of Nero, or that the profession of it was the dimly-indicated offence which under Domitian brought persecution on his own near relations, Flavia Domitilla and her husband, the consul Flavius Clemens. It was not a mere rhetorical flight when Tertullian, in the end of the second century, told the heathens that his brethren were to be found filling the camp, the assemblies, the palace, and the senate. The same writer distinctly states that Septimius Severus, in the earlier part of his reign, allowed men and women of very

high rank to profess the gospel; and in like manner we are told by Origen, a little after Tertullian's time, that among the converts were men of dignified position, with noble and delicate ladies. We have seen that, at a later date, Diocletian's empress and daughter were believed to be of the number; and in the edicts both of that prince and of his predecessor Valerian, it is assumed that in many cases the penalties for professing Christianity would be incurred by persons of wealth and station.

That the "poor of this world" were often found "rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom of God"—that the preaching of Christ, addressed as it was to all, found more acceptance among the simple than among the wise men of the world—that the gospel was sometimes introduced into families by the agency of slaves—that female influence was effective in spreading it—such statements we need not care to controvert. But we have seen also how by degrees the faith won its converts and its advocates among men of the highest ability and cultivation; and how the Christian schools came to be frequented even by many of the heathen, on account of the advantages which they offered for a liberal and philosophical education. The very rebukes addressed by Clement, in his 'Pedagogue', to the Christians of Alexandria, prove that he had to deal with a wealthy and luxurious community.¹ And, on the whole, there is reason to believe that, while the gospel had its proselytes in every rank below the throne, "its main strength lay in the middle, perhaps the mercantile, classes".

The proportion which the Christians bore to the heathen population of the empire has been very variously estimated. We are not concerned on religious grounds to question Gibbon's calculation, that, until their religion was sanctioned by the authority of Constantine, they did not amount to "more than a twentieth part" of the whole; indeed, if all the hindrances to the progress of the gospel be fairly considered, even such a proportion would deserve to be regarded as a token rather of great than of little success but there can be little doubt that the estimate is by far too low. By other writers the Christians have been reckoned as a tenth or a fifth of the whole body of Roman subjects; in some districts, as in the dominions of Maximin, they were perhaps even the majority.

The Hierarchy.

In the course of the second and third centuries the hierarchy of the church underwent some changes. The only order which existed in the apostolic age, in addition to those of bishops, priests, and deacons, was that of deaconesses—women (and at first usually-widows) who were employed in such ministrations to persons of their own sex as were either naturally unsuitable for males, or were so regarded by the customs of the ancient world—especially in the east. Thus, they assisted at the baptism of female converts; they visited the women of the community at their homes; and, by obtaining access to their apartments, from which the clergy were excluded, they had the means of doing much for the advancement of the faith among the middle and higher classes.

But in the end of the second century, or early in the third, several new offices, below the order of deacons, were introduced. These originated in the greater churches, where—partly from a supposed expediency of limiting the number of deacons to that of the apostolical church at Jerusalem, and partly from the importance which the deacons acquired in such communities, as being intrusted with the administration of the public funds—a need was felt of assistance in performing the lower functions of the diaconate, which it is too probable that the deacons had in many cases begun to regard as unworthy of them. The first mention of any inferior office is in Tertullian, who speaks of readers. The fuller organization of the lesser orders comes before us in the epistles of St. Cyprian, and in one of his contemporary Cornelius, bishop of Rome, who states that the Roman church then numbered forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolyths, and fifty-two exorcists, readers, and door-keepers. The business of the subdeacons was to take care of the sacred

vessels and to assist the deacons in their secular duties; the acolyths lighted the lamps and attended at the celebration of the sacraments; the exorcists had the charge of the energumens (or persons who were supposed to be possessed by evil spirits); the readers were employed to read the Scriptures in the services of the church.

These offices were not universally adopted. As to that of exorcist, the Apostolical Constitutions (which represent the eastern system as it was about the end of the third century) declare that it is not to be conferred by ordination, as being a special gift of divine grace, and a voluntary exercise of benevolence.

While the ministry of the church was thus receiving an addition of inferior offices, the authority of its highest members, the bishops, became more defined, and distinctions were introduced into their order. The circumstances of the times required that power should be centralized, as an expedient conducive to strength and safety; moreover, as their flocks increased in numbers and in wealth, and as the clergy subject to them were multiplied, the position of the bishops naturally acquired a greater appearance of outward dignity. There seems, however, to be much exaggeration in the statements of some writers, both as to the smallness of the authority which they suppose the episcopate to have originally possessed, and as to the height which it had attained in the course of these centuries. Even to the end of the period we meet with nothing like autocratic power in the bishops. They were themselves elected by the clergy and people; they consulted with the presbyters in the more private matters, and with the body of the faithful in such as concerned the whole community; even the selection of persons to be ordained for the ministry of the church was referred to the consent of its members generally.

From time to time circumstances rendered it desirable that the pastors of neighbouring churches should meet in consultation, agreeably to apostolic precedent. In addition to such occasional synods, the custom of holding regular meetings twice, or at least once, a year was introduced in the latter part of the second century. The origin of these stated synods appears to have been in Greece, where they were recommended by the analogy of the ancient deliberative assemblies, such as that of the Amphictyons, which still existed and by degrees they were introduced into other countries. The chief city of each district was regarded as the metropolis, or mother city. There the synods met; the bishop of the place naturally took a lead as president, and he became the representative of his brethren in their communications with other churches. Thus the metropolitans acquired a pre-eminence among the bishops : and, although every bishop was still regarded as of equal dignity,—although each was considered to be independent in his own diocese (unless, indeed, suspicions of his orthodoxy invited his brethren to interfere for the vindication of the faith, and for the protection of his flock),—although each, within his own sphere, retained the direction of the ritual and of indifferent matters in general,—the individual dioceses became practically subject to the decisions of the larger circles in which they were included.

A still higher authority than that of ordinary metropolitans was attached to the bishops of the great seats of government, as Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. The title of patriarch, by which these came to be distinguished, was not, however, restricted to them in the period which we are now surveying.

The authority of the churches which could trace their origin to apostolic founders was highly regarded. Irenaeus and Tertullian, in arguing with heretics who refused to abide by the words of Scripture under pretence of its having been corrupted, refer them to the tradition of the apostolic churches and to the uninterrupted succession of their bishops, as evidence of the apostolic doctrine. In so doing, Tertullian places all such churches on the same level—classing Philippi, Corinth, Thessalonica, and Ephesus with Rome. But the great church of the imperial city had especial advantages, which could not fail to exalt it in a manner altogether peculiar. It was the only apostolic church of the west, and the channel through which most of the western nations had received the gospel; it was believed to have been founded by the

labours and adorned by the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul; it was strong in the number of its members, and in the wealth which enabled it not only to maintain a higher degree of state than other churches, but to send large charities to the less opulent brethren in every quarter; it was linked with all other communities by continual intercourse; while it was preserved by national character from those speculative errors which so greatly disquieted the churches of the east. Hence the Roman church necessarily became pre-eminent above every other. But while this eminence was willingly acknowledged in ordinary circumstances, the pretensions of Rome were firmly resisted whenever such bishops as Victor or Stephen attempted to interfere with the independent rights of their brethren in the episcopate. The history of these centuries clearly shows that the bishops of Rome did not as yet possess any jurisdiction over other churches, or any other authority than the precedence and the influence which naturally resulted from their position.

From the cities, in which it was first planted, Christianity gradually penetrated into the country. When a church was formed in a village or a small town, it was administered by a presbyter, subject to the bishop of the neighbouring city, and in some cases by a chorepiscopus (or country bishop). Although this title does not occur before the fourth century, the office which it designates was of much earlier origin. The *chorepiscopi* were subordinate to the bishops of cities, and acted for them in confirming the baptized, in granting letters of communion, in ordaining the clergy of the minor orders, and sometimes, by special permission, the priests and deacons. It is a question to what order of the ministry they belonged. Some writers suppose that they were all bishops; others (among whom are Romanists of high name as well as presbyterians) consider them to have been presbyters; while, according to a third opinion, some were of one class and some of the other. If we regard the object of their appointment, this last view may seem the most probable. As the chorepiscopi were substitutes of the city bishops, and empowered to discharge some part of their functions, it may in some cases have been sufficient to appoint a presbyter, with authority to perform certain acts which by such delegation might rightly be intrusted to presbyters, although not included in the ordinary presbyterial commission; while in other cases it may have been expedient that the chorepiscopus should be a bishop, although, as being the deputy of another bishop, he was limited in the exercise of his powers.

The right of the Christian clergy to “live of the gospel” was asserted and acknowledged from the first. As the church became more completely organized, they were withdrawn from secular business, and were restricted to the duties of their ministry; in the African church of St. Cyprian's time a clergyman was forbidden even to undertake the office of executor or guardian. Their maintenance was derived from the oblations of the faithful; in some places they received a certain proportion of the whole fund collected for the uses of the church; in other places, as at Carthage, provision was made for them by special monthly collections. The amount of income thus obtained was naturally very various in different churches; it would seem that the practice of trading, which is sometimes spoken of as a discredit to the clergy, and forbidden by canons, may in many cases have originated, not in covetousness, but in a real need of some further means of subsistence in addition to those provided by the church.

Rites and Usages.

During the earliest years of the gospel—while the congregations of believers were scanty and poor, and their assemblies were held in continual fear of disturbance on the part of the heathens—although it seems probable that they may have set certain rooms apart for the performance of their worship, it is not to be supposed that any entire buildings can have been devoted exclusively to religious uses. We find, however, that in Tertullian's time churches were already built: the notices of them become more frequent in the course of the third century ; and, as has been stated in a former chapter, a new splendour of structure and

ornament was introduced during the long interval of peace which followed after the persecution under Valerian.

In these churches a portion was separated from the rest by railings, which were intended to exclude the laity. Within this enclosure were the holy table or altar, which was usually made of wood, the pulpit or reading-desk, and the seats of the clergy.

In the apostolical times, baptism was administered immediately on the acknowledgment of Christ by the receiver; but when the church became more firmly settled, converts were required to pass through a course of moral training, combined with instruction in the faith, before admission to its communion by this sacrament. Their entry on this training (during which the title of Christians was already given to them, as well as that of catechumens) was marked by a solemn reception, with prayer, the sign of the cross, and imposition of hands. The length of the preparatory period was not uniform the council of Illiberis (Elvira, near Granada) appoints two years, while the Apostolical Constitutions prescribe three, although with a permission that the term may be shortened in special cases. If the catechumen were in danger of death during his probation, he was baptized without further delay.

With the system of preparatory training was introduced the practice of confining the ordinary administration of baptism to particular seasons. Easter and Whitsuntide were considered as especially suitable, on account of the connection between the sacrament and the great events which those seasons respectively commemorated; and it was on the vigil of each festival that the chief performance of the baptismal rites took place. Yet baptism might still be given at other times: "Every day is the Lord's", says Tertullian, after stating the reasons for preferring Easter and Pentecost; "every hour, every time, is fitting for baptism; if there be a difference as to solemnity, there is none as to grace".

Agreeably to apostolical practice, a profession of faith was exacted at baptism. Hence arose the use of creeds, embodying the essential points of belief, which were imparted to the catechumens in the last stage of their preparation. The name given to these forms—*symbola*—seems either to have meant simply that they were tokens of Christian brotherhood, or to have been borrowed from the analogy of military service, in which the watchwords or passwords were so called. Renunciation of the devil and other spiritual enemies was also required; and it was probably in the second century that the rite of exorcising was introduced into the baptismal office—a rite which was founded on the view that men were under the dominion of the evil one until set free by the reception of Christian grace. About the same time probably were added various symbolical ceremonies:— the sign of the cross on the forehead; the kiss of peace, in token of admission into spiritual fellowship; white robes, figurative of the cleansing from sin; and the tasting of milk and honey, which were intended to typify the blessings of the heavenly Canaan.

Baptism was administered by immersion, except in cases of sickness, where effusion or sprinkling was used. St. Cyprian strongly asserts the sufficiency of this "clinical" baptism but a stigma was justly attached to persons who put off their baptism until the supposed approach of death should enable them (as it was thought) to secure the benefits of the sacrament without incurring its obligation to newness of life. In opposition to this error, Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian earnestly insist on the principle that right dispositions of mind are necessary in order to partake of the baptismal gifts, and warn against trusting to the virtue of an ordinance received in circumstances where it was hardly possible to conceive that such dispositions could exist.

That the baptism of infants was of apostolical origin, there are abundant grounds of presumption. Thus, our Lord Himself, by receiving and blessing little children, showed that they are capable of spiritual benefits. His charge to "make disciples of all nations, baptizing them" was given to persons who had been accustomed to the admission of infants into a spiritual covenant by the rite of circumcision, and even to the baptism of the children of proselytes. St. Paul seems to assume that all who were capable of becoming members of the

Jewish church were equally admissible to the Christian church; and we hear nothing of any dissensions on this point, whereas the exclusion of their infants would surely have been a grievance sufficient to provoke in the highest degree the characteristic jealousy of Jewish converts. We read of whole households as having been baptized at once, without a hint that any members of them were excepted on account of tender age. And in St. Paul's charges as to the training of children, they seem to be regarded as already members of the church for otherwise we might certainly have expected to meet with directions for their instruction and discipline in preparation for baptism. The first distinct mention of infant-baptism is by St. Irenaeus; but the whole bearing of early writings is in accordance with the judgment of Origen, who referred the practice to apostolical tradition. Tertullian, in terms hardly consistent with a belief in original sin (which, however, he elsewhere strongly declares), argues against hastening to administer baptism to "the age of innocence"; but his objection proves that this was the established usage, and he himself allows that infants may be baptized when in danger of death.

Tertullian is also a witness for the use of sponsors at baptism.

Confirmation, by imposition of hands and anointing with chrism, was originally given immediately after baptism; but in the second century the administration of it was ordinarily reserved to bishops, although in the east it was still sometimes performed by presbyters. When baptism was administered by a bishop or in his presence, as in cities at the great festivals, the supplementary rites were immediately added; in other cases, they were deferred until there should be an opportunity of receiving them at the hands of the bishop. Confirmation was bestowed on infants as well as on other baptized persons; and in some churches a practice of administering the Eucharist to infants and young children—founded on a belief that our Lord's words in St. John imposed a universal necessity of that sacrament in order to salvation—was established by the middle of the third century.

The elements of Christian worship appear, by the notices which occur in the New Testament, to have been the same from the earliest days, although varieties of detail and arrangement obtained in different churches. The ordinary service of the day which is called Sunday, in the second century, is described by Justin Martyr. It began with passages from the Scriptures, read in a language which the hearers in general could understand; or, where no version as yet existed in a tongue intelligible to the common people, the selected passages were first read in Greek or Latin, and were then rendered into the local dialect by an interpreter. After this followed a discourse by the presiding ecclesiastic, which was usually directed to the application of the lessons which had been read. These addresses were at first simple and familiar in style, and hence received the name of homilies (*i.e.* conversations); but by degrees they rose into greater importance as a part of the service, and acquired something of a rhetorical character, which had originally been avoided for the sake of distinction from the harangues of secular orators and philosophers. Psalmody formed a large portion of the early Christian worship. It consisted partly of the Old Testament psalms, and partly of hymns composed on Christian themes; and both in the church and among heretical sects it was found a very effective means of impressing doctrine on the minds of the less educated members.

In the apostolic age the administration of the Eucharist took place in the evening, after the pattern of its original institution. The service included a thanksgiving by the bishop or presbyter for God's bounty in supplying the fruits of the earth; and in acknowledgment of these gifts the congregation presented offerings of bread and wine, from which the elements for consecration were taken. At the same time money was contributed for the relief of the poor, the maintenance of the clergy, and other ecclesiastical purposes. The bread used in the administration was of the common sort, leavened; the wine was mixed with water,—at first, merely in compliance with the ordinary custom of the east, although mystical reasons for the mixture were devised at least as early as the time of Clement of Alexandria, and an opinion of its necessity afterwards grew up. Before the consecration, the names of those who had offered,

and of such saints or deceased members of the church as were to be specially commemorated, were read from the diptychs; and, although the practice of reciting such lists was afterwards abandoned on account of the inconvenient length to which they had grown, it became usual to insert in the diptychs the names of the sovereign, of the patriarchs, and of the neighbouring bishops, as a sign of Christian fellowship.

The Eucharist was at first preceded, but at a later date was more usually followed, by the *agape* or love-feast. The materials of this were contributed by the members of the congregation, according to the means of each; all, of whatever station, sat down to it as equals, in token of their spiritual brotherhood; and the meal was concluded with psalmody and prayer. It was, however, too soon found (as even the apostolic writings bear witness) that the ideal of this feast was liable to be grievously marred in practice. There was danger of excess and selfishness in partaking of it; for the richer Christians there was a temptation either to “shame” their poorer brethren, or, by a more subtle form of evil, to value themselves on their bounty and condescension towards them. It was found also that the secret celebration of such meals tended to excite the suspicions of the heathen; that it gave rise and countenance to the popular reports of Thyestean banquets and other abominations. For such reasons the *agape* was first disjoined from the Lord's Supper, and then was abandoned. In the fourth century canons were directed against celebrations bearing this name, but which were altogether different from those to which it had been attached in earlier times.

After a time, and probably with a view of disarming the jealousies of the heathen, the administration of the Eucharist was transferred from the evening to the morning, when it was added to the service which had before been usual. Hence arose a distinction between the parts of the combined service. The earlier—the mass of the catechumens—was open to energumens (or possessed persons), to catechumens, penitents, and in the fourth century even to heretics, Jews, and heathens; while to the celebration of the holy mysteries—the mass of the faithful—none were admitted but such as were baptized and in full communion with the church. This division of the service must have been fully established before Tertullian's time, since he censures the Marcionites for their neglect of it.

In the very earliest times of the church, the sacramental breaking of bread was daily; but the fervour of devotion in which such an observance was possible soon passed away, and the celebration was usually confined to the Lord's day. In Africa an idea of the necessity of daily communion (which was supposed to be indicated in the petition for “our daily bread”) led to a custom of carrying home portions of the consecrated bread, and eating a morsel of it every morning, before going forth to the business of the day. Thus the individual Christian was supposed to witness and maintain his union with his brethren elsewhere; and in this private use of one of the sacramental elements without the other appears to have originated one of the most inexcusable corruptions of the later Latin church. The Eucharist being regarded as the chief sign and bond of Christian communion, it was considered that all the members of the church were bound to partake of it, except such as were debarred by ecclesiastical censures. All, therefore, who were present at the celebration of the sacrament communicated; and portions of the consecrated elements were reserved for the sick and for prisoners, to whom they were conveyed by the deacons after the public rites were ended.

THE LORD'S DAY

While the idea of the Christian life regards all our time as holy to the Lord, it was yet felt to be necessary that human weakness should be guided and trained by the appointment of certain days as more especially to be sanctified by religious solemnities. Hence, even from the very beginning of the church, we find traces of a particular reverence attached to the first day of the week. The special consecration of one day in seven was recommended by the analogy of the ancient sabbath; the first of the seven was that which the apostles selected, as

commemorative of their Master's rising from the grave, with which a reference to the creation was combined. On this day the believers of the apostolic age met together; they celebrated it with prayer, psalmody, preaching, administration of the Lord's Supper, and collections for the needs of the church; and according to their example the day was everywhere observed throughout the early centuries as one of holy joy and thanksgiving. All fasting on it was forbidden; the congregation stood at prayers, instead of kneeling as on other days. The first evidence of a cessation from worldly business on the Lord's day is found in Tertullian, who, however, is careful (as are the early Christian writers in general) to distinguish between the Lord's day and the Mosaic sabbath.

In memory of our Lord's betrayal and crucifixion, the fourth and sixth days of each week were kept as fasts by abstinence from food until the hour at which he gave up the ghost—the ninth hour, or 3 p.m. In the manner of observing the seventh day, the eastern church differed from the western. The orientals, influenced by the neighbourhood of the Jews and by the ideas of Jewish converts, regarded it as a continuation of the Mosaic sabbath, and celebrated it almost in the same manner as the Lord's day; while their brethren of the west extended to it the fast of the preceding day.

Agreeably to the analogy of the elder church, the first Christians assigned certain seasons to an annual remembrance of the great events in the history of redemption. Of these seasons the chief was the Pascha, which included the celebration both of the crucifixion and of the resurrection. The festival of the resurrection was preceded by a solemn fast, as to the length of which the practice varied. Irenaeus states that some were in the habit of keeping one day, some two days, some more, and some forty; but whether the forty ought to be understood as signifying days or hours is disputed. In any case, the observance of the fast was as yet voluntary, except on the day of the crucifixion.

The whole pentecostal season—from Easter to Whitsuntide—was regarded as festival; as on Sundays, the people prayed standing, and all fasting was forbidden. Whitsun-day itself was observed with especial solemnity; and in the course of the third century Ascension-day began to be also distinguished above the rest of the season.

It would seem that at Rome the Saviour's birth was celebrated on the 25th of December that the eastern church (like the Basilidians) kept the 6th of January in memory of the Epiphany—by which name was understood his manifestation as the Messiah at his baptism; and that when, in course of time, the commemoration of the nativity made its way into some parts of the east, it was also observed on the same day—the words of St. Luke being supposed to intimate that the baptism took place on the anniversary of the birth. The adoption of the Epiphany in the west (where a reference to other events in the gospel history was joined with, and at length supplanted, the subject of the old oriental festival), and the separate celebration of Christmas-day in the east, belong to the fourth century.

The memory of martyrs was very early honoured by religious commemorations, as appears from the letter written in the name of the church of Smyrna on the death of St. Polycarp. On the anniversary of a martyr's suffering (which was styled his *natalitia* or birthday, as being the day of his entrance on a better life) there was a meeting at the place of his burial—often a subterranean catacomb or crypt; the acts of his passion were read, and the brethren were exhorted to imitate his virtues; prayer was made; the eucharist was celebrated, with an especial offering of thanks for the martyr; and sometimes the agape followed. But, although a belief early crept in that the intercession of martyrs had somewhat of a like power for opening the kingdom of heaven to that which was allowed them in restoring penitents to the communion of the earthly church,—while it was supposed to obtain both forgiveness and grace for the brethren who were yet in the flesh—although Origen even ascribes to the deaths of martyrs an atoning effect akin to that of the Redeemer's sacrifice—their interest was bespoken only by entreaties before their suffering; they, like the rest of the faithful departed, were supposed to have not as yet entered on the perfect blessedness of heaven; nor is there in

the writings or in the sepulchral monuments of the early Christians any evidence of prayer either to the martyrs or through them after death.

It does not appear that festivals were as yet assigned to the apostles, except in those churches with which they had been more especially connected.

A service in remembrance of departed relatives was usual on the anniversaries of their deaths. The surviving kindred met at the grave; the Eucharist was celebrated; an oblation for the deceased was laid on the altar with those of the living; and his name was mentioned in prayer, with a commendation to eternal peace.

PENANCE.

The commission of grievous error in life or doctrine was punished by exclusion from the communion of the church; and, in order to obtain re-admission, offenders were obliged to submit to a prescribed course of penance. The regulations as to the length and manner of this penance varied in different times, and in the several branches of the church ;n the administration of it was chiefly in the hands of the bishops, who were at liberty to exercise their discretion in each case, on a consideration not only of the penitent's demeanour under the discipline, but of his entire history and character. Reconciliation after the heaviest sins, such as murder, adultery, and idolatry, was allowed only once to the baptized. In some cases, the whole life was to be a period of penance; in some, reconciliation was not granted even in the hour of death, although the refusal was not meant to imply that the sinner was shut out from the Divine forgiveness. The church's office was not supposed in these ages to extend beyond prescribing the means which might best dispose the sinner's mind for seeking the mercy of God; Cyprian, Firmilian, and other teachers are careful to guard against the danger of imagining that ecclesiastical absolution could forestall the sentence of the last day. The dissensions which took place at Rome and at Carthage in consequence of the persecution under Decius afford abundant evidence of the popular tendency to error in connection with this subject. The difficulties then felt in treating the cases of the lapsed led to the establishment in some churches of penitentiary priests, whose business it was to hear privately the confessions of offenders, and to direct them in the conduct of their repentance. And towards the end of the third century, the system was further organized by a division of the penitents into four classes, each of which marked a particular stage in the course, and had a special place assigned to the members in the time of divine service.

The churches of the early Christians had no images or pictures; for the connection of art with heathen religion and with the moral impurities of heathenism was regarded as a reason against the employment of it in sacred things. It was through the usages of common life that art gradually found its way into the church. Instead of the figures or emblems of gods with which the heathen adorned their houses, their furniture, their cups, and their signets, the Christians substituted figurative representations, such as a shepherd carrying a lamb on his shoulders, emblematic of Christ the good Shepherd a dove, the symbol of the Holy Ghost; a ship, significant of the church, the ark of salvation, sailing towards heaven; a fish, which, by its connection with water, conveyed an allusion to baptism, while the letters which formed its Greek name might be interpreted as designating the Saviour; a lyre or an anchor, the types of Christian joy and hope. And in this system were introduced even such heathen emblems as could be interpreted in a Christian sense by the initiated—for example, the vine of Bacchus and the phoenix. In like manner the Saviour was represented as Orpheus, as Apollo, or (in his character of the good Shepherd) as Mercury; and Theseus slaying the Minotaur typified the victory of David over Goliath. But as yet hardly any other than symbolical figures were used. Even in the catacombs of Rome, which were withdrawn from the sight of the heathen, symbol prevails over the attempt at literal representation, and the ideas of the New Testament are commonly figured under the likeness of the Old, as where the story of Jonah is made to serve

for a type of the resurrection, and Moses striking the rock symbolizes the waters of baptism. Even from the gospel history types are chosen in preference to attempting a more direct representation. Thus the feast on the miraculously multiplied loaves and fishes signifies the Eucharist, and perhaps the early pictures of the raising of Lazarus, in which he appears as a child, are rightly interpreted as meaning the spiritual rising from the death of sin in baptism. Neither art nor tradition professed to convey an idea of the Saviour's human form, while, on the supposed authority of some prophetic texts, it was generally believed to have been mean beyond that of mankind in general; the earliest imaginary representations of him are met with, not among orthodox Christians, but among the Carpocratian heretics and in the eclectic heathenism of Alexander Severus. Towards the end of the period, however, we find among the canons of the council of Illiberis one which forbids pictures in churches, "lest", it is said, "that which is worshipped and adored be painted on the walls". Such an enactment is evidence at once of a recent and growing practice, and of the light in which it was regarded by the simple and austere mind of the Spanish church.

The figure of the cross (with which, as Tertullian witnesses, it was the custom of the early Christians to sign their foreheads very frequently in the occasions of their daily life) was early introduced into churches. It had not, however, during this period assumed its place over the altar, nor was any devotion paid to it.

Moral Character of Christians—Asceticism—Celibacy

As the Christians of the early centuries embraced the gospel at the risk of much worldly sacrifice and suffering, we naturally expect to find that their lives were generally marked by a serious endeavour to realize their holy calling. And thus on the whole it was, although the condition of the church from the very beginning bore witness to the truth of those prophetic parables which had represented it as containing a mixture of evil members with the good. The apologists, while they acknowledge many defects among their brethren, are yet always able to point to the contrast between the lives of Christians and the utter degradation of heathen morals as an evidence of the power of the gospel. No stronger proof of this contrast need be sought than the fact that the philosophers who undertook to reinvigorate the heathen system with a view of meeting the aggressions of the new religion, found a moral reformation no less necessary than a reform of the current doctrines of heathenism.

The mutual love of Christians—a love which in its disinterested sympathy for all men was something wholly new to the heathen—was that which most impressed those who viewed the church from without. Their care of the poor, the aged, the widows, and the orphans of the community, their reverential ministrations to the brethren who were imprisoned for the faith—their kindness to slaves, whom the maxims of the ancient world had regarded as mere animated tools, whereas the gospel, while it did not interfere with the difference of social position, yet raised the slave to the footing of spiritual brotherhood with his master, and reminded the master that he too was the redeemed servant of Christ—the liberal gifts sent from one country to another for the relief of distress—the contributions raised in order to the deliverance of captives, the system of letters of communion, which not only procured for Christians admission to spiritual privileges in every church which they might visit, but entitled them to the charity and good offices of its members—such were some of the tokens in which the spirit of love was conspicuously shown; and while the sight of these things had its due effect on many, as a witness for the faith which could produce such fruits, it probably became one means of attracting unworthy converts from the needy classes, through the hope of sharing in the bounty of the richer brethren.

The force of Christian principle shone forth with especial lustre in seasons of general calamity. The charitable labours of Cyprian and his flock on occasion of the plague in the reign of Gallus have been already mentioned. A like course was taken at the same time by

Dionysius and the church of Alexandria; and, as we have lately seen, the Christian spirit was again nobly manifested by the Alexandrians during the famine and pestilence under Maximin.

It was felt that in their ordinary life Christians ought to be marked as distinct from heathens. Certain occupations were altogether forbidden—as those of diviners, actors, gladiators, charioteers, and makers of images. A convert who had followed any such calling was required to forsake it before admission to baptism; and, until he could find some other means of supporting himself, he was maintained from the funds of the church. St. Cyprian strongly condemns a Christian, who, having been formerly a player, endeavoured to earn a livelihood by giving lessons in his old profession. Attendance at theatres was forbidden, not only on account of the original connection between the drama and heathen religion, or of the frequent offences against decency and morality which occurred in the performances of the stage, but also because the waste of time on such frivolous amusements was considered to be inconsistent with the spiritual life. Stories are told of judgments on persons who had ventured to disregard the rule; thus Tertullian relates that a woman who went to a theatre returned home possessed of a devil, and that the evil spirit, on being reproached by the exorcist for assaulting one of the faithful, answered that he had a right to do so, inasmuch as he had found her on his own ground. The games of the circus, the gladiatorial shows, and the combats of wild beasts, were interdicted in like manner. Some Christians, as we learn from Tertullian, attempted to argue that such prohibitions were not warranted by Scripture; but the great African vehemently denounces the interested casuistry which sought to relax the severity of the church's laws.

The sense of the obligation to be unlike the heathen, while it acted as a safeguard to the virtue of many Christians, was yet not without danger in other respects. It sometimes became a temptation to a narrow, self-satisfied, and contemptuous spirit; it incited to a needless and offensive display of differences; it tended to an overvaluation of mere outward distinctions and acts, in respect both of their necessity and of their importance. Hence arose the extreme reverence for confessorship and martyrdom, without sufficient regard to the character and motives of the sufferers. Hence too came the system of professing an extraordinary austerity, and a renunciation of things which were allowed to be lawful for the mass of believers. Such renunciation had been practised both among Jews and among heathens; and as early, at least, as the beginning of the second century, there were some Christian ascetics who bound themselves to an especial strictness of living, but without any perpetual or irrevocable vows. That the church, however, was not at that time disposed to attach an undue value to such exercises, may be inferred from the statement, that when one of the Lyonese martyrs, Alcibiades, attempted to continue in prison his custom of living on bread and water only, his fellow prisoner Attalus was charged in a vision to warn him against refusing God's creatures and risking offence to his brethren; and that thereupon Alcibiades conformed to the usual diet. The ascetic life was more fully reduced to system when the influence of Platonism grew on the church—bringing with it the idea, common in oriental religions, of attaining to a likeness of the Divine repose by a lofty abstraction from mundane things. While ordinary believers were allowed to follow the usual business of the world, the higher spirits were to devote themselves to prayer and meditation; and in the countries where this division was first recognized, the influence of climate powerfully conduced to a preference of the contemplative over the active life.

In the course of the second century societies had been formed for the purpose of living together under a religious rule. Some, considering even such society to be too distracting, shut themselves up in utter seclusion; and in the third century these eremites, or hermits, retired further from the haunts of men, to bury themselves in the wildest and most inaccessible solitudes. Paul of Alexandria has been mentioned as having withdrawn into the wilderness from the Decian persecution. Antony, the most celebrated of the hermits, although his earlier history falls within this period, may more fitly be noticed hereafter.

The state of celibacy was, from the first, regarded as higher than that of matrimony; nor is it easy to distinguish in how far the commendations of single life were founded on its advantages in times of distress, or on its exemption from the dangers of heathen connection, and in how far they implied a belief in an essential superiority.

When, however, this superiority was exaggerated by sectaries, so as to disparage the holiness of marriage, the members of the church earnestly combated such opinions. It was found, too, that a profession of celibacy was not always enough to give security against the temptations of this world. Thus Tertullian, in his Montanistic days, threw out serious imputations against the character and motives of some who had been enrolled among the virgins of the African church; and Cyprian found himself obliged to write against the vanities of dress and demeanour in which the virgins of the same church in his time indulged. Moreover, when the lawful intercourse of the sexes was forbidden or renounced, grievous scandals sometimes arose in its place.

The single life came by degrees to be considered especially suitable for the clergy; but no constraint was as yet put on them, although a progress of restriction may be observed during the period. Thus, whereas it appears, from Tertullian's invectives, that even second marriages were frequently contracted by the clergy of his day, we find the council of Illiberis, a century later, enacting that bishops, priests, deacons, and even the inferior clergy, should live with their wives as if unmarried.

The severity of this rule was, however, beyond the general notions of the age. Other canons, about the same date, forbid the marriage of the higher clergy, but do not interfere with the conjugal relations of such as had been married before their ordination to the diaconate.

The recognition of a distinction between a higher and a lower Christian life was dangerous, not only because it tended to encourage the mass of men in laxity, —so that the teachers of the church had often to combat excuses for careless living which rested on such grounds, —but also as laying a temptation to pride and self-sufficiency in the way of those who embraced the more exalted profession. Yet both in this and in many other respects, although we may see in the first three centuries the germ of errors and mischiefs which afterwards became unhappily prevalent, their appearance is as yet only in the germ. Hence we may, at the same time, detect the evil which lurks in ideas and practices of those early days, and yet duly reverence the holy men who originated or advanced such ideas or practices, without any suspicion of the evil which was in them. An understanding Christian must never forget that, in the experience of the ages which have since passed, Providence has supplied him with instruction and warning which were not bestowed on the primitive church. He must remember that, for the formation of his own opinions, and for the guidance of his own conduct, he is bound to consider the proved results of things which at first were introduced as conducive to the further advancement of piety. While it is his duty to resist every feeling which would lead him to exalt himself above earlier and more simple times, he must yet, with a due sense of responsibility for the use of the means of judgment which have been vouchsafed to him, endeavour to discriminate, by the lights of Scripture and history, not only between absolute truth and fully developed falsehood, but between wholesome and dangerous tendencies, and to ascertain the boundaries at which lawful progress ends and corruption begins.

BOOK II.
FROM CONSTANTINE TO GREGORY THE GREAT, A.D. 313-5.

CHAPTER I.

CONSTANTINE - DONATISM-ARIANISM
A.D. 313-337.

The idea that the emperors of Rome might be Christians had been regarded by Tertullian as one which involved in consistency and impossibility; but it was now to be realized. Constantine had probably been trained in the religion of his father, which appears to have been an eclectic system, founded on the belief in one supreme God. Some years of his youth were spent at the court of Diocletian and Galerius in the character of a hostage, and while thus detained he had opportunities of observing the deceits by which the pagan priesthood endeavoured to influence the emperor's mind; he witnessed the publication of the persecuting edict at Nicomedia and the horrors which followed. When hailed by the legions (A.D. 306) in Britain as his father's successor, he continued and extended the toleration which Constantius had bestowed on the Christians: but it would seem that in this he was rather influenced by indifference and by political considerations than by any inclination to embrace their religion. Whatever his secret belief may have been, he continued to share in all the public rites of paganism, and professed to regard Apollo as his especial patron.

The most critical event in Constantine's religious history took place in the year 312, as he was on his march against Maxentius. Eusebius tells us that, as the tyrant was known to be preparing for the struggle by magical and superstitious rites, Constantine felt the need of supernatural aid in order to cope with him, and therefore considered to what god he should betake himself; that, remembering how his father had always been blessed with prosperity, whereas the persecutors of Christianity had come to miserable ends, he resolved to forsake the service of idols, and prayed to the god of Constantius—the one supreme Being; and that, as he was engaged in such thoughts, he saw in the sky, soon after midday, a luminous cross, with the words "By this conquer". While perplexed by the vision the emperor fell asleep; when the Saviour appeared to him, bearing in his hand the same symbol which had been displayed in the heavens, commanding him to use it as his standard in war, and giving him the assurance of victory. On awaking, Constantine described the ensign which had been shown to him in his dream, and from that time his troops marched under the protection of the *LABARUM*—a banner on which the cross was combined with the first letters of the Redeemer's name. The emperor then sought and received from the Christian clergy instruction as to the meaning of the vision which had been vouchsafed to him; and after his victory at the Milvian Bridge he erected at Rome a statue of himself, holding in his right hand a cross, while the inscription attributed his victory to the power of that "saving sign".

The story of a vision or dream in which the cross was displayed to Constantine, with a charge that he should use it as a device, and with a promise of victory, is also related by other ecclesiastical writers. But it is told with variations which, while they add to the presumption

that it had some foundation in truth, increase the difficulties of the account which Eusebius professed to have received, under the sanction of an oath, from the emperor shortly before his death. The literal accuracy of these narratives will now find few defenders. Educated as Constantine had been, and after the experience through which he had passed, it is extremely improbable that he could have been so utterly unacquainted with everything relating to Christianity as the historians here represent him. Perhaps we may fairly suppose that he had been accustomed to regard the Christian God as one of many—as standing on a level with the host of pagan deities; that the circumstances of his opposition to Maxentius may have turned his thoughts towards this God, and that he may have been on the outlook for some omen of the future; that he may have seen a remarkable appearance in the air, which to his excited imagination bore the form of the Christian symbol, while, although his soldiers witnessed the same sight, it had not for them the shape or the meaning with which the emperor's fancy invested it; that the motto (if not to be explained in the same manner as the cross itself) may possibly have been nothing more than the inference drawn from the phenomenon; that the dream was a continuation of the thoughts in which the mind had before been engaged. And, if it be assumed that Eusebius reported his hero's relation with perfect accuracy, it is surely not unwarrantable to suppose that the other circumstances may have grown up within the emperor's mind in the course of years, as his adhesion to the Christian faith became more entire, and as his continued prosperity confirmed him in the belief that he was an especial favourite of Heaven—a belief which is strongly marked throughout his career.

The benefit conferred on the Christians by the edicts of 312 and 313 was toleration, not ascendancy over other religions; and if we attempt to discover the progress of Constantine's own opinions by his acts and legislation, we find that much is doubtful and perplexing in the history of his next years. He spoke of the Divinity in vague and ambiguous terms. He omitted the secular games, which in the ordinary course would have been celebrated in 314, to the great indignation of the Romans, he refused to take part in the rites of Jupiter Capitolinus. He favoured the Christians in many ways; he bestowed munificent gifts on the community, and built churches; he committed the education of his son Crispus to the celebrated Christian rhetorician Lactantius; he associated much with bishops, frequently making them the companions of his table and of his journeys; he interfered in the settlement of religious disputes. In 313 he exempted the catholic clergy from the decurionate—an office which, from having once been an object of ambition, had come to be generally regarded as an oppressive burden, on account of the expense, the labour, and the unpopular functions connected with it. As it was found that, in consequence of this law, many persons, whose property rendered them eligible as decurions, pressed into the minor orders of the church for the purpose of obtaining an exemption, Constantine afterwards ordered that no person qualified for the decurionate should be admitted to ordination; that the clergy should be chosen from the poorer members of the church: and that only so many should be ordained as were necessary to fill up vacant places. But when some cities attempted to reclaim those who had become clerks with the object of evading civil office, the emperor ordered that such persons as were already ordained should not be molested.

It would appear that in 315 Constantine exempted the lands of ecclesiastics from the ordinary taxes—an exemption which was afterwards withdrawn. In the same year he abolished crucifixion as a punishment, and decreed that any Jews who should attempt to raise a tumult against Christians should be burnt. In 316 he allowed that the emancipation of slaves, which had until then been performed before a magistrate, might also take place in churches; and, in order to give popularity to the new method, it was divested of many troublesome formalities with which the act of emancipation had formerly been encumbered. By two laws of the year 319 he forbade private sacrifices and divination, and ordered that priests or diviners should not enter dwelling-houses for the exercise of their art, under the penalty of being burnt. But by the same laws the public exercise of such rites was still permitted; and two

years later, while the practice of magic with any hurtful object was severely denounced, the emperor sanctioned the use of magical means for bodily cures, or for the prevention of storms. In 321 an edict was issued for the general observance of Sunday. Agricultural labours were to be carried on, but in the towns there was to be a cessation from traffic and from judicial business; and even the heathen soldiers were obliged to repeat on that day a prayer to the supreme Deity. In the same year, as a concession to the zeal of the Christians for celibacy, the old laws against unmarried and childless persons were abolished; and by another edict the church was allowed to receive legacies—a privilege which, in the event, had an important effect on its temporal condition.

But as to all these enactments and proceedings it is questionable in how far they may be regarded as evidence of the emperor's personal disposition towards Christianity. The omission of the secular games, and the slight offered to the Capitoline Jupiter, need not have meant anything beyond a contempt for the popular religion. The laws which conferred privileges and removed disabilities did no more than put the Christian community on a level with the heathens, or even with the Jews. The private divinations condemned by Constantine were not properly a part of the old religion, but rather were a corruption which a reformer in the interest of that religion would have wished to abolish; they were, moreover, objectionable on political grounds, and had therefore been censured by Diocletian, by Tiberius, and even by so ancient an authority as the laws of the twelve tables. Nay, even the law for the observance of Sunday—the festival of the sun, or Apollo, called by its heathen name—while it had its special and sacred meaning for Christians, might have been regarded by the rest of Constantine's subjects as merely adding to the number of holidays by an exercise of the pontifical authority which belonged to him as emperor.

In seeking to understand Constantine's policy as to religion, we must distinguish between the sovereign and the man. As emperor he desired that his subjects should live in peace and order, and that the framework of the constitution should be preserved; in this capacity, therefore, it was his interest to avoid offending the prejudices of his people, to extend to all an equal protection, to allow in religion a freedom of thought limited only by the necessities of civil government. In his private opinions, which were probably at first vaguely monotheistic, he received a determination in favour of Christianity about the time of his march against Maxentius, and thenceforth advanced by degrees until at length he openly avowed the faith of the gospel. By thus considering separately his official and his personal character, we may perhaps best understand much that at first sight appears inconsistent; how he retained throughout his life the office of Pontifex Maximus, the highest in the pagan hierarchy; how he took part in heathen ceremonies, regarding them as attached to his imperial function; how, in two edicts of the same year, he enjoined the solemn observance of Sunday, and directed the regular consultation of the aruspices.

The joint triumph of Constantine and Licinius over Maxentius and Maximin (314) was soon followed by differences which were decided by the defeat of Licinius in the battles of Cibalis and Mardia. By a new partition of the empire all Europe, except Thrace, was assigned to Constantine; but a revival of jealousies produced another war, which ended in the ruin of Licinius. This prince, whom some writers have very improbably supposed to have been once a catechumen, oppressed his Christian subjects, perhaps regarding their religion as a token of inclination to his rival's interest. He demolished churches, put some bishops to death, and it is said that he was on the point of giving orders for a general persecution when he was diverted by the progress of Constantine. The emperors mustered their hosts under the standards of Christ and of heathenism respectively; each party relied on presages and visions which were supposed to come from heaven; and the triumph of Constantine was especially ascribed to the God of Christians. From that time pagan emblems disappear from his coins, and he declares himself in his edicts to be an instrument of God for spreading the true faith.

Constantine now recalled all Christians who were in exile or in the mines; he ordered that those who had been deprived of public employments on account of their religion should be reinstated, that the property of martyrs should be restored to their heirs, and that, if no heirs could be discovered, it should be given to the church (A.D. 324). In an edict addressed to all his subjects, he advised them to embrace the gospel; but at the same time he professed to wish that it should be advanced by means of persuasion only. He endeavoured, however, to render it attractive by bestowing employments and honours on proselytes of the higher classes, and by donations to the poor—a course which, as Eusebius himself acknowledges, produced a great amount of hypocrisy and pretended conversion. He ordered that churches should be everywhere built, of a size sufficient to accommodate the whole population. He forbade the erection of images of the gods, and would not allow his own statue to be set up in temples. All state sacrifices were prohibited, and such of the provincial governors and officials as adhered to the old religion were ordered to abstain from rites of this kind; yet other public sacrifices—those which were undertaken by the priests, as distinguished from ceremonies performed in the name of the state—were allowed to continue. There is reason to suppose that in the end of his reign Constantine issued an edict against them; but if so, it was little enforced. While the emperor exerted himself for the elevation of the Christian community, he refrained from any such attacks on the religion of the majority as would have been likely to excite opposition. His measures were intended to appear as a reform of abuses which had crept into the pagan system—not as directed against that system itself. Commissioners were sent throughout the empire, with instructions to visit the temples and to inquire into the worship which was performed in them; and these commissioners, although unarmed, and unprotected by any military guard, were allowed to do their work without hindrance—a circumstance which shows how little hold the heathen religion retained on the general mind. In consequence of this visitation, many statues were stripped of their precious ornaments, destroyed, or carried away, and many impostures of the priests were exposed. Constantine respected the temples in general, but he shut up and unroofed some which were almost deserted, turned others into churches, and destroyed those which had been the scenes of immoral rites or of pretended miracles.

The change in the position of Rome towards the empire, which had originated in the policy or in the caprice of Diocletian, was carried further by Constantine. He paid only two visits to the city after that which followed his victory over Maxentius; and his reception was not such as to make a favourable impression on his mind. With wonderful speed a new capital, called after the emperor's name, was raised on the site of Byzantium. Whereas Rome was the chief stronghold of heathenism, Constantinople was to be wholly a Christian city. Churches were erected in every quarter, Statues of gods and illustrious men were removed from the cities and temples of Greece and Asia to decorate the streets and public places, while they served as trophies of victory over the old religion. The chief room of the palace was adorned with representations of sacred subjects, among which was one of the crucifixion. The gladiatorial shows, and other barbarous exhibitions which formed the delight of the Romans, were never allowed at Constantinople, although in the older capital the popular feeling was as yet so strong that the emperor did not venture to interfere with it.

In the outward duties of religion Constantine was very diligent. He caused himself to be represented in the attitude of prayer on coins and medals and in statues; he studied the Scriptures, and regularly attended the services of the church; he kept the paschal vigil with great devotion; he listened, standing, to the longest addresses of his bishops; he even composed religious discourses, and after they had been translated from Latin into Greek, with which he was but imperfectly acquainted, he delivered them before his court. One of these sermons is still extant, having been preserved as a specimen by Eusebius, to whom it is probably indebted for more than its Greek idiom. In this composition the emperor recommends the Christian religion, dwelling on the evidence borne by prophecy, with which

he classes the Sibylline verses and the fourth Eclogue of Virgil; and, as was his custom, insisting strongly on the contrast between his own prosperity and the calamities of princes who had persecuted the church. In his journeys he was accompanied by a travelling chapel. Bishops were his chosen associates; and too many of them were dazzled by the splendour of such a position, so that he found them willing to let his faults pass uncensured, and to admit a dangerous amount of interference in spiritual things. Eusebius relates that one of these bishops—probably the historian himself—went so far in flattering the emperor with assurances of salvation as even to draw down a rebuke from him. It has indeed been maintained that Constantine's Christianity was merely a matter of policy; but the charge is palpably unjust; for although some of his measures as to religion were unquestionably dictated by political interest,—although his understanding of Christian doctrine was very imperfect, and his life was far from being that of a consistent believer,—there is no reasonable ground for doubting that his conviction was sincere, and that he earnestly endeavoured to employ his power for the benefit of the church and for the extension of the truth.

The emperor's mother, Helena, was induced by him to embrace his new religion, and during the remaining years of her life distinguished herself by the fervour of her zeal and devotion. In 326 she visited the Holy Land, with the intention of seeking out the places which had been hallowed by the chief events of Scripture history. The site of the holy sepulchre was to be marked by a church which should exceed all others in splendour. The temple of Venus, with which Hadrian had defiled the place, was demolished; the earth below it was dug up as polluted, when, it is said, three crosses were discovered, and near them the label on which the superscription had been written over the Saviour's head. As, however, there was not enough to distinguish with certainty the cross on which he had suffered, Macarius, bishop of the city, proposed a test. A lady of his flock, who was supposed to be at the point of death, was carried to the spot; prayers were put up that the true cross might be revealed through her cure; and, after two of the three had been applied to her in vain, the third wrought an instantaneous recovery. In addition to the place of the entombment, those of the nativity and the ascension, and the site of the oak or turpentine-tree of Mamre, were covered with churches, in token of Helena's piety, and of the unrestricted bounty which Constantine enabled her to exercise.

The reign of Constantine was marked by the beginning of two great controversies—the Donatistic and the Arian : the former arising in the west, out of a disagreement as to discipline; the latter, of eastern origin, involving the very essence of Christian doctrine. The emperor took part in both, but the goodness of his intentions was not always directed by knowledge and sound judgment. Wielding an absolute power, and imperfectly instructed as to the faith which he professed, he was continually tempted to confound religious with civil considerations. Sometimes the desire to preserve peace among his subjects induced him to view error with indifference; at other times he regarded and punished the proceedings of religious parties as offences against his imperial authority.

We have repeatedly had occasion to notice the peculiar character which marked the Christianity of northern Africa. In that country Montanism had found a congenial soil, and had acquired its great champion, Tertullian. From Africa, too, it was that the Novatianist sect had in part derived its origin; and there its rigid principles had been received with the greatest enthusiasm. There the strict view as to the nullity of schismatical baptism had been maintained by Cyprian; and in the history of that great bishop we have seen the extravagant honour which the Christians of Africa attached to the outward acts of martyrdom and confessorship.

In the persecution under Diocletian many of the African Christians exhibited the characteristic spirit of their country. They endeavoured to provoke martyrdom by violent behaviour; in some cases, it is said, they were impelled to this by debts, disrepute, or wretchedness, and by the hope of at once washing away in their blood the sins and crimes of a whole life. To all such courses Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, was strongly opposed. He

himself, when asked to give up the sacred books of his church, substituted for them some heretical writings. He forbade his people to visit in prison those who had ostentatiously courted death; he refused to acknowledge such persons as martyrs; and in carrying out this policy his chief instrument was his archdeacon, Caecilian.

In the year 305, a synod of about twelve bishops met at Cirta (now Constantine) to elect a bishop for that city. The president, Secundus, bishop of Tigisis and primate of Numidia, began by inquiring into the conduct of his brethren during the late persecution. Several confessed that they had delivered up the Scriptures; one, Purpurius by name, on being charged with the murder of two of his nephews, told Secundus that he was not to be frightened by such questions; that he had killed, and would kill, all who stood in his way; and he taxed Secundus himself with being a *traditor*. When the inquiry had proceeded so far as to inculpate the greater part of the bishops who were present, one of them proposed that, for the sake of peace, past offences should be forgotten, and that every one should make his account to God alone; and the synod, acting on this suggestion, proceeded to elect one who had been a *traditor*, Silvanus, to the see of Cirta. It is to be noted that the very persons who on this occasion were so lenient towards the crime of traditorship became afterwards the chief leaders of the more rigid party.

Although Mensurius had incurred much enmity by his conduct during the persecution, the spirit which he had provoked did not break out into any considerable manifestation during his lifetime. On his death, which took place in 311, as he was returning from Rome, where he had been summoned to appear before Maxentius, two presbyters, named Botrus and Celesius, aspired to the vacant see, and, for their own purposes, contrived that the election should take place without summoning the Numidian bishops. The choice, however, fell on the archdeacon Caecilian, who was consecrated by Felix, bishop of Aptunga. Before leaving Carthage, Mensurius had intrusted some plate and other property of the church to certain elders of the congregation, and had left an inventory in the hands of a female member of his flock. This document was now delivered to Caecilian, who asked the elders to produce the articles enumerated in it; and these persons, who had supposed themselves secure against inquiry, and had intended to appropriate the deposit, endeavoured to avenge themselves by forming a party in opposition to the new bishop. The faction was joined by the disappointed presbyters, and was supported by the influence and wealth of Lucilla, a lady whom Caecilian had formerly offended by reproving her for a practice of kissing the bone of a supposed martyr before partaking of the Eucharist. In consequence of an invitation from the malcontents, a body of Numidian bishops, seventy in number, and headed by their primate, Secundus, appeared at Carthage. They cited Caecilian before them, alleging that he ought not to have been consecrated except in their presence, and by the primate of Numidia; and, moreover, that his consecration was void, inasmuch as Felix of Aptunga was a *traditor*. Personal charges were also brought against Caecilian. His exertions to check the fanatical spirit during the persecution were exaggerated into monstrous inhumanity; it was said that he had stationed men at the prison-doors, with whips in their hands, to drive away such of the faithful as should carry provisions for the relief of the martyrs; that he himself had beaten some persons who went to the prison on this errand of charity; that he had broken the vessels which they carried, and had scattered the food, so that some of the prisoners had in consequence been starved to death. In answer to the summons of the Numidians, Caecilian refused to appear before them, but professed himself willing to satisfy them if they would go to him; he maintained that his consecration was regular and valid, and offered, if they could prove it otherwise, to submit to a fresh consecration at their hands. On this Purpurius broke out with his usual violence: "Let him come", he said, "to receive our imposition of hands, and we will break his head by way of penance". The Numidians excommunicated Caecilian with his adherents, and ordained a rival bishop, Majorinus, who had formerly been a reader under him, but was now a member of

Lucilla's household. By this formation of a decided schism, many persons, who had before stood aloof from Caecilian, were induced to return to his communion.

Constantine, soon after becoming master of the west by his victory over Maxentius, sent a large sum of money for the relief of the African Christians; and as reports which reached him had produced impressions unfavourable to the malcontent party, he ordered that his gifts, with the privileges conferred on Christians by his late edicts should be limited to those who were in communion with Caecilian, while he used some harsh language as to the "madness" of their opponents. On this the discontented party, through the proconsul Anulinus, presented to the emperor a petition, desiring that their cause might be examined by the bishops of Gaul, from whom it was supposed that impartiality might be expected, as their country had been exempt from the late persecution, so that they had escaped the difficulties and dissensions connected with the question of giving up the Scriptures. Even such an application to the civil power—a request that it would appoint a commission of ecclesiastical judges—was altogether inconsistent with the attitude which the Donatists afterwards assumed towards the state; and their adversaries did not fail in later times to remind them from which party the original appeal to the emperor had proceeded.

Constantine complied with their request by issuing a commission to the bishops of Cologne, Autun, and Arles, with whom he joined Melchiades (or Miltiades) of Rome, and another; but this commission was afterwards extended, so that the assembly before which the cause was tried consisted of about twenty bishops, who in October 313 met in the Lateran, then the palace of the empress Fausta. Caecilian attended, with ten bishops of his party; and a like number of accusers appeared, headed by Donatus, bishop of Casse Nigra, in Numidia. The decision was in favour of Caecilian, and Melchiades proposed a conciliatory expedient—that both parties should reunite in communion, and that, where rival bishops laid claim to a see, the bishop who had the earlier consecration should keep possession. Donatus and his brethren, however, disdained all compromise. They complained that their cause had not been sufficiently examined; they renewed their charges; they accused the judges of corruption; they declared that a synod of only twenty bishops was insufficient to overrule the sentence of the seventy who had condemned Caecilian; and they prayed the emperor to grant them a further hearing.

On this Constantine summoned a council from all parts of the western empire to Arles, whither the judges, the accusers, and the accused were conveyed at the public expense. About two hundred bishops—by far the greatest ecclesiastical assembly that had yet been known (if the number be rightly given),—met on the 1st of August 314, under the presidency of Marinus, bishop of Arles. The bishops of Rome and of Ostia were represented by deputies. The deliberations of the council resulted in a fresh acquittal of Caecilian, and some canons were passed with a view to the African dissensions. It was enacted that clergymen who had given up the Scriptures, the sacred vessels, or the lists of the faithful, should be deposed, if convicted by the evidence of public records, but that mere hearsay testimony was not to be admitted in such cases; that false accusers should be excluded from communion, and should not be readmitted until in prospect of death; that if a person in himself unexceptionable had been ordained by a *traditor*, his ordination should stand valid. And, for the settlement of the old question as to baptism, it was decided that, where a person had received baptism from heretics in the name of the Trinity, he should be admitted into the church by imposition of hands for the conveying of the Holy Spirit; but that, if the proper form of words had not been used, he should be rebaptized.

The defeated party entreated the emperor to take the matter into his own hands—a request which contrasts strangely with the principles which they afterwards maintained as to the independence of the ecclesiastical power. Although offended by their obstinacy, Constantine agreed, and, after some delays, the question was heard before him at Milan, where he gave a sentence to the same effect with those already pronounced by the synods of

Rome and Arles. This judgment was followed up by severe edicts against the sectaries. They were deprived of their churches; many of them suffered banishment and confiscation; even the punishment of death was enacted against them, although it does not appear that this law was enforced in any case during the reign of Constantine.

Majorinus is supposed to have died in 315, or earlier, and was succeeded in the schismatical episcopate by Donatus “the Great”—so styled by his followers for the sake of distinction from the bishop of Casae Nigrae. It was from this second Donatus that the sect, which had before been known as “the party of Majorinus”, took the name which it bears in history. He is described as learned, eloquent, a voluminous writer, a man of rigid life, but of excessive pride. He is said to have been desirous that his followers, instead of being styled Christians in common with their opponents, should be called after himself (although at a later time they resented the appellation) to have carried himself loftily towards the other bishops of his communion; to have scorned to receive the Eucharist in public; to have been very intemperate in his language towards all who differed from him. His partisans boasted of his miracles, and of the answers which he had received to prayer, and are charged with paying him honours which trenched on those due to the Deity—with singing hymns to him, and swearing by his grey hairs. The character of the sectaries answered to that of their chief. They displayed an extreme austerity, which was too often a pretext for the neglect of the more unpretending duties of morality and religion. They professed to embody in each individual that holiness which Scripture ascribes to the ideal church of Christ as a whole. They held that the true church existed only in their own communion, which, with the exception of one scanty congregation at Rome and the private chapel of a wealthy female Donatist in Spain, was limited to a corner of Africa. They boasted of miracles and revelations. They rebaptized proselytes, and compelled such professed virgins as joined the party to submit to penance, and to renew their vows.

Constantine soon began to perceive that against such fanaticism force would be as unavailing as reason. In 317 he wrote to the catholic bishops of Africa, exhorting them to treat the schismatics with gentleness; and when, in 321, the Donatists presented to him a memorial, in which they declared that they would have nothing to do with his “scoundrel of a bishop”, he repealed the laws against them, and allowed their exiles to return—expressing a horror of their frenzy and turbulence, but declaring that he left them to the judgment of God. This policy of indulgence was continued throughout the remaining years of the reign, during which the emperor’s attention was drawn away from the African schism by the nearer and more widely-spread Arian controversy. In the meanwhile the Donatists became the stronger party in Africa. A synod of the sect in 330 was attended by two hundred and seventy bishops, and the whole number of their bishops is said to have at one time amounted to four hundred.

The appearance of the circumcellions among the Donatists is placed by some writers as early as 317, while others date it a quarter of a century later. These were persons of the poorest class, ignorant of any language but the Punic; their name was derived from the practice of begging *around* the *cells* or cottages of the country people, instead of earning a livelihood by regular industry. The accounts of them might be disbelieved, as fictions of their enemies, were it not that later experience forbids us to be hasty in rejecting statements of extravagances and crimes committed under the name of religion. Their zeal was often combined with excesses of drunkenness and lust; and in these the “sacred virgins” of the party shared. Bands of both sexes roamed about the country, keeping the peaceable inhabitants in constant terror. They styled themselves the Lord’s champions; their shout of “Praises to God!” was heard, according to St. Augustine, with greater dread than the roaring of a lion. Supposing that our Lord’s words to St. Peter (Matt. XVI. 52) forbade them the use of swords, they at first carried no other weapon than heavy clubs, called *Israels*, with which they beat their victims—often to death; but the scriptural scruple was afterwards overcome, and they added to their “*Israels*” not only slings, but swords, lances, and hatchets. They attacked and plundered the

churches and houses of the catholic clergy; they committed violent outrages on their persons; in later days they used to put out their eyes with a mixture of lime and vinegar. Professing to redress the wrongs of society, they interfered between creditors and their debtors, between masters and their slaves; offences which deserved punishment were allowed to pass unnoticed, lest the circumcellions should be called in by the culprits; all property was unsafe in the region infested by these furious fanatics; and the officers of justice were afraid to perform their functions.

The frenzy of the circumcellions was directed against themselves as well as others. Sometimes they courted death by violently disturbing the pagan worships. They stopped travellers on the roads, and, with threats of killing them, demanded death at their hands. In the same way, they compelled judges who were travelling on their circuits to hand them over to the executioners. Many drowned themselves, rushed into fire, or threw themselves from precipices; but hanging was a death which they eschewed, because they would have nothing in common with the *traditor* Judas. The more moderate Donatists disapproved and dreaded the excesses of the circumcellions. Councils of the sect condemned suicide; but the practice continued, and those who perpetrated or procured their own death were popularly honoured as martyrs.

Constans, who in 337 succeeded to the western part of his father's empire, endeavoured to conciliate the Donatists by the same system of presents which had been found effectual in winning proselytes from heathenism to the church. It would seem that three such attempts were made; the agents in the last of them were Paul and Macarius, who were sent into Africa in 347. When these commissioners invited all Christians to share in the emperor's gifts, Donatus repelled the offer with a great show of indignation: "What", he asked, "has the emperor to do with the church?"—and he forbade the members of his communion to accept anything from *traditors*. It was reported that the commissioners were charged to set up the emperor's image in churches for the purpose of adoration. The circumcellions rose in revolt, and a battle was fought, in which the imperial troops were victorious—two Donatist bishops, the chief instigators of the insurrection, being among the slain. Macarius then required the sectaries to return to the church, and sentenced those who refused to banishment.

Optatus, the chief controversial opponent of Donatism until the time of Augustine, acknowledges that they were treated with harshness, but assures us that this was against the wishes of the catholic bishops. The Donatists in Augustine's day used to speak of the "times of Macarius" as those in which their forefathers had been most severely tried; and they affected to call the catholics *Macarians*, in memory of the persecutor. By the vigorous measures employed against them, the schism appeared to be suppressed for a time, and Donatus died in exile.

The distinctive tenet of Arianism—the denial of the Saviour's Godhead—had already appeared in the heresies of the Ebionites, of Artemon, and of Theodotus. But now that Christianity had assumed a new position, questions of doctrine produced an amount of agitation before unknown; the Arian controversy, and some which followed it, were not only felt throughout the whole church, but had an important effect on political affairs. And, sad as it undoubtedly is to contemplate the distractions thus occasioned, we must yet remember that by fighting out these differences, instead of attempting to stifle them by compromise, the church gained a fixed and definite form of sound words, which was of the greatest value, and even necessity, for the preservation of her faith through the ages of ignorance which followed.

Although Alexandria was the birthplace of Arianism, the origin of the heresy is rather to be traced to the other great church of the east, over which Paul of Samosata had exerted a powerful and lasting influence. While the Alexandrian tendency was spiritual and mystical, the theologians of Antioch were given to dialectic subtleties, and were more distinguished for acuteness than for largeness or depth of mind; and such was the tone which prevailed in the school of Lucian, an eminent teacher of Antioch, whose history has already been noticed.

Lucian, induced rather by a sympathy with Paul's spirit than by any near agreement in his opinions, left the church together with the bishop, or in consequence of his condemnation: and although he afterwards returned, and was honoured in the church as a martyr, the effects of his teaching remained for evil. The Arians claimed him as their founder. Among his pupils were Eusebius of Nicomedia, Leontius, and other persons who became prominent as leaders of the party; even Arius himself has been reckoned as one of them, although the connection appears very doubtful.

Arius is supposed to have been, like Sabellius, a native of Libya or Cyrenaica. He is described as a man of strict life, of grave appearance and agreeable manners—with an air of modesty, under which, according to his enemies, he concealed strong feelings of vanity and ambition. After having been ordained deacon by Peter, bishop of Alexandria, about the beginning of the century, he became connected with a party which Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis, the second in rank of the Egyptian sees, had formed on grounds which appear to have resembled those of the Donatistic schism. For this, Arius was excommunicated by Peter; but the next bishop, Achillas, readmitted him to the church, ordained him presbyter, and intrusted him with a parochial cure in the city. On the death of Achillas (A.D.311), after an episcopate of a few months, Arius is said by some writers to have aspired to the bishopric; Philostorgius, a member of his party, even states that he had a majority of votes, and that he voluntarily gave way to Alexander, who was elected. But there is no good evidence for the story of his having been a candidate at all.

Amidst contradictory reports as to the beginning of the controversy, it seems to be certain that on some public occasion, when Alexander was discoursing on the unity of the Divine Trinity, Arius charged his doctrine with Sabellianism. Alexander at first endeavoured to convince him of his error by friendly expostulations; but, finding that they were ineffectual, that he himself was blamed for tolerating Arius, and that a presbyter named Colluthus even made this the pretext for a schism, the bishop appointed a conference, at which, after having heard the arguments on both sides with judicial impartiality, he decided against Arius. The condemnation was ratified by a synod of Egyptian and Libyan bishops; and the heresiarch with his adherents was excommunicated.

Arius found many to sympathize with him—partly from the attractiveness of a doctrine which brought down the mysteries of the Godhead to the sphere of human analogies and conceptions; partly because the multitude is usually ready to take part with any one who may suffer from the exercise of lawful authority. Among his followers were two bishops, about twelve presbyters and as many deacons, and a great number of virgins. Being unable to remain at Alexandria, he took refuge in Palestine, and a lively correspondence followed—Arius endeavouring to gain friends by veiling his more offensive opinions, while Alexander dispersed warnings against him, and withstood all the intercessions of the historian Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, and of others who attempted to mediate.

Among these was another Eusebius, who had been associated with Arius as a disciple or admirer of Lucian, and was now bishop of Nicomedia. Eusebius procured from a Bithynian synod an acknowledgment of his friend as orthodox, and received him when he had been dislodged from Palestine through the influence of the Alexandrian bishop. At Nicomedia the heresiarch composed his *Thalia*—a book chiefly consisting of verses, and described by his opponents as an imitation of a heathen versifier named Sotades, whose writings are said to have been alike disgusting in subject and contemptible in execution. The *Thalia* was intended to advance the Arian doctrine by introducing it into pieces which might be sung as an accompaniment of meals; and with a like view Arius wrote songs for millers, sailors, and travellers. The character of his mind, as exhibited in his heresy and in the arguments for it, forbids us to suppose that these productions had anything of poetry except the form.

Constantine, on becoming master of the east, found the church distracted by the newly-risen controversy. In the hope of allaying this he wrote a letter to Alexander and Arius

jointly—telling them that belief in a Providence was the one essential doctrine of Christianity, while he reproved them for contending about idle questions and imaginary differences, and recommended peace and unity, which, he said, they might learn even from the manner in which the heathen philosophers conducted their disputes. This document has been highly extolled as a model of wisdom and moderation, but would better deserve the praise if the Godhead of the Redeemer were, in a Christian view, that utterly trifling matter which the emperor then supposed it to be. Armed with the imperial letter, Hosius, bishop of Cordova, to whom the settlement of the affair was committed, proceeded to Alexandria, and held a synod; but, although he succeeded in healing the schism of Colluthus, the only result as to the Arian question was to convince him that the Arians were impracticable. The dissensions occasioned by the controversy had by this time become very serious; the disputes of the Christians were ridiculed in the heathen theatres; and in some places the emperor's statues were treated with indignity.

Constantine now took a new view of the affair. He began to understand that the doctrine at stake was of the highest and most essential importance; and, moreover, the Arians appeared to him as disturbers of the public peace. In order, therefore, to a settlement of the controversy, and of the disputes as to the time of Easter, which had been lately revived, he summoned a general council of the whole church, to be held at Nicaea, in Bithynia. It was the first time that such an assemblage, had been possible; for never until now had the east and the west been united under a sovereign professing the Christian faith : and the summons necessarily proceeded from the imperial authority, as being the only authority which was acknowledged by all the Christians of the empire.

Something has been said in a former chapter as to the manner in which the Christian doctrines on such subjects as that which was now in question had gradually been defined and exhibited. In the earlier time, down to the age of Irenaeus, the Godhead of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost had been strongly held; so strongly, indeed, that the language of the fathers might have been misconstrued into something like Sabellianism. When heresies of that character had appeared, from the time of Praxeas downwards, they had been met by declarations which tended to establish the distinction of the Divine Persons, with a subordination of the Second and the Third as ministering to the First. The task appointed for the fourth century was to reconcile and to combine the truths which had thus been successively brought into prominence.

The terms by which the relations of the Divine Being had been expressed were intended to be regarded as complementary of each other in conveying such a shadow of the mystery as is within the compass of human thought and language; and, if taken singly, they were liable to be misunderstood. Thus the term Son, while it expressed the sameness of nature and the derivation of “God from God”, was defective, inasmuch as it suggested ideas of posteriority, inferiority, material generation, and too great personal distinctness. On the other hand, the term Word or Reason conveyed the ideas of coeternity, essential indwelling, and mediation, but tended to obscure that of personality—rather suggesting that the Second was to the First as an attribute or a mode of operation. On the incompleteness of such images Arius founded his heresy. His original objection against Alexander was, that, if the Son were begotten, the Father was anterior to him; therefore the Son had a beginning; “once he was not”. He could not (it was argued) have been taken from the Father's substance; therefore he was made out of nothing. And thus, by a sophism drawn from the title of Son, Arius concluded against the very doctrine which that term was expressly intended to convey—the identity of nature between the Second Person and the First. The Word, he said, was created by the Father, at his own will, before the worlds—before all time. He was the highest of creatures—“a creature, yet not as one of the creatures”—and therefore styled only-begotten. He was framed after the pattern of the indwelling Divine Logos or Wisdom, enlightened by it, and called by its name. But although the Arians exhausted language in expressing the height of the Son's elevation, they

yet, by representing him as a creature, removed him to an infinite distance from the supreme Source of being. They assigned him a part like that of the gnostic demiurge in the work of creation; God (they said) created by him, because the Divinity itself could not come into contact with the finite world. According to them, he was employed in creation as an instrument, whereas in catholic language the Father was said to have wrought by him as by a hand. It was said that the Son was styled God in an inferior sense—as men also are occasionally so styled in Scripture. The texts in which he himself speaks of his unity with the Father were explained as signifying either a mere agreement of will, or an indwelling of God in him after the same manner as in men.

The peculiar weapon of Arius was logic; his mind was incapable of any speculation which rose into a higher region. The details of his system are obscured, partly by the variations to which he resorted as the consequences of his principles were pressed on him; partly by his own recoil from results which he had not foreseen or understood; and partly from his wish to disguise his opinions in such terms as might seem most plausible to the orthodox, and might be most likely to win for him the sympathy of the undiscerning. Among the doctrines which he once held and afterwards retracted was that of the mutability of the Son's will. He might, it was said, have fallen like Satan; the Father, foreseeing that he would not fall, anticipated the reward of his merits by bestowing on him the titles of Son and Logos, which he was afterwards to earn.

The incarnation, according to Arius, was merely the assumption by the Son of a human body—his nature supplying the place of a soul. Hence scriptural expressions, which really relate to the Saviour's humanity, were applied to his pre-existent nature, and it was argued from them that that nature was inferior to the Divine.

The first general council met at Nicaea in June 325. The number of bishops present was about three hundred, and with them were many of the lower clergy. Even some heathen philosophers were attracted to the place of assembly and held conferences and disputes with the bishops.

The controversy had not yet begun to agitate the west; and from that portion of the emperor's dominions there were only Hosius of Cordova, Caecilian of Carthage, and two Roman presbyters, Vito and Vincent, sent as representatives of their bishop, Sylvester, whose age prevented his attendance. One bishop came from Scythia, and one from Persia, while the great body were from the eastern division of the empire. Among those who were thus assembled there was, no doubt, much variety as to their amount of ability and knowledge; but the object of their meeting was not one which required any high intellectual qualifications. For the more subtle arguments and definitions were not introduced into the controversy until a later time, and the fathers who assembled at Nicaea were not called to reason on the grounds of their belief, but to witness to the faith which the church had held on the disputed subjects. It has been supposed by some writers that Eustathius of Antioch was president; by some, that the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch presided by turns; while others have assigned the chief place to Eusebius of Caesarea. The most general opinion, however, is in favour of Hosius, whose name is first among the subscriptions but there is no ground whatever for the idea that the office belonged to him in the character of a Roman legate, or that he held that character in any way. The number of bishops favourable to Arius is variously stated at thirteen, seventeen, and twenty-two; the most eminent among them were the two Eusebiuses, —who, however, did not fully agree in doctrine, as the bishop of Nicomedia carried his views to the whole length of the heresy, while the historian's opinions appear to have been of the class afterwards styled *semi-Arian*. In the earlier sessions, which seem to have been held in a church, Arius was repeatedly heard by the fathers in defence of his opinions. He avowed his heresy without disguise, and it is said that the avowal caused all who were present to stop their ears. His chief opponents in argument were Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, and Athanasius, archdeacon of Alexandria, who was in attendance on his bishop, Alexander.

About a fortnight after the opening of the council, Constantine arrived at Nicaea, and the sittings were transferred to the palace where the emperor appeared at them, and acted as a moderator. Immediately on his arrival, he found himself beset by bishops who eagerly importuned him to listen to their grievances against each other; and as these quarrels were not only scandalous, but seemed likely to interfere with the proper business of the council, he resolved to put a summary end to them. Having appointed a day for the decision of such matters, he took his seat as judge, and received all the memorials which contained the mutual complaints and recriminations of the bishops. Then, after having shortly exhorted them to unity and concord, he burnt the documents without opening them, “lest the contentions of the priests should become known to any one”. After this, the council proceeded to the discussion for which it had been assembled. The partisans of Arius, and especially that section of which Eusebius of Nicomedia was the leader, attempted to shelter themselves under ambiguous terms. Eusebius of Caesarea offered for acceptance a creed which he declared to be agreeable to the faith which he had received from his predecessors, which he had learnt as a catechumen, and had always held and taught; but this document, although of orthodox appearance, was so artfully framed as to evade the very questions which it was the business of the council to determine. He censured the terms proposed by the Catholics, as not being scriptural;—a futile objection, inasmuch as the matter in dispute was the sense of those Scriptures which all professed to accept; and somewhat shameless, as coming from a party which had opened the controversy by the introduction of terms unknown to Scripture. In order to meet the evasions of this creed, the word *homoousion* (*i.e.* of the same substance or essence) was proposed. Objections were taken to it, as tending to suggest the notion of materiality, as obscuring the personal distinction, as having been connected with some heretical systems, and, in particular, as having been condemned (although in another sense) by the council which deposed Paul of Samosata. Eusebius, however, acknowledged that it had been used by fathers of good repute, and at length he agreed to adopt it. A creed was drawn up, resembling that of Eusebius, and, like it, mainly derived from the older forms of the eastern church, but differing from it by the addition of the necessary safeguards against the Arian errors; and this creed, with a solemn condemnation of Arius, was generally signed by the bishops—among the rest by Eusebius himself, whose adherence, as explained in a letter to his flock, was more creditable to his ingenuity than to his candour. The learned and courtly historian professed to have accepted the word *homoousion* as meaning that the Son was like the Father, and unlike all the other creatures; and to have joined in the condemnation of Arius because the censured terms were novel and unscriptural, but without intending either to pronounce the opinions in question false, or to affirm that they were held by the accused.

The paschal question was settled by a decision against the quartodeciman practice. Twenty canons were passed on various subjects connected with the government and discipline of the church; and the deliberations of the council were succeeded by the celebration of Constantine’s Vicennalia, during which he entertained the bishops at a splendid banquet, and, after having exhorted them to cultivate peace among themselves, dismissed them with a request that they would pray for him.

The emperor followed up the council’s judgment by banishing Arius into Illyria, and including in the sentence two Egyptians, Secundus and Theonas, who were the only bishops that had throughout adhered to the heresiarch. Severe penalties were denounced against Arius and his followers, and it was even made a capital offence to possess his writings. Constantine ordered that the party should be styled *Porphyrians*,— a name derived from that of the latest noted controversialist who had appeared on the side of heathenism and intended to brand the Arians as enemies of the Christian faith; and in a letter addressed to the heresiarch, the emperor, not content with vehemently attacking his doctrine, and condescended to pun on his name and to ridicule his personal appearance. Three months after the council, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicaea, who had subscribed the creed but not the anathema, were

condemned by a local synod on some new charge; and the emperor, who had given orders for their trial, sentenced them to banishment.

Within a few months after his return from Nicaea, Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, died. Athanasius, whom he had recommended for his successor in the see, was then absent,—having, it would seem, intentionally prolonged his absence on a mission to the court from a wish to avoid the dangerous and laborious dignity. He was, however, chosen by general acclamation; and although some faint charges of irregularity were afterwards brought against the manner of his appointment, it would seem to have been really beyond exception. From the age of thirty to that of seventy-six Athanasius held the see, devoting himself with all his powers to the assertion of the orthodox doctrine, which for him was no speculative opinion, but was intimately connected with the whole Christian life. To his abilities and constancy is due, under the Divine Providence, the preservation of the eastern church, and perhaps even of the whole church, from the adoption of the Arian heresy, or from a vague and creedless system, which would probably have issued in an utter abandonment of Christianity. He displays in his writings a manly and direct eloquence; a remarkable and unusual combination of subtlety with breadth of mind; extreme acuteness in argument, yet at the same time a superiority to mere contentiousness about words. His unbending steadiness of purpose was united with a rare skill in dealing with men; he knew when to give way, as well as when to make a show no resistance. His activity, his readiness, his foresight, his wonderful escapes and adventures, gave countenance to the stories of magical art which circulated among his enemies, and to the belief of his admirers that he possessed the gifts of miracles and prophecy. Throughout all his troubles he was supported by the attachment of his people, and of the hundred bishops who owned allegiance to the see of Alexandria.

The Arian party in no long time began to gain strength in the imperial court. Constantia, the widow of Licinius and sister of Constantine—a princess who had been under the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia—was persuaded by a presbyter whose name is said by writers of later date to have been Eutocius, that Arius had been misrepresented and unjustly condemned. When on her death-bed, she endeavoured to impress her brother with the same belief, and recommended the presbyter to him; and by this man the emperor, whose apprehension of the question had never been independent or discerning, was persuaded to invite Arius to his court. The heresiarch appeared, with Euzoius, a deacon of Alexandria, who had been included in the excommunication. They produced a creed, which although defective in the critical points, was expressed in inoffensive, and for the most part scriptural, terms; and Constantine was satisfied of their orthodoxy. Eusebius and Theognis also soon obtained a recall, protesting that they had no sympathy with the errors imputed to Arius; that their only offence had been that of doubting whether he held these errors—a doubt, they said, which the emperor himself had lately justified.

The Arian or Eusebian party had now full possession of court influence, and they made an unscrupulous use of it to eject such catholic bishops as stood in the way. Among these was Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, who had offended them by charging Eusebius of Caesarea with unfaithfulness to the Nicene doctrine. Eusebius retorted by an accusation of Sabellianism—an error which the Arianizers habitually imputed to their orthodox opponents; and at a party synod, held in his own city, the bishop of Antioch was deposed on charges of heresy and adultery, which were alike unfounded. As the attachment of his people to Eustathius, and their indignation at this sentence, appeared to threaten a disturbance of the public peace, the emperor's jealousy was aroused, and the bishop was sent into exile. After two Arians in succession had held the see for a short time, Eusebius was solicited to accept it; he declined, however, and his refusal was approved by the emperor.

The occupant of the other great eastern see was far more obnoxious, not only on account of his formidable character and talents, but as being the bishop of that church from which Arius had been expelled, and through which it was desired by his partisans that he should be

formally readmitted to catholic communion. After Eusebius of Nicomedia had in vain attempted to mediate, the emperor himself was persuaded to write to Athanasius, requiring him to receive Arius with his followers, and threatening deposition and banishment in case of refusal. But the undaunted bishop replied that he could not acknowledge persons who had been condemned by a decree of the whole church; and Constantine desisted from urging the matter.

The Arians now made overtures to the Meletians. The council of Nicaea had endeavoured to provide for the healing of the Meletian schism by an arrangement as to the possession of sees which were claimed both by catholic and by Meletian bishops but Meletius, although for a time he acquiesced in this measure, had afterwards been persuaded to continue the breach by ordaining one John to succeed him as the chief of his community. The Meletians, in their enmity against the Alexandrian primate, were easily induced to lend themselves as tools to his Arian opponents; and, although hitherto free from doctrinal error, they gradually became infected with the heresy of their new allies. In the alleged grievances of the Meletians the Arians found means of besieging the emperor with a multitude of complaints against Athanasius; but the bishop exposed the futility of these complaints so successfully as even for a time to turn Constantine's indignation against the authors of them.

In 334 Athanasius was summoned to appear before a council at Caesarea, but disregarded the citation on the ground that he could not expect justice at the hands of such a tribunal. In the following year was cited before another council, to be held at Tyre; and as the order was then enforced by the imperial authority, with threats of personal violence, he thought it well to comply. At this assembly sixty bishops were present, and a lay commissioner of the emperor directed and overawed their proceedings. Athanasius appeared at the head of fifty Egyptian bishops, and was about to take the place to which the dignity of his see entitled him, when he was ordered by the president, Eusebius of Caesarea, to stand, as being a person under accusation. On this one of the Egyptian bishops, Potammon, a man of high repute for sanctity, is said to have addressed Eusebius: "Do you sit, while the innocent Athanasius is tried before you? Remember how you were my fellow-prisoner in the persecution. I lost an eye for the truth : by what compliances was it that you came off unhurt?". Eusebius found it expedient to evade the question. "Your behavior", he answered, "gives countenance to the charges against your party; for if you try to play the tyrants here, no doubt you must do so much more at home". And he broke up the meeting for the day.

Athanasius was arraigned on a variety of charges, some of them arising out of collisions with the remaining adherents of Meletius and Colluthus, in the course of the visitations which he indefatigably performed throughout his vast province. The most serious was, that he had killed a Meletian bishop named Arsenius, had cut off one of his hands, and had used it for magical purposes; and a human hand was exhibited in evidence of these crimes. In answer to all these charges, Athanasius defended himself boldly and triumphantly. The story as to Arsenius was refuted by producing the man himself, alive and un mutilated,—the friends of Athanasius having succeeded in discovering him, notwithstanding the endeavours of the opposite party to keep him concealed. As the case against Athanasius had thus broken down, a commission, chosen from among his bitterest enemies, was sent into the Mareotis to collect fresh evidence against him. He protested against the unfair composition of this body; and, without waiting for the result of its inquiries, he embarked for Constantinople, threw himself in the emperor's way as he was riding near the city, and, reminding him of the judgment at which they must both one day appear, extorted from him a promise of a new investigation in the imperial presence. Constantine was so far moved by this appeal that he wrote in a tone of reproof to the council, which had already decreed the deposition and excommunication of Athanasius, and, having removed to Jerusalem for the purpose of dedicating the magnificent church which the emperor had lately erected over the holy sepulchre, had there admitted Arius and Euzoius to communion.

The leaders of the Arian faction persuaded the other bishops to return to their homes, and themselves repaired to Constantinople. Dropping the charges on which they had condemned Athanasius in the council, they asserted that he had threatened to stop the sailing of the Egyptian fleet, on which the new capital depended for its supplies of corn. The accusation was well devised with a view to rouse Constantine's jealousy; for on a similar suspicion he had a few years before put to death a philosopher named Sopater, who had long enjoyed his intimacy; and the artifice of the Arians was successful. Whether from belief of the charge, from a wish to remove so influential a man from a scene where he might be dangerous, with a view of withdrawing him for a time from exposure to the malice of his enemies, the emperor banished Athanasius to Treves, where the champion of orthodoxy found an honourable reception at the court of the younger Constantine.

But the spirit of its bishop continued to animate the Alexandrian church. The attempts of Arius to obtain re-admission were steadily repelled; and at length reports of disturbances occasioned by his proceedings induced the emperor to summon him to Constantinople. A council which was sitting there condemned Marcellus of Ancyra, one of Athanasius' most conspicuous partisans, on a charge of Sabellianism, to which he had at least given countenance by the use of incautious language; and it is said that the same council ordered the admission of Arius to communion. The heresiarch appeared before the emperor, and without hesitation subscribed a profession of orthodoxy, declaring that he had never held any other doctrine. With this compliance Constantine was satisfied, and sending for the bishop, Alexander, he told him that Arius must be received into communion on the following day, which was Sunday. Alexander, who had occupied the see of Byzantium while it was as yet an undistinguished city, and had now almost completed his hundredth year, had already been threatened by Eusebius of Nicomedia with deposition in case of a refusal, and had been for weeks engaged with his flock in solemn deprecation of the intended evil. On leaving the emperor's presence, he entered the church of Peace, prostrated himself under the holy table, and prayed that, rather than he should witness such a profanation, either he himself or the heresiarch might be taken from the world. On the evening of the same day, Arius was parading the streets of the city on horseback amidst a large party of his adherents, talking lightly and in a triumphant tone of the ceremonies appointed for the morrow, when the pressure of a natural necessity compelled him to dismount and withdraw. He was soon after found dead, and his end is related with circumstances which are intended by the narrators to recall to mind that of the traitor Judas.

Notwithstanding the part which Constantine had taken in the affairs of the church, he had not yet been received as a member of it by baptism, when, in his sixty-fourth year, he was seized with a dangerous sickness, at a palace near Nicomedia. Feeling the approach of death, he sent for some bishops, to whom he declared that he had deferred his baptism from a wish to receive it in the waters of Jordan, but that, as the opportunity of doing so was denied to him, he begged them to administer the sacrament. After having been admitted by imposition of hands to the highest class of catechumens, he was baptized by the bishop of the neighbouring city, Eusebius, and during the remaining days of his life he retained the white robe of baptism, refusing to wear the imperial purple. On Whitsunday at noon, in the year 337, he expired.

CHAPTER II.

THE SONS OF CONSTANTINE
A.D. 337-361.

The first Christian emperor was succeeded by his three sons, Constantine, Constantius, and Constans. The eldest, who held the sovereignty of Gaul, Spain, and Britain, was killed in 340, in an invasion of Italy, which was part of the territory of Constans; and Constans took possession of all that belonged to his deceased brother. In 350 Constans himself was put to death by Magnentius; and on the defeat of that usurper, in 353, the whole empire was reunited under Constantius, who had until then been sovereign of the east.

Constantine, it is said, intrusted his testament to the same Arian presbyter who had exerted so important an influence on the religious policy of his last years; and by him it was delivered to Constantius, who happened to be nearer than either of his brothers to the place of their father's death. By this service Eutocius (if that was his name) obtained free entrance to the palace; and in no long time the Arian doctrine had been embraced by the emperor, the empress, the ladies of her court, and the eunuchs—a class of persons which Constantine had confined to inferior offices, but which in this reign became so important as to justify the sarcasm of a heathen historian, who described the emperor's relation to them by saying that he had considerable interest with their chief. Constantius is characterized as chaste, temperate, and of strict life, but vain and weak, a slave to restless suspicion, and unrelenting in his enmity to those whom he suspected. His interference in the affairs of the church was alike injudicious and unfortunate. Although, like his father, he remained unbaptized until shortly before his death, he pretended to the character of a theologian : his vanity and his ignorance laid him open to the arts in which the leaders of Arianism were skilled; and throughout his reign the empire was incessantly agitated by religious controversy. The highest questions of Christian doctrine became subjects of common talk, and excited the ignorant zeal of multitudes very imperfectly influenced by Christian principle. The synods were so frequent, that the public posting establishment is said to have been ruined by the continual journeyings of the bishops, to whom the emperor gave the privilege of free conveyance to these assemblies.

Constantine had steadily resisted both the importunity of the Arians, who wished that the see of Alexandria should be filled by one of their own party, and the entreaties of the Alexandrians for the restoration of the rightful bishop, although these were supported by the authority of the famous hermit Antony, whom the emperor admitted to a free correspondence with him. It is said, however, that on his death-bed he gave orders for the recall of Athanasius and other banished bishops. His successors, at a conference in Pannonia, agreed to restore the exiles; and Athanasius, after an absence of about two years and four months, returned to Alexandria, bearing with him a letter, in which the younger Constantine assured the Alexandrian laity that the restoration was agreeable to the late emperor's intention. The bishop was received with a joyful welcome by his flock; but the Arian (or Eusebian party) soon renewed its attempts against him. One Pistus, who had been associated with Arius, was set up as a rival bishop. It was represented to Constantius that Athanasius had caused disturbances of the peace; that he had sold the allowance of corn which the emperor had bestowed on the Alexandrian church, and had misappropriated the price; and, further, he was charged with irregularity in resuming his see by the warrant of secular authority alone, whereas he had been deposed by a council of bishops. The same charges, and the old report of the inquiry instituted

by his enemies in the Mareotis, were carried to Rome by a deputation of Eusebian clergy, but were there met by some emissaries of Athanasius, who were provided with a synodical letter from nearly a hundred Egyptian bishops, attesting his merits and his innocence.

In the end of 340, or in the beginning of the following year, a council met at Antioch for the dedication of a splendid church which had been founded by Constantine. The number of bishops is said to have been ninety-seven, of whom forty were Eusebians. They passed a number of canons, which have been generally received in the church; one of these, in itself unexceptionable, but framed with a special design that it should become a weapon against Athanasius, enacted that, if any bishop, after having been deposed by a council, should appeal to the temporal power, instead of seeking redress from a higher council, he should forfeit all hope of restoration. It would seem that after a time the Eusebians became dominant in the assembly, either through the retirement of the orthodox bishops, or through reliance on the support of Constantius, who was present. They renewed the charges against Athanasius, condemned him under the canon just mentioned, and, after the bishopric of Alexandria had been refused by Eusebius (afterwards bishop of Emesa), consecrated to it a Cappadocian named Gregory, a man of coarse and violent character. Gregory immediately proceeded to take possession of his see, accompanied by a military escort, under the command of Philagrius, prefect of Egypt, who was an apostate from the faith. The heretical bishop entered the city in the beginning of Lent. Churches were attacked by the soldiers, with a mob of Arians, Jews, and heathens; and horrible outrages and profanations were committed, which reached their height on the solemn days of the Passion and the Resurrection. The Catholics were not only ejected from the churches, but were prevented from holding their worship in private houses. Having thus settled matters in the capital, Gregory set forth on a visitation of his province. A party of soldiers attended on him, and by his orders many bishops, monks, and virgins were beaten—among them the aged Potammon, who was treated with such severity that he died in consequence.

On the arrival of Gregory at Alexandria, Athanasius withdrew to a retreat in the neighbourhood, and after having issued an address to all bishops, desiring them to join in condemnation of the intruder, he betook himself to Rome, where a synod of fifty bishops pronounced him innocent, and confirmed to him the communion of the church. Other expelled bishops also appeared before the same council; among them was Marcellus of Ancyra, who had resumed his see on the death of Constantine, and had been again dispossessed of it, but was now able to satisfy Julius of Rome and his brethren that the charges of heresy on which he had been deprived were founded on misapprehension. A correspondence followed between Julius and the eastern bishops, but without any satisfactory result, as the Eusebians, who had before proposed that the case of Athanasius should be referred to a council, evaded the execution of their own proposal when they found that the Alexandrian bishop had himself appeared at Rome.

The council of Antioch produced four creeds. As the death of Arius had released his partisans from the difficulties which arose out of their personal regard for him, they now endeavoured to give plausibility to their cause by approaching as nearly as possible to the orthodox statements, in the hope that by new formularies the Nicene creed might gradually be obscured. In their attacks on Athanasius during the reign of Constantine, they had been careful to advance charges which did not relate to doctrines, but to practical matters; and the same policy of avoiding the open statement of differences as to doctrine was now continued. The creeds of Antioch were therefore so composed that in ordinary circumstances they would have been received as satisfactory. The more offensive positions of Arianism were distinctly condemned, and the council repudiated the name of Arians,—“for how”, it was asked, “should we, who are bishops, follow a presbyter?”. The dignity of the Saviour was set forth in the highest terms; the studious omission of the word *homoousios* (co-essential) was all that could excite suspicion as to the orthodoxy of the framers. Of these formularies, the second (which

claimed an older author, the martyr Lucian) was that which afterwards became distinguished as the “Creed of the Dedication”.

In the meantime Constantinople had been the scene of repeated disturbances. Bishop Alexander, on his death-bed, being consulted by some of his clergy as to a successor, replied that, if they wished for a man “apt to teach”, and of holy life, they ought to choose Paul; if they wanted a man of business and address, with an appearance of piety, they should choose Macedonius, who was a presbyter of long standing. Paul was elected, but was soon deprived by the Arians on various charges of irregularity in his life and in the manner of his appointment. After the death of Constantine he returned to his see, but was compelled to make way for Eusebius, who was translated from Nicomedia; and on his death, in 342, the ejected bishop and Macedonius were set up by the opposite parties. The city was thrown into violent commotion, and Constantius sent a military force to suppress the disorder; whereupon the populace set fire to the lodgings of the commander, Hermogenes, dragged him about the streets, and murdered him. The emperor, in great indignation, hastened to Constantinople, drove out Paul, and deprived the citizens of half their allowance of corn; but, regarding Macedonius as a sharer in the cause of the tumult, and being also displeased with him for having allowed himself to be consecrated without seeking the imperial permission, he did not establish him as bishop. Paul soon after returned, but, having allowed himself to be decoyed into an interview by Philip, the praetorian prefect, he was seized and privately sent away by sea, while the prefect proceeded to instal Macedonius. The populace flocked together in excitement, and upwards of three thousand perished, either through the pressure of the crowd, or by the weapons of the soldiery. From 342 to 380, with the exception of two years, the bishopric of the eastern capital was in the hands of the Arians.

Alarmed by the scenes which had taken place at Constantinople, and by similar tumults in other places, Constantius agreed with Constans, who steadily adhered to the cause of Athanasius, that a general council should be summoned. The place appointed for its meeting was Sardica (now Sophia), in Illyria, a city which stood on the borders of east and west, but within the western division of the empire. Athanasius was desired by Constans to wait on him at Milan, and, through the emperor's arrangement, proceeded to Sardica in company with Hosius. About the same time a deputation of oriental bishops appeared at Milan—bearing with them a new creed which had lately been drawn up by a council at Antioch. This document, which from its length was styled *macrostiche*, was in form rather an argument than a definition; and like other late creeds of the same party, it was sound in itself, but provoked suspicion by avoiding the term *co-essential*. The western bishops were dissatisfied with it, partly because their ignorance of Greek made them distrustful, and partly from a wish to adhere to the Nicene creed as sufficient. At Sardica seventy-six eastern and about a hundred western bishops attended, and Hosius presided over the assembly—not as legate of the Roman see, but in right of his age, character, and influence.

The orientals at the outset protested against the admission of Athanasius, Marcellus, and other deposed bishops as members of the council. It was answered that these bishops were not to be regarded as deposed, since the latest decisions were in their favour; that they were ready to meet all charges; and that the council might reopen the whole question from the beginning. But the orientals adhered to their objection, and, finding that it was firmly resisted, they withdrew across the border of the empires to Philippopolis, in Thrace, where they held a separate synod under the presidency of Stephen, bishop of Antioch. Two eastern bishops remained at Sardica, while Ursacius of Singidunum (Belgrade), Valens of Mursa (Essek), and three other Arians of the west, took part in the council of Philippopolis. The western council declared the Nicene creed to be sufficient; the orientals drew up a fresh creed, more Arian than those of Antioch; and each assembly passed a sentence of deposition against the most conspicuous members of the other, while Julius of Rome was included amongst those with whom the orientals forbade all communion. The western bishops also enacted a number of

canons, and again pronounced Athanasius and Marcellus innocent; but their judgment was not of itself enough to reinstate Athanasius in his see, and he retired to Naissus, in Dacia.

The party which enjoyed the favour of Constantius continued to occupy the sees of the east, and to exercise fresh violences against the orthodox. After a time, however, the emperor changed his policy—partly in consequence of a threat of war from Constans, who required the restoration of Athanasius, partly through disgust at the detection of an infamous plot which had been laid by Stephen, bishop of Antioch, against some envoys of the western church; and he wrote thrice to Athanasius, inviting him to resume his see. Athanasius complied with this invitation, and on his way visited Antioch, where he had an interview with Constantius. The emperor begged him, as a favour, to allow one church at Alexandria to those who were not of his communion, and the bishop expressed his willingness to do so, on condition that the members of his communion should receive a like indulgence at Antioch. But Constantius, on conferring with the Arians who had suggested his proposal, found that they were not disposed to make the exchange, as at Antioch orthodoxy was dangerously strong among the laity, whereas at Alexandria both the temper of the people and the abilities of the bishop forbade them to expect any great success.

Athanasius was admitted to communion by a council at Jerusalem, and was recommended to his flock by an imperial letter, which ordered that the record of former proceedings against him should be cancelled. The intruder Gregory had died, or had been killed, a short time before; and Athanasius, on his return to Alexandria, was received with universal rejoicing. The thankfulness of his people was shown in bountiful works of charity, and many persons of both sexes embraced a monastic or ascetic life on the occasion.

His enemies felt that their power was at an end. Ursacius and Valens, the most noted supporters of Arianism in the west, went to Rome, and, with a profession of regret for the part which they had been induced to take against the bishop of Alexandria, entreated a council to receive them into communion. But the hopes of the Arians were speedily revived by the murder of Constans, although Constantius wrote to assure Athanasius that he should find from him the same support as from his brother: and they renewed their machinations against the Alexandrian bishop by attacking his adherents in other quarters. This policy was favoured by the circumstance that some of their opponents had lately run into serious errors. Marcellus of Ancyra was again deposed—having, it would seem, developed his heterodoxy more distinctly. His pupil Photinus, bishop of Sirmium, went so far as to teach palpable Sabellianism: that there was no personal distinction in the Godhead; that the Logos was nothing else than the Divine attribute of wisdom, which at length was manifested in Jesus, whom he regarded as a mere man, although supernaturally born; and that the Holy Ghost was only an influence. For these tenets Photinus was repeatedly condemned, and in 351 he was deposed by a synod held in his own city.

About the same time many orthodox bishops were also ejected from their sees. Paul of Constantinople, who had recovered his bishopric before or soon after the council of Sardica, was again driven out, and was carried off to Cucusus, a savage place in the lesser Armenia, where, after having been for some time deprived of food, he was strangled. Macedonius was intruded into the see, and behaved with such violence—branding, fining, banishing, and even putting to death, those who were opposed to him, both in Constantinople and in other places to which his power extended,—that the emperor himself found it necessary to remonstrate with him. The Novatianists, who had retained their orthodoxy as to the doctrines impugned by Arius, were exposed to the same persecution with the Catholics; and when these were deprived of their own churches, they resorted to the three which the Novatianists possessed within the city. But, although a temporary connection was thus established by the community of suffering, the principles of the sect prevented its permanent reconciliation with the church.

On the 8th of September 351 a great battle was fought between the troops of Constantius and Magnentius near Mursa (now Essek), the episcopal city of Valens. During the

engagement, Constantius was praying in a church, with the bishop at his side; and it is said that Valens, having learnt the defeat of the enemy by means of a chain of scouts, announced it as having been revealed to him by an angel. By this artifice, or by some other means, Valens gained an influence over the emperor's mind, and he diligently used it for the furtherance of the opinions which he had for a time pretended to disown. Constantius was assailed with a multitude of charges against Athanasius. He was persuaded that the bishop was proceeding tyrannically in Egypt and Libya against all who would not submit to him. Much was made of the fact that on his way to Alexandria, after his late exile, he had conferred ordination in dioceses where the bishops were opposed to his opinions. It was said that he had caused the death of the younger Constantine; that he had exasperated Constans against Constantius; and—a charge which he repelled with especial horror and indignation—that he had corresponded with the murderer of Constans, the usurper Magnentius.

Liberius, who in April 352 succeeded Julius as bishop of Rome, was immediately beset by complaints of the orientals against Athanasius; but a letter from an Egyptian synod determined him to disregard them as unfounded. In the following year (355), however, the power of the Alexandrian bishop's enemies was increased by the final defeat of Magnentius, in consequence of which Constantius came into undisputed possession of the west. Their object now was to procure a condemnation of him from the western bishops, who, although sound in faith, were for the most part liable to be imposed on through their ignorance of the Greek theological subtleties, and through fear of their new sovereign, by whom the matter was studiously represented as a personal question between himself and a refractory bishop. A synod was held at Arles, where Liberius was represented by Vincent, bishop of Capua (perhaps the same who, as a presbyter, had been one of the Roman legates at Nicaea), and by another Campanian bishop.

The emperor insisted on the condemnation of Athanasius, and Vincent, on proposing, by way of compromise, that the opinions of Arius should at the same time be anathematized, was told that these were not then in question. The legate at length yielded and subscribed. Liberius, in deep distress on account of his representative's compliance, requested the emperor to call a free council for the investigation of the case; and the Eusebians, although with very different objects, also pressed for the assembling of a council. The petition thus urged from different quarters was granted, and in 355 about three hundred western bishops, with a few from the east, met at Milan. The sessions of the council were held in the palace, and its deliberations were overawed by Constantius and his soldiers. An edict of Arian purport was read, the substance of which the emperor professed to have received by revelation; and he dwelt on the success of his arms as a proof that the Divine blessing rested on his opinions. The attempts of some orthodox bishops to obtain an inquiry into the question of faith was met by Ursacius and Valens with a peremptory demand that they should join in the condemnation of Athanasius and should communicate with the dominant party; and the sentence was signed by all but three bishops, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, and Dionysius of Milan. To the objection that the acts required of the orthodox were unwarranted by the rules of the church, the emperor replied, "Whatever I will, let that be esteemed a canon; for the bishops of Syria allow me to speak so". The three recusants were banished, many other bishops were sent into exile, and their places were filled with intruders, whose heterodoxy was their only qualification for the episcopate. A general persecution was carried on for the purpose of enforcing conformity to the emperor's will, while the orthodox cried out that the days of Nero and of Decius had returned.

There were still two important persons in the west to be gained by the victorious party—Liberius, conspicuous for his position, and Hosius, the "father of the bishops", who had been a confessor under Maximin, had sat in the council of Illiberis half a century before, and had been president of the council of Sardica,—perhaps even of the great council of Nicaea. After some fruitless overtures had been made to Liberius, the influential chief of the eunuchs,

Eusebius, was sent to Rome, for the purpose of tempting him by offers and by threats; and, as the bishop refused to wait on Constantius, he was forcibly carried off from his city in the middle of the night. On his arrival at Milan, he was admitted to several interviews with the emperor, of whom he demanded that a council unrestrained by the imperial influence should be summoned to investigate the case of Athanasius. Constantius reproached him as being the only bishop who still adhered to the Egyptian primate, whose removal the emperor professed to regard as more important to himself than the victories which he had gained over Magnentius and other pretenders to the throne. Liberius was firm; he refused the offer of three days for consideration; and, on receiving sentence of banishment to Beroea, in Thrace, he indignantly rejected large sums of money which were sent to him by the emperor, the empress, and the chief of the eunuchs, as contributions towards the expenses of his journey. Hosius also withstood all attempts to shake his constancy, and, after having been kept under restraint a year, was banished to Sirmium. In the room of Liberius, the archdeacon Felix (who, however, is said by some authorities to have been orthodox in faith) allowed himself to be consecrated by three foreign bishops, the chief of whom was Acacius of Caesarea, in Palestine.

The Arians now thought themselves strong enough to proceed to the ejection of Athanasius. Several attempts were made to draw him away from his see by the use of the emperor's name; but he refused to attend to anything short of a warrant as express as that which had authorized his restoration, or as the assurance of protection which Constantius had voluntarily given him after the death of Constans. As the emperor was reluctant to grant such a warrant (apparently out of fear that it might provoke an insurrection of the Alexandrians and a stoppage of the corn supplies on which Constantinople depended), another course of proceeding was adopted. Syrian, general of Egypt, who was charged to effect the removal of the bishop, (A.D. 356), lulled him and his flock into security by promising to write to the emperor for distinct instructions, and about three weeks later proceeded to execute his purpose. In the night of the 9th of February, 356, as Athanasius with many of the Alexandrians was preparing for a celebration of the Eucharist by keeping vigil in the church of St. Theonas, the general, with 5000 soldiers and a mob of Arians, surrounded the building. The bishop, hearing the noise without, calmly seated himself on his throne, and desired that the 136th Psalm should be sung—the whole congregation joining in the response "For his mercy endureth for ever". The soldiers forced the doors, and a fearful confusion ensued. Many persons were trodden under foot, crushed to death, or pierced with javelins; the consecrated virgins were stripped and beaten; the soldiers pressed onwards to the choir, and Athanasius was urged to save himself by flight. But he declared that he would not depart until his people were safe, and, rising, desired them to join in prayer, and to withdraw as quickly as possible. The bishop himself was determined to remain to the last; but as the danger became more urgent, the clergy, when the greater part of the congregation had escaped, closed round him, and carried him away, exhausted and in a swoon. The soldiery and the mob continued their outrages, and the ornaments of the church were plundered or defaced. The Catholics of Alexandria addressed the emperor in a protest against the violence which had been committed; but he replied by justifying Syrian, and ordering them to discover and give up Athanasius.

In the beginning of Lent, a new Arian bishop, named George, a Cappadocian, like his Arian predecessor Gregory, arrived at Alexandria. This intruder, although he was recommended in extravagant terms by imperial letters, is described by the catholic writers as a man who had behaved discreditably in low secular employments; rude, illiterate, and disdainful even to put on an outward show of piety. The reproach of gross ignorance is hardly consistent with the fact of his possessing a library so rich both in Christian and in heathen literature, that after his death it excited the interest of the emperor Julian; but the other charges are confirmed by the testimony of the pagan Ammianus Marcellinus; indeed George, by his

exactions, became no less odious to the pagans than he was to the orthodox. Supported by the civil power, he raged against the Catholics of every class—bishops, clergy, monks, virgins, and laity—plundering, scourging, mutilating, banishing, and committing to the mines. Some bishops died in consequence of the cruelties which were inflicted on them. One renegade, who joined the usurper's party, submitted to re-ordination. After a time George was driven out by his people, and took refuge with the emperor; but he returned with ampler powers, and made himself more detested than ever.

The aged Hosius, worn out by exile, imprisonment, privation, and even torture, at length gave way, and in 357 subscribed at Sirmium a heterodox creed, of which it was even pretended that he was the author; but he did not, apparently, sign the condemnation of Athanasius. By this submission he recovered his see; and he died shortly after at the age of a hundred or upwards. Athanasius, who speaks of him with tenderness and pity, states that on his death-bed he protested against the violence to which he had been subjected, and abjured the errors to which he had yielded a forced assent.

The fall of Hosius was speedily followed by that of Liberius. In April 357, Constantius visited Rome, where no emperor had been seen since 326. A number of ladies of rank, after having in vain endeavoured to persuade their husbands to undertake the office of intercession, waited on him with a petition for the recall of Liberius. Constantius answered that the bishop might return if he could agree with his brethren of the court party, and proposed that he and Felix should jointly govern the church. This compromise, on being announced in the circus, was received with a derisive cry, that it would suit well with the factions into which the frequenters of that place were divided—that each of the colours might have a bishop for its head; and the whole assembly burst into a shout, “One God, one Christ, one bishop”. But in the following winter Liberius, weary of his Thracian exile, entreated in abject terms that he might be recalled. He professed to concur heartily with Ursacius, Valens, and their oriental partisans; he appeared even greedy of humiliation in disavowing his former opinions; and, after subscribing an Arian or Semiarian creed, he was allowed to return to Rome. Felix was expelled, not without bloodshed between the parties of the rival bishops, according to some accounts; and the remaining eight years of his life were spent in peaceful obscurity.

Arianism appeared to be everywhere triumphant; but in this time of triumph internal differences, which had hitherto been concealed, began to show themselves openly.

It had been the policy of the Arians or Eusebians to veil their heresy by abstaining from any distinct declaration on the most critical points, and putting forth professions which in themselves were sound, although short of the full catholic belief. And now an unexpected result of this system appeared: the formulas which had been intended speciously to cover the heterodoxy of their framers had in the course of years trained up a party which honestly held them, without the errors which the more advanced Arians had been careful to keep in reserve. The Semiarians or *homoiousians* (as they are styled) believed that the Son was “like in all things” to the Father; that his essence was like that of the Father—differing from it only in not being identical with it; that he was truly a Son, begotten beyond time and before all worlds. Eusebius of Caesarea was the precursor of Semiarianism; but its appearance as the distinctive doctrine of a party did not take place until long after his death. There was much of personal respectability and of piety among the Semiarians. Athanasius and Hilary speak of them as brethren—being willing to believe that they were not really heterodox, but only scrupled at the use of the word “co-essential”, as apparently savouring of Sabellianism, and as having been condemned in Paul of Samosata. To this party—of which Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea were the leaders—the majority of the eastern bishops now belonged.

On the other hand, Arianism for the first time came forth without disguise in the doctrines of Aetius and his pupil Eunomius. The former, a man of very low origin, who in early life had been a goldsmith, was ordained deacon by Leontius of Antioch, and was afterwards deposed by him. Aetius is described as notorious for his disputatious character. His

early education had been scanty; but at a later time he acquired from a philosopher of Alexandria a knowledge of geometry and dialectics, and, without having any proper acquaintance with ecclesiastical learning, he insisted on applying the rules of these sciences as the measure of religious truth.

Aetius unflinchingly carried out the principles of Arianism to their conclusions, so as to offend and annoy the more cautious of its professors, who spoke of him as “the godless”. He maintained that the Son, as being a creature, was necessarily unlike the Father, not only in substance but in will; and from this tenet his party got the name of *anomoeans*. Eunomius, who attained to the bishopric of Cyzicum, went still further in the same direction. Although he professed to refer to Scripture, his system was not founded on it, but was merely a work of reasoning. It was purely intellectual, excluding all reference to the affections. He discarded the idea of mystery in religion; he held that God knows no more of his own nature than man may know of it; that the Son resembles the Father in nothing but his working; that the Holy Spirit was created by the Son. He denied all sacramental influences, and—unlike Arius, who was himself a man of rigid life—he opposed everything like asceticism.

Between the Anomoeans and the Semiarians stood the crafty, secular, and unscrupulous party which was now called after Acacius, the successor of Eusebius in the see of Caesarea. Agreeing in principles with the anomoeans, they by turns favoured them when it was safe, and disavowed them when it would have been inconvenient to show them countenance; and for a time they endeavoured to conceal the difference between themselves and the Semiarians as to the essence (*ousia*) of the Son by proscribing the term as unscriptural, and as having been the source of trouble to the church. The emperor’s own opinions were Semiarian; but the policy of Acacius and the personal influence of Valens counterbalanced his doctrinal convictions.

Leontius, who had been appointed bishop of Antioch on the deprivation of Stephen in 349, and had endeavoured to preserve peace in his church by an equivocating policy, died in the end of 357. On being informed of his death, Eudoxius, bishop of Germanicia, who was in attendance on the emperor in the west, requested leave to go into Syria under false pretences, and got possession of the vacant see. The favour which the new bishop openly showed to Aetius provoked the Semiarians to hold a council at Ancyra, where they condemned the anomoean doctrine and the second creed of Sirmium; and their decisions were ratified by the emperor, who, at their desire, resolved to summon a general council for the final settlement of the questions which had so long distracted the church. On this the Acacians took the alarm, and, fearing that both catholics and Semiarians might unite to condemn them, they fell on the expedient of dividing the council, in the hope that they might be able to manage its separate portions. Their arguments as to the difficulties and the expense of bringing bishops from all parts of his dominions to one place were successful with Constantius. It was resolved that the western branch of the church should be cited to Rimini, and the eastern to Nicaea; and that ten deputies from each division should afterwards meet in the presence of the emperor.

About four hundred and fifty bishops assembled at Rimini in May 359, under the presidency (as is supposed) of Restitutus, bishop of Carthage. A creed, drawn up by some Acacians and Semiarians at a previous meeting, and known as the Third Creed of Sirmium, was offered to the council by Valens and Ursacius. It proscribed the term essence as unscriptural and liable to misapprehension, and declared the Son to be “like the Father in all things, as the Holy Scriptures say and teach”. The Acacians hoped that the catholics would be drawn to subscribe by taking these words according to their most obvious sense, while for themselves they interpreted them as meaning *like in all things to which Scripture extends the likeness*; but the bishops, although for the most part unskilled in theological subtleties, were animated by a strong distrust of the party, and declared that the Nicene creed was sufficient. Ursacius, Valens, and four others were excommunicated for refusing to sign it; and deputies of each party were sent off to the emperor, with a request that no innovation on the faith might be attempted, and that the members of the council might be allowed to return to their homes.

Constantius, who was on the point of setting out for the seat of the Persian war, deferred seeing the envoys until his return, on the ground that his mind was so occupied by political business as to be unfit for the due consideration of Divine things. During his absence, the representatives of the council, who were detained at Nice in Thrace, were practised on by his courtiers; and thus after a time they were drawn into signing the same creed which had been offered for acceptance at Rimini, but rendered more objectionable by the omission of the words “in all things”. In the meantime, their brethren who had remained at Rimini were sedulously plied with arguments from the emperor's character and intentions, from the desirableness of peace, the inexpediency of contending about (as was said) a mere question of words, the hopelessness of bringing the orientals to adopt the term *co-essential*. Valens, by way of dissipating their suspicions, uttered anathemas which seemed to be altogether irreconcilable with Arianism; and at length, pressed by solicitations, desirous to return to their homes before winter, and deluded as to the meaning of their act, they also subscribed the formula which was presented to them. “The whole world” says St Jerome, “groaned, and was astonished to find itself Arian”. On returning to their dioceses, the bishops began to understand the import of their submission. Many of them then repudiated the creed which they had signed, and wrote letters of sympathy to Athanasius.

The place of the eastern council's meeting had been transferred from Nicaea to Nicomedia; but in consequence of an earthquake, by which that city was reduced to ruins, a further change became necessary, and Seleucia, the capital of Isauria, was eventually fixed on. The whole number of bishops who attended was about a hundred and sixty, of whom a hundred and five were Semiarians, thirty-five Acacians, and the rest orthodox. The last of these parties was composed of Egyptians, together with Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, one of the most powerful champions of the catholic faith, who had been banished into Phrygia in the year 356, and was now summoned to take part in the deliberations of his eastern brethren. The Acacians, finding themselves outnumbered, attempted under various pretences to break up the assembly; and the dissensions which arose were so violent that the imperial commissary, Leonas, found himself obliged to dissolve it. The majority signed the creed of the dedication; the Acacians condemned both *homoousion* (of the same essence) and *homoiousion* (of like essence) as inexpedient, and anathematized the term *anomoion* (unlike). Both Semiarians and Acacians sent off deputies to the court; and, although Constantius agreed in opinion with the Semi-arians, and the council had been convened for the purpose of establishing their ascendancy, the Acacians, by contriving to be the first to reach him, succeeded in winning his ear. A council was held at Constantinople in the emperor's presence, where each party preferred charges against its opponents. Aetius was deposed from the diaconate, being given up by the Acacians as a scapegoat, while, on the other hand, Basil of Ancyra and other Semiarians were deposed and banished as insubordinate. It was ordered that the creed of Rimini should be signed everywhere, and all who refused compliance were treated with severity.

Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, had rendered himself obnoxious to the Acacian party by showing an inclination towards the Semiarians. It was therefore resolved to get rid of him; and in order to his removal, advantage was taken of the emperor's displeasure, which had been justly excited by the bishop's violent proceedings, and was now swelled by a fresh offence. As the church in which the body of the great Constantine had been deposited—hastily and unsubstantially erected, like the buildings of the new capital in general—was already likely to fall, Macedonius removed the coffin to another church; and Constantius was irritated, both by his presuming to take such a step without the imperial permission, and because the factions of Constantinople had made the removal the occasion for a serious disturbance. The bishop was therefore deposed on various charges of misconduct (for the Acacians, out of fear lest the emperor's sympathy should be excited, were careful to avoid the question of doctrine in their proceedings against the Semiarians); and Eudoxius of Antioch

was appointed his successor, while the bishopric of Antioch was bestowed by a council on Meletius, formerly bishop of Sebaste, a man of high reputation who had until then been reckoned among the Arian party. Meletius, it is said, on taking possession of his new see, at first confined his preaching to practical subjects; but when he had thus gained some hold on his flock, he began openly to teach the Nicene doctrine. For this the council, which was still sitting, deposed and banished him within thirty days after his installation, and in his room appointed Euzoius, formerly a deacon of Alexandria, who had been the associate of Arius in the early stages of the heresy. Ever since the deprivation of Eustathius, an orthodox party had been kept up within the church of Antioch, notwithstanding the Arianism of the bishops. This party now formed a separate communion, which regarded Meletius as its head; but the old Eustathians, who had throughout stood aloof, refused to communicate with them, on the ground that Meletius had received his appointment from Arians, and that his followers had been baptized into heresy

The council of Antioch set forth an undisguisedly anomoean creed, declaring the Son to have been created out of nothing, and to be unlike the Father both in substance and in will. St. Athanasius reckons this as the eleventh creed to which the variations of Arianism had given birth : Tillemont makes it the eighteenth. Amidst such a continual manufacture of new standards of doctrine, it was no wonder that the heathens derided the Christians as having still to learn in what their faith consisted.

The reign of Constantius was now near its end. The Caesar Julian had been proclaimed Augustus by his troops in Gaul, and had advanced far towards the eastern capital. Constantius set out to meet him, but was arrested by illness at Mopsucrenae, in Cilicia, where he died on the 3rd of November 361, at the age of forty-four, and in the twenty-fifth year of his reign. A short time before his death, but whether at Antioch or at Mopsucrenae is uncertain, he was baptized by the Arian bishop of Antioch.

CHAPTER III.

JULIAN
A.D. 361-363.

Immediately after the death of the great Constantine, the soldiery at Constantinople committed a massacre among the princes of his house. With the exception of his three sons—of whom two were at a distance, while Constantius was even supposed to have instigated the murderers—the only survivors of the imperial family were two children of the late emperor's half-brother, Julius Constantius, who himself had been one of the victims. Gallus was spared because his sickly constitution seemed to preclude the apprehension of future danger from him; his half-brother Julian, who was only six years of age, is said to have been saved and concealed in a church by Mark, bishop of Arethusa.

The early education of these brothers was superintended by Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was distantly related to the younger prince's mother. When Julian had reached the age of fifteen, they were removed to Macellae, near Caesarea, in Cappadocia. They lived in the palace of the old Cappadocian kings, and were treated in a manner suitable to their rank, yet were kept in a seclusion which had the nature of imprisonment. They were trained in a strict routine of religious observances; they were even admitted into the order of readers, and officiated in the service of the church. After five years had been thus spent by the young princes, the attention of Constantius was especially directed to them by the circumstance that the murder of Constans had left them the only male heirs of the imperial family. Gallus was appointed Caesar, was married to a widowed daughter of the great Constantine, and was established at Antioch, while his brother was allowed to study at Constantinople. But as the popularity which Julian gained there excited the emperor's jealousy, he was soon ordered to Nicomedia, where he endeavoured to disarm the suspicions of Constantius by shaving his head and living like a monk. In the end of the year 354, Gallus, who had displayed both violence and incapacity in his new elevation, was removed from his government, and was put to death by order of Constantius. At the same time Julian was summoned from Ionia to the court at Milan, where he was detained in a state of suspense for seven months; but at length, through the influence of the empress Eusebia, who steadily befriended him, he obtained leave to attend the schools of Athens.

The Persians on the east, and the barbarian nations on the north, obliged Constantine to seek for assistance in the government of the empire. Julian was therefore declared Caesar in November 355. He received in marriage the hand of the emperor's sister Helena, and at the suggestion of Eusebia, who represented him as a harmless, studious youth, who would either bring credit to the emperor by success, or would deliver him from uneasiness by meeting with death, he was sent to undertake the government of Gaul. Although his life had hitherto been that of a student, he soon distinguished himself by his ability both in war and in civil administration. But his relations with Constantius were of no friendly kind: the emperor openly decried and ridiculed him, thwarted and crippled him in his administration, and assumed the credit of his victories. The army murmured because its commander was not furnished with the means of bestowing the usual donatives; and this discontent was at length swollen to a height by an order which Julian received when in winter-quarters at Paris, in April 360. On being informed that their general was required to despatch the strength of his

troops to the Persian frontier, the soldiers rose in mutiny; and, notwithstanding a show of resistance to their wishes, which was perhaps not wholly sincere, the Caesar was hailed as Augustus, was raised aloft on a buckler, and was crowned with a circlet formed of the chain by which the standard-bearers of the legions were distinguished. Eusebia and Helena, whose mediation might have prevented a breach between the imperial kinsmen, were both lately dead. Julian's proposals for a division of the empire were scornfully rejected; and, after some fruitless negotiation, he resolved to march against Constantius. Carrying out a brilliant conception with an energy which triumphed over all difficulties, he penetrated through the Black Forest to the Danube, embarked his army on the great river, and landed at a point within a few miles of Sirmium. He had already become master of almost all the west, when the death of Constantius saved the empire from the miseries of a civil war.

The policy of Constantius towards paganism had been, on the whole, a continuation of his father's. Laws are found which forbid sacrifice and idolatry even on pain of death; and under Julian the pagan orators complained of severities exercised against their religion in the late reign. It is, however, certain that the more rigorous laws, even if they were actually published at the time, were not generally acted on. Paganism was still largely cherished, especially among the aristocracy of the older capital, among the philosophical and literary class, and among the peasantry. Its rites appear to have been freely practised, even by persons in authority. The first Christian emperor was, like his predecessors, enrolled among the gods. Constantius retained the style of Pontifex Maximus; on his visit to Rome in 357, he showed respect to the old religion, and even made appointments to priestly offices; and although he was unremitting in his hostility to the arts of astrology and divination, it was on account of their dangerous political character. Some temples were given up for Christian purposes, or were bestowed on favourites of the court; but there were enactments against destroying temples and defacing heathen monuments. The doctrinal controversies of the time diverted the attention of the Christians from paganism, while they also rendered each party unwilling to provoke the multitude which was without the church. It was in vain that some of the more intemperate Christian writers among whom Firmicus Maternus is the most noted, attempted to urge the government to more vigorous measures for the suppression of idolatry.

Before setting out on his expedition, Julian, although he still kept up the outward appearance of Christianity, placed himself under the guardianship of the "Immortal Gods", and propitiated them with copious sacrifices. Even after having advanced as far as Vienne, he celebrated the festival of the Epiphany; but before reaching Thrace, he threw off all disguise, and openly professed himself a pagan. It is not difficult to understand the motives of this defection, on account of which the epithet apostate has become the usual accompaniment of his name. His Christian training, with its formal and constrained devotion, had been so conducted that it could hardly have failed to alienate a mind like his—quick, curious, restless, and vain. His desire of knowledge had been thwarted in its direction; in his earlier years he had been forbidden to seek instruction from those heathens who were most celebrated as professors of rhetoric and the prohibition had lent a charm to their opinions. Filled with an enthusiastic admiration for the heroes and sages of heathenism, he was unable to understand the dignity of Christian meekness and endurance; and, moreover, he had come to estimate the system in which he had been educated by the imperfections of those around him, while heathenism appeared to him in ideal brightness, as embodied in the lives of its worthies—as connected with literature, philosophy, and art. The eyes of the pagans had early been fixed on him as the hope of their religion. He was courted by philosophers and rhetoricians, and in all his changes of residence he was handed over by one of them to another. These teachers not only entangled his mind in their speculations, but practised on it by the proscribed arts of theurgy and divination, flattering him with the idea of one day becoming master of the empire. At Ephesus, in his twentieth year, he was formally initiated into paganism by Maximus, a philosopher who had gained a powerful influence over him; and during his stay at Athens he

was admitted to the Eleusinian mysteries. But the secret of his apostasy was carefully kept until his assumption of the imperial title rendered a longer hypocrisy needless.

Julian arrived at Constantinople on the 11th of December 361, and left it in the middle of the following May. He reached Antioch in the end of June 362, and remained there until March 5, 363, when he set out on his fatal expedition into Persia. Thus the greater part of his short reign was spent in two cities especially unfavourable to his religion; for Constantinople had never until this time been polluted by public sacrifice, and at Antioch—although the inhabitants were too commonly licentious, luxurious, and passionately fond of frivolous diversions—Christianity was generally professed, so that there were only a few aged people who looked back with regret to the days when paganism had been the national creed. The utter decay of the old religion in the Syrian capital may in some measure be estimated from a story which is told by the emperor himself—that when, after having restored the temple of Daphne, near the city, he repaired to it on the day of a great local festival, he found, instead of the splendid ceremonial and the crowd of worshippers which he had expected, that only a single old priest was in attendance, with no better sacrifice than a goose, which the poor man had been obliged to provide at his own cost.

Julian's paganism was very unlike the old political religion of Rome; it was eclectic, philosophical, enthusiastic, and more akin to Gnosticism than even to the theology of the ancient Greeks. He believed in one supreme God, whom he identified with the Mithra or sun-god of oriental worship. Under this deity he acknowledged others—the tutelaries of nations, sciences, and the like. He believed the world to be eternal, and from the diversity of national character he argued against the common origin of mankind. The worship of images was defended by him on philosophical grounds, very remote from the popular belief. The convert's zeal for the old religion far outstripped that of its hereditary professors. A pagan historian of the time describes him as rather superstitious than properly religious; and his heathen subjects in general looked with surprise and disrespect on the profusion of his costly sacrifices, and on the share which he himself took in them—performing even the coarsest and most repulsive functions. In other respects, too, his vanity displayed itself in an ostentatious disregard of the form and dignity which are usually associated with sovereign power. In his appearance and habits he affected a cynical roughness, which drew on him the satire of the wits of Antioch; and he condescended to reply to their jests and ballads by a book in defence of his beard. He reformed the luxury of the court with an unwise and precipitate severity; he disbanded the host of eunuchs and parasites who had been attached to it during the late reign, and replaced them by philosophers and professors of divination, many of whom proved unable to bear with equanimity the honours and employments which were bestowed on them.

The religious policy of the last two reigns was now reversed. The immunities and endowments which had been bestowed on the clergy were transferred to the heathen priesthood; but whereas Constantine, in restoring church-property to the rightful owners after the persecution, had indemnified the existing holders at the expense of the state, Julian ordered that Christians who had been concerned in the destruction of temples should rebuild them at their own cost, and that money received from property which had formerly belonged to the pagan religious establishment should be refunded. Even if the means of such restitution had been in their hands, the restoration of temples (which would in many cases have involved the demolition of churches erected on their sites) was intolerable to the consciences of the Christians; and in consequence of the edict many of the clergy were subjected to tortures, imprisonment, and death. The case of Mark, bishop of Arethusa, is especially noted. "The magistrates", says Gibbon, "required the full value of a temple which had been destroyed; but as they were satisfied of his poverty, they desired only to bend his inflexible spirit to the promise of the slightest compensation. They apprehended the aged prelate, they inhumanly scourged him, they tore his beard; and his naked body, anointed with honey, was suspended between heaven and earth, and exposed to the stings of insects and the rays of a Syrian sun.

From this lofty station Mark still persisted to glory in his crime, and to insult the impotent rage of his persecutors. He was at length rescued from their hands; Julian spared his life; but if the bishop of Arethusa had saved the infancy of Julian, posterity will condemn the ingratitude, instead of praising the clemency of the emperor”.

Julian knew from the experience of former times that the employment of force against Christianity, far from suppressing it, had tended to its advancement. He was unwilling to excite the zeal of the Christians by the opportunity of martyrdom; he was unwilling to sully his own reputation by harsh measure; he wished to gain credit by a display of toleration which might contrast with the persecutions of Constantius. The stories of martyrdoms which are referred to this reign are probably for the most part fabulous; and although much of oppression and outrage was committed against the Christians, it does not appear that the emperor was directly concerned in such acts. It is, too, very evident that the Christians sometimes provoked the ruling party by needlessly offensive conduct, and that their complaints are not always free from exaggeration. But although Julian declared that argument and persuasion were the only means to be employed for the furtherance of his opinions, he allowed proceedings of a very different kind. He refused justice to the Christians with a shameless partiality, and made the refusal offensive by sarcasm. Thus when the Arian bishop George was murdered by the pagans of Alexandria, he took no further notice of the deed than by very slightly reproofing them. In consequence of a disturbance between the orthodox and the Valentinians of Edessa, he seized on the property of the Edessan church, and distributed it among his soldiers—telling the Christians that their wealth would no longer be a hindrance to their attaining the kingdom of heaven. When Christians appealed to him against the illegal violence of governors or of mobs, he reminded them that their religion enjoined on them the duty of patience under wrong. He deprived them of civil and military employments, and excluded them from the courts of law; and he alleged as his reason that the gospel forbids worldly ambition, bloodshed, and litigation. Although he professed to consider the devotion of the heart essential in religion, he used artifices to entrap his Christian subjects into outward, and even unconscious, acts of homage to the gods; thus he surrounded his own picture with heathen figures and emblems, so that the usual obeisance to it should involve an appearance of idolatry. In like manner, on the occasion of a donative, he required his soldiers to cast a few grains of incense into the fire—representing this as merely an ancient custom, without any explanation of the import which he attached to it as an act of worship.

By a strange exercise of tyranny, Julian issued an edict that no “Galilean”—for thus he required by law that the Christians should be styled—should become a teacher of classical literature. By way of giving a reason for this order, he declared that the Greek language belonged to his own party, and denounced the immorality and covetousness of persons who taught a system which they themselves did not believe; but, as it seems incredible that the emperor could have seriously confounded the religion with the literature of Greece, other motives have been conjectured—such as jealousy of the eminence which some Christian rhetoricians had acquired, and a wish to deprive the Christians of the controversial advantages which they might derive from an acquaintance with the absurdities of the pagan mythology. It has been said that he went so far as to prohibit “Galileans” even to attend the public schools, or to study the classical writers—overlooking the Divine element of the gospel, ascribing its success to human culture, and thinking to defeat it by reducing its professors to the condition of an illiterate sect. This, however, appears to be a mistake, except in so far as the law against teaching must also have operated as a bar to learning; for many of those who in other times would have resorted to pagan masters for instruction in secular studies, must have felt themselves excluded from their schools, now that an attack was made on the Christian teachers, and that classical learning was to be used as a temptation to apostasy. But in order that the benefits of classical study should not be wholly lost to Christian youth, Apollinarius of Laodicea and others are said to have provided an ingenious substitute for the forbidden

textbooks by clothing the Scripture history in the forms of Greek composition—such as epic poetry, drama, and Platonic dialogue.

While the emperor thus in many ways exerted himself against the gospel, he yet paid it the remarkable tribute of attempting to reform paganism by borrowing from Christian institutions. He pointed to the Christians as distinguished by their obedience to the rules of their religion. He admonished the heathen priests to adopt a stricter life than that which had been usual among their class—charging them to abstain from secular business and amusements; to be charitable to the poor; to take care that their wives and families should not be Christians; to be diligent in study, and to abstain from the perusal of unedifying books. He attempted to imitate the system of episcopal superintendence and that of commendatory letters, the monastic orders, the penitential discipline, the arrangement of churches, the liturgy, the hours of prayer, the expositions of religious doctrine by preaching, the care of the poor and distressed, of the sick and of the dead.

The edict of Hadrian, which forbade the Jews to approach their holy city, was still in force; and the legislation of Constantine and his son had pressed severely upon them. Julian was favourably disposed towards their religion; he respected it as an ancient national faith, although he considered it to be wrong in representing its God as the only deity; and the Mosaic sacrifices accorded with his ideas as to outward worship. It is said that he summoned some of the most eminent Jews into his presence, and asked why they did not offer sacrifices according to their lawgiver's command. On their answering that it was not lawful to sacrifice except in the temple of Jerusalem, of which they had been long deprived, the emperor gave them leave to rebuild the temple, and appointed one of his own officers to superintend the work. The dispersed Jews assembled from all quarters, in eagerness to forward the undertaking by their labour and their hoarded wealth. Women gave their ornaments towards the cost, and themselves carried burdens of earth in their silken dresses; even tools of silver are said to have been used in the work. The long-depressed people were loud in proclaiming their expectations of a triumphant restoration, when the attempt was terribly defeated. The newly-laid foundations were overthrown by an earthquake; balls of fire burst forth from the ground, scorching and killing many of the workmen; their tools were melted by lightning; and it is added by some writers that the figure of a cross surrounded by a circle appeared in the sky, and that garments and bodies were marked with crosses, which it was impossible to efface. The truth of some of these phenomena is attested by the heathen Ammianus Marcellinus, as well as by Christian writers, and the story, in its essential parts, is broadly distinguishable in character from the tales of contemporary miracles in general. As the rebuilding was avowedly undertaken in defiance of the Christian religion—as its success would have falsified the evidence borne to the gospel by those words of Scripture which had declared that Judaism was passed away, and that the temple should be desolate—we may reverently believe that the occasion was one on which some special exertion of the Divine power might probably be put forth. It will, however, remain a question how much of the story ought to be regarded as fabulous embellishment; how far the occurrences which produced the impression of miracle may have been the result of ordinary physical causes, and how far there was a mixture of that which is more properly to be styled miraculous.

Julian spent the long winter evenings of 362-3 in composing an elaborate attack on Christianity, which he continued and finished after setting out on his expedition into Persia. He had intended, on his return, to resume the building of the Jewish temple. What his policy might have been in other respects, if his life had been prolonged, can only be conjectured; but, as his enmity against the Christians had evidently increased, it is probable that the course which he had hitherto pursued with so little success would have been exchanged for a system of undisguised persecution. His death, in consequence of a wound received in a nocturnal skirmish, was hailed by the Christians with joy. Prophecies and visions of his end had before been current among them. By some it was supposed that he had received his death-wound

from an angel. Sozomen, in reporting the groundless insinuation of Libanius, that it was inflicted not by a Persian but by a Christian, so far forgets his own Christianity as to argue that such an act may be laudably done for the cause of God and religion.

We now turn to the internal history of the church. Julian on his accession recalled all who had been banished on account of religion. In this measure his object was twofold—to gain the praise of liberality, and at the same time to damage the Christian cause by giving free scope to the dissensions of the various parties. But in the latter hope he was disappointed. The Arians, when deprived of the imperial support, lost all spirit and vigour; and the common danger from the ascendancy of paganism moderated the controversies which had raged so long and so fiercely.

Athanasius, when expelled from Alexandria in 356, had withdrawn into the deserts of Egypt. Among his faithful partisans, the monks, he found a refuge which enabled him to defy the enmity of Constantius, who attempted to arrest him, and exerted himself to prevent his reception in Ethiopia if he should flee into that newly-converted country. During an exile of six years, the bishop kept a watchful eye on all the fortunes of the church, and by seasonable writings combated the heresy which had driven him from his see. On receiving the tidings that Constantius was dead, the heathen populace of Alexandria murdered the intrusive bishop, George, who had made himself even more hateful to them than to the Catholics. Athanasius, on returning to resume his see, was received with triumphal pomp and festivity. The churches were at once surrendered to him, so that the Arians, who had set up one Lucius as their bishop, could only meet in private houses. Athanasius proceeded to assemble a council, which Lucifer of Cagliari and Eusebius of Vercelli, who had been released from banishment in the Thebaid, were invited to attend. Eusebius appeared, and the Sardinian bishop was represented by two of his deacons, while he himself repaired to Antioch, with a view of attempting to suppress the schism by which the church of that city had long been distracted.

The case of the clergy who had conformed to Arianism in the late reign was decided with that wise consideration for persons which in Athanasius always accompanied his zeal for the truth. It was enacted that those who had erred through simplicity or ignorance should be allowed to retain their positions on subscribing the Nicene creed; and that such as had taken a more active part on the Arian side should, on repentance, be admitted to communion, but should be deprived of ecclesiastical office.

Another question which engaged the attention of the council, related to the use of certain theological terms. The words *ousia* and *hypostasis* had in the beginning of the controversy been used by the orientals as equivalent; both had been translated in Latin by *substantia*, and had been understood by the Latins as signifying the *nature* of God. But in course of time a distinction had been introduced in the east, so that, while *ousia* continued to denote *nature*, *hypostasis* was used in the sense which we are accustomed to express by the term *person*; and this distinction was especially characteristic of such theologians as had come out of the Arian connection to embrace the Nicene faith. The Latins, then, hearing that three hypostases were maintained by some of the orientals, took alarm, as if the words signified three different grades of nature; while the other party insisted on the necessity of using the term *hypostasis* in the new sense—considering that the use of the Greek *prosopon*, which answered to the Latin *persona*, savoured of Sabellianism, as expressing rather three manifestations of the one Godhead than that distinction which is asserted in the catholic doctrine. The council, under the guidance of Athanasius, who during his residence in the west had become acquainted with the meaning of Latin theological language, endeavoured to settle this dispute by ascertaining and explaining that the difference as to one or three hypostases was merely verbal; and by recommending that the Nicene creed should be adhered to, and that the terms in question should be avoided, except when opposition to particular heresies might render it necessary to use them.

Eusebius and others proceeded from Alexandria to Antioch with a commission to mediate in the healing of the schism. But in the meantime Lucifer had rashly taken a step which tended to exasperate and prolong it, by consecrating Paulinus, a presbyter of the Eustathian party, in opposition to Meletius, who had just returned from exile. Thus Antioch had three rival bishops—the Arian Euzoius, with the orthodox Meletius and Paulinus; and to these a fourth, of the Apollinarian sect, was soon after added. In such circumstances it was impossible to enforce any ecclesiastical discipline, since offenders, if threatened with censure in one communion, found the others ready to welcome them as proselytes; and in the meanwhile the wide patriarchal jurisdiction of Antioch, with the authority which belonged to the third of Christian sees in the general affairs of the church, was in abeyance.

Eusebius mildly expressed his regret at the ordination of Paulinus, and forthwith quitted Antioch. But the vehement Lucifer disavowed the act of his representatives who had signed the Alexandrian decrees; he broke oft communion with all bishops who should accept those decrees, and, after returning to his own diocese in Sardinia, he founded a schism, on the principle that no one who had subscribed the creed of Rimini should be admitted to reconciliation. This sect, which is not charged with any heretical doctrines, found a considerable number of adherents in Italy and Spain. It even set up a bishop at Rome; but Luciferianism became extinct in the beginning of the following century, if not earlier.

The schism of Antioch continued. Meletius was supported by the eastern orthodox; Paulinus by Egypt and the west; and, notwithstanding the exertions of the Alexandrian council, the difference of usage as to the term *hypostasis* continued to be a badge of the parties respectively.

Peace was established in the western church chiefly through the labours of Eusebius and of Hilary of Poitiers, who had been allowed to resume his bishopric soon after the councils of Rimini and Seleucia, as the court partly thought it desirable even on such terms to remove so formidable an opponent to a distance from the principal scene of action. The two bishops indefatigably exerted themselves for the re-establishment of orthodoxy on the terms of the Alexandrian synod, in which they obtained the concurrence of councils at Rome and elsewhere.

The effects of Athanasius' labours after his return to Alexandria soon drew on him the notice of Julian, who knew and dreaded his energetic character; while the representations of "magi, philosophers, aruspices, and augurs", were not wanting to excite the emperor against him as the most dangerous enemy of paganism. In the end of 362, Julian directed against him a special mandate, stating that Athanasius had lately presumed to baptize some Greek (i.e. heathen) ladies of high rank; and declaring that the edict by which exiles were allowed to return to their country had not been intended to restore them to their ecclesiastical offices—a distinction which appears to have been invented for the occasion, as it was not enforced in any other case. The Christians of Alexandria petitioned in favour of their bishop; but Julian was only the more exasperated. He styled Athanasius an "insignificant manikin"; he told them that they were at liberty to make another bishop, but that so mischievous a person must not remain among them; and, whereas the former sentence had been limited to banishment from the city, it was now extended to all Egypt, with an order that it should be immediately executed. On hearing of the rescript, Athanasius said to his friends, "Let us withdraw; this is a little cloud which will soon pass over". He embarked on the Nile, and sailed up the stream, until, on being told that a vessel was in pursuit, he ordered the steersman of his boat to turn round, met the pursuers, who had not observed his movements, ingeniously baffled their inquiries, and returned in safety to Alexandria. A renewal of the search, however, soon after compelled him to leave his place of concealment there, and he again found an asylum among the monks until he received the tidings of Julian's death.

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF JULIAN TO THE END OF THE SECOND GENERAL
COUNCIL
A.D. 363-381.

The forced ascendancy of paganism ended with the life of its patron. On the following day Jovian, a Christian, was chosen emperor. The army declared itself Christian; the labarum, which had been disused during the reign of Julian, was again displayed at its head; the philosophers and soothsayers, who had basked in the favour of the late emperor, retired into obscurity. Jovian, however, allowed full toleration to his pagan subjects; and with respect to the divisions among Christians, he declared that he would molest no one on account of religion, but would love all who should study the church's peace.

On his arrival at Antioch, after an ignominious, though necessary, accommodation with the Persians, and a disastrous retreat, the new emperor was beset by representatives of the various Christian parties, each hoping to gain him to its side. His mind was, however, already decided in favour of the Nicene faith; he wrote to Athanasius, requesting instruction and advice, and inviting him to visit the court. The bishop complied, and by personal intercourse he gained an influence over Jovian which his enemies in vain attempted to disturb. The Acacians, with their usual suppleness, resolved to conform to the spirit of the time. They attended a synod held by Meletius at Antioch, and signed the Nicene creed, evasively explaining co-essential as meaning "begotten of the Father's essence, and like the Father in essence".

The reign of Jovian lasted somewhat less than eight months; he was found dead in his bed at Dadastana, in Bithynia, on February 17, 364. On February 26 Valentinian was elected by the army as his successor, and a month later the new emperor associated with him his brother Valens, to whom he assigned the eastern division of the empire. Valentinian was possessed of many great qualities. He vigorously and successfully defended the northern frontiers against the barbarians who were pressing on the empire; he was the author of wise and important regulations for its internal governments. But the justice on which he prided himself was relentlessly severe; the manner of its execution was often inhuman, and he was subject to violent fits of passion, by one of which his death was occasioned. Valens, until elevated by his brother's favour, had been a person of little note. His capacity was inferior to that of Valentinian; he is described by Gibbon as "rude without vigour, and feeble without mildness".

It is said that both the brothers had exposed themselves to danger by the profession of Christianity in the reign of Julian. Valentinian, when raised to the throne, adhered to the Nicene faith; but, warned by the ill-success of Constantius in enforcing conformity, he adopted a policy of general toleration, to which a severe law against the Manichaeans is not to be regarded as an exception, since it was rather directed against the magical practices of which they were suspected, than against their erroneous opinions. He invariably declined all interference in questions of doctrine, which he professed to leave to those who had been trained for the consideration of them. He allowed Auxentius, an Arian, to retain the important see of Milan—whether deceived by the bishop's specious professions, which might have been enough to satisfy an uncritical and somewhat indifferent soldier, or swayed by the influence of

the empress Justina, who was a zealous Arian. But with this exception the western sees were, during Valentinian's reign, in the possession of orthodox bishops.

In the east it was otherwise. Valens is said to have been originally a catholic, and appears to have been alike ignorant and careless of religion; but he was won over to Arianism by his wife, who in 367, as he was about to set out for the Gothic war, persuaded him to receive baptism from Eudoxius of Constantinople. It is said that the bishop exacted of him an oath to persecute the Catholics, and it is certain that the hostility which he had always shown towards them became from that time more bitter and more active.

Macedonius, on his ejection from the see of Constantinople by the Acacians, had connected himself with the Semiarians, and, although he himself died soon after, the party thenceforth took its name from him. The Macedonians had requested Jovian either to establish the "creed of the dedication", agreeably to the original and unbiassed decision of the council of Seleucia; or, reverting to the condition in which things had stood before the meetings at Seleucia and Rimini, to summon a general synod, which should be free from all secular control. They now obtained leave from Valens to hold a council at Lampsacus—the emperor supposing that they would agree with Eudoxius and the Acacians, who had by this time retracted their subscriptions to the Nicene creed. The bishops who met at Lampsacus, however, took up the same position with the majority of the council of Seleucia. They signed the creed of the dedication, with the word *homoiousios*, which they declared to be necessary for preserving the personal distinction of the Godhead; they cited Eudoxius and his party before them, and on their non-appearance sentenced them to deposition. But on applying to Valens for a confirmation of their proceedings, they found that the Acacians had preoccupied his mind, and that they were themselves condemned to deprivation and banishment unless they would subscribe an Arian creed.

The zeal which Valens soon after manifested in favour of Arianism induced the Macedonians to look towards the west for sympathy and support, and deputies were sent into Italy with letters for Valentinian and Liberius. The letters addressed to the emperor were not delivered; for the bearers, finding that he was in Gaul, did not follow him into that country. Liberius was at first distrustful of them; but on their anathematizing all heresies, and signing the *homoousion* (which they interpreted as equivalent to *homoiousion*), he acknowledged them as being in communion with him, and wrote to the bishops by whom they had been commissioned. A like recognition was obtained from other western bishops; and thus the Semiarians, with the exception of a few who disavowed the late proceedings, were reunited with the orthodox.

In 367 Valens issued an order that such bishops as had been banished by Constantius, and had returned to their sees under Julian, should again be ejected. At Antioch, where he established his residence, he drove out Meletius, although he allowed Paulinus to remain. It was attempted under the same law to expel Athanasius, and he is said to have been driven to take refuge for a time in his father's tomb : but his people represented to the emperor that his case did not fall under the letter of the edict, and made such demonstrations of their attachment to the bishop in other ways, that Valens thought it well to permit his return. And thus, while the cause to which his life had been devoted was oppressed in all other parts of the eastern empire, the great champion of orthodoxy was allowed to spend his last years in undisturbed possession of his see.

The elder actors in the Arian controversy were now passing away. Liberius died in 366, and the succession to the see of Rome was disputed between Damasus and Ursinus, or Ursicinus. This contest, which arose out of the old rivalry between Liberius and Felix, and did not involve any question of doctrine, occasioned violent tumults, and even great slaughter. On one occasion a hundred and sixty partisans of Ursinus, men and women, were killed in the church which bore the name of Liberius (now St. Mary Major). At the end of three years Ursinus was banished to Gaul; but he repeatedly revived his claim to the bishopric of Rome,

both during the lifetime of Damasus and at his death. Acacius died in 366; Hilary, in 367 or 368. The last mention of Ursacius and Valens as living is in the condemnation pronounced on them by synods at Rome and elsewhere about 369. Eudoxius of Constantinople died in 370 ; Lucifer of Cagliari, in 371; Euzoius of Antioch, in 376.

On the death of Eudoxius, Evagrius was set up as his successor by the Catholics of Constantinople, and Demophilus by the Arians; but Evagrius was soon driven out, and his adherents were subjected to a variety of outrages. A complaint of this usage was presented to Valens at Nicomedia by eighty presbyters of the orthodox party; but, instead of obtaining redress, they were compelled to embark on board a ship, which the crew (it is said, by command of one of the emperor's officers) set on fire and deserted; and the whole company of ecclesiastics perished. Other barbarities are related of Valens—as that at Antioch he ordered many of the orthodox to be drowned in the Orontes. The monks of Egypt and Pontus were especially obnoxious to him—partly because the monastic profession afforded to many an excuse for indolence, and withdrew them from their duties to the state, and partly on account of their steady adherence to the Nicene faith and the exertion of their powerful influence in its behalf. The emperor in 373 ordered that monks should be dragged from their retreats, and should be compelled to perform their service as citizens, under the penalty of being beaten to death. The Egyptian deserts were invaded by soldiers commissioned to enforce the edict, and many of the monks suffered death in consequence.

Athanasius is supposed by the best authorities to have died in May, 373. He had designated as his successor one of his presbyters named Peter. The Arian Lucius, who had been set up as bishop after the murder of George, and had held possession of the see during the exile of Athanasius under Julian, was now brought back by his party, and Peter was driven out with circumstances of outrage and profanation similar to those which accompanied the expulsion of his great predecessor by Gregory and George. Peter took refuge at Rome, and after a time returned with letters of recommendation from the bishop, Damasus; whereupon, as Valens was then at a distance—having been diverted from theological controversies by the Gothic war—the people rose against Lucius and reinstated the orthodox bishop.

Valentinian was succeeded in 375 by his son Gratian, who had already for eight years held the dignity of Augustus. The new emperor, whose own age was only sixteen, admitted as a nominal colleague his half-brother, the younger Valentinian, a child four years old. By the death of Valens, at the disastrous battle of Adrianople, Aug. 9, Gratian became in 378 master of the whole empire; but he hastened to relieve himself of a part of his cares by bestowing the sovereignty of the east on Theodosius, son of a general of the general of the same name, whose distinguished services in Britain and in Africa had been requited by his execution at Carthage three years before. The younger Theodosius had since lived in retirement on his estates in Spain, until he was summoned to share the empire, in the hope that his abilities might avert the dangers with which it was threatened by the Gothic invaders.

Gratian, on succeeding to the dominions of Valens, proclaimed liberty of religion to all except Manichaeans, Eunomians, and Photinians, and recalled the banished bishops of the east. The Semiarians, on being thus freed from the oppression of Valens, broke off the connection which they had so eagerly formed with the orthodox; but many refused to join in this movement, and remained united to the catholic body.

It would seem to have been about this time that a denial of the Divinity of the Holy Ghost became the chief characteristic of the party. Heterodox opinions on that subject had been implied in all the varieties of Arianism; but as the nature of the Third Person in the Trinity had not been brought into discussion while the Godhead of the Son was in question, nothing had been defined respecting it in the Nicene creed. Athanasius, however, with his characteristic perception of consequences, had always strenuously asserted the equal and co-essential Godhead of the Spirit, as well as that of the Son, and, in a treatise written from the desert during his exile under Constantius, had confuted the error of the *Pneumatomachi* (or

adversaries of the Spirit), which was then acquiring distinctness. Although the name of *Macedonianism*, which was afterwards attached to this heresy, would naturally convey the idea that it was invented by Macedonius, it was really nothing more than a remnant of Arianism retained by a party which had shaken off the other errors of that system; for the Semiarians now acknowledged the Godhead of the Son, while they maintained that the Spirit was as a servant—as one of the angels. Nor do we even know what opinion Macedonius himself held on the question; for it was not until some years after his death that his name was connected with the heretical tenet, through the circumstance that the Semiarians happened to be called after him at the time when this tenet became the prominent mark of their party.

In the meanwhile the Nicene faith had made progress. The consistency of its supporters stood in advantageous contrast with the continual variations of their opponents. The monks lent to it the great and growing authority of their reputation for sanctity; and, as has been mentioned, a large portion of the Semiarians adhered to the orthodox connection into which they had been driven by the tyranny of Valens. Throughout all the long controversy the belief of the great mass of Christians had been very little affected. In their pastoral teaching, as in their creeds, the Arian bishops and clergy had usually studied to observe orthodoxy of statement and language, so that their doctrine, although incomplete, was not untrue. Thus their flocks received the words in the sound meaning which was apparent on the surface, so that, according to a celebrated expression of St. Hilary, “The ears of the people were holier than the hearts of the priests”. And now, although Athanasius was gone, the great weight of ability and learning among the Christians was on the side of orthodoxy, which had lately gained a very important accession in the east. A class of theologians had arisen, who, born and educated in countries where Semiarianism prevailed, had in their earlier years been connected with that system—trained up according to its sound though imperfect creeds, in such a manner that one of them, when he had become an eminent champion of the Nicene doctrine, could yet speak of his opinions as having undergone no other change than a development like that of the plant from the seed. The members of this school maintained the identity of *homoousion* with *homoiousion* they brought with them into the orthodox communion many of their old associations; and through their influence it was that several Semiarians came to be acknowledged by the church as saints, and that the canons of the Semiarian councils of Antioch (A.D. 341) and Laodicea (A.D. 372?) gained a reception in the east, which was eventually extended to the west. The most distinguished of the “later Nicene” teachers were three Cappadocians—Basil, his brother Gregory of Nyssa, and his friend Gregory of Nazianzus or Nazianzum. Of these eminent men the first and the last must be here more particularly noticed.

Basil and the Nazianzen Gregory were born about the same time—probably in the year 329. Basil was of a noble Christian family. The father of Gregory had belonged to a sect known by the name of hypsistarians, whose creed was a strange medley of Jewish and Persian notions he had been converted by his wife Nonna, a woman of remarkable piety, and had been appointed to the bishopric of Nazianzum, a poor diocese, which had fallen into great disorder in consequence of long vacancy and neglect. An acquaintance formed between the youths at the schools of Caesarea, in their native province, ripened into the closest intimacy at Athens, where they spent several years. They were distinguished in all the studies of that city, and withstood the influences by which many who, like themselves had been trained in the Christian faith, were there drawn away to heathenism. During a part of the time Julian was their fellow-student; and Gregory professes to have already observed in the future emperor indications of the evil which was manifested in his later career. Both Basil and Gregory resolved to renounce the hopes of secular eminence, and to embrace a religious life. Each was baptized after leaving Athens, and Gregory promised at the font to devote all his gifts and powers to the service of God. Basil, after having travelled in Egypt and elsewhere, returned to his native country, and became one of the clergy of Caesarea. He withdrew for five years into

the desert of Pontus, where he founded monastic establishments, monachism having been lately introduced into that country by Eustathius, bishop of Sebaste. The system which Basil adopted was the caenobitic (or that of living in communities) as being in his judgment more conducive to the exercise of graces than the solitary life, which in Egypt had been regarded as the higher of the two. "God," he said, "has made us—even like the bodily members—to need one another's help. For what discipline of humility, of pity, or of patience can there be, if there be no one towards whom these virtues can be practised? Whose feet wilt thou wash, whom wilt thou serve, how canst thou be the last of all—if thou art alone?". In his rule practical industry was combined with religious exercises, and by the labours of his monks a barren tract was brought into cultivation and fertility. Basil returned to Caesarea in 362, and was ordained presbyter; but after a short time he again retired into the desert for three years, in consequence of some unexplained jealousy on the part of his bishop, Eusebius. In each of his retreats he was accompanied for a time by Gregory, who, however, was on both occasions called away by disagreements between his father and the monks of Nazianzum, originating in the circumstance that the aged bishop had been induced to sign the creed of Rimini. Gregory by his ascetic life had gained a powerful influence over the monks; he convinced them that his father had been deceived through ignorance of controversial subtleties, and had acted without any heretical intention; and he twice succeeded in establishing peace. He also reconciled Basil with Eusebius; and on that bishop's death he effected the promotion of his friend to the see of Caesarea, to which was attached the primacy of the greater part of Asia Minor.

The indefatigable labours of Basil, his controversies, his endeavours to unite the orthodox among themselves, to gain over sectaries to the church, and to establish peace between the east and the west, must be passed over with a mere allusion. During the short time between his elevation and the death of Athanasius he enjoyed the confidence of that great prelate; and he succeeded the Alexandrian bishop as leader of the eastern orthodox. Like Athanasius, he was able to preserve his church from the Arianism which was triumphant throughout the east during the reign of Valens. While a presbyter under Eusebius, he had baffled the theologians of the emperor's train in disputation; but soon after his advancement to the episcopate a fresh attempt was made on him. Valens, determined that Caesarea alone should not continue to resist him, sent Modestus, prefect of Cappadocia, with a commission to expel Basil if he should refuse to conform to the dominant religion, and Modestus summoned the archbishop to appear before him. To his threats Basil replied that he did not fear them; confiscation, he said, could not touch a man who had no property except a single suit of ragged clothes and a few books; as for banishment, he denied that such a thing was possible—go where he might, he could find a home, or rather he regarded the whole earth as God's, and himself as a stranger everywhere; his feeble body could bear no tortures beyond the first stroke; and death would be a favour, since it would conduct him to God. The prefect, who had opened the conference in a very peremptory tone, was subdued by the archbishop's firmness, and reported the result to his master, who soon after arrived at Caesarea. Valens himself was awed by the presence of Basil and the solemnity of the catholic worship, which he witnessed on the feast of the Epiphany, but without being admitted to communicate. The impression thus made is said to have been heightened by miracles; and not only was Basil left unmolested in his see, but the emperor bestowed a valuable estate on a large hospital which the archbishop's charity had founded.

Soon after this Valens divided Cappadocia into two provinces; whereupon Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, which became the capital of the second division, asserted that the ecclesiastical government ought to follow the arrangements of the civil, and claimed for himself the rights of a metropolitan. Finding that the claim revived some jealousies which had been felt at his election to Caesarea, Basil resolved to strengthen himself by erecting new bishoprics; and one of the places chosen for this purpose was Sasima, an outpost on the border of his opponent's province—the meeting-place of three great roads, a posting station and the

seat of a frontier custom-house; a wretched little town, dry, dusty, and continually disquieted by the brawls of waggoners, travellers, and revenue officers. Here Basil, with that disregard for the character and feelings of others which is not uncommon in persons of a strongly practical nature, determined to place Gregory, who had some years before been forcibly ordained¹ a presbyter by his own father. Gregory made no secret of his repugnance to the execution of this scheme; he said that the archbishop's elevation had caused him to forget what was due to their ancient and equal friendship; he resisted until he was overpowered by the united urgency of his father and Basil; and he afterwards traced all the troubles of his later life to the consent which was at length extorted from him. After his consecration he felt himself oppressed by his high views of the episcopal responsibility, by his love for a life of contemplation, and by the sense of his unfitness to dispute his position with Anthimus. He refused to proceed to Sasima, and was then persuaded by his father to assist him in the care of Nazianzum. After the old man's death, which took place in 374, Gregory continued for some time to administer the diocese, while he endeavoured to obtain the appointment of a regular bishop; but, finding his exertions for this purpose vain, he withdrew to Seleucia, where he spent three or four years in retirement.

Theodosius, as a Spaniard, belonged to the Nicene party, but at the time of his elevation to the empire was only a catechumen. In the beginning of 380 he fell dangerously sick at Thessalonica; when he sent for the bishop of the place, and, after having ascertained his orthodoxy, received baptism at his hands. His admission to the church was followed by an edict, which was at first limited to Constantinople, but in the following year was extended to all his dominions—that those only should be acknowledged as catholic Christians who adhered to the faith of the co-essential Trinity, as it had been taught by St. Peter to the Romans, and was then held by Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria; that all who denied this doctrine should be reputed as heretics and discouraged. Gratian also—at the instigation (it is supposed) of Ambrose, bishop of Milan—limited by later edicts the toleration which he had announced in 378.

In November 380, Theodosius arrived at Constantinople. About two years before, when the death of Valens appeared to open a new prospect to the orthodox, Gregory of Nazianzum had been induced by Basil and other leaders of the party to undertake a mission to that capital. He entered on the enterprise with much distrust of his qualifications. Arianism was in great strength at Constantinople, where the see had for nearly forty years been filled by its partisans. The Novatianists had some churches; the Apollinarians were gaining a footing in the city; but the orthodox were very few, and even these were divided among themselves by sympathy with the opposite parties in the schism of Antioch. Gregory was obliged at first to officiate in the house of a relation—which, from the resurrection (*anastasis*) of the true faith, acquired the name of *Anastasia*, and was afterwards enlarged into a splendid church. At the outset he had to encounter much prejudice. His austere, simple, and recluse life appeared in unpopular contrast with the free and secular habits of the Arian clergy. His doctrine was regarded as polytheistic. He was repeatedly assaulted by the populace, and by the staff of the Arian establishment—monks, virgins, and beggars; he was stoned, he was carried before magistrates as a disturber of the peace, his church was invaded by night and profaned. But he persevered in his mission, and, although the object of it was controversial, he earnestly endeavoured to counteract in his hearers the prevailing habit of familiarly discussing the highest mysteries of religion—exhorting them “not to make a sport of the things of God, as if they were matters of the theatre or of the race-course”. By degrees, his eloquence, the practical and religious tone of his doctrinal teaching, and the influence of his mild and serious character, began to tell, so that the little Anastasia became unable to contain the crowds which resorted to it. The progress of this success had, indeed, been slightly interrupted by one Maximus, an Egyptian, who had formerly been a cynic philosopher. This man, after having insinuated himself into Gregory's confidence, was ordained bishop in a disorderly manner by some emissaries of

Peter of Alexandria, although Peter had before approved of Gregory's mission. But the pretender was rejected by the people, and in vain endeavoured to find support from the emperor and from the bishop of Rome.

On his arrival at Constantinople, Theodosius summoned before him the Arian bishop, Demophilus, and required him to subscribe the Nicene creed, on pain of deprivation. Demophilus assembled his flock, and reminded them of the Saviour's charge "when persecuted in one city to flee to another". The Arians were forthwith turned out of all the churches, and began to hold their meetings without the walls of the capital. A few days after this, Theodosius formally put Gregory into possession of the principal church of Constantinople. The morning was gloomy, Gregory was suffering from illness, and, as the procession passed through streets lined with troops, he was dismayed by the thought that a bishop should need such a protection against his own flock. But at the moment of his entrance into the choir, a sudden burst of sunshine lighted up the building, and the people, catching enthusiasm from the change, cried out that the emperor should place him on the episcopal throne. Gregory, however, declined to take his seat, and feeling himself, from agitation and bodily weakness, unable to address the congregation, he employed the voice of another to speak for him—"Now it is time to acknowledge the benefits which the blessed Trinity has bestowed on us; but of the throne we will consider hereafter". Such was the exasperation of the Arians that attempts were made to assassinate him.

Theodosius proceeded to assemble a council, which met at Constantinople on May 2, 381. It was composed of oriental bishops only; but its decrees were afterwards gradually received throughout the west, and it is consequently acknowledged as the second general council. A hundred and fifty orthodox prelates attended. Among them were Meletius, Gregory of Nyssa (whose brother Basil had died in the preceding year), and Cyril of Jerusalem, who had formerly been connected with the Semiarian party. The Macedonians had been invited, in the hope that they might renew the union which they had formed with the Catholics in the reign of Valens; but, although thirty-six of them appeared in answer to the summons, it was found that they would not submit to a reconciliation.

The earlier sessions were held under the presidency of Meletius, to whom the see of Antioch had lately been adjudged by an imperial commissary; and by him, after an examination of the pretensions of Maximus, Gregory was solemnly enthroned as bishop of Constantinople. But Meletius died while the council was sittings and deplorable dissensions followed. With a view to healing the schisms which had so long afflicted the church of Antioch, six of its clergy, who were regarded as the most likely to be raised to the episcopate, had lately entered into an engagement, which is said to have been even ratified by an oath, that on the death of either Paulinus or Meletius, they would acknowledge the survivor as rightful bishop; but a jealousy which had arisen between the Asiatic bishops and those of Egypt and the west now interfered with the execution of this arrangement. The Asiatics objected to Paulinus as having been ordained by a Latin, Lucifer, and as being connected with the Latin party; and, notwithstanding the earnest remonstrances of Gregory, now president of the council, whose natural inclination towards the Meletian party was overpowered by his desire of peace and by his sense of the impropriety of the proceeding—they consecrated Flavian, one of the six who are represented as having bound themselves to renounce their pretensions to the see.

Timothy, who had just succeeded his brother Peter at Alexandria, soon after arrived, with a train of bishops. The Egyptians were offended at not having been earlier summoned to the council, and were greatly exasperated by the late proceedings. They resolved once more to set up their countryman Maximus, and to depose Gregory, under the pretext that his appointment to Constantinople was in breach of a Nicene canon, which forbade the translation of bishops. The malice and unfairness of this objection were palpable; for the canon had often been disregarded in practice, and Gregory's acceptance of the see hardly came even within its

letter, inasmuch as he had neither acted in the diocese of Sasima, nor been appointed to that of Nazianzum; much less did it violate the intention of the canon, which was to check the ambition of bishops. But he was not disposed to contest the question. He was sick both in body and in spirit, and even before the opening of the council had attempted to withdraw from his stormy position of eminence to the quiet life of contemplation which he best loved; he had accepted the bishopric only in the hope that he might be able to mediate between the eastern party and that which was formed by the junction of the western with the Egyptian bishops. Both now turned against him—the Asiatics, because he had opposed them in the matter of Antioch; the bishops of Egypt and Macedonia, because, although opposed to the election of Flavian, he had presided over the council by whose members it was determined. Gregory entreated that no one would attempt to maintain his rights, and declared that he would gladly become a Jonah to appease the furious waves of party strife. His resignation was accepted—reluctantly by the emperor, but with an indecent eagerness by the majority of the bishop; and he took leave of the council in an eloquent and pathetic discourse—stating his orthodox faith, recounting his labours at Constantinople, and strongly denouncing the luxury and secularity, the jealousies and corruptions, which disgraced the church and her rulers. A list of persons qualified to succeed to the bishopric was drawn up, and from it the emperor selected Nectarius, a man of senatorial rank, who, being as yet only a catechumen, was forthwith baptized, and within a few days was consecrated—wearing the episcopal robes over the white dress of a neophyte. Gregory, after leaving Constantinople, again assumed the charge of Nazianzum, until he succeeded in obtaining the appointment of a regular bishop. He spent his last years in retirement, soothing himself with the composition of poetry, and died in 389 or 390.

The council of Constantinople, by additions to the article on the Holy Ghost (which were in substance taken from a work of Epiphanius, written some years before), brought the Nicene creed to its present form, except that the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son was not mentioned. Among its canons was one which assigned to the bishop of Constantinople a precedence next after the bishop of Rome—“forasmuch as it is a new Rome”. Of the heresies condemned by the council, the only one which has not been already noticed is the Apollinarian. The founder of this, Apollinarius or Apollinaris, was son of an Alexandrian rhetorician of the same name, who settled at Laodicea in Syria. Both father and son were distinguished as writers; they were the chief authors of the ingenious substitutes for the classics by which the Christians endeavoured to baffle Julian’s intention of excluding them from the cultivation of literature; and the younger Apollinarius especially had gained a high reputation by his controversial works against various forms of heresy. He was honoured with the friendship of St. Athanasius, and in 362 was appointed to the bishopric of Laodicea.

An opinion condemned by the Alexandrian council of 362 has been wrongly identified with the error of Apollinarius, which was not put forth until later. It was, however, current during the last years of Athanasius, who wrote in refutation of it, although—probably from considerations of old friendship, and of the services which Apollinarius had formerly rendered to the orthodox cause—he abstained from mentioning his name.

While the Arians altogether denied the existence of a human soul in Christ, and employed the texts which relate to his humanity as proofs of the imperfection of his higher nature, Apollinarius followed the Platonic school in dividing the nature of man into body, animal or vital soul and intellectual or rational soul (*nous*). From the variableness and sinfulness of man's rational soul he argued that, if the Saviour had had such a soul, he must together with it have had its freedom of will, and therefore a tendency to sin; consequently (he proceeded to say), that part of man's nature was not assumed by the Saviour, but the Divine Logos supplied its place, controlling the evil impulses of the animal soul, of which the body is the passive instrument. Some of the followers of Apollinarius, if not he himself, maintained that the flesh of Christ existed before his appearance in the world, and was not taken by him

of the substance of the blessed Virgin, but was brought down from heaven—a notion for which they professed to find authority in some texts of Scripture.

After the death of Athanasius, Apollinarius published his opinions more openly. He did not suppose himself to be opposed to the catholic faith, but rather to have discovered the true grounds on which it was to be maintained. Finding however that this view of the matter was not generally accepted, he formed a sect of his own, setting up bishops at Antioch and elsewhere; and, like Bardesanes and Arius, he procured currency for his doctrines by embodying them in hymns and popular songs. Notwithstanding the anathemas pronounced against Apollinarianism by many synods, and at last by the general council of Constantinople, its founder retained his bishopric until his death, which took place before the year 392. The sect appears to have run into further errors, but did not long survive him.

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE END OF THE SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL TO THE DEATH OF
THEODOSIUS—ST. AMBROSE.
A.D. 381-395.

I. It has been mentioned that the Arian Auxentius was allowed by Valentinian to retain the important see of Milan. On his death, in 374, the emperor was requested to nominate an archbishop, but, agreeably to his principle of avoiding interference in spiritual affairs, he referred the choice to the people. An eager contest ensued between the Catholics and the Arians. While both parties were assembled in the principal church, and it seemed likely that their excitement would break out into deeds of violence, the governor of Liguria, Ambrose, appeared, and made a speech exhorting them to peace. When he ceased, a little child, it is said, was heard to utter the words, "Ambrose, bishop!", and immediately the cry was caught up by the whole assemblage. The governor, who, although of Christian parentage, was as yet only a catechumen, wished to avoid an office so alien from his former thoughts and studies. He attempted by various devices to convince the Milanese that his character was unsuitable; he fled more than once from the city; but he was brought back, and, as Valentinian approved of the election, was consecrated within a week after his baptism.

Ambrose, the son of a praetorian prefect of Gaul, had been educated as an advocate, and at the time of his election to the archbishopric was thirty-four years of age. He forthwith set himself to make up by assiduous study for his previous neglect of theological learning. It would seem that, on his sudden elevation, he yielded himself without suspicion or reserve to the tendencies of that fashion of religion which he found prevailing; and from the combination of this with his naturally lofty and energetic character resulted a mixture of qualities which might almost seem incompatible,—of manliness, commanding dignity, and strong practical sense, with a fanciful mysticism and a zealous readiness to encourage and forward the growing superstitions of the age. "The Old and New Testament" it has been well said, "met in the person of Ambrose—the implacable hostility to idolatry, the abhorrence of every deviation from the established form of belief; the wise and courageous benevolence, the generous and unselfish devotion to the great interests of humanity".

After the death of Valentinian, Ambrose acquired a strong influence over the mind of Gratian, for whose especial instruction he wrote some treatises. But in Justina, the widow of the late emperor, and mother of the younger Valentinian (whose chief residence was at Milan), he found a bitter and persevering enemy. This princess was devoted to the Arian creed, and her first disagreement with Ambrose appears to have been in 379, when he defeated her in an attempt to procure the appointment of a heretical bishop to Sirmium. But notwithstanding this collision, when tidings reached Milan in 383 that Gratian had been murdered at Lyons by the partisans of the rebel Maximus, Justina placed her young son in the archbishop's arms, and entreated him to become his protector. Ambrose accepted the charge, proceeded to Treves, where Maximus had fixed his court, and obtained his consent to a

partition of the west—Maximus taking for himself Britain, Gaul, and Spain, while the other countries were left to Valentinian.

Two years later, however, a fresh contest with the empress-mother arose. Ambrose had succeeded in extinguishing Arianism among the citizens of Milan, so that its only adherents in the place were a portion of the court and some Gothic soldiers. To these the archbishop was required, on the approach of Easter, to give up, first, the Portian basilica, (a church without the walls), and afterwards the largest church within the city, which had just been erected on the site now occupied by that which bears his name. He was twice summoned before the council, who told him that he must yield to the imperial power. He replied that he was ready to part with anything that was his own—even his life ; but that he was not at liberty to surrender what was sacred : “Palaces” he said, “are for the emperor; churches are for God’s priests”. The populace of the city were greatly excited. They tore down the hangings which had been put up by way of preparing the churches for the reception of the emperor; they seized an Arian presbyter in the streets, and would probably have killed him, if Ambrose had not interposed to rescue him; they surrounded the palace while the archbishop was in attendance on the council. The imperial ministers in alarm entreated him to restrain his partisans; Ambrose answered that it was in his power to refrain from exciting them, but that it was in God’s hand only to appease them; that, if he were suspected of having instigated the tumult, he ought to be punished by banishment or otherwise. Even the soldiery showed a disposition to take part with the Catholics, and some of them, who had been sent to occupy the new church, declared that they were come, not to fight, but to join in the archbishop’s prayers. The empress at length yielded, and a heavy fine which had been laid on the traders of Milan as a punishment for the first demonstration in favour of Ambrose was remitted.

In the beginning of the following year an edict was issued, allowing entire freedom of religion to those who should profess the creed of Rimini, and denouncing death against all who should molest them. Soon after its publication Ambrose was required, under pain of deprivation, to argue his cause with the bishop of the Arian party, a Goth who had assumed the name of the former Arian bishop Auxentius, in the presence of the emperor and some lay judges; but he boldly refused, on the ground that matters of faith ought not to be submitted to such a tribunal. When Easter was again at hand, a fresh demand was made for the church within the walls. With an allusion to the story of Naboth, Ambrose replied that he would not give up the inheritance of his fathers, the holy and orthodox bishops who had filled the see before him. On being ordered to leave the city, he refused to yield except to force, and his flock, in fear lest he should either withdraw or be carried off, anxiously guarded him—passing several nights in the church and the adjoining buildings, while the outlets were watched by the imperial soldiers. During these vigils Ambrose introduced, for the first time in the west, a mode of singing which had lately originated in somewhat similar circumstances at Antioch—that, instead of leaving the psalmody to the choristers, the whole congregation should divide itself into two choirs, by which the chant was to be taken up alternately.

The matter was still undecided, when Ambrose, on proceeding to complete the consecration of the church which had been the object of so much contention, was requested by his people to use the same ceremonies as on a certain former occasion. He answered that he would do so if relics of saints should be found, and gave orders to dig up the pavement near the altar-rails in the church of St. Felix and St. Nabor; when two skeletons were discovered, of extraordinary size, “such as the olden time produced”, with the heads separated from the bodies, and with a large quantity of fresh blood. These relics, after having been exposed for two days, were deposited in the new church. Demoniacs who were brought near to them showed signs of great disturbance; some of the possessed declared that the bones were those of martyrs, and proclaimed their names, Gervasius and Protasius—names which had been utterly forgotten, but which old men were at length able to remember that they had heard in former days; in other cases the demons cried out that all who refused to confess the true

doctrine of the Trinity, as it was taught by Ambrose, would be tormented even as they themselves then were. Other miracles are related as having been brought by the touch of the cloth which covered the relics, and even by their shadow as they were carried along. The most noted was, that a butcher, well known in Milan, who had lost his sight, recovered it on touching the hem of the pall, and, as a witness to the cure, he became for the rest of his days sacristan of the church in which they were preserved. The general excitement was now such, that, although the Arians questioned and ridiculed the miracles, Justina no longer ventured to press her claims against the bishop, who was supposed to have been distinguished by a Divine interposition in his behalf.

An apprehension of renewed danger from Maximus may perhaps have contributed to this result. In following year (387) Ambrose was again sent to the court of Treves, with a commission to treat for the delivery of Gratian's body. He asserted in a remarkable manner the dignity of the episcopal character, but returned without effecting his object and soon after Maximus, in violation of his engagements, invaded the territories of Valentinian. The young emperor and his mother fled for protection to Theodosius, who in the summer of 388 marched westwards, defeated the usurper, who was given up by his own adherents, and was put to death; and for a time the victor fixed his residence at Milan.

The power which Ambrose had exerted over the younger princes was no less felt by "the Great" Theodosius. Soon after his arrival at Milan the emperor was about to seat himself within that part of the cathedral which was appropriated to the clergy, when the archbishop desired him to withdraw to a position at the head of the laity. Theodosius expressed thanks for the admonition, excused himself on the ground that at Constantinople the imperial seat was within the railings of the choir, and on his return to the east, astonished the more courtly clergy of his capital by introducing the practice of Milan.

The zeal of Theodosius for unity of faith and worship among his subjects was encouraged and directed by Ambrose, who assumed a right of moral control over the emperor's proceedings. On one occasion, at least, this influence appears to have been pushed beyond the bounds of equity. The Christians of Callinicum, in Mesopotamia, had destroyed a Jewish synagogue, and, in revenge for an insult offered to some monks, as they were on their way to keep a festival, had also burnt a Valentinian place of worship. Theodosius ordered that the bishop of the town, who had encouraged these proceedings, should restore the buildings, or pay the price of them. On hearing of the order, Ambrose wrote to the emperor by way of remonstrance, and, as his letter had no effect, he followed it up by a personal appeal in a sermon, maintaining that it was inconsistent with the duty of a Christian prince to sanction the employment of Christian funds for such purposes. Theodosius yielded, and recalled his sentence. We may be inclined to wonder that Ambrose, if he failed to see the injustice of the position which he advanced, and its inconsistency with any sound principles of civil government, was yet not led to suspect its truth by the consideration that it would have warranted the oppression of a Christian minority by heathens, or of an orthodox minority by heretics. But so far was he from feeling any misgiving on this account, that he even ventured to cite the destruction of churches under Julian, and the recent burning of the episcopal house at Constantinople by the Arians, as if these acts were sufficient precedents for a justification of the Mesopotamian outrages.

An interposition of a more creditable nature followed. The most prominent defect in the noble and amiable character of Theodosius was a proneness to violent anger. That he could be merciful after great provocation was remarkably shown in his forgiveness of the people of Antioch, who in 387 rose in sedition on account of a tax, burnt some houses, and threw down the statues of the emperor, of his deceased wife, to whom he had been tenderly attached, and of other members of his family. But in 390 his passion became the occasion of a fearful tragedy at Thessalonica. The populace of that city, on the occasion of a chariot-race, demanded the release of a favourite charioteer, whom Botheric, commander-in-chief of the

district, had imprisoned for attempting an abominable crime; and on Botheric's refusal, they broke out into tumult, and murdered him with many of his soldiery and others. The emperor, although greatly exasperated by the report of the insurrection, promised, at the intercession of Ambrose, to pardon the Thessalonians; but his secular advisers, who regarded with great jealousy the influence of the bishop over his mind, were afterwards able, by insisting on the heinous character of the offence, to procure from him an order which was carefully kept secret from Ambrose. The people of Thessalonica were invited to a performance of games in the circus, and, while there assembled, were attacked by an overwhelming force of soldiers. Neither age nor sex was regarded; no distinction was made between guilty and innocent, citizen and stranger. For three hours an indiscriminate butchery was carried on, and at least seven thousand victims perished.

The report of this massacre affected Ambrose with the deepest horror. Theodosius was then absent from Milan, and before his return the archbishop retired into the country, whence he wrote a letter, exhorting him to repent, and declaring that, until due penance should be performed, he had been forbidden by God to offer the Eucharistic sacrifice in the emperor's presence. The letter had its effect in convincing Theodosius of the guilt which he had incurred by allowing treacherous barbarity to take the place of justice. But this was not enough for Ambrose. As Theodosius was about to enter the Portian church, the archbishop met him in the porch; laying hold of his robe, he desired him to withdraw, as a man polluted with innocent blood; and when the emperor spoke of his contrition, Ambrose told him that private regrets were insufficient to expiate so grievous a wrong. Theodosius submitted and retired. For eight months he remained in penitential seclusion, laying aside all his imperial ornaments, until at the Christmas season he presented himself before the archbishop, and humbly entreated readmission into the church. Ambrose required, as a condition of his granting this, that some practical fruit of repentance should be shown; and the emperor consented to issue a law by which, in order to guard against the effects of sudden anger, the execution of all capital punishments was to be deferred until thirty days after the sentence. Having thus gained the privilege of readmission into the communion of the faithful, Theodosius, on being allowed to enter the church, prostrated himself on the pavement with every demonstration of the deepest grief and humiliation; and Ambrose, in his funeral oration over the emperor, assures us that from that time he never passed a day without recalling to mind the crime into which he had been betrayed by his passion.

The behaviour of Theodosius in this remarkable affair was evidently not the result of weakness or pusillanimity, but of a real feeling of his guilt—a sincere acknowledgment of a higher Power to which all worldly greatness is subject. In order to judge rightly of Ambrose's conduct, we must dismiss from our minds some recollections of later times, which may be very likely to intrude themselves. The archbishop appears to have been actuated by no other motive than a solemn sense of his duty. He felt the dignity with which his office invested him; he held himself bound, by interposing it in behalf of justice and humanity, to control the excesses of earthly power. His sternness towards the emperor has nothing in common with the assumptions of those who, in after ages, used the names of God and his church to cover their own pride and love of domination.

In the autumn of 391 Theodosius returned to the east, leaving Valentinian in possession, not only of his original dominions, but of those which had been ceded to Maximus after the murder of Gratian. Justina had died in 388, and from that time the young emperor was entirely under the guidance of Ambrose. In 392 he wrote from Vienne, urgently desiring the archbishop to visit him—partly in order to establish a better relation with the Frankish general Arbogast, who had been placed with him by Theodosius as a protector, but had begun to show symptoms of a dangerous ambition; and partly to administer the sacrament of baptism, which Valentinian, according to the custom of the time, had hitherto delayed to receive. Ambrose set out in obedience to the summons; but before his arrival, Valentinian had been murdered by the

Frank. Once more Theodosius moved into the west, to put down the rhetorician Eugenius, whom Arbogast had raised to a nominal sovereignty. But within four months after his victory he died at Milan—the last emperor who fully maintained the dignity of the Roman name. Ambrose survived him a little more than two years, and died on Easter eve, 397.

Although paganism lost the ascendancy which it had possessed during the brief reign of Julian, it yet for a time enjoyed full toleration. While barbarians threatened the empire, its rulers felt the inexpediency of irritating that large portion of their subjects which adhered to the old religion. Valentinian and his brother, indeed, carried on a searching inquiry after the practice of magical arts, and punished those concerned in it severely—in many cases with death. But the edicts on this subject were only renewals of earlier laws; and the motive of them was not religious but political, inasmuch as the practices of divination and theurgy were connected with speculations and intrigues as to matters of state. These practices were carried on, not by the ignorant vulgar alone, but by members of the old Roman aristocracy, and by the high philosophic party which had been powerful under Julian; and many persons both of the aristocratic and of the philosophical classes were among the victims of Valentinian's laws. The consultation of the aruspices for innocent purposes was, however, still allowed. Guards of soldiers were allowed to protect the temples, although Christians were exempt from this service. Valentinian even endowed the priesthood with privileges exceeding those which they had received from his heathen predecessors, and in some respects greater than those which the Christians enjoyed; and the orthodox subjects of Valens complained that, while they themselves were subjected to banishment and disabilities on account of their faith, the heathens were freely allowed to practise all the rites of their idolatry—even the impure and frantic worship of Bacchus. In 364 Valentinian forbade nocturnal sacrifices; but on receiving a representation that the Greeks would consider life intolerable if they were deprived of their mysteries, he exempted these from the operation of his law. At a later period, Valentinian and Valens were induced by political causes to prohibit all animal sacrifices; yet the other rites of heathen worship were still permitted, and at Rome and Alexandria, where paganism was strong, the edict was not enforced.

Under Theodosius and the contemporary emperors of the west there was a more decided movement for the suppression of paganism. In 381, and again in 385, Theodosius renewed the laws against sacrifices. In 386 he sent Cynegius, the prefect of the east, into Egypt, with a commission to shut up the temples. But while the law spared the buildings themselves, the zeal of Christians very often exceeded it. So long as the temples were standing, they alarmed one party with the apprehension, and flattered the other with the hope, that a second Julian might arise. In order to remove the occasion of such feelings, many temples were destroyed, and in some cases it was alleged by way of pretext (whether truly or otherwise) that sacrifice had been illegally offered in them. The work of demolition was chiefly incited or executed by monks; in countries where these did not abound—such as Greece—the splendid monuments of heathen architecture were allowed to remain, whether disused, employed as churches, or converted to secular purposes. The celebrated sophist Libanius composed a plea for the temples, which has the form of a speech addressed to the emperor, although it was probably neither delivered before him, nor even presented to him in writing. The orator complains of black-garbed men, more voracious than elephants, and insatiably thirsty, although veiling their sensuality under an artificial paleness; that, although the law forbade no part of paganism except bloody sacrifices, these monks went about committing acts of outrage and plunder; that they treated the priests with violence; that they even seized lands under the pretence that they had been connected with illegal rites; and that, if appeal were made to the shepherds in the cities (*i.e.* the bishops), the complainants, instead of obtaining any redress, were told that they had been only too gently treated. He traces all the calamities of the time to the change of religion. He appeals to the New Testament precepts in proof that the forcible measures of the Christians were contrary to the spirit which their own faith inculcated. He endeavours to alarm

the superstition of his readers, by saying that the service of the ancient deities was still kept up in Egypt, because the Christians themselves feared to risk the fertility of the country by suppressing it.

In no long time this last assertion was put to the test. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, a violent man, whose name will be often mentioned hereafter, obtained from the emperor a grant of a temple of Bacchus, and intended to build a church on the site of it. In the course of digging for the foundation of the new building, some indecent symbols used in the worship of Bacchus were found, and these were publicly paraded in mockery of the religion to which they belonged. The pagans, exasperated by this insult to their faith, rose in insurrection, killed a number of Christians, and shut themselves up in the temple of Serapis, which with its precincts formed a vast pile of building, towering over the city, and was regarded as one of the wonders of the world. They made sallies from time to time, slew some Christians, and carried off many prisoners, whom they either compelled to sacrifice, or, in case of refusal, subjected to cruel tortures; some of the prisoners were even put to death by crucifixion. On receiving a report of the matter from the governor of Alexandria, the emperor answered that, as the Christians who had been slain were martyrs, those who had been concerned in their death were not to be punished, but rather, if possible, were to be attracted to the true faith by clemency; but he ordered that the temples of Alexandria should be destroyed. The Serapeum was deserted by its defenders, who had been induced by the governor to attend the public reading of the imperial rescript, and on hearing the sentence against the temples had fled in consternation. The idol of Serapis, the tutelary deity of the city, was of enormous size, and was adorned with jewels and with plates of gold and silver. There was a popular belief that, if it were injured, heaven and earth would go to wreck; and even Christians looked on with anxiety when a soldier, mounting a ladder, raised his axe against the figure. But when it was seen that with impunity he first struck off a cheek, and then cleft one of the knees, the spell was at an end. The head of the god was thrown down, and a swarm of rats rushed forth from it, exciting the disgust and derision of the crowd. The idol was soon broken into pieces, which were dragged into the amphitheatre and burnt. On examining the temple, a discovery was made of infamies by which it had been polluted, and of tricks by which the priests had imposed on the credulity of the worshippers and in consequence of this exposure many persons were converted to the church. The pagan party, however, began to exult when it was found that the rising of the Nile was that year delayed beyond its usual time. The emperor was consulted: "Better", he answered, "that it should not rise at all, than we should buy the fertility of Egypt by idolatry". At length the river swelled to a more than ordinary height, and the pagans began to hope that Serapis would avenge himself by an inundation; but they soon had the mortification of seeing the waters subside to their proper level. The temple of the god was demolished, and a church was built on its site, while the other buildings of the Serapeum were preserved. In obedience to the emperor's command, the temples were destroyed at Alexandria and throughout Egypt. The statues were burnt or melted down, with the exception of one, which, we are told, Theophilus preserved as an evidence against paganism, lest the adherents of that system should afterwards deny that they had worshipped objects so contemptible.

The old religion was more powerful in the west than in the east. Most of the high Roman families clung to it—not, apparently, from any real conviction of its truth, but from a feeling of pride in maintaining the traditions of their ancestors, and from unwillingness to undertake the labour of inquiry. A profession of paganism was no bar to the attainment of high offices in the state; and with these the Roman nobles, like their forefathers, ambitiously sought to combine the dignities of the pagan hierarchy. In the capital a vast number of temples and of smaller religious edifices was still devoted to the ancient worship; while in the rural districts of Italy the system was maintained by the connection of its deities with every incident in the round of agricultural labour. Bishops are found reproaching the Christian landowners with the

indifference which, disregarding everything but money, allowed the population of their estates to continue in the undisturbed practice of idolatry. Throughout the western provinces generally, the old barbarian religions prevailed in some places; the worship of the Roman gods in others. From the fact that the foundation of many bishoprics in the west is traced to the period between the years 350 and 380, it has been inferred that an organized attack on paganism was then first attempted in those regions.

Gratian, in his earlier years, maintained the principle of religious equality; but the influence of St. Ambrose afterwards produced an important change in his policy, so that this young emperor inflicted heavier blows on paganism than any which his predecessors had ventured to attempt. There was in the senate-house at Rome an altar of Victory, erected after the battle of Actium, at which the senators took the oath of fidelity to the emperor and the laws, and on which libations and incense were offered at the beginning of every meeting. The removal of this altar was the only considerable act by which Constantius had interfered with the religion of the capital; but it was restored by Julian, and continued to hold its place until in 382 Gratian ordered that it should be again removed. A body of senators, headed by Symmachus, the most eloquent orator of his time—a man of eminent personal character, and distinguished by the highest civil and religious offices,—proceeded to Milan for the purpose of requesting that the altar might be replaced. But the Christian party in the senate had already prepossessed the emperor's mind by means of Damasus and Ambrose; and he refused to see the envoys. At the same time he deprived the temples of their lands, withdrew from them all public funds, rendered it illegal to bequeath real property to them, and stripped the vestals and heathen priests of the religious and civil privileges which they had enjoyed. Then perhaps it may have been, and with the hope of effectually appealing to his feelings, that a deputation of the priesthood displayed before him the robe of the Pontifex Maximus—a dignity which had been held by all his predecessors, as well since as before the conversion of Constantine. But Gratian rejected it as unbecoming a Christian.

In 384 a fresh attempt was made on the young Valentinian. Symmachus again appeared at Milan as the chief of a deputation, and delivered to the emperor an eloquent written pleading on behalf of the altar of Victory and of the old religion. He drew a distinction between the emperor's personal conviction and the duty of his position as ruler of a state which for centuries had worshipped the gods of paganism. He dwelt on the omens connected with the name of Victory, and traced the famines, wars, and other calamities of recent years to the anger of the gods on account of the withholding of their dues. He urged that it was an unworthy act to withdraw the funds by which the pagan worship had been maintained. He personified Rome addressing the emperor as a mother, reminding him of her ancient glories, and professing herself unable to learn any other religion than that by which she had acquired her greatness.

Ambrose, who, on hearing of the application of the pagan party, had written to the emperor, earnestly exhorting him to refuse it, followed up his letter by a formal and elaborate reply to Symmachus. He argued that it was unlawful for a Christian sovereign to countenance a system which he must believe to be hateful to God. It would, he said, be a wrong to the Christian senators if they were compelled to take a part in the sacrifices to Victory; and they must be considered as sharing in the acts of the senate, whether they were personally present at its meetings or not. He met the plea as to the misfortunes of the empire by referring to those of princes who had professed idolatry. The ancient glories of Rome (he said) could not have been derived from the worship of the gods; for her conquered enemies had been of the same religion. Her hoary age would become not less venerable, but more so, by her embracing the truth of the gospel. Christianity had grown under oppression, whereas paganism, according to the statement of its own advocates, depended for its very life on the endowments and emoluments of the priesthood. Heathenism found a difficulty in keeping up the number of its seven vestals, notwithstanding the high privileges attached to the order, whereas multitudes of

Christian women had voluntarily chosen a virgin life of poverty and mortification. And what deeds of charity had heathenism to produce against the maintenance of the needy, the redemption of captives, and other such things which were the daily work of Christians?

In reading these rival pleadings, we cannot but be struck by the remarkable contrast in tone between the apologetic diffidence of Symmachus and the triumphant assurance of Ambrose, who in his previous letter had gone so far as to tell the emperor that, if he made the required concession to idolatry, the church would reject him and his offerings. The cause of paganism is rested, not on the truth of doctrine, but on an appeal to historical and patriotic associations. It is evident that, apart from all consideration of the value of their respective arguments, the Christian champion has already in reality gained his cause, and that the petition of Symmachus must be—as it proved to be—unsuccessful.

The pagan party next applied to Theodosius, when in Italy after the death of Maximus. The emperor was at first inclined to yield, but Ambrose swayed him as he had swayed the younger princes. Once more a pagan deputation was sent to Valentinian in Gaul, when he was at a distance both from his colleague and from the archbishop; but this attempt was also a failure.

In 392, an important law was issued by Theodosius for the whole empire. With an elaborate specification it includes all persons of every rank and in every place. Sacrifice and divination, even although performed without any political object, are to be regarded as treasonable, and to be capitally punished. The use of lights, incense, garlands, or libations, and other such lesser acts of idolatry, are to involve the forfeiture of the houses or lands where they are committed. Heavy fines, graduated according to the position of the offenders, are denounced against those who should enter temples; if magistrates should offend in this respect, and their officers do not attempt to prevent them, the officers are also to be fined.

It is probable that the severity of this enactment may have contributed to swell the party of Eugenius, whom the pagans hailed as a deliverer. Whether he himself apostatized is uncertain; but his master, Arbogast, was avowedly a pagan, and during the short period of the rhetorician-emperor's power, the altar of Victory was replaced, the rites of the old religion were revived in all their completeness, and the confiscated property of the temples was restored. It has been said that Theodosius, on visiting Rome after the defeat of Eugenius, referred the choice between Christianity and paganism to the vote of the senate, and that the gospel was adopted by a majority; but the story is exceedingly improbable, and is perhaps no more than an exaggeration founded on some discussion which took place at Milan between the emperor and a deputation of the senate.

To speak of the age of Theodosius as having witnessed the “ruin” and the “total extinction” of paganism is much beyond the truth. The adherents of the old religion, although debarred from the exercise of its rites, were still allowed to enjoy perfect freedom of thought, and the dignities of the state were open to them. The execution of the laws against it was very partial; as they were exceeded where the Christian party was strong, so where that party was weak they were not enforced, and in some cases the very magistrates to whom they were addressed were pagans. At Rome, the emperor himself was complimented, like his predecessors, by being enrolled among the gods at his death. The statues of the gods were not destroyed; that of Victory was still allowed to remain in the senate-house, although the altar which had been the subject of contention was removed. But yet the old system was evidently doomed. Its remaining strength was not in belief but in habit. The withdrawal of public funds told on it to a degree which would have been impossible if there had been any principle of life in it. The priests, when attacked, succumbed in a manner which indicated an utter want of faith and zeal. Although paganism was common among men of letters, no one of these attempted theological controversy; their efforts in behalf of their religion did not reach beyond pleadings for toleration. St. Jerome speaks of the temples at Rome about this time as left to neglect, disorder, and decay.

Among those of his subjects who professed Christianity, Theodosius was resolved to establish unity of religion. Immediately after the conclusion of the general council of Constantinople, he ordered that all churches should be given up to the Catholics, that no meetings of heretics should be held, and that no buildings should be erected for such meetings. In 383 he summoned a conference of bishops of all parties, with the hope of bringing them to an agreement, but the difference of creeds was found irreconcilable, and in the same year the emperor issued fresh edicts against the Arians. During the remaining years of the reign, frequent laws were directed against heresy—a term which was now no longer restricted to the denial of the leading doctrines of the faith, but was applied also to lesser errors of doctrine and to separation from the communion of the church. The especial objects of the emperor's animosity were Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians, Apollinarians, and Manichaeans. By various enactments, he deprived these sectaries of all right to assemble for worship either in cities or in the country; he confiscated all places in which they should hold meetings; he rendered them incapable of inheriting or bequeathing property, and inflicted other civil disabilities; he forbade them to dispute on religion; he condemned those who should either confer or receive sectarian ordination to pay a penalty of ten pounds weight of gold. Against some classes of heretics he denounced confiscation and banishment; the “elect” of the Manichaeans were even sentenced to death.

Repulsive as such legislation is to the feelings of those who have learnt to acknowledge the impossibility of enforcing religious belief, the effect in a great measure answered the emperor's expectations. Neither heathenism nor sectarianism had much inward strength to withstand the pressure of the laws which required conformity to the church. Crowds of proselytes flocked in, and, amidst the satisfaction of receiving these accessions, it was little asked whether in very many cases the apparent conversion were anything better than a mask for hypocrisy or indifference.

It would seem that the severest edicts of Theodosius were intended only to terrify, and were never actually executed. But the example of inflicting death as the punishment of religious error had already been given in that part of the empire which was subject to the usurper Maximus.

Priscillian was a Spaniard—well-born, rich, learned, eloquent, and skilled in disputation. His doctrines were partly derived through Elpidius, a rhetorician, and Agape, a lady of rank, from an Egyptian named Mark, who had travelled into Spain. They are described as a compound of various heresies—Manichaeism, Gnosticism, Arianism, Photinianism, and Sabellianism—to which was added the practice of astrology and magic. That Priscillian held a dualistic principle appears certain. He admitted the whole canon of Scripture, but by means of allegory, or by altering the text, overcame the difficulties of such parts as did not agree with his system; and like some of the gnostic parties in an earlier age, he relied mainly on some apocryphal writings. His followers are said to have regarded falsehood as allowable for the purpose of concealing their real tenets; they attended the churches, and received the Eucharistic elements, but did not consume them. Priscillian's precepts were rigidly ascetic; he prescribed separation for married persons; but, like other heresiarchs, he is charged with secretly teaching sensuality and impurity.

It was about the year 378 that the progress of Priscillianism, especially among the female sex, began to attract notice, and in 380-1 it was condemned by a council of Spanish and Aquitanian bishops at Saragossa. Two bishops, however, Salvian and Instantius, took part with Priscillian, and, being reinforced by Hyginus of Cordova, who had once been a vehement opponent of his views, they consecrated him to the see of Avila. The opposite party appealed to the secular power, and, by order of Gratian, the heresiarch and his consecrators were banished from Spain. With the hope of obtaining a reversal of this sentence, Priscillian set out for Rome in company with Salvian and Instantius. In their progress through Aquitania they gained many proselytes, especially at the episcopal city of Elusa (Eauze). At Bordeaux the

bishop prevented their entrance into the town, but they found a welcome in the neighbourhood from Euchrotia, the widow of a distinguished poet and orator named Delphidius; and as they moved onwards they were attended by her, with her daughter Procula, and a numerous train of female converts. On arriving at Rome they were unable to obtain an audience of Damasus, and there Salvian died. His companions returning northward, found themselves opposed at Milan by the influence of Ambrose; but by means of bribes and solicitations to persons in high office, they procured from Gratian an order for their restoration to their sees. The proconsul of Spain was won by similar means, and Ithacius and Idacius, the leaders of the opposite party, were banished from that country as disturbers of the public peace.

During the remainder of Gratian's reign, Ithacius, a bold and able man, but of sensual and worldly habits, found himself unable to contend against the corruption by which the Priscillianists influenced the court. When, however, his case appeared desperate, fresh hopes were excited by the report that Maximus had been proclaimed in Britain; and, when the usurper was established at Treves, after the murder of Gratian, Ithacius brought the question before him. Maximus referred it to a council, which was held at Bordeaux. By this assembly Instantius was first heard, and was condemned; whereupon Priscillian, when required to defend himself, appealed to the emperor, and the council allowed the appeal.

Priscillian and his accusers repaired to Treves, where Martin, bishop of Tours, the “apostle of the Gauls”—famed for his sanctity, his miracles, and his successful exertions against idolatry—arrived about the same time. Martin repeatedly implored Ithacius to desist from prosecuting the heretics before a secular tribunal, on which Ithacius told him that he too was a Priscillianite. Martin also represented to the emperor that the trial of an ecclesiastical offence before secular judges was unexampled, and entreated that the matter might be settled in the usual way, by the deposition of the leading heretics from their sees, according to the ecclesiastical condemnation which had been passed on them. His influence was powerful enough to delay the trial while he remained at Treves; and on taking leave of Maximus he obtained a promise that the lives of the accused should be safe. But the usurper was afterwards induced—it is said, by the hope of seizing on Priscillian's property—to depart from this resolution. The heretics were brought to trial, and by the use of torture were wrought to a confession of impure doctrines and practices. Ithacius, after having urged on the prosecution with great bitterness until the case was virtually decided, devolved the last formal part of the work on a lay advocate—professing that his own episcopal character forbade him to proceed in a cause of blood. Priscillian, Euchrotia, and five of their companions were condemned to death and were beheaded. Instantius was banished to the Scilly islands, and others of the party were sentenced to banishment or confiscation.

Martin again visited the court of Maximus in order to plead for the lives of some of Gratian's officers, at a time when a number of bishops were assembled for the consecration of Felix to the see of Treves. These bishops, with only one exception, freely communicated with the instigators of the late proceedings, who, fearing the influence of Martin, attempted, although unsuccessfully, to prevent his entering the city. Maximus endeavoured, by elaborate attentions, to draw him into communicating with Ithacius and his party; but the bishop of Tours firmly refused, and they parted in anger. Late at night, Martin was informed that orders had been given for the execution of the officers in whom he was interested, and that two military commissioners were about to be sent into Spain, with orders to extirpate Priscillianism. The information struck him with dismay, not only on account of the peril to Gratian's adherents, but because, from the manner in which he himself and others had been charged with Priscillianism by Ithacius, he knew that the imputation of that heresy would be used as a pretext against orthodox persons of ascetic life; in great anxiety he made his way to the emperor's presence, where, on condition that Gratian's officers should be spared, and that the commission against Priscillianism should be revoked, he promised to communicate with the Thracians. Martin shared, accordingly, in the consecration of Felix next day, but refused to

sign the act, and immediately left Treves. It is related that, as he was on his way homewards, thinking sadly on his late compliance, an angel appeared to him, who consoled him, but told him he had acted wrongly. From that time, says his biographer, Martin felt in himself an abatement of the power of miracles; and for the remaining sixteen years of his life he avoided all councils and assemblies of bishops.

The execution of Priscillian and his companions was regarded with general horror, alike by Christians and by pagans. St. Ambrose, when on his second mission to Treves, chose rather to risk and to forfeit his object than to communicate with Maximus and the bishops who had been concerned in the deed of blood. Siricius, bishop of Rome, joined in the condemnation of the party which had acted with Ithacius; and their leader was deposed, and died in exile.

Priscillianism did not at once become extinct. The church of France was long disturbed by dissensions which arose out of it. The heresiarch's body was carried from Treves into his native country, where it was revered by his partisans as that of a martyr; and his name was used by them in oaths. Many members of the sect were reunited to the church after a council held at Toledo in 400, but a remnant of it is mentioned as still existing at the date of the first council of Braga, in 561.

CHAPTER VI

SUPPLEMENTARY.

While the empire was distracted by the Arian controversy, the gospel penetrated into some countries beyond the bounds of the Roman power.

Whatever may have been the effect produced in his native country by the conversion of Queen Candace's treasurer, recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, it would appear to have been transitory; and the Ethiopian or Abyssinian church owes its origin to an expedition made early in the fourth century by Meropius, a philosopher of Tyre, for the purpose of scientific inquiry. On his voyage homewards, he and his companions were attacked at a place where they had landed in search of water, and all were massacred except two youths, Edesius and Frumentius, the relatives and pupils of Meropius. These were carried to the king of the country, who advanced Edesius to be his cupbearer, and Frumentius to be his secretary and treasurer. On the death of the king, who left a boy as his heir, the two strangers, at the request of the widowed queen, acted as regents of the kingdom until the prince came of age. Edesius then returned to Tyre, where he became a presbyter. Frumentius, who, with the help of such Christian traders as visited the country, had already introduced the Christian doctrine and worship into Abyssinia, repaired to Alexandria, related his story to Athanasius, and requested that a bishop might be sent to follow up the work; whereupon Athanasius, considering that no one could be so fit for the office as Frumentius himself, consecrated him to the bishopric of Axum. The church thus founded continues to this day subject to the see of Alexandria—“drinking”, as the Abyssinians themselves express it, “of the patriarch’s well”. Its metropolitan is always an Egyptian monk, chosen and consecrated by the Coptic patriarch

After the expulsion of Athanasius from his see in 356, Constantius wrote to the princes of Axum, desiring that they would not shelter the fugitive, and also that Frumentius might be sent to Alexandria, to receive instruction in the faith from the Arian bishop, George. Athanasius, however, was safe among the monks of Egypt, and it does not appear that the request as to Frumentius met with any attention.

An Arian missionary, named Theophilus, is celebrated by the historian of his party, Philostorgius, while his labours are not unnaturally overlooked by the orthodox writers. He was a native of the island of Diu, and, having been sent as a hostage to the imperial court, was consecrated as a bishop by Eusebius of Nicomedia. Theophilus preached in southern Arabia, and apparently also in Abyssinia and India, as well as in his native island. In India he is said to have found the remains of an older Christianity, which Philostorgius describes as *heteroousian*, (*i.e.*, holding that the Persons of the Godhead differ in essence)—an assertion which seems to have had no other foundation than the fact that the Indians were unacquainted with the terms which had been introduced into the language of orthodox theology since the rise of the Arian controversy.

The conversion of the Iberians or Georgians is referred to the reign of Constantine. Some of these barbarians, on an incursion into the empire, had carried off among their captives a pious Christian woman, whose religious exercises and mortifications were observed with surprise and awe. After a time, a child—one of the king's children, according to Socrates—fell sick, and, agreeably to the custom of the country, was carried from one woman to another, in the hope that some one of them might be able to cure him. The captive, on being at length consulted, disclaimed all knowledge of physic, but, laying the child on a couch, said, “Christ,

who healed many, will heal this child also"; when, at her prayer, the boy recovered. The queen was soon after cured in like manner; and the captive refused all recompense. Next day the king, while hunting among the mountains, found himself enveloped in a thick mist or darkness. After having called on his gods in vain, he bethought himself of applying to the stranger's God, and the darkness immediately cleared away. Other miracles are added to the story. The king and queen gave their people the example of conversion, and the Iberians, on application to Constantine, were supplied with a bishop and clergy

The Christian communities of Persia have been mentioned as existing in the earlier period. The faith continued to make progress in that country; and Constantine, soon after declaring his own conversion, wrote in favour of the Christians to Sapor II, who was king of Persia from 309 to 381. But the progress of a rival religion was watched with jealousy and alarm by the magi; and on the breaking out of a war between Sapor and Constantius, they represented to the king that the converts were attached to the Roman interest. A persecution was begun by Sapor's subjecting the Christians to special and oppressive taxes. Their chief, Simeon, bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, was then seized, and was carried into the presence of the king, who required him to conform to the national religion, and, on his refusal, sentenced him to imprisonment. As he was led away, Uthazanes, an old eunuch, who had lately been persuaded to renounce Christianity, saluted him reverentially; but the bishop turned away his face. Uthazanes, deeply affected by the reproach, broke out into lamentation—"If my old and intimate friend thus disowns me, what may I expect from my God whom I have denied?". For these words he was summoned before the king, and, after having withstood both threats and entreaties, was condemned to death. Uthazanes had brought up Sapor; he now begged a favour for the sake of his old kindness—that it might be proclaimed that he was not guilty of treason, but was executed solely for being a Christian. The king willingly assented, in the hope that the declaration would deter his subjects from Christianity; but an opposite effect followed, as the sight of the courage which could sacrifice even life for the gospel induced many to embrace the Christian faith. Simeon and many others were put to death. In the following year the severity of the persecution was increased; and notices of martyrdoms are found from time to time throughout the remainder of Sapor's reign.

We have already seen that the gospel was introduced among the Goths by captives who were carried off during the reigns of Valerian and Gallienus. Theophilus, bishop of the Goths, was among the members of the Nicene council, and seems to have been the immediate predecessor of Ulfilas, who, notwithstanding his Teutonic name, is said to have been descended from Cappadocian captives. Ulfilas was probably born in 318, and was consecrated as a bishop at the age of thirty—perhaps while employed on a legation to the emperor Constantius, in 348. In 355 the persecution of Athanaric, judge or prince of the Ostrogoths, who regarded the profession of Christianity as a token of inclination to the Roman interest, compelled the bishop to lead a large body of Goths across the Danube, and seek a refuge within the empire; and it would seem that this exodus, as well as his labours and influence among his people, contributed to suggest the title which was bestowed on him by Constantius,—“the Moses of the Goths”. About fifteen years later the persecution was renewed, and many of Athanaric's subjects, who had embraced Christianity, were put to death. In 376 Ulfilas was employed by Fritigern, prince of the Visigoths—the division of the Gothic nation to which he himself belonged, and among which his labours had been chiefly exercised—to negotiate with Valens for permission to settle within the imperial territories; and on the revolt of the nation against their new protectors, he was sent on an unsuccessful mission to the emperor immediately before the battle of Adrianople. The death of Ulfilas took place in 388, at Constantinople, where he was endeavouring to mediate with Theodosius in behalf of his Arian subjects.

Ulfilas employed civilization as the handmaid of religion. To him his countrymen were indebted for the invention of an alphabet, and for a translation of the Scriptures—from which,

it is said, the books of Samuel and Kings were excluded, lest their warlike contents should be found too congenial to the ferocity of the barbarians. The Goths received their bishop's words as law and through his influence they were unhappily drawn away from the orthodox faith, which they had at first professed. The date and the circumstances of this change are subjects of much disputed Ulfilas, indeed, appears to have been more distinguished for practical efficiency than for theological knowledge, and to have imperfectly apprehended the importance of the question between Arianism and Nicene orthodoxy. He is known to have been associated with Acacius and Eudoxius at Constantinople in 360, and to have signed the creed of Rimini; but it would seem that he nevertheless kept up his connection with the Catholics after that time, and that the distinct profession of Arianism among the Goths did not take place until the reign of Valens, when it became a condition of their admission into the emperor's dominions. When that heresy had been ejected from the church—when it had ceased to be debated in councils and to exercise the learning and the acumen of cultivated theologians—it gained a new importance as being the creed of the barbarian multitudes who overran the empire.

The existence of lately-founded churches among the Saracens on the borders of Arabia is mentioned by Eusebius. The roving bands of this wild people were greatly impressed by the life of the monks who had retired to the deserts, and they visited them with reverence. In the reign of Valens, a Saracen queen, named Mavia, who had been at war with the Romans, stipulated as a condition of peace that Moses, a solitary of renowned sanctity, should be given to her nation as bishop. Moses reluctantly consented to undertake the office, but absolutely refused to receive consecration from Lucius, the Arian bishop of Alexandria; and he was eventually consecrated by some of the orthodox bishops who were in exile.

RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE.

For nearly three hundred years the church had been providentially left to develop itself as a society unconnected with the powers of this world, and by the time when its faith was adopted by the emperors of Rome, it had attained the condition of a great independent body, with a regular and settled organization. But, although it had thus far appeared as separate, it was not incapable of a connection with the state, in which the religious element should hallow the secular, while the secular power in turn should lend its influence for the advancement of religion. There was, however, danger lest, in such a connection, one or both of the parties should forget that the church is not a function of the state, but is itself a divinely-instituted spiritual kingdom; and, while it was thus possible that ecclesiastics might rely too much on the secular power, there was also the opposite danger, that they might assume towards it an authority professedly derived from heaven, but really unwarranted by any Christian principle.

When Constantine became a convert to the gospel, the change found both parties imperfectly prepared for understanding the relations which resulted from it. It was likely that the emperor, who was by office Pontifex Maximus—the highest minister of heathen religion, and knowing no authority in that system more sacred than his own,—would be unwilling to accept, or even unable to conceive, the different position which was assigned to him in his new communion. It was likely that the clergy, unused as they had hitherto been to intercourse with persons of such exalted rank, would be dazzled on finding themselves invited to associate with the sovereign of the Roman world, and would be disposed to allow him an undue control in spiritual affairs. Yet on the other hand, as Constantine became their pupil in religion, the power nominally exercised by the emperor was virtually wielded by those ecclesiastics who for the time held possession of his mind. And although the party which had the ascendancy during the last years of his reign, and throughout that of Constantius, lent itself unduly to the assumptions of the emperors, yet this servility was not without some good effect, inasmuch as the imperial interference, however objectionable in itself, was thus veiled

under the appearance of regular ecclesiastical proceedings. The deprivations, ejections, and intrusions of bishops were sanctioned by subservient synods; so that, in respect of form, the age of Constantine and Constantius has not left the embarrassing precedents which would have resulted if the temporal power had been arrayed on one side and the church on the other, without the intervention of a secular, unscrupulous, and numerous faction of ecclesiastics. And, lamentable as it is that, almost in the first years of the connection between church and state, the emperor should be seen on the side of heterodoxy, even this also had its advantage. Whereas the patronage and co-operation of the court might have lulled the orthodox into security, and they might thus have silently and unconsciously yielded up their rights, as suspecting no evil from a friend, the disfavour and discountenance which they met with guarded them against such submission; they were forced to declare at the earliest stage that the power of the emperor in spiritual things was not unlimited. And it may be matter of instruction and of comfort in later times, to know that any difficulties which may be experienced in dealing with those earthly powers to which Christians are bound to yield a willing obedience in all lawful things, were not without a parallel in that very age to which the imagination might be disposed to attribute almost an ideal perfection in respect of the relations between the church and the state.

Eusebius speaks of Constantine as a “kind of general bishop”, and elsewhere relates that the emperor once told some of his episcopal guests that, as they were bishops within the church, so he himself was bishop without it. The meaning of these words has been disputed with a zeal which would attribute too much both of precision and of importance to a saying sportively uttered at table; but it is at least certain that Constantine acted as if he believed himself entitled to watch over the church, to determine which of conflicting opinions was orthodox, and to enforce theological decisions by the strength of the secular power. His own appearance in the council of Nicaea while he was yet unbaptized, the presidency of Constantius, while only a catechumen, at the council of Antioch, and his deputation of lay officers to control the synods of Rimini and Seleucia, are instances of the manner in which the imperial superintendence was exerted. And yet (as has been before observed) in all these cases, whatever there may have been of lay control, the formal decision of matters was left to the voice of the bishops. The pains which were taken to draw prelates of high personal or official authority—such as Athanasius, Hosius, and Liberius—into a compliance with the measures of the court, are also a remarkable testimony to the importance which was attached to the episcopal judgments.

The introduction of general councils contributed greatly to increase the imperial influence. These assemblies were necessarily summoned by the emperor, since no spiritual authority possessed the universal jurisdiction which was requisite for the purpose; their decisions were confirmed by him, promulgated with his sanction, and enforced by civil penalties of his appointment.

The emperor was regarded as the highest judge in all causes. The bishops of Rome considered it a distinction to be allowed to plead for themselves before his judgment-seat, after the example of St. Paul. But it soon began to be felt that both bishops and presbyters were disposed to carry to the imperial tribunal matters in which the judgment of their brethren had been, or was likely to be, pronounced against them. In order to check this, the council of Antioch, in 341, and that of Sardica, in 347, passed canons, by which it was forbidden to haunt the court under pretext of suits, or to appeal to the emperor except with the consent of the metropolitan and other bishops of the province to which the appellant belonged. In the earlier times, it had been usual for Christians, in order to avoid the scandal of exposing their differences before heathen tribunals, to submit them to the arbitration of the bishops. The influence which the bishops had thus acquired was greatly increased by a law which is usually (though perhaps erroneously) referred to Constantine. It was ordered that, if both parties in a case consented to submit it to the episcopal decision, the sentence should be without appeal;

and the secular authorities were charged to carry it out. Many later enactments relate to this subject. In some canons, persons who should decline the bishop's jurisdiction are censured as showing a want of charity towards the brethren. By this power of arbitration, the bishops were drawn into much secular business, and incurred the risk of enmity and obloquy. To some of them the judicial employment may possibly have been more agreeable than the more spiritual parts of their function; but many, like St. Augustine, felt it as a grievous burden and distraction, and some relieved themselves of the labour by appointing clerical or lay delegates to act for them.

Constantius in 355 enacted that bishops should be tried only by members of their own order—i.e., in synods. But this privilege was limited by Gratian, who in 376 ordered that matters which concerned religion and ecclesiastical discipline should belong to bishops and ecclesiastical synods, but that criminal jurisdiction should be reserved to the secular courts; and such was the general principle of the age. As, however, crimes are also sins, and the boundaries which separate ecclesiastical from secular questions are not always easy to determine, there arose frequent cases of difficulty between secular punishment and ecclesiastical penance; indeed, the legislation of the early part of the fifth century on this subject is inconsistent with itself—showing at once the weakness of the emperors and the watchfulness of the ecclesiastical authorities. In cases of crime the clerical office was not as yet supposed to carry with it any exemption from the secular jurisdiction.

The influence of the gospel, which had perhaps begun in some degree to affect the Roman legislation even while paganism was yet the religion of the state, was now more directly and more powerfully exerted in this respect. Moral offences, of which former legislation had taken no notice, were denounced; and at the same time a humaner spirit is found to interpose for the protection of the weak, for the restraint of oppression, and for the mitigation of cruel punishments. The bishops were often charged by law with the duty of befriending various classes of persons who might stand in need of assistance; thus a law of Honorius, in 409, which orders that judges should on every Sunday examine prisoners as to the treatment which they received, imposes on the bishops the duty of superintending its execution. As magistrates became Christian, the church exercised a supervision over them which was of considerable effect; and sometimes the clergy pronounced its censures on local governors who had exercised their power tyrannically. Thus Athanasius excommunicated a governor of Libya; and Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, a generation later, excommunicated Andronicus, governor of Pentapolis.

Intercession for offenders became an acknowledged duty and privilege of the clergy, who often successfully interfered to save the lives of criminals in the hope that penance might enable them to make their peace with heaven. But this right of intercession was liable to abuse and corruption. Some of the clergy sold their influence for money; monks and others, in the latter part of the century, carried their extravagance so far as forcibly to rescue malefactors on the way to execution; and laws were enacted to check such perverse and disorderly exhibitions of humanity.

The privilege of asylum, which had belonged to some temples, became attached to all churches; and although the earliest laws on the subject date only from the last years of the century, they recognize the privilege as having long before existed on the ground of popular opinion. In the state of society which then was, the institution had many important uses; but corruptions naturally crept in, and against these edicts were issued. Thus Theodosius enacted in 392 that public debtors who took refuge in churches should be delivered up, or else that their debts should be paid by the bishop who sheltered them. The younger Theodosius, in 431-2, while he extended the right of sanctuary to the whole precinct which surrounded churches, found it expedient at the same time to guard the privilege against some misuses; and in the following century further restrictions were imposed by Justinian.

The Hierarchy.

Of the changes among the lower clergy during this period (besides the creation of some new offices which were required by the necessities of the church) may be mentioned the institution of two local fraternities: the *copiatae* of Constantinople and the *parabolani* of Alexandria.

The *copiatae* or *fossarii* (grave-diggers) were employed in burying the dead—especially the Christian poor, whose interment was free of cost; their number was 1100 under Constantine, but was reduced to 950 by a law of the younger Theodosius. It appears that similar guilds were established in other populous cities. The *parabolani* (so called from the hazardous nature of their duties) were appointed to attend on the sick. In the dissensions of the Alexandrian church they acquired a character for turbulence, so that in 416 the inhabitants of the city preferred a complaint against them to Theodosius the Second. The *parabolani* were therefore laid under some restraints by the emperor, and their number was reduced to 500; but two years later it was raised to 600. Both the *copiatae* and the *parabolani* were reckoned as belonging to the clergy, and enrolment among them was sought for the sake of the privileges and exemptions which were attached to it. In many cases the membership appears to have been honorary—persons of wealth paying for admission, enjoying the immunities, and taking no share in the duties. Against this corruption a law of Theodosius II was directed.

The deacons, whose number in some of the greater churches was still limited to seven, acquired an increase of importance in proportion to the greater wealth which was entrusted to their administration. The power of baptizing and of preaching was now occasionally conferred on them, and some of them even took on themselves the priestly function as to the consecration of the Eucharist; but this usurpation was strongly forbidden. In some cases they claimed precedence of the presbyters, and would have regarded it as a degradation to be ordained to the presbyterate, so that canons were even found necessary to check their assumptions. In every considerable church one of the deacons presided over the rest. It is uncertain at what time this office of archdeacon was introduced: at Carthage it would seem to have been towards the end of the third century, as it is not mentioned by St. Cyprian, whereas, about fifty years later, Cecilian is described as archdeacon to Mensurius. The distinction of one deacon above his brethren may perhaps have been originally a matter of personal eminence, and may have afterwards come to be established as official. The archdeacon was appointed by the bishop; he was his chief assistant in the government of the church, and was generally regarded as likely to succeed to the bishopric. In the end of the fourth century a similar presidency over the presbyters was given in some churches to an archpriest (archipresbyter)—to whom the administration of the diocese was intrusted in the absence or incapacity of the bishop.

The position of the chorepiscopi was found to excite the jealousy of the superior bishops. Their functions were therefore more strictly limited by canons, and in some quarters a movement was made for the suppression of the office. The council of Laodicea forbids the appointment of bishops in villages and country places; it orders that, in their stead, presbyters with the title of *peridontae* (circuit-visitors)—answering to the archdeacons or rural deans of our own church—should be employed, and that the chorepiscopi already ordained should do nothing without the approbation of the city bishops. In the following century, however, chorepiscopi are mentioned as sitting in the council of Chalcedon, although only as delegates of other bishops; and the title is found much later, both in the east and in the west. Thus, the second council of Nicaea, in 787, speaks of chorepiscopi as ordaining readers by permission of the bishops,—a notice which seems to imply that they then belonged to the order of presbyters, and were much the same with the *peridontae* intended by the Laodicean canon. The western chorepiscopi of the eighth and ninth centuries will come under our notice hereafter.

The system of distinctions within the order of bishops was now carried out more fully than in the former period. The religious divisions of the Roman world had generally followed the civil divisions, although this rule was not without exceptions; and thus, when Constantine introduced a new partition of the empire into dioceses, each of which embraced several provinces, a nearly corresponding arrangement naturally followed in the church. The bishop of the chief city in each diocese rose to a pre-eminence above the other metropolitans. These bishops usually received in the east the title of exarch, and in the west that of primate; the most eminent of them were afterwards styled patriarchs—a title which had formerly been given to all bishops, and of which the new and restricted sense appears to have been adopted from the Jews. The degree of authority exercised by patriarchs or exarchs was not uniform. It was greatest at Alexandria, where the patriarch had the right of consecrating all the bishops of Egypt and Libya without the intervention of metropolitans. The bishop of Rome had a like power within his narrower jurisdiction, where, as in Egypt, the grade of metropolitans had not yet been introduced; but in other countries it was usual that the chief bishop should consecrate the metropolitans, and that these should consecrate the inferior bishops.

With the introduction of the larger ecclesiastical divisions came that of synods collected from their whole extent. The patriarchs or exarchs presided; and these councils became the highest ordinary authorities in the affairs of the church.

The council of Nicaea recognizes three principal sees—Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch—as presiding over the churches in their respective quarters. Each of these three was at once the church of a great capital, and was reckoned to have the honour of apostolical foundation. From the time when Constantine raised Byzantium to its new dignity, the bishopric of that city, which had previously been subject to the metropolitan of Heraclea, the civil capital of Thrace, necessarily became an important position, insomuch that, even before any formal grant of ecclesiastical privileges or precedence had as yet been conferred on it, Eudoxius was supposed to be promoted by a translation to Constantinople from the great and venerable see of Antioch. The second general council enacted that the bishop of Constantinople should stand next to the bishop of Rome, “forasmuch as it is a new Rome”—a reason which clearly shows that, in the opinion of the assembled bishops, the secular greatness of the old capital was the ground on which its ecclesiastical precedence rested. The honour thus bestowed on Constantinople was not, however, accompanied by any gift of jurisdiction.

The causes which, during the earlier period, had acquired for Rome a pre-eminence over all other churches were, in the fourth century, reinforced by new and important circumstances. Although within his own city the bishop was restrained by the prevalence of heathenism among the nobility, the removal of the court gave him a position of independence and importance beyond what he could have obtained if the imperial splendour had been displayed on the same scene with his own dignity; and the Arian controversies greatly increased his influence in relation to the whole church. In the distractions of the eastern Christians, the alliance of the west was strongly desired by each party. The bishop of Rome, as being the chief pastor in the western church, naturally became the organ of communication with his oriental brethren, to whom he appeared as the representative of the whole west, and almost as wielding its entire authority. Even where one of the oriental parties protested against his interference, the Roman bishop gained by the application of the other party for his aid, or by its consent to his proceedings. Except during the temporary lapse of Liberius, the Roman influence was steadily on the side of orthodoxy, and as Rome thus stood in honourable contrast with the variations of the eastern bishops, its constancy acquired for it strength as well as credit, and the triumph of the cause which it had espoused contributed to the elevation of the see. Moreover, the old civil analogy introduced a practice of referring for advice to Rome from all parts of the west. The earliest extant answer to such an application is the synodical letter of Siricius to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona. But by degrees these “decretal

epistles” rose more and more from a tone of advice to one of direction and command; and they were no longer written in the name of a synod, but in that of the pope alone.

The records of this time, however, while they show the progress of Rome towards the position which she afterwards attained, are utterly subversive of the pretence that that position belonged to her from the beginning, and by virtue of divine appointment. Thus, when the council of Nicaea, with a view to the schism of the Egyptian Meletius, ordained that the bishop of Alexandria should, agreeably to ancient custom, have jurisdiction over Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis, “forasmuch as this is also customary for the Roman bishop”—and further, that “in Antioch and in other provinces the privileges of churches should be preserved”—it is evident that no other right over his suffragans is ascribed to the bishop of Rome than that which is also acknowledged to belong to the bishop of Alexandria; and that the privileges of these and of other sees are alike referred to ancient usage as their common foundation.

Again, when the council of Sardica enacted that any bishop who should wish to appeal from a synod might, with the consent of his judges, apply to Julius, bishop of Rome, and that, if the bishop of Rome thought fit, a new trial should be granted¹—it is clear that the power assigned to the Roman bishop is not recognized as one which he before possessed, but was then conferred by the council. The bishop of Rome had no power of evoking the cause from before another tribunal; he had no personal voice in the decision; he could only receive appeals on the application of the councils from which they were made—the power of making such appeals being limited to bishops—and commit the trial of them to the bishops bordering on the appellant's province, with the addition, if he should think fit, of legates representing himself. Moreover, as the council of Sardica was composed of western bishops only, there was no pretext for enforcing this canon on the eastern church; and, as the occasion which led to the enactment was temporary, so the mention of Julius by name, without any reference to his successors, seems to indicate that the power conferred was temporary and personal, and was granted in consideration of the pledges which the Roman bishop had given for his adherence to the orthodox cause. Indeed, it may be said that this power was only such as in ordinary circumstances would have been acknowledged to belong to the emperor, and that it was transferred to Julius, because the exercise of it could not be safely left in the hands of the Arian Constantius. In like manner, when Gratian, in 378, with a view of withdrawing the partisans of Ursicinus from secular tribunals, acceded to the request of a Roman synod that the judgment of them should be committed to Damasus, the temporary and special nature of the grant is inconsistent with any such idea as that the jurisdiction of which it speaks had before belonged to the bishops of Rome, or was an ordinary prerogative of their office.

The old Latin version of the Nicene canons, and Rufinus in his summary of them, define the jurisdiction of the Roman bishop as extending over the “suburbicarian churches”. The name of suburbicarian was given to the provinces which composed the civil diocese of Rome—the seven provinces of middle and lower Italy, with the islands of Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily. To these the patriarchate of Rome was then limited—Milan, Aquileia, and afterwards Ravenna, being independent centres of ecclesiastical government. And since both language and historical facts combine to support this view, it needless to consider seriously such constructions of the canon as that which would persuade us that by the “suburbicarian churches” were meant all those of the western empire, or even all the churches of the world!

The interference of the Roman bishop was still resisted whenever he attempted to invade the privileges of other churches. The African and the eastern churches acted throughout in entire independence of the Roman authority, and frequent canons were made against carrying causes out of the provinces to which they belonged. There was no idea of any divine right of superiority to other churches; for, although it was often said that the bishop of Rome ought to be honoured as the successor of St. Peter, that apostle himself was not yet regarded as more

than the first among equals, nor were his successors supposed to have inherited any higher distinction above their brethren in the episcopate.

From the time of Constantine the members of the Christian ministry attained a new social position, with secular advantages which had until then been unknown. The exemption from curial offices, which was granted to them by the first Christian emperor, was, indeed, withdrawn or limited by his successors; but they enjoyed a valuable privilege in their freedom from all 'sordid' offices, and from some of the public imposts, although still liable to the land-tax, and to most of the ordinary burdens. The taxes to be paid by ecclesiastics who were engaged in trade were regulated by laws of Constantius, Valentinian, and Gratian; and from the fact that such laws were passed, rather than a prohibition of trading, it may probably be inferred that resources of this kind were still necessary for the support of some among the clergy. The wealth of the body, however, was vastly increased. Constantine, besides munificent occasional gifts, bestowed on them a stated allowance of corn, which was revoked by Julian. Jovian restored a third part of this, and promised to add the rest when the cessation of a famine then raging should enable him to do so; but his reign ended before he could fulfill his intention, and the promise was disregarded by his successors. Tithes were now paid—not, however, by legal compulsion, but as a voluntary offering, so that we need not wonder to find complaints of difficulty and irregularity in the payment; and a very great addition of riches flowed in on the church in consequence of the law of Constantine which allowed it to receive bequests of property.

These changes naturally operated for evil as well as for good. For the sake of the secular benefits connected with the ministry, many unfit persons sought ordination; while the higher dignities of the church became objects of ambition for men whose qualifications were not of a spiritual kind. At the election of a bishop, unworthy arts were employed by candidates; accusations which, whether true or false, give no agreeable idea of the prevailing tone of morals, were very commonly brought by each faction against the favourite of its opponents; and disgraceful tumults often took place.

The intercourse of courts was a trial for the bishops; while in many it naturally produced subserviency, in others it led to a mistaken exaltation of spiritual dignity in opposition to secular rank. Thus, it is told with admiration that St. Martin of Tours, when at the court of Maximus, allowed the empress to wait on him at table; and that, when the emperor had desired him to drink first, and expected to receive the cup back from him, the bishop passed it to his own chaplain, as being higher in honour than any earthly potentate.

Luxury and pride increased among the clergy of the great cities. St. Jerome agrees with Ammianus Marcellinus as to the excessive pomp by which the Roman hierarchy was distinguished, the splendour of their dress and equipages, the sumptuousness of their feasts; while the heathen historian bears a testimony which is above suspicion to the contrast presented by the virtue, simplicity, and self-denial of the provincial bishops and clergy in general. Praetextatus, an eminent pagan magistrate, who was concerned in suppressing the feuds of Damasus and Ursicinus, sarcastically told Damasus that he himself would forthwith turn Christian, if he might have the bishopric of Rome. The emperors found it necessary to restrain by law the practices of monks and clergy for obtaining gifts and legacies. Thus Valentinian, by a law which was addressed to Damasus, and was read in all the churches of the capital, enacted that ecclesiastics and monks should not haunt the houses of widows or of female wards; and that they should not accept anything by donation or will from women who were connected with them by spiritual ties. Jerome, who draws many lively pictures of the base devices by which some of his brethren insinuated themselves into the favour of wealthy and aged persons, says, with reference to this edict, "I do not complain of the law, but I grieve that we should have deserved it". Other acts followed, annulling all dispositions of property which women on professing a religious life might make to the prejudice of their natural heirs, and guarding against the evasions which might be attempted by means of fictitious

trusteeships. Such bequests were, however, discouraged and often refused by the more conscientious bishops, such as St. Ambrose and St. Augustine. And while we note the facts which show how in this age, as in every other, the church but too truly realized those parables which represent it as containing a mixture of evil amidst its good, we must not overlook the noble spirit of munificence and self-denial which animated multitudes of its bishops and clergy, or their exertions in such works of piety and charity as the relief of the poor, the redemption of captives, the erection of hospitals, and the adornment of the divine worship.

The changes of the fourth century tended to depress the popular element in the church. By the acknowledgment of their religion on the part of the state, by the increase of wealth, by their intercourse with personages of the highest rank, by the frequency of synods collected from large divisions of the church, and limited to their own order, by the importance which accrued to them when questions of theology entered into politics, and agitated the whole empire—the bishops were raised to a greater elevation than before above the other orders of the clergy. The administration of the church was more thrown into their hands; and in the election of bishops the influence of the order became greater, chiefly in consequence of the factions of the people. Thus, when a vacant see was disputed by exasperated parties, it often happened that the prelates whose business it was to ratify the election, suggested a third candidate by way of compromise, and that their nomination was accepted. In some cases the election, instead of being held in the city for which a bishop was to be appointed, was transferred to the metropolis of the province. The privilege of choice, which was often injudiciously used by the multitude, was gradually limited by canons which fixed the qualifications for the episcopate. And, although the right of voting was not yet restricted to persons of superior station, the emperor swayed the elections to the greater sees—especially those of the cities in which he resided—and sometimes directly nominated the bishops.

The orders of the ministry remained as before, but it was not usual to proceed regularly through the lower grades to the higher. Thus we find that very commonly deacons were raised to the episcopate, or readers to the presbyterate, without passing through even a symbolical ordination to the intermediate offices; and we have seen in the instances of Ambrose and Nectarius that even unbaptized persons were chosen for bishops, and, after receiving baptism, were advanced at once to the highest order of the ministry.

The practice of forcible ordinations was a remarkable feature of this age. The only expedient by which a person could protect himself against the designs of a bishop or a congregation who considered him fit for spiritual office, was that of swearing that he would not submit to be ordained; for it was thought that one who had taken an oath of this kind ought not to be compelled to forswear himself. When the custom of such ordinations had been introduced, reluctance to undertake the ministerial function was often feigned for the purpose of gaining importance. Both forced ordinations and the hasty promotion of neophytes were after a time forbidden by canons and by imperial edicts, in some of which a curious distinction was made between the case of bishops who had been ordained without their own consent, and that of presbyters or lower clergy in like circumstances. The latter were allowed to renounce their orders; but this liberty was denied to the bishops, on the ground that none were really worthy of the episcopate but such as were chosen against their will. In the fifth century, ordination began to be employed as a means of disqualifying persons who had been unfortunate in political life for taking any further part in the public affairs of the world. Some of the latest emperors of the west were set aside by this expedient.

The influence of the monastic spirit tended to advance the practice of celibacy among the clergy, and the opinion of its obligation. At the council of Nicaea, it was proposed that married bishops, presbyters, and deacons should be compelled to abstain from intercourse with their wives; but Paphnutius, an Egyptian bishop, strongly opposed the motion. He dwelt on the holiness of Christian marriage, and represented the inexpediency of imposing on the clergy a yoke which many of them might be unable to bear, and which might therefore

become the occasion of sin, and injurious to the church. It was, he said, enough to adhere to the older law, by which marriage after the reception of the higher orders was forbidden. The argument was strengthened by the character of the speaker. He was honoured as a confessor, having lost his right eye and had his left thigh hamstrung in the last persecution; he had a high reputation for sanctity, so that he was even supposed to possess miraculous power; his motives were above suspicion, as he himself lived in celibacy and strict asceticism. Under his guidance, therefore, the council rejected the proposal; and the example thus set by the most revered of ecclesiastical assemblies was followed in other quarters. Thus, the council of Gangra, which was held chiefly for the consideration of the errors imputed to Eustathius of Sebaste, condemns, among other extravagances connected with this subject, the refusal to communicate with married priests. And in the eastern churches generally, although the practice of celibacy or of abstinence from conjugal intercourse became usual, it continued to the end of the century to be voluntary.

In the west, an important step towards the establishment of celibacy was taken by Siricius, in his decretal epistle of the year 385, addressed to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona. After stating that some clergymen had had children, and had defended themselves by pleading the Mosaic law, he argues that the cases are unlike, inasmuch as among the Jews the priesthood was hereditary, whereas among Christians it is not so; and further that, as the Jewish priests separated themselves from their wives during the periods of ministering in the temple, so for the Christian clergy, who are always on duty, the separation must be perpetual. He ordered that presbyters and deacons should abstain from their wives; that such as had before violated this rule through ignorance should be allowed to retain their places, but on condition of observing continence, and without the hope of promotion; that if any one attempted to defend the contrary practice, he should be deposed; that no man who had married a widow, or who had been more than once married, should be eligible to the ministry; and that clergy contracting such marriages should be deposed. The frequency of enactments in pursuance of this decretal, and the mitigations of its provisions which some of them contain, indicate that great difficulty was found in enforcing it; and this inference is amply supported by other facts.

In proportion as the marriage of ecclesiastics was discouraged, the practice of entertaining female companions or attendants in their houses increased. The council of Nicaea enacted that no women should be admitted in this capacity, except such as from near relationship or from age might be regarded as beyond suspicion of improper familiarity with the clergy.

Monasticism.

THE monastic life received a vast impulse during the fourth century. As the profession of Christianity was no longer a mark of separation from the mass of men, some further distinction appeared necessary for those who aspired to a higher life. Moreover, with the cessation of persecution the opportunities of displaying heroism in confession and martyrdom had ceased. Hence many persons, seeing the corruption which was now too manifest in the nominally Christian society, and not understanding that the truer and more courageous course was to work in the midst of the world and against evil, thought to attain a more elevated spirituality by withdrawing from mankind and devoting themselves to austerity of life and to endeavours after undisturbed communion with heaven.

Paul, who has been mentioned as the first Christian hermit, spent his life, from twenty-three to a hundred and thirteen, in the desert, without contemporary fame or influence. In the year of his retirement, A.D. 251, the more celebrated Antony was born of Christian parents at Coma, a village in the Thebaid. We are told by his biographer (who, if he was not himself the great Athanasius, is supposed to have written under his influence) that in boyhood and youth

Antony showed a thoughtful and religious character. He had learnt to read and write his native Coptic, but never acquired even the alphabet of Greek, and was unable to speak that language. Before reaching the age of twenty he lost his parents, and came into possession of a considerable property. One day he was struck by hearing in church the gospel of the rich young man, who was charged to sell all that he had, give to the poor, and follow the Saviour, that he might have treasure in heaven. Antony forthwith made over his land to the inhabitants of his village, turned the rest of his estate into money, and bestowed all on the poor, except a small portion which he reserved for the maintenance of his only sister. On another occasion he was impressed in like manner by the words, "Take no thought for the morrow", and, in order to fulfill the command, he parted with the remainder of his property, committed his sister to a society of religious virgins, and embraced an ascetic life.

At first he took up his abode near his own village; for, says his biographer, such was then the practice of those who desired to live religiously, when as yet there were no monasteries in the desert. He laboured with his own hands, and gave away all that he could spare from his necessities. He visited all the most famous ascetics whom he could hear of —endeavouring to learn from each his distinguishing virtue, and to combine all their graces in his own practice. After a time he shut himself up in a tomb, from which he removed, ten years later, to a ruined castle near the Red Sea. But, although he continually increased his mortifications, he found that temptation followed him from one retreat to another. He fancied himself beset by devils in all manner of frightful shapes, and at other times by worldly thoughts or by sensual enticements. The noise of his conflicts with the enemy was heard by those who passed by his dwelling; more than once he was found almost dead from the chastisement which had been inflicted on him by his ghostly assailants. Antony became famous: many persons made pilgrimages to see him; and having spent twenty years in his castle, without either leaving its walls or admitting any one within them, he went forth and received disciples, who settled around him, studding the desert with their cells.

The persecution under Maximin drew Antony to Alexandria, where he attended on the sufferers, and in every possible exposed himself to death; but when the heat of the danger had passed over, he concluded that the crown of martyrdom, to which he had aspired, was not intended for him, and, wishing to escape from the oppressiveness of the admiration which waited on him, he sought out, under the guidance of some Saracens, who were miraculously thrown in his way, a solitude more remote than that in which he had before lived. His abode was now a cave in the side of a lofty mountain, with a supply of cool water and the shade of a few palm-trees beside it; he cultivated a small patch of corn and vegetables, that he might be able not only to spare others the labour of supplying him with bread, but to furnish something for the refreshment of visitors. The beasts of the desert, in resorting to the water, damaged his crops; but he gently laid hold of one, and said to them, "Why do you injure me, when I do you no hurt? Depart, and, in the name of the Lord, come hither no more!" and his charge was obeyed. The more Antony withdrew from the world, the more eagerly was he followed. Multitudes flocked to him, and imitators of his manner of life arose in great numbers. He reconciled enemies, comforted mourners, and advised in spiritual concerns.

His interposition was often requested in behalf of the oppressed, and was never exerted in vain. When any such business had drawn him to leave his cell, he returned as soon as possible: "A monk out of his solitude", he said, "is like a fish out of water". Constantine and his sons sought his correspondence, entreated his prayers, and invited him to their courts; but, instead of being elated by the honour, he said to his disciples, "Marvel not if the emperor writes to us, since he is a man; but rather marvel that God hath written his laws for men, and hath spoken them to us by his Son". In the Arian controversies, Antony and his monks were steady and powerful supporters of orthodoxy. He wrote to Constantine, urging the recall of Athanasius from his first exile, and received an answer expressed in terms of high respect. In order to aid the orthodox cause, he paid a second visit to Alexandria, where his appearance

made even a greater impression than before, and many pagans were converted in consequence. He was favoured with visions and revelations for the comfort of the brethren in the faith; and in cases of doubt he prayed for direction, and received instructions from above. Innumerable miracles were ascribed to him, and he supposed himself to work them, but was free from all pride on account of the gift. His ghostly enemies still continued their assaults, and philosophers frequently attacked him, in the hope of turning his illiteracy into ridicule; but the firmness of his faith, together with his natural shrewdness, gave him the victory alike over men and demons. Severe as his habits were, he had nothing of the savageness which became too common among his followers; he well understood the dangers of the solitary life, and was earnest in warning against a reliance on the mere outward form of monachism.

Antony lived to the age of a hundred and five, and died a few days before Athanasius sought a refuge among the monks of the desert in 356. Of his two sheepskins he bequeathed one to the bishop of Alexandria, and the other to Serapion, bishop of Thmuis. A cloak, the gift of Athanasius, which had been worn for many years, was to be restored to the donor, and the hermit's garment of hair-cloth fell to two disciples who had long been his especial attendants. He charged these disciples to bury him in a place unknown to all but themselves, lest his remains should be embalmed and kept above ground—a manner of showing reverence to deceased saints which he had often endeavoured to suppress.

The coenobitic system—that of ascetics living in a community—originated with Pachomius, who was, like Antony, a native of the Thebaid. The founder was born in 292, was converted to Christianity, and practised rigid austerities under the direction of a solitary named Palaemon, until he was visited by an angel, who told him that, as he had made sufficient progress in the monastic life, he must now become a teacher of others, and gave him a code of rules, written on a brazen tablet, which the disciples of Pachomius professed to have in their possession. Pachomius then instituted a society in an island of the Nile called Tabenne, which had been indicated to him by a voice from heaven. The brotherhood was soon extended, so that before the founder's death it embraced eight monasteries, with 3,000 inmates (of whom 1,400 were in the mother-establishment): and in the beginning of the following century the whole number of monks was not less than 50,000.

The monks lived in cells, each of which contained three. They were under engagements of absolute obedience to the commands of a chief, who was called abbot (from a Syriac word signifying father), or archimandrite (from the Greek *mandra*, a sheepfold). Under him each of the monasteries was governed by a head of its own, and the chief abbot from time to time made a circuit of visitation. The whole society assembled at the mother monastery twice every year—at the Easter festival and in the month of August. The monks were, by direction of the brazen tablet, divided into twenty-four classes, which took their names from the Greek alphabet, and were arranged according to the characters of the individuals; thus the simplest were in the class which bore the name of the letter I, while the more knowing were ranked under the letters of more complicated form. A strict community of all things was enforced, so that it was considered as a serious breach of discipline to speak of 'my' coat, or book, or pen. The monks employed themselves in agriculture, basket-weaving, rope-making, and other kinds of industry. The produce of their labour was carried down the Nile in boats belonging to the society, and manned by monks; and the money which it fetched in the markets at Alexandria was not only enough for their own support, but enabled them to perform works of charity. They prayed many times a day, fasted on the fourth and sixth days of the week, and communicated on the Sabbath and on the Lord's day. Their meals were taken in common—each being preceded by psalmody. They ate in silence, and with their hoods drawn over their faces, so that no one might see his neighbours, or anything but the fare set before him. The heavenly rule was not stringent as to the quantity of food—ordaining only that each monk should labour in proportion to his eating; but most of them carried their abstinence beyond the letter of its requirements. The sick were tended with remarkable care. The monks had a

peculiar dress, the chief article of which was a goatskin, in imitation of Elijah, who was regarded as a pattern of the monastic life. They were never to undress, except that at communicating they unloosened their girdles. They slept with their clothes on, and in chairs so constructed as to keep them almost in a standing posture.

Pachomius had a sister, whom the fame of his institution induced to visit Tabenne. On being informed of her arrival, the abbot desired the porter of the monastery to beg that she would be content with the assurance of his welfare; and to inform her that, if she were disposed to imitate his manner of life, he would cause a monastery to be provided for her at a distance from him. This message had the effect which Pachomius intended; the monastery was built for his sister by monks from Tabenne; and in a short time she found herself abbess of a large community of women, regulated by a code which her brother had framed on the model of his own, and subject to his orders, although he never personally visited it. After this first example the formation of such societies was rapid—the female recluses being styled nuns—a title of uncertain derivation and meaning. Pachomius died in 348.

About the same time when Pachomius established his order at Tabenne, the elder Macarius took up his abode in the desert of Scetis—a vast solitude near the Libyan frontier of Egypt—and Ammon settled on the Nitrian or Nitre mountain. Around these chiefs were soon gathered large numbers of monks, living in separate cells, which either were solitary or were grouped together in clusters called *laurae*. The monks met on the first and last days of the week for public worship; if any one were absent it was concluded that he must be sick, and some of the brethren were sent to visit his cell. Except on such occasions they never spoke. The Nitrian monks were reckoned to be about 5,000 in the end of the century.

The monastic system was speedily extended beyond the borders of Egypt. In Syria it was introduced by Hilarion, a pupil and imitator of Antony, who lived fifty years in the desert near Gaza. In Mesopotamia it was eagerly welcomed, and derived especial lustre from the genius and piety of the mystic St. Ephrem. Eustathius bishop of Sebaste established monasteries in Armenia, and, as has been already mentioned, St. Basil organized societies of coenobites in Pontus and Cappadocia. Athanasius, on his visit to Rome in 340, was accompanied by some Egyptian monks, who were the first that were seen in the west. Their wild and rude appearance excited the disgust of the Romans, but with many this feeling was soon exchanged for reverence. The profession of religious celibacy found votaries among the younger ladies of the capital, and among the earliest of these who embraced it was Marcellina, the sister of St. Ambrose. The zeal with which Ambrose, after becoming a bishop, advocated the cause of celibacy, may perhaps have been in some measure prompted by his sister. He wrote treatises on the subject, maintaining that young women ought to embrace the virgin life in defiance of the will of their parents, and fortifying his argument by tales of judgments which had befallen persons who dared to dissuade their relatives from such a course. He extolled virginity in his sermons — even (as he says) to the weariness of his hearers. The matrons of his city endeavoured to preserve their daughters from the fascination of these discourses by forcibly keeping them at home; but crowds of virgins from other quarters—some of them even from Mauritania—flocked to seek consecration at the hands of the bishop of Milan. The little islands on the coasts of Italy and Dalmatia became sprinkled with monasteries and cells. St. Martin, who had lived as a monk in the island of Gallinaria, introduced monasticism into Gaul, built religious houses near Poitiers and Tours, and was followed to his grave by two thousand of the brethren. In Africa monasticism made less progress than elsewhere. It did not obtain any footing until it was introduced by St. Augustine, within the last ten years of the century; nor was the authority of that great bishop, or even the example which he gave by living in coenobite fashion with his clergy, sufficient to attract to the monastic life any but persons of the Tower ranks. Salvian, about the year 450, witnesses that it still continued to be unpopular in Africa, and that monks were objects of persecution in that country.

The rules and habits of the monastic societies differed according to circumstances, and according to the judgment of their founders. Industrial occupations —such as field-labour, building, weaving, or the manufacture of nets, baskets, and sandals—were generally prescribed in the east, and Augustine wrote a treatise against those monks who wished to be exempt from these employments. But St. Martin regarded such things as likely to become hindrances to devotion, and would allow no other manual work than that the younger brethren should transcribe books. The monks of Gaul, indeed, having ample employment for their energies in combating the idolatry and superstition of the barbarians among whom they were placed, did not need to have their hours relieved from vacancy in the same manner as the inhabitants of the Egyptian or Syrian deserts. As to food and clothing, also, the varieties of climate were considered. “A large appetite”, says Martin’s biographer, “is gluttony in Greeks, but in Gauls it is nature”.

Pachomius required a probation of three years before admission into his order, and a similar rule was adopted in other societies. There was as yet no vow exacted at entrance, although St. Basil suggests that a formal profession should be required; nor was the profession of monasticism irrevocable, for, although withdrawal was a subject for penance, it was yet in some cases even recommended as the safest course.

All the chief teachers of the age, both in the east and in the west, vied with each other in the praise of celibacy and monasticism. St. Jerome, in particular—the most learned man of his day, who may be regarded as the connecting link between the eastern and the Latin divisions of the church—exercised a powerful influence in the promotion of monachism, and the story of his life belongs in great part to the general history of the subject.

This celebrated teacher of the church —in whom we see extraordinary intellectual gifts and a sincere zeal for the service of Christ strangely combined with extravagance of opinion and conduct, greediness of power and authority, pride, vanity, violent irritability, and extreme bitterness of temper— was born of Christian parents at Stridon, on the borders of Pannonia and Dalmatian. He studied at Rome under Donatus, the commentator on Virgil, and, after having reached manhood, felt himself called to a religious life, and was baptized. After having travelled in Gaul and other countries, he withdrew in 374 to the desert of Chalcis, eastward of Syria, where he entered on a course of the most violent mortifications. But the impulses of sensuality, to which he confesses that he had yielded before his baptism, revived in the solitude where he had hoped to find freedom from temptation. He strove against them by fasting and prayer; and, wishing to add some humiliating occupation to these exercises, he began the study of Hebrew under a converted Jew—the language being recommended for his purpose by the indignity of learning an alphabet, by the unmusical sound of the words, and by the unadorned plainness (as Jerome considered it) of the sacred writings. The acquisition proved valuable in a degree more than sufficient to compensate for the injury which he tells us that his Latin style, and even his pronunciation, had suffered from it.

Jerome had devoted himself with zeal to classical literature, while he despised the Scriptures for their simplicity. The bent of his studies was changed by a remarkable incident, either while he was residing at Antioch before betaking himself to the desert, or during his retirement. He had a severe illness, and was supposed to be dead, when he found himself placed in the presence of the Judge, and, on being asked his condition, answered that he was a Christian. “Thou liest”, it was said; “thou art not a Christian, but a Ciceronian; for where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also”. He was severely beaten, but at his earnest entreaty, and through the intercession of the saints who stood around, his life was spared in pity of his youth. He swore never again to open a heathen book, and on returning to the world found, as he tells us, that his shoulders were black and his body aching from the blows which he had received. Jerome seems to have afterwards dealt with this story according to his convenience—treating it as a solemn reality when he wished to dissuade others from the study of secular learning, and as a mere dream when he found himself unable to deny that he had

not strictly observed his oath. In later ages his vision was often pleaded in favour both of an indolent unwillingness to study and of a fanatical contempt of letters.

The controversies of the time disquieted even the desert. Jerome quarrelled with the neighbouring monks as to the disputes of Meletius, Paulinus, and the Apollinarian Vitalis for the possession of the see of Antioch, and as to the use of the term *hypostasis*. An appeal to Damasus of Rome for direction seems to have decided him in favour of Paulinus he left the desert in 377, and in the following year was ordained presbyter by that bishop, with a stipulation that he should not be bound to any particular sphere of duty. After having spent some time at Constantinople, during the episcopate of Gregory Nazianzen, whom he greatly revered, he settled in 382 at Rome, where he acted as ecclesiastical secretary to Damasus, and assisted him in his studies.

This position, with his talents, his learning, and the reputation of religious experience which he had brought from the east, gave him the means of powerfully forwarding the cause of monasticism and celibacy. He soon gained an immense influence among the Roman ladies of rank, among whom Marcella, Asella, Paula, and Fabiola were conspicuous. He directed their spiritual life; he read and explained the Scriptures to them, while their eager questions often went beyond his power of answering; he endeavoured to draw all women into a resolution to preserve their virginity or their widowhood, and to engage in a course of asceticism. When remarks were made on his confining his instructions to the weaker sex, he answered that if men would ask him about Scripture he would not occupy himself with women. When charged with disparaging marriage, he answered that he praised it, inasmuch as marriage gave birth to virgins. The religion which Jerome taught these female pupils was not without its temptations to pride, from which it may be doubted whether his warnings were sufficient to preserve them. They were charged to seclude themselves from all other persons; the virgin Eustochium was exhorted to avoid all intercourse with married women as corrupting. The pursuits of piety and of unusual learning animated them to despise the ordinary amusements of the world; and they were taught to regard such amusements, without any distinction, as sins of the most deadly kind. On those who followed his directions Jerome lavished hyperbolic praises. He tells them that a mother who gives up her daughter to celibacy becomes the “mother-in-law of God”—an expression which not unnaturally gave occasion for charges of profanity. One of his epistles is an elaborate panegyric on Asella, written to Marcella, whom, with an amusing show of gravity, he begs not to communicate it to her friend who was the subject of it. His eulogium on Paula after her death begins thus—“If all the members of my body were turned into tongues, and all my joints were to utter human voices, I should be unable to say anything worthy of the holy and venerable Paula's virtues”. Eustochium he styles “the precious pearl”—“the precious jewel of virginity and of the church”. She, he says, “in gathering the flowers of virginity”, answers to the good ground in the parable which yielded an hundredfold, while her sister Paulina, who had died in wedlock, was as that which brought forth thirty-fold, and their mother, the widowed Paula, as that which brought forth sixty-fold. With no less zeal he extols Demetrias, a member of the great Anician family, who with her mother Juliana had been driven by the calamities of Rome to seek a refuge in Africa. On the eve of the day appointed for her marriage, this “foremost maiden of the Roman world for nobility and wealth” declared her resolution to embrace a life of celibacy. Augustine, Jerome, and other eminent teachers wrote to her on the occasion; among them Pelagius, whose peculiar tenets were then beginning to attract attention, addressed to her, at her mother's request, an elaborate epistle, in which his errors were so strongly expressed that Augustine and Alypius thought it necessary to counteract the effect of it by writing jointly to Juliana. “What an exultation was there throughout the whole family!” exclaims Jerome. “As if from a fruitful root, a multitude of virgins sprang up at once, and a crowd of dependants and servants followed the example of their pattern and mistress. Through every house ran a fervour of professing virginity. Nay, I say too little—all the churches

throughout Africa danced, as it were, for joy. The fame of the act penetrated not only to cities, towns, and villages, but even to the very tents of the barbarians. All the islands between Africa and Italy were filled with the rumour; and the rejoicings, unchecked in their progress, ran further and further". He goes on to say that Rome had put off her mourning garments—regarding the "perfect conversion" of her child as a token of divine favour towards herself—a compensation for the calamities which she had lately endured; that the shores of the Mediterranean and the regions of the east resounded with celebrations of Demetrias. "Even now", he tells her, in words which admit of more than one application, "you have received, O virgin, more than you have offered. Whereas only one province had known you as the bride of man, the whole world has heard of you as the virgin of Christ". The constant dwelling on the subject of virginity in writing to such correspondents—the strange, and sometimes grossly indecent, comparisons with earthly love by which Jerome illustrates their mystical union with the heavenly bridegroom—are singularly at variance with modern ideas of delicacy. Nor, indeed, is it easy to understand why the choice of an unmarried life—which among ourselves is an everyday effect of mere economical prudence—should be extravagantly magnified as the loftiest reach of heroic sanctity.

Of the Roman ladies who fell under the influence of Jerome, Paula and her daughter Eustochium are the most intimately connected with his history. Paula was born in 347. Her father was said to be descended from Agamemnon; her mother from the Scipios and the Gracchi. Her husband, Toxotius, who traced his line-age through the Julian family to Aeneas, died in 380, leaving her with a young son of his own name, and with four daughters—Blaesilla, Paulina, Eustochium, and Rufina. Paula had already exchanged the luxury and delicacy of her former life for a course of strict religion before she became acquainted with Jerome. Eustochium, who had been trained under the care of the noble and pious widow Marcella, was the first Roman maiden of high birth who dedicated her virginity to God. At the desire of her uncle Hymetius, his wife, Praetextata, once more attired her after the fashion of this world, in the hope that she might be persuaded to abandon her resolution; but Jerome relates that in the same night the matron was visited in her sleep by an angel of terrible countenance and voice, who told her that since she had preferred her husband's command to Christ's, the sacrilegious hands which had touched the virgin's head should wither; that within five months she would be carried off to hell; and unless she repented forthwith, her husband and sons should be taken from her in one day. These threatenings (he says) were all fulfilled; and he does not fail to draw a moral for others from the fate of Praetextata.

Blaesilla, the eldest daughter of Paula, became a widow within seven months after her marriage. On her recovery from a dangerous illness, she devoted herself, by what is styled "a sort of second baptism", to prayer and mortification. Her tears flowed, not for the loss of her husband, but for the irreparable forfeiture of the virgin's crown. She learnt Hebrew with wonderful rapidity, and contended with her mother which of them should commit to memory and should chant the greater number of psalms in the original. After three months of this life Blaesilla died, her end having apparently been hastened by her austerities. At her funeral, which was conducted with pomp suitable to her rank, Paula was greatly agitated, and she was carried home as if dead. The crowd of spectators burst forth into loud cries, "See how she weeps for her child, after having killed her with fasting!" and they were clamorous for the death or banishment of the monks, by whose arts they declared that both mother and daughter had been bewitched. Jerome, who was especially aimed at, wrote to reprove Paula for having, by her exhibition of grief, given this occasion to the enemy; the devil (he said) having missed her daughter's soul, was now attempting to catch her own.

In addition to the popular excitement, Jerome had provoked the dislike of many Roman nobles, whose female relatives had been under his guidance. He had also made many enemies among the professed virgins by censuring their inconsistencies in dress and manners, and was

deeply engaged in quarrels with the clergy, whom he taxed with ignorance, luxury, rapacity, and selfishness, while they retorted by complaints of his intolerable arrogance. Even his ardent admirer Marcella was unable to approve the scorn and the asperity with which he treated his opponents; and the satirical letters which he wrote against his brethren were eagerly circulated among the heathen as tending to the disparagement of Christianity altogether.

By the death of his patron Damasus, which took place in 384, within a month after that of Blaesilla, he lost his official employment. He tells us that, in the earlier days of his residence at Rome, he had been in the highest estimation, and had even been regarded as worthy to succeed to the bishopric; but by this time the general opinion had changed. He had made himself unpopular; he was accused of magic, and of improper familiarity with Paula. "What?" he indignantly asks, "was I ever charged with following after silken dresses, glittering jewels, painted faces, or the desire of gold? Was there no other among the Roman matrons who could subdue my mind but one who is always weeping and fasting, squalid in filthy rags, almost blinded by her tears?—one who spends whole nights in supplications to God for mercy; whose songs are the Psalms, whose speech is the Gospel, whose pleasure is continence, whose life is a fast?". That his own intractable character had been in any degree to blame for the troubles which had arisen, was an idea which Jerome could neither conceive nor entertain; in 385, after a residence of somewhat less than three years, he left Rome in disgust for the east.

Paula soon after followed, with Eustochium. Jerome draws an elaborate picture of her kindred, her marriageable daughter Rufina, and the young Toxotius, accompanying her to the place of embarkation, and imploring that she would not abandon them. Perhaps indignation may mingle with our other feelings as we read his eulogies on the mistaken heroism which led her, in the fancied pursuit of a higher religious life, to cast aside the duties which God and nature had laid upon her.

Jerome and Paula met again at Antioch, and spent some time in travelling, together or apart. Paula visited, with the greatest devotion, all the holy sites; while Jerome employed himself in endeavouring, by the help of local traditions, to bring the topography of Palestine to bear on the illustration of Scripture. From the Holy Land they passed into Egypt, where they sojourned among the Nitrian monks, and Jerome attended the lectures of Didymus, the last eminent master of the catechetical school of Alexandria, who, although blind from early childhood, was among the foremost men of his age, not only for genius, but for theological and secular learning. In 387 the matron and her spiritual guide took up their abode at Bethlehem, then a place of great resort, both for pilgrims from all parts of the Christian world, and for settlers who wished to enjoy such advantages as the neighborhood of scenes famous in sacred history might be expected to yield for the religious life. Jerome describes in lofty terms the love, the harmony, and the mutual forbearance which reigned among the sojourners in the Redeemer's birthplace; but his praises were perhaps chiefly founded on the improvement in his own position, as compared with that of his latter days at Rome; and it is certain that if Bethlehem was at peace when he arrived there, his temper soon introduced the elements of discord.

Paula became an object of interest to pilgrims, whose veneration more than compensated for the secular advantages which she had resigned. For a time Jerome lived in a small cell. He was supported by Paula, but would accept only the coarsest clothing, with a diet of bread, water, and pulse. By selling the remainder of his patrimony, through the agency of his brother Paulinian, whom he sent into the west for the purpose, he was able to build a monastery, in which it is supposed that he took up his abode, and an hospital, which was open to all strangers except heretics, "lest", he said, "Joseph and Mary, if they were to come again to Bethlehem, should again find no room; for our purpose is to wash the feet of those who come to us—not to discuss their merits". His chief literary occupation was the translation of

the Scriptures. While at Rome he had, at the desire of Damasus, corrected the Latin version of the Gospels by the Greek; he now, in like manner, corrected the Latin of the Old Testament according to the text of the Septuagint exhibited in Origen's *Hexapla*, which he procured from the library of Caesarea; but he afterwards entered on a greater undertaking, of vast importance for the ages which were to follow—a direct translation from the Hebrew. These labours excited great odium against him on the part of persons by whom the reverence which regards God's word as sacred was ignorantly extended to the defects of the versions which they had been accustomed to use. His correction of the Gospels had contributed to swell his unpopularity at Rome; to attempt any improvements on the Septuagint, which was supposed to be itself inspired, was regarded as a daring impiety. Rufinus, in the bitterness of controversy, denounced Jerome for bringing the knowledge which he had bought from “a Barabbas of the synagogue” to disparage the books which the apostles had delivered to the church; even Augustine wrote to dissuade him from prosecuting his task, on the ground that, after the labours of so many translators, there was probably nothing considerable to be done.

By his correspondence Jerome acted as a spiritual director to many religious persons at Rome and elsewhere, while at home he superintended the exercises and employments of Paula and Eustochium. The hours of the pious widow and her daughter were spent in study, devotion, and works of charity : such was their eagerness to penetrate into the meaning of Scripture, that Jerome often found himself perplexed by their pertinacious questionings. Paula daily bewailed the vanities of her youth with a profusion of tears; even in illness she refused to depart from her custom of lying on the bare floor in a hair shirt; nor would she taste wine, although the advice of her physician was supported by the spiritual authority of Jerome and of Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus. She built three monasteries for women, and one for men. Her property had been greatly reduced by her largesses for religious and charitable purposes before leaving Rome and in the course of her travels; she now gave away the remainder, and, when Jerome remonstrated, she answered that it was her wish to die a beggar, without leaving anything for her daughter, and to be indebted to the charity of others for a shroud. Eustochium is celebrated as a model of filial obedience; she never, it is said, slept away from her mother, never ate except in her company, never took a step without her: she never had any money of her own during her mother's lifetime, and at Paula's death found herself charged with the maintenance of a multitude of male and female recluses, and burdened with debts which the devout widow had contracted at high interest, in order to obtain the means for her extravagant alms-deeds.

After a residence of nearly twenty years at Bethlehem, Paula died in 404, and was buried in the church of the Nativity. The funeral rites lasted a week. The bier was borne by bishops, while others of that order carried lamps; and the attendance of clergy, monks, and laity was immense. The inscription on the grave, composed by Jerome, set forth the illustrious descent and connections of Paula, with her sacrifice of all for Christ. Eustochium survived her until 419, and in the following year Jerome himself died, having attained the age of eighty-nine.

The founders of monasticism intended that their disciples should be patterns of the highest Christian life, rather than directly teachers. They were therefore originally laymen, but by the repute of sanctity they soon gained an influence which raised them into a rivalry with the clergy. Although for the most part little qualified by education to judge of theological questions, they were consulted on the highest and the most difficult. Some of them were resorted to as oracles; even the emperor Theodosius, before resolving on war, thought it well to assure himself by the opinion of John, a celebrated solitary of the Thebaid. By many of the monks ecclesiastical office was regarded as inconsistent with the higher spiritual life. Thus St. Martin of Tours considered that his power of miracles was weakened from the time when he left his monastery for the episcopate. Pachomius charged his brotherhood to shun ordination as a snare and it is recorded as a saying current in Egypt, that “a monk ought to avoid bishops and women; for neither will allow him to rest quietly in his cell, or to devote himself to the

contemplation of heavenly things". Ammonius, one of the monks who had accompanied Athanasius to Rome, on being chosen for a bishopric, cut off one of his ears, supposing that, as under the Jewish law, the mutilation would disqualify him; and, on being told that such was not the case, he threatened to cut out his tongue. When, however, an abbot named Dracontius declined a bishopric as being a hindrance to spiritual improvement, Athanasius strongly combated his opinion. "Even when a bishop", he writes, "you may hunger and thirst, and fast as often as Paul. . . . We know of bishops who fast, and of monks who eat; of bishops who abstain from wine, and of monks who drink; of bishops who do miracles, and of monks who do none; of many bishops who have never married, and of monks who have had children". But, although the original idea of monachism discouraged the reception of ecclesiastical orders, many monks regarded ordination as an advancement, and for that reason sought after it. St. Augustine intimates that these were not always the persons who were most likely to do credit to the clerical office; but even where there was no previous objection on the ground of character, the effect of transferring monks to the ranks of clergy was often unsatisfactory. St. Chrysostom, a warm advocate of monasticism, mentions that he had known some who made continual progress as monks, but deteriorated when brought into active life as ecclesiastics; and perhaps this change may be explained by supposing that the monastic training had failed to prepare them for functions which require a knowledge of men, and a sympathy with human feelings.

There is much that is beautiful and attractive in the idea of monasticism—a life dedicated to prayer and contemplation, varied by labours for the good of mankind; a bond of brotherhood, linking together as equals all who should enter into the society, from the man who had forsaken rank and wealth and power—perhaps even sovereignty—to the emancipated slave; renunciation of individual possessions for a community of all things, in imitation (as was supposed) of the first Christians after the day of Pentecost. But while we acknowledge this, and believe that in very many cases the benefits of the monastic institution were largely realized—while we see in the establishment of this system a providential preparation for the coming ages of darkness, in which it was to be of inestimable service to the church, to literature, and to civilization—we must notice even thus early some of the evils which were mixed with it. Foremost among these may be placed the danger of the distinction between an ordinary and a more exalted Christian life. This idea St. Chrysostom strongly and frequently opposed. "All men", he says, "ought to rise to the same height, and that which ruins the whole world is that we imagine a greater strictness to be necessary for the monk alone, but that others may lead careless lives. Indeed it is not so, it is not so; but we are all required to exercise the same discipline; and this I very strongly assert,—or rather, not I, but He who will be our judge. The Saviour's precepts that we should take his yoke upon us, that we should enter in at the strait gate, that we should hate the life of this world, and all such like, are not addressed to monks only, but to all. But the distinction was too commonly adopted—not only to the relaxation of religion and morals among the multitude, who learnt to devolve the higher duties on the monks, and were led into a general disregard of the divine laws by finding themselves exempt from the operation of certain rules which claimed a divine authority, such as the monastic precepts on the subject of marriage; but to the danger of those who embraced a course which was thus marked out as far above that required of mankind in general".

The institution was not of Christian origin. It was common to eastern religions; the scriptural patterns of it were all drawn from the days of the Old Testament—Elijah, the Rechabites, St. John the Baptist whereas a warrant for it under the gospel was only to be found by violently distorting the meaning of some passages, or by magnifying them beyond their due proportion. The monk was to avoid those trials of life for the bearing of which grace is promised, and was to cast himself on other trials, for which he might possibly be unfit. He was placed in hostility, not only to the corruption and evil of the world, but to that which is good in it. He was to renounce its charities and its discipline; he was to become a stranger to

his natural affections. Antony himself believed it to be a duty to overcome his love for his sister, whom, after their early parting, he never saw again until she had become an aged abbess; and we have seen how harshly Pachomius disowned the ties of kindred. Pior, a disciple of Antony, on leaving his father's house, vowed that he would never again look on any of his relations. After he had spent fifty years in the desert, his sister discovered that he was still alive; she was too infirm to seek him out, but her earnest entreaties set in motion the authority of his superiors, and Pior was ordered to visit her. Having arrived in front of her dwelling, he sent her notice of his presence. As the door opened, he closed his eyes, and held them obstinately closed throughout the meeting; and, having allowed his sister to see him in this fashion, he refused to enter her house, and hurried back to the desert. Another monastic hero, on receiving a large packet of letters from his home, with which he had held no communication for fifteen years, burnt it without opening it, lest the contents should distract his mind by suggesting remembrances of the writers. A still more extraordinary example of the manner in which the monks were expected to deaden their natural feelings is said to have been given by one Mucius. On his desiring admission into a monastery, with his son, a boy eight years old, they were compelled, by way of trial, to remain long without the gate. The constancy with which this was borne prevailed on the monks to admit them, although children were usually excluded; but their probation was not yet ended. They were separated from each other, the child was ill-treated in every way, was dressed in rags, kept in a disgustingly filthy state, and often beaten without any cause. Mucius, however, made no remonstrance; and at length, on being told to throw his son into the river, he obeyed this command also. The boy was saved, and it was revealed to the abbot of the house that his new inmate was a second Abraham.

The overstrained and misdirected idea of obedience which appears so remarkably in the case of Mucius, runs through the whole history of early monachism. The applicants for admission into a monastic society were required to approve themselves by submitting to insults, contempt, harsh usage, and degrading employments; the faith and patience of the monks were tried by the imposition of wearisome and preposterous labours. Thus it is related that John, the same whose responses afterwards directed the policy of the great Theodosius, was commanded by his abbot to remove a huge rock, and struggled at the manifestly hopeless task until he was worn out by the violence of his exertions. At another time he was ordered to water a dry stick twice a day; and for a year he faithfully persisted in the work, toiling, whether sick or well, through all the inclemencies of the seasons, to fetch the water twice every day from a distance of two miles. On being asked at length by his superior whether the plant had struck root, the monk completed his obedience by modestly answering that he did not know; whereupon the abbot, pulling up the stick, released him from his task. In such narratives it seems to be expected that we should admire not only the endurance of the submissive monk, but the execrable tyranny of the taskmaster.

The zeal with which St. Ambrose taught that virginity ought to be embraced in defiance of the will of parents has already been mentioned. St. Jerome is yet more extravagant. "Although", he writes, in exhorting Heliodorus to become a hermit, "your little nephew should hang about your neck; although your mother, with hair disheveled and garments rent, should show you the breasts at which she nourished you; although your father should lie on the threshold;—trample on your father, and set out! Fly with dry eyes to the banner of the cross! The only kind of piety is to be cruel in this matter".

An over-valuation of celibacy already called down the censure of some councils. That of Gangra anathematizes those who condemn marriage as if it were inconsistent with salvation; it forbids virgins to exalt themselves above the married, and orders that women should not forsake their husbands as if matrimony were unholy. The whole tone of its canons is directed against the error of making a higher religion the pretext for the neglect of natural and ordinary duties. Other councils forbade the reception of married persons into monasteries

without the consent of their partners, and the profession of celibacy by women before the age of mature understanding. The council of Saragossa (A.D. 381) fixes this at forty; the third council of Carthage (A.D. 397), at twenty-five; St. Basil, without naming any particular age, requires that the profession shall be the effect of a settled and independent resolution.

Some monks lived entirely for contemplation and devotion, depending on others for food—as Paul, called the Simple, a monk of Scetis, who said three hundred prayers a-day, keeping an account of them by pebbles. But in general, the need of some additional occupation was felt by the fathers of monasticism. It was a saying that “a monk employed is beset by one devil, but an idle monk by a whole legion”. The industrial occupations prescribed for the monks, however, were not in general such as very thoroughly to occupy them. There was, after all, much vacant time, and, although some of them cultivated learning, there was in most cases a want of mental resources for the profitable use of leisure. Antony, indeed, when a philosopher asked him how he could live without books, was able to reply that for him the whole creation was a book, always at hand, in which he could read God's word whensoever he pleased. But this capacity for the contemplative life was not universal. Among the multitude who embraced the monastic profession—some from a mere spirit of imitation; others from disappointment in love or in ambition, from excited feelings of remorse, or in consequence of a sudden shock; some from a wish to distinguish themselves, and to gain the reputation of holiness; some from a disinclination to earn their support by any active callings. The means which were taken to avoid temptation rather served to excite it, by placing always before the mind the duty of combating certain forms in which it might be expected to appear. Thoughts of blasphemy and visions of impurity are continually mentioned in the histories of monks. Many were driven into positive insanity by solitude and excessive abstinence, working on enthusiastic temperaments; many to despair, with thoughts of suicide, which were sometimes carried into act. The biographies are full of fights with devils, of visions and miracles—especially cures of demoniacs, raising of the dead and compelling them to speak. The brute creatures play a large part in the miraculous tales. Thus it is said that the younger Macarius was visited by a lioness, who laid her blind cubs at his feet, that they might receive their sight. The saint, after praying, performed the work; and the mother expressed her gratitude by a present of sheepskins. It would be difficult to determine in how far these stories are true; how far the phantasies of excited imagination may have been mistaken for realities; how far ordinary things have been exaggerated into the miraculous; or how far the narratives are mere falsehoods, invented for the glory of the heroes and of the institution.

With many the outward imitation of the founders of monachism was all in all, while unhappily the spirit which preserved such men as Antony from the evils of their system was wanting. Austerities' frightful to think of were too often combined with a want of true Christian faith and purity of heart. Many monks fancied themselves above needing the ordinances of grace; many relapsed from an overstrained asceticism into self-indulgent habits. Spiritual pride and fanaticism abounded. And often it was found that the love of earthly things, which was supposed to have been overcome by embracing the monastic state, revived in new and subtle forms; as we are told that many who had renounced wealth and splendour became chary of a knife, a style, a needle, or a pen; that they would not let any one even touch their books, and for such trifles were ready to break out into violent anger.

After a time, monks, forgetting the original object of their institution, began to flock into towns, for the sake of the gifts which were to be expected, and of the other advantages which such places offered. This was forbidden in 390 by a law of Theodosius, issued, it is said, at the instigation of judges, who found the visitors apt to interfere with the course of justice. Two years later the law was relaxed, but only to the extent of allowing the monks to repair to, cities for the redress of judicial wrongs. The credulity and liberality of the inhabitants were practised on by hypocritical monks, who affected strange dress and savage manners,—loading themselves with heavy chains, exhibiting pretended relics, and telling outrageous

fictions of adventures which they professed to have had with evil spirits,—while their private life was spent in luxury and profligacy.

Few of the monks were able even to read; and in them the ignorance which would have been despised in the clergy was admired as a token of sanctity. In consequence of their ignorance they were liable to be swayed by any one who might get possession of their minds. Their partisanship was violent; they denounced any deviation from their own narrow views as utterly anti-Christian; and, although in the Arian and Apollinarian controversies they did good service, it was often in a rude and improper manner. They interfered tumultuously in the elections of bishops. Crowds of them went about in the east, destroying temples; and as such were the specimens of the monastic class which came into contact with the pagans, we cannot wonder that their illiteracy and their lawless fury excited in these strong feelings of disgust and detestation. Libanius, whose description of them has been already quoted in part, is vehement against these “drones” who live in luxury at other men’s cost; and he charges them with getting a large portion of the soil into their possession under false pretences of religion. The emperor Julian can find nothing worse to say against the pretenders to the character of cynics than that they are like the class of “renunciants” among the “Galileans”, who, by giving up such trifles as they possess, acquire wealth, state, and reverence. In like manner Eunapius speaks of the monks as leading a “swinish life”; he says that any one who chooses to dress in black and to disregard public decency may acquire a tyrannic power. If a comparison with the circumcellions, which St. Augustine is very eager to rebut, was undeserved by the monks of northern Africa, it would have done but little injustice to those of some other regions.

The monastic spirit soon began to exhibit itself in extravagant forms. Thus the *doscoi*, or grazers, whose manner of life originated in Mesopotamia, but was afterwards imitated in Palestine, dwelt in mountains or deserts, without any roof to shelter them—exposed, almost entirely naked, to the heat and to the cold, and browsing on grass and herbs until, both in body and in mind, they lost the likeness of humanity. Others of these Christian *fakirs*, after having professedly attained a perfection superior to all human feelings, used to feign madness, and to astonish the inhabitants of cities by ostentatious displays of ridiculous and unseemly behaviour, in order (as it was interpreted) to show their contempt for worldly glory. And in the beginning of the fifth century appeared the fanaticism of the stylites, or pillar-saints.

The first of these, Simeon, a native of the border-land between Syria and Cilicia, was employed in boyhood to tend his father's sheep; but, having been induced by some words which he heard in church to resolve on embracing a religious life, he entered a strict monastery at the age of thirteen, and remained there nine years. His abstinences and other mortifications excited the wonder and admiration of the monks. One day, on being sent to draw water, he took the rough palm-rope of the convent well, bound it tightly round him, and pretended that he had been unable to find it. At the end of a fortnight, the secret was betrayed by the drops of blood which the rope forced out from his flesh; and, on examination, it was found to have eaten into his body so deeply that it could hardly be seen. Simeon bore without a groan the torture of having it extracted, but would not allow any remedies to be applied to his wounds; and the abbot thereupon begged that he would leave the monastery, lest his severities should raise a spirit of emulation which might be dangerous to the weaker brethren. Simeon then withdrew to a place about forty miles from Antioch, where he lived ten years in a sort of narrow pen; after which he built a pillar, and took his position on the top of it, which was only about a yard in diameter. He removed successively from one pillar to another, always increasing the height, which in the last of them was forty cubits; and in this way he spent thirty-seven years. His life is compared to that of angels—offering up prayers for men from his elevated station, and bringing down graces on them. His neck was loaded with an iron chain. In praying, he bent his body so that his forehead almost touched his feet; a spectator once counted twelve hundred and forty-four repetitions of this movement, and then

lost his reckoning. The stylite took only one scanty meal a-week, and fasted throughout the season of Lent. He uttered prophecies, and wrought an abundance of miracles.

Some time after he had adopted his peculiar manner of life, a neighbouring society of monks sent to ask why he was not content with such fashions of holiness as had sufficed for the saints of earlier days. The messenger was charged to bid him leave his pillar, and, in case of a refusal, to pull him down by force. But Simeon, on hearing the order, put forth one of his feet, as if to descend; whereupon the messenger, as he had been instructed, acknowledged this obedience as a proof that the stylite's mode of life was approved by God, and desired him to continue in it.

Simeon's fame became immense. Pilgrims from distant lands—from Persia and Ethiopia, from Spain, Gaul, and even from Britain—flocked to see him; and during his own lifetime little figures of him were set up in the workshops of Rome, as charms against evil. The king of Persia sent ambassadors to him; he corresponded with bishops and emperors, and influenced the policy both of church and state, while, by his life and his exhortations, he converted multitudes of Saracens and other nomads of the desert.

At length the devil appeared to Simeon in the form of an angel, and in the name of God invited him to ascend, like Elijah, in a fiery chariot, to the company of angels and saints who were represented as eager to welcome him. Simeon raised his right foot to enter the chariot, but at the same time made the sign of the cross, on which the tempter vanished. In punishment of the stylite's having so far given way to presumption, the devil afflicted him with an ulcer in his thigh; and Simeon, by way of penance, resolved that the foot which he had put forth should never again touch his pillar, but during the remaining year of his life supported himself on one leg. Simeon died in 460, at the age of seventy-two; and we are told that around the spot which had long been his abode, all nature mourned his departure. The birds wheeled about his pillar, uttering doleful cries; men and beasts filled the air with their groans to a distance of many miles; while the mountains, the forests, and the plains were enveloped in a dense and sympathetic gloom. An angel with a countenance like lightning, and in raiment white as snow, appeared discoursing with seven elders, in awful tones, of which the words could not be distinguished; and as the precious body was carried to Antioch, to serve the city as a defence, instead of the walls which had been lately overthrown by an earthquake, a multitude of miracles marked its way.

On Simeon's death, a disciple named Sergius, in obedience to his desire, carried his cowl to the emperor Leo; but, as the emperor did not appear to be sufficiently impressed by the announcement of the legacy, Sergius bestowed it on Daniel, a monk of Mesopotamian birth, whose sanctity had already been attested by many miracles. Daniel had formerly visited Simeon; he was now urged by visions to imitate his manner of life, and set up a pillar in a spot which had been indicated by a dove, about four miles north of Constantinople. The owner of the soil, whose leave had not been asked, complained of this invasion to Leo and to the patriarch Gennadius; and Gennadius, envious of Daniel's holiness, or suspecting him of vanity, was about to dislodge him, when miracles were wrought in vindication of the stylite's motives. Daniel was therefore allowed to retain his position, and after some time Gennadius, whose suspicions were not yet extinct, was directed by a vision to ordain him to the priesthood. The stylite professed himself unworthy, and would not allow the patriarch to approach him; but Gennadius, standing at the foot of the pillar, went through the form of ordination. Daniel then ordered that a ladder should be brought; the patriarch mounted to the top of the column, administered the Eucharist to the newly-ordained priest, and received it at his hands.

For thirty-three years Daniel continued to occupy his pillar, until he died at the age of eighty. By continually standing, his feet were covered with sores and ulcers; and it was in vain that his disciples endeavoured to discover by what nourishment he supported life. The high winds of Thrace sometimes stripped him of his scanty clothing, and almost blew him from his

place, and sometimes he was covered for days with snow and ice, until Leo forcibly enclosed the top of his pillar with a shed. Like Simeon, he was supposed to possess the gifts of prophecy and miracles; he was regarded as an oracle of heaven, and was visited with reverence by kings and emperors. It is said that, through all the temptations to pride which he so laboriously courted, Daniel was able to preserve his humility; and, although general assertions of this kind carry little weight, perhaps a better evidence may be found in the statement that he discouraged all who approached him with complaints against their bishops.

Although the stylite manner of life was regarded by some teachers as vainglorious and unprofitable, Simeon found many imitators in Syria and in Greece, where stylites are mentioned as late as the twelfth century. But, except in a very few cases, this fashion does not appear to have been adopted in other countries. When one Wulfilaich, towards the end of the sixth century, attempted to practise it in the district of Treves, the neighbouring bishops ordered his pillar to be demolished.

Rites and Usages.

The more general adoption of Christianity was followed by an increase of splendour in all that concerned the worship of God. Churches were built and adorned with greater cost; the officiating clergy were attired in gorgeous vestures; the music became more elaborate, and many new ceremonies were introduced. But, praiseworthy as was the design of making the outward service as worthy of its object as the means of the worshippers would allow, the change was not unaccompanied by serious evils, which even already began to produce their effects. St. Jerome complains of the magnificence which was lavished on churches—their marble walls and pillars, their gilded ceilings, their jewelled altars—which he contrasts with the neglect of all care in the choice of fit persons for the ministry; and he scornfully reprobates the arguments which would defend the richness of furniture and decoration in Christian churches by analogies derived from the Jewish system. Multitudes were drawn into the church by the conversion of the emperor, without any sufficient understanding of their new profession—with minds still possessed by heathen notions and corrupted by the general depravation of heathen morality. The governors of the church attempted to recommend the gospel to such converts by ceremonies which might rival those of their old religion, and so, it was hoped, might attract them to the true and saving essentials with which the Christian ceremonies were connected. But unhappily Christianity itself lost in the process—not only being discredited by unworthy professors, but becoming affected in its doctrines and practices by heathenism. Pagan usages were adopted,—the burning of lamps or candles by day (which, even so lately as the time of Lactantius, had been a subject of ridicule for the Christian controversialists), incense, lustrations, and the like; and there was indeed too much foundation for the reproach with which the Manichean Faustus assailed the church:—“The sacrifices of the heathen ye have turned into feasts of charity; their idols into martyrs, whom ye honour with the like religious offices unto theirs; the ghosts of the dead ye appease with wine and delicates; the festival days of the nations ye celebrate together with them [as the kalends and the solstices]; and of their kind of life ye have verily changed nothing”. A merely external performance of duties, as it was all that heathenism required, came to be regarded by many as sufficient in Christianity also, and bounty to the church was supposed to cover the guilt of sins. St. Augustine says that an ordinary Christian who professed any seriousness in spiritual things had as much to bear from the mockery of his brethren as a convert to Christianity endured from the mockery of the heathen. And we have already had occasion to notice the unfavourable effect which the monastic system produced on the religion of men engaged in secular life.

Many persons were found at church for the great Christian ceremonies, and at the theatres, or even at the temples, for the heathen spectacles. The ritual of the church was

viewed as a theatrical exhibition. The sermons were listened to as the displays of rhetoricians; and eloquent preachers were cheered with clapping of hands, stamping of feet, waving of handkerchiefs, cries of "Orthodox!" "Thirteenth apostle!" and other like demonstrations, which such teachers as Chrysostom and Augustine often tried to restrain, in order that they might persuade their flocks to a more profitable manner of hearing. Some went to church for the sermon only, alleging that they could pray at home. And when the more attractive parts of the service were over, the great mass of the people departed, without remaining for the administration of the Eucharist, which in the first ages had usually been received by the whole congregation, but was now (in the Greek church, at least) received by most persons at Easter only. The doctrinal controversies also, which occupy so large a space in the history of the century, acted unfavourably on its religious tone, by bringing the highest mysteries of the faith into idle discussion, and by throwing into the background the necessity of a practically religious life.

Usages which had grown up insensibly were now fixed by express regulations; and by this and the other means which have been mentioned, the ritual system was so overlaid with rules and ceremonies as to give occasion for St. Augustine's well-known complaint, "that they were grown to such a number that the state of Christian people was in worse case concerning that matter than were the Jews". Things which would have been good either as expressions of devotion or as means of training for it, became, through their multiplication and through the importance which was attached to them, too likely to be regarded as independent ends.

The heathen temples were in some cases turned into churches; but, intended as they were for a ritual which was chiefly carried on in the open courts, and of which addresses to the people formed no part, their structure was ill suited for Christian worship. The type of the Christian churches was taken from buildings of another kind,—the basilicae; and the name itself was adopted into ecclesiastical use, as signifying the dwelling-places of the Almighty King. These buildings were oblong, and were usually separated by two ranges of pillars into a middle part or nave, and two aisles of inferior height. At the farther end was a portion styled in Greek *bema*, and in Latin *tribuna*, distinguished from the rest by the elevation of its floor, and terminating in a semicircular projection, called the *absis* or *apse*. The lower portion of the building was used as a sort of exchange; in the *bema* stood the tribunal of the judge, with an altar before it. These arrangements were easily accommodated to the purpose of worship, whether in basilicas which were given up to the church, or in new buildings erected on the same plan.

At Constantinople, from the foundation of the city, a new form of ecclesiastical architecture was employed—its chief characteristics being the cruciform plan, and the cupola which soared upwards from the intersection of the cross, as if in imitation of the canopy of heaven. This style in later times not only prevailed through the Greek church, including the countries of the Slavonic race, but was introduced by Justinian at Ravenna, and through the influence of the Ravennese examples affected other parts of western Europe.

Contrary to the practice which afterwards became general among the Teutonic nations, the early churches usually fronted the east. Paulinus of Nola mentions this arrangement, and tells us that he himself, in building his church to the honour of St. Felix, deviated from it by turning the front towards the patron's tomb.

The part of a church nearest to the entrance was the *narthex*, or vestibule, occupied by penitents and catechumens, and open to all comers. This was separated by the "beautiful gates" from the nave, in which the "faithful" were placed; at the upper end of the nave, in a place corresponding to that which in the secular basilicas was appropriated to the bar, was the choir, slightly raised above the level of the nave, and separated by a railing from the innermost portion of the church, the *bema*, or sanctuary. From the time of Constantine the wooden altars of the primitive church began to be superseded by stone. The introduction of this material is ascribed to Sylvester of Rome, although without any certain authority, and the change appears

to have been completely established before the times of Gregory Nyssen and Chrysostom. Women were seated apart from the men—sometimes in enclosed galleries, an arrangement which was especially followed in eastern countries. The church was usually surrounded by a court, containing the lodgings of the clergy and other buildings, among which, in cathedrals and other greater churches, was the baptistery. Churches were now dedicated with great solemnity, and the anniversary of the consecration was celebrated.

The arts of painting and sculpture began to be taken into the service of the gospel. This change, however, did not originate with the clergy. Eusebius of Caesarea, in the early part of the century, expressed himself strongly against the attempt to represent the holy personages of Scripture—saying that the glory of the Saviour cannot be represented, and that the true image of the saints is a saintly life. Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus (whose name will again come before us), while travelling in the Holy Land in 394, tore a curtain, which he found hanging before the sanctuary of a church, with a figure either of the Saviour or of a saint painted on it—declaring such representations to be contrary to Scripture. But the account of the incident shows that new views as to their lawfulness had already obtained a footing among Christians. It was usual to depict subjects from the Old Testament as figurative of their evangelical antitypes: thus the water from the rock was employed to signify baptism; Moses bringing the manna from heaven represented the Eucharist; and the sacrifice of Isaac typified the crucifixion. In addition to these symbolical pictures, the walls of many churches were covered with martyrdoms and scriptural scenes, and wealthy persons had their garments embroidered with subjects of the same kinds. It was not, however, until the very end of the century that single figures were thus painted—a sort of pictures the most likely to attract the honour which was soon bestowed on them. St. Augustine reluctantly confesses that in his time many were “adorers of pictures”. Statues were not yet erected; nor was the Saviour himself represented, otherwise than in symbolical forms, until the next century; although the teachers of the church, abandoning the earlier view as to the uncomeliness of his personal appearance, took up one of an opposite kind, and thus prepared the way for the introduction of that type on which the artists of later ages have expressed their ideal of serene majesty and tenderness.

The cross was adorned with gems and gold, and was perhaps set upon the altars of churches. Julian charged the Christians with worshipping it. But the crucifix, like all other representations of our Lord which are associated with sorrow and suffering, was not known until some centuries later.

BAPTISM.

During the fourth century much was done to fix those parts of the liturgy which until then had been fluctuating. The name of St. Basil in the east, and that of St. Ambrose in the west, are especially celebrated in relation to this work, although both have been connected with much that is of later date. The hymns of Ambrose became the models for such compositions in the western church, and, from the general designation of the style as Ambrosian, it came to pass that many pieces were wrongly ascribed to him, as if they had been the productions of his own pen.

The division of the service into the “mass of the catechumens” and the “mass of the faithful” was maintained, until, in the fifth century, its abolition naturally followed on the general profession of Christianity and the general practice of infant baptism. Now that the celebration of Christian worship was not attended with danger, the earlier portion of the service—including psalmody, reading of Scripture, prayers, and sermon—was open to Jews and heathens, as well as to catechumens and penitents.

At baptism some new ceremonies were introduced—as the use of lights and salt, and an unction with oil before baptism (significant of the receivers being “made kings and priests

unto God”, in addition to that with chrism, which continued to be administered after the sacrament). The previous training was methodized by a division of the catechumens into three classes, hearers, kneelers, and competents, the last being candidates who were fully prepared. The vigils of Easter and Pentecost were, as before, the most usual times for baptism. In the east, the Epiphany became popular as a baptismal season, connected as it was with the Saviour’s baptism in the Jordan, and the administration at Whitsuntide was disused. The custom of baptizing on the Epiphany also made its way into Africa and other western countries; but when some Spanish bishops baptized at Christmas, Epiphany, and on the festivals of saints, Siricius, in his decretal epistle to Himerius (A.D. 385), noted it as a presumption, and ordered that baptism should not ordinarily be given except at Easter and Whitsuntide.

The practice of deferring baptism has been exemplified in many instances in the preceding chapters. The delay, however, did not arise from any opinion that the baptism of infants was unlawful (for in case of danger they were baptized, and the institution was regarded as apostolical), but from fear lest a greater guilt should be contracted by falling into sin after baptism. And the time to which the sacrament was postponed was not, as with modern sectaries, that of attaining to years of discretion; but the season of serious illness or other danger, or, in the case of clergymen and monks, that of entering on a new and strict manner of life. Eminent teachers of the church, a Gregory of Nazianzum and his namesake of Nyssa, endeavoured to counteract the custom by exposing the mistakes on which it rested. Gregory of Nyssa states that, when alarmed by earthquakes, pestilence, or other public calamities, such multitudes rushed to be baptized, that the clergy were oppressed by the labour of receiving them.

The customs of churches varied as to the frequency of celebrating the Eucharist. Where there was no daily consecration, it was usual to reserve the consecrated bread, which thus became liable to be used for superstitious purposes; as we are told that Satyrus, a brother of St. Ambrose, was saved in a shipwreck by tying a morsel of the holy bread to his neck; and that in another case the application of such bread, by way of a poultice, opened the eyes of a blind person. When the elements were consecrated, the people partook of both; to refuse the wine was noted as a token of Manichaeian heresy.

The name of agape was now used in a sense different from that which it had originally borne—to designate festivals held by churches at the tombs of their martyrs, or by families at those of their relatives. These festivals took the place of the heathen Parentalia, and were celebrated with so much of unseemliness and excess that bishops and councils, during the latter part of the century, exerted themselves to suppress them. But so great a hold had such celebrations on the multitude, that the abolition of them was no easy matter, and could hardly be attempted without danger. Thus the third council of Carthage, in 397, does not venture to forbid them, except as far as possible and notices of them are found as having continued in some places until the following century

The Lord's day was observed with greater strictness than before, although the distinction between it and the Sabbath, as to origin, authority, and manner of observance, was still carefully maintained. Constantine, as we have seen, ordered that no legal proceedings and no military exercises should take place on it; yet he allowed agricultural labour to be carried on, lest the benefit of favourable weather should be lost. The council of Laodicea, while it condemned all Judaizing in the observance of the day, directed that labour should be avoided on it as much as possible. Theodosius in 379, and again in 386, enacted that no civil business should then be done, and abolished the spectacles in which the heathen had found their consolation when the day was set apart from other secular uses by Constantine.

The custom of observing the Sabbath in a similar manner to the Lord's day was now declining. The Laodicean canon, which has just been quoted, denounced a cessation from work on it as Judaical.

The quartodeciman practice as to the observance of Easter was condemned by the council of Nicaea, and was thenceforth regarded as a mark of heterodoxy. But as the council did not direct by what means the proper day should be determined, it was found that, although Easter was everywhere kept on a Sunday, the reckonings of different churches varied, sometimes to the extent of a month or more. The science of Alexandria gave the law to the eastern churches in general; and in the sixth century the Alexandrian calculation was adopted at Rome.

The tendency of the age to an increase of ceremonies affected the celebration of Easter. The week before the festival was observed with additional solemnity. On the Thursday the Eucharist was celebrated in the evening, in special remembrance of its original institution; on Easter-eve, 'the great Sabbath', cities were illuminated, and crowds of worshippers, carrying lights, symbolical of the baptismal "enlightening," flocked to the churches, where they continued in vigil until the morning of the resurrection. The following week was a season of rejoicing; the newly-baptized wore their white robes until the Sunday of the octave.

The Epiphany now made its way from the eastern churches into the west, where it was kept chiefly in remembrance of our Lord's manifestation to the magi, but also with a reference to his first miracle and other manifestations. As the Donatists rejected the festival, we may infer that it must have been unknown in Africa until after the date of their separation from the church; the earliest express notice of its celebration in any western country is in 360, when Julian kept it at Vienne, shortly before avowing his apostasy. In like manner the observance of the Nativity passed from the west to the east. It was introduced at Antioch soon after 375, and was there kept on the 25th of December, although some churches combined it with the Epiphany. The idea that our Christmas-day was chosen from a wish to compensate for the heathen festivals of the season is refuted by the fact that the policy of the earlier Christians, from whom it had come down, met the festivities of the heathen by appointing not feasts, but fasts. Thus, in the west, a fast of three days at the beginning of the year was established in opposition to the Saturnalia.

The festivals of some of the most distinguished saints, such as St. Peter and St. Paul, St. John the Baptist and St. Stephen, from having had only a local celebration, became, in the fourth century, general throughout the church.

The practice of fasting, which had formerly been left in great measure to the discretion of individuals, was now settled by ecclesiastical laws. The Lenten fast, of thirty-six days, "a tithe of the year", became general both in the east and in the west, although with a difference as to its beginning, from the circumstance that in the east the Sabbath, as well as the Lord's day, was excepted from the time of fasting.

Acts of mercy were connected with certain holy days and seasons. Thus Constantine ordered that the emancipation of slaves should take place on Sundays. While he forbade legal proceedings in general on Sunday, he excepted the ceremony of emancipation, and such other acts of grace as were suitable to the character of the day. Easter became the chief season for emancipation. Theodosius in 380 forbade the carrying on of criminal law-proceedings during Lent. Nine years later he issued a like prohibition of all bodily punishments during the same season; and in 387 he renewed the laws of the elder and younger Valentinians, by which it was ordered that all prisoners, except those guilty of the very worst offences, should be released at Easter.

PENANCE.

During the course of the century many canons were made on the subject of penance, which was thus carried into great minuteness of detail. In the east the regulation of penance was ordinarily left to the consciences of individuals; especially after Nectarius, in consequence of a scandal which had occurred, abolished the office of penitentiary presbyter at Constantinople in 391. Socrates, who wrote about the year 439, expresses an apprehension of

evil results from the abolition, and Sozomen, somewhat later, states that a deterioration of morals had ensued. The office of penitentiary does not appear to have existed in the west and there the performance of formal penance came to be regarded as necessary in order to the Divine forgiveness. The ancient division of penitents into classes is not mentioned after the fifth century.

The honours paid to martyrs were naturally increased, as, from the cessation of persecution, the opportunities of martyrdom became very rare. And the influence of heathenism told most unhappily in this matter. Converts regarded the martyrs as holding a place in their new religion like that of the heroes in the pagan system; they ascribed to them a tutelary power, and paid them honours such as those which belonged to the lesser personages of the pagan mythology. Nor was the Arian controversy without its effect in directing men's minds unduly towards the saints and martyrs. For, as the great object of orthodox controversialists, in the fourth century, was to vindicate the Saviour's divinity, and thus his manhood was comparatively little spoken of, he was now in thought removed further from mankind; a want of less exalted intercessors was felt, and a reverence for nearer objects grew up. From the middle of the century it became usual to deliver panegyric orations on the days assigned to the commemoration of martyrs. The preachers, feeling themselves bound to make the most of their subjects on such occasions, ran out into glorifications of the martyrs, which, if at first intended only as rhetorical ornaments, were soon converted into matter of doctrine. In addition to the earlier belief that the martyrs interceded for their brethren, it was now supposed that they were cognisant of wishes addressed to them. The popular heathen opinion, that the spirits of the dead continued to hover about the resting-places of their bodies, was combined with the idea that the souls of the martyrs were already in the presence of God. Hence arose a practice of invoking them at their graves, and requesting their intercession for all manner of temporal as well as spiritual benefits; and by degrees such addresses came to be put up irrespectively of place. Poetry too contributed to advance the movement; the invocations which heathens had addressed to their gods and muses were transferred by Christian poets to the saints. Other holy persons— as the worthies of Scripture and distinguished monks—were soon associated with the martyrs in the general veneration. Yet the prayers which had in earlier times been offered up for saints and martyrs, in common with the rest of the faithful departed, were retained, notwithstanding their growing inconsistency with the prevalent belief, until in the beginning of the fifth century they were abandoned as derogatory to the objects of them. Saints were, like the heathen gods, chosen as special patrons, not only by individuals, but by cities. It was not without plausible grounds that heathens, as Julian and Eunapius, began to retort on Christians the charge of worshipping dead men, and that the Manicheans, as we have seen, joined in the reproach. St. Augustine strenuously repelled it; he exhorted to an imitation of saints in their holiness, and endeavoured, as did also St. Chrysostom, to oppose the tendency towards an undue exaltation of them. But before his time practices nearly akin to worship of the saints had too surely made their way into the popular belief and feeling, as indeed Augustine is himself obliged to confess.

The bodies of martyrs began to be treated with special honour. Altars and chapels were built over their graves; their relics were transferred from the original places of burial, were broken up into fragments, of which each was supposed to possess a supernatural virtue, and were deposited under the altars of churches. There is no mention of such translations in the account of the churches built by Constantine; but in the reign of Constantius some bodies, supposed to be those of apostles, were found, and were solemnly removed to Constantinople. We are told that remains of other Scripture saints, as far back as the prophet Samuel, and even the patriarch Joseph, were afterwards discovered; and, in order to prevent the risk of mistake as to bodies which had been lying in the earth for hundreds or thousands of years, the saints themselves were said to have appeared in visions, and to have revealed the places of their

interment. There was a readiness to believe that every grave of an unknown person- was that of a martyr. St. Martin, it is said, by praying over a grave which had been thus honoured, called up a shade of ferocious appearance, and forced the supposed martyr to avow that he had been a robber, and had been executed for his crimes.

It has been already related that St. Antony disapproved of the Egyptian manner of showing reverence for saints by keeping their bodies above ground, and took measures for escaping such honours. St. Hilarion, the founder of monasticism in Palestine, having died in Cyprus, one of his disciples, Hesychius (who was himself afterwards canonized) stole his body from the grave, and carried it off to the Holy Land. A rivalry ensued between the places of the two interments,—the Cypriots maintaining that, if the saint's body were in Palestine, his spirit remained with themselves; and miracles were said to be performed at both. In another case, the possession of the remains of some monks who had been slain by the Saracens was disputed with bloodshed by the inhabitants of two neighbouring towns.

Relics were supposed to work miracles; they were worn as amulets, and the churches in which they were preserved were hung (although perhaps not before the next century) with models of limbs which had been restored to strength through their virtue. Pretended relics were imposed on the credulous, and various abuses arose. For the purpose of restraining these, Theodosius enacted, in 386, that no one should buy or sell the bodies of martyrs, or should translate them from one place to another.

The blessed Virgin Mary was not as yet honoured above other saints. The Collyridians, a party of female devotees who passed from Thrace into Arabia in the last years of the century, are noted as heretics for offering cakes to her with rites which were perhaps derived from the heathen worship of Ceres. But with the growing admiration of the virgin life, of which St. Mary was regarded as the type, there was a progress of feeling towards opinions which became more decided during the controversies of the following century. On the other hand, the perpetual virginity of the Saviour's mother was denied by the anomoean Eunomius, by some of the Apollinarians, by Helvidius, a Roman lawyer (A.D. 383), and Bonosus, bishop of Sardica (A.D. 392); and a sect of Antidico-marianites (adversaries of Mary), called forth by the extravagances of the Collyridians, is mentioned as having existed in Arabia.

Anything like worship of angels was as yet supposed to be expressly forbidden by Scripture. St. Ambrose is the only father of this age who recommends invocation of guardian angels.

From the time of the empress Helena's visit to the Holy Land, a great impulse was given to the practice of pilgrimage. It was supposed, not only that the view of scenes hallowed by their association with the events of Scripture would enkindle or heighten devotion, but that prayers would be especially acceptable if offered up in particular spots; and, as had been the case under the heathen system, some places were believed to be distinguished by frequent miracles. From all quarters—even from the distant Britain—pilgrims flocked to the sacred sites of Palestine, and on their return they carried home with them water from the Jordan, earth from the Redeemer's sepulchre, or chips of the true cross, which was speedily found to possess the power of reproducing itself. Many, it is said, were even led by their uncritical devotion to visit Arabia for the purpose of beholding the dunghill on which the patriarch Job endured his trials. Pilgrimage became a fashion, and soon exhibited the evil characteristics of a fashion, so that already warnings were uttered against the errors and abuses which were connected with it. The monk St. Hilarion, during his residence of fifty years in Palestine, visited the holy sites but once, and for a single day—in order, as he said, that he might neither appear to despise them on account of their nearness, nor to suppose that God's grace was limited to any particular place. St. Gregory of Nyssa wrote a treatise for the express purpose of dissuading from pilgrimage. Among our Lord's beatitudes, he says, there is none for those who shall visit Jerusalem. For women the pilgrimage must be at the least, distracting, since they cannot perform it without male companions; and there is continual danger from the

promiscuous society of the hostelryes on the way. The Saviour is no longer bodily in the holy places; He and the Holy Spirit are not confined to Jerusalem. Change of place will not bring God nearer to us : wherever we are, He will come to us, if our hearts be a fit abode for Him to dwell in and walk in : but if the inner man be full of evil thoughts, although we were at Golgotha, on the Mount of Olives, or at the memorial of the Resurrection, we are as far from receiving Christ within us as they who have not even begun to feel Him. For himself, Gregory says that he had made the pilgrimage, not out of curiosity, but on his way to a council in Arabia, and had escaped the usual dangers by travelling in an imperial carriage, and in the company of religious brethren: yet the sight of the localities had added nothing to his belief of the nativity, the resurrection, of the ascension; while the desperate wickedness of the inhabitants had proved to him that there could be no special grace in the places, and had taught him to value more highly than before the religion of his own Cappadocia. Monks (he says) ought to endeavour to go on pilgrimage from the body to the Lord, rather than from Cappadocia to Palestine. Even Jerome—although he had fixed his abode in the Holy Land, and although in some of his writings he expatiates on the influence of its hallowed associations—yet elsewhere very earnestly warns against the delusions by which the multitude of pilgrims was led thither. “It is not matter of praise”, he tells Paulinus, “to have been at Jerusalem, but to have lived religiously at Jerusalem”. The scenes of the crucifixion and of the resurrection are profitable to such as bear their own cross and daily rise again with Christ—to those who show themselves worthy of so eminent a dwelling-place. But as for those who say ‘The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord’—let them hear the apostle’s words—‘Ye are the temple of the Lord, and the Holy Spirit dwelleth in you’. The court of heaven is open to access from Jerusalem and from Britain alike; for the kingdom of God is within you”

Opposition to the Tendencies of the Age.

The novel ideas and practices which were introduced into the church excited the mockery of the older sects —such as the Novatianists and the Manichaeans— who loudly charged the Catholics with paganism. The teachers of the age could not fail to discern and to reprobate some of the growing corruptions, and attempted to counteract them. But they bore with, and even encouraged, much that eventually proved mischievous—partly from a desire to facilitate the progress of the gospel and to deal tenderly with converts partly from a regard to the pious intention which lay under strange and injudicious manifestations, or from a want of that historical experience which would have enabled them to detect the lurking germs of evil. On the other hand, there were persons who decidedly set themselves against the tendencies of the time; but unhappily with such a mixture of error in their own opinions, and sometimes with such indiscretion in their conduct, as excited a general odium, and served to strengthen the cause which they opposed. Two of these, Helvidius and Bonosus, have lately been mentioned; the former was encountered by St. Jerome, the latter by St. Ambrose.

Aerius, a presbyter of Sebaste, in the Lesser Armenia, was of earlier date—about A.D. 360. He is described by Epiphanius as an Arian; but his notoriety arose from his attacks on the discipline and observances of the church. In consequence, it is said, of having been disappointed in his aspirations to the bishopric of Sebaste, he began to assert that bishops and presbyters were equal—an opinion which in those days was altogether new, since almost all the sects had at their outset been careful to obtain episcopal ordination for their ministers, and even those which had departed from the usual form of polity had acknowledged the necessity of a graduated hierarchy. Yet although Aerius denied the Divine institution of episcopacy, he appears to have admitted its lawfulness. He denied the utility of stated fasts, and of prayers and alms for the departed; his followers, in determined opposition to the church, chose Sunday for their occasional fasts, while they ate freely on the fourth and sixth days of the week, and

spent the penitential part of the paschal season in feasting. It would seem, indeed, that Aerijs altogether objected to the celebration of Easter; although some writers have supposed that his objections were directed only against the practice of eating the paschal lamb, which had been retained until his time in some churches, and which he regarded as a remnant of Judaism.

Among the western opponents of the prevailing system was Jovinian, a monk of Rome, who began to publish his opinions about A.D. 388. Although he did not forsake his monastic profession, one of his chief tenets was a denial of the superiority usually ascribed to celibacy. He denied the perpetual virginity of the Redeemer's mother, and maintained that, if single and married persons were equal in other respects, their conditions were also equal. He combated the exaggerated reverence which was attached to the act of martyrdom. He denied the merit of fasting, and the distinctions of food. He maintained, with a strange perversion of Scripture texts, that there was no other distinction between men than the grand division into righteous and wicked; that there was no difference of grades in either class, and that there would hereafter be no difference of degrees in rewards or in punishments. Whosoever had been truly baptized had, according to Jovinian, nothing further to gain by progress in the Christian life; he had only to preserve that which was already secured to him. But the baptism which Jovinian regarded as true was different from the sacrament of the church; indeed, he altogether set aside the idea of the visible church. The true baptism, he said, was a baptism of the Spirit, conferring indefectible grace, so that they who had it could not be overcome by the devil. If any one, after receiving the baptismal sacrament, fell into sin, it was a proof that he had never received inward baptism; but such a person might, on repentance, yet be made partaker of the true spiritual baptism. All sins were regarded by Jovinian as equal; nor did he admit any difference as to guilt between those which were committed before baptism and those which followed after it.

With such doctrines there was naturally connected an insufficient idea as to the importance of individual sins. Jovinian's opinions were favoured by the popular feeling at Rome, where he made numerous converts, and induced many persons of both sexes, who had before embraced the celibate life, to marry; but among the clergy he found no adherents. After having been condemned and excommunicated in 390, by a synod under Siricius, he repaired to Milan, in the hope of finding favour with Theodosius; but Ambrose had been warned against him by Siricius, and the Roman sentence was repeated at Milan. Jerome wrote against him with violent personality, and in so doing exaggerated the merits of celibacy to such a degree as to give Jovinian's cause an advantage, while his own friends were dismayed at his indiscretion. Pammachius (who had married a daughter of Paula, and on her death had renounced eminent wealth and station to become a monk) endeavoured, although in vain, to suppress the treatise; and, in order to take off the effects of its extravagance, Augustine wrote in a more moderate strain a book "Of the Good of Marriage". Nothing further is known of Jovinian. Jerome speaks of him as dead in 404; yet it has been conjectured that he was the same who, under the name of Jovian, was charged eight years later with disturbing the Roman church by holding religious meetings, and was sentenced by an edict of Honorius to be severely beaten and afterwards banished.

Another of Jerome's adversaries may be fitly noticed in this place, although he did not appear until somewhat later than the time embraced in the preceding chapters.

Vigilantius was the son of an innkeeper at Calagurris (Hourra, or Caskres), on the French side of the Pyrenees. After having been employed in early youth in his father's trade, he was taken into the household of Sulpicius Severus, the biographer of St. Martin, where he enjoyed the opportunity of applying himself to letters; and he was advanced to the order of presbyter. Through Sulpicius he became acquainted with Paulinus, a noble Aquitanian of Roman family, who, after having filled high secular offices—even, it is said, the consulship— forsook the world, was forcibly ordained a presbyter at Barcelona, and settled at Nola in Campania, in

order that he might be near the tomb of St. Felix, a confessor of the time of Decius. Paulinus may be regarded as an example of the manner in which the spirit of the age acted on a religious and enthusiastic mind. In the fervour of penitence for a life of which he probably exaggerated the sinfulness, he persuaded his wife Terasia to renounce the married estate, sold all her property as well as his own, and lived monastically with a few companions in the practice of works of piety and charity. His reverence for saints was carried to an extent beyond that which had as yet become usual. He devoted himself especially to St. Felix: he built a church over the tomb, and adorned it with paintings, among which were scenes from the Old Testament and a symbolical representation of the Trinity. Every year, on the festival of the confessor, Paulinus produced a poem in celebration of his life or miracles; every year he repaired to Rome for the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul. The example and influence of a person so distinguished by rank and so devout in life, who was the correspondent of Jerome, Augustine, Rufinus, and others of the most eminent among his contemporaries, could not fail to advance greatly the superstitions to which he was addicted.

Vigilantius, after having visited Paulinus at Nola, set out for the east, being furnished by him with a letter of introduction to Jerome, which procured for him an honourable reception from the recluse of Bethlehem. But disagreements soon arose. Vigilantius accused Jerome of Origenism, and although he retracted the charge before leaving Bethlehem, he again asserted it in his own country.

Some time after his return to the west, Vigilantius began to vent peculiar opinions. He assailed the prevailing excess of reverence for departed saints; he maintained that their souls, which existed “in Abraham’s bosom, or in the place of rest, or under God’s altar”, could not be present at their tombs; he denied the possibility of their intercession after death, and the miracles which were reported to be wrought at their graves. Miracles (he said) were beneficial to unbelievers only; by which he seems to have implied that, as the power of working them had been given for the conviction of the Jews and heathens, the time in which they might be expected was past. He attacked the veneration of relics as idolatrous, and the lighting of candles at the tombs of saints in the daytime as a pagan superstition. He wished that all vigils except that of Easter should be abolished, and spoke of them as giving occasion to debauchery. He denied the usefulness of fasting, continence, and monasticism, and regarded the profession of chastity as a source of corruption. He maintained that it was better to retain property, and to bestow of it by degrees for pious and charitable purposes, than at once to relinquish the whole; and that it was better to seek for objects of charity at home than to send money to Jerusalem.

Jerome, whose old animosity against Vigilantius was revived by the publication of these doctrines, attacked him with the most furious abuse. He reproached him with having been a tapster, and told him that he now applied to Holy Scripture the same tricks of falsification which he had formerly practised on the wine which he dispensed and on the money which he gave in change; that he opposed fasting, continence and sobriety, because they interfered with the profits of his early trade. The argumentative part of the pamphlet cannot be described as very happy. Jerome partly denies the existence of the superstitions which Vigilantius had censured—or, at least, he denies that they existed as anything more than popular usages, unsanctioned by the church; and, by way of overwhelming his opponent, he asks how he can presume to question practices which had been approved by emperors and bishops.

In justice to Vigilantius, it ought to be remembered that our only knowledge of his opinions comes from a very violent and unscrupulous adversary. They would seem to have been produced by a reaction from the system in which he had been for a time engaged—the system exemplified in his patron Sulpicius, in Paulinus, and more coarsely in Jerome. It is a circumstance greatly in his favour that, to the vexation of his opponents, his own bishop showed him countenance, and that he found other supporters in the episcopal order; and

although we may hesitate to acquit him of error, there can be little doubt that it is an abuse of language to brand him with the title of heretic.

Nothing is known of the later history of Vigilantius. His doctrines—urged probably with a blamable vehemence and confidence—were so much opposed to the current of the time, that they did not require a council to condemn them; and they were soon obliterated by the Vandal invasion, to which it has been conjectured that their author himself may have fallen a victim.

At the end of a period so full of controversy as the fourth century, I may advert to an objection which has often been brought against preceding writers, and to which I cannot but feel that my own work is liable, in common with theirs. It is said that Church-history, as it is usually written, is only a record of quarrels; and wishes are expressed for a history which should more fully display the fruits of the gospel for good. On some such principle Milner wrote; but if the required book were possible, it cannot be said that Milner has superseded the need of further labours in the same line. I believe, however, that the plausible objection in question is founded on a misconception. Church-history must follow the analogy of secular history. As the one deals in detail with wrongs and calamities, with wars, with intrigues, with factions, but must pass over with mere general words the blessings of prosperity, and must leave utterly unnoticed the happiness which is enjoyed not only under good governments, but even notwithstanding the very worst; so the other must dwell on the sad story of errors and contentions, and must allow the better side to remain untold. It is not the “peace on earth”, but the “sword” that must be its theme. History takes cognizance of men only as they affect other men; of things only as they differ from the everyday course. In Church history, even saints appear too commonly in their least favourable aspect. The occasions which bring them forward are often such as to draw forth their defects rather than their excellencies. Their better part, in so far as it can be written, belongs mainly not to history, but to biography; nay, even of noted and illustrious saints, the highest graces are not matter even for biography; they cannot be written on earth. And the great and immeasurable blessings of the gospel do not consist in the production here and there of a conspicuous hero of the faith, but in its effect on the vast unrecorded multitudes whom it has guided in life, whom it has comforted in trouble, whose death it has filled with the hope of immortality. Unrecorded as these things have been, we yet cannot doubt of their reality, but are assured that the same benefits which we witness in our own day and in our own sphere must in all times have flowed from the same enduring source. Instead, therefore, of requiring from a historian of the church that which is foreign to the nature of his task, we must read with the remembrance that the better portion of Christian history is to be supplied by our own thoughts—thoughts grounded on a belief in the Divine assurances, and confirmed by such opportunities as we may have enjoyed of witnessing their fulfillment.

BOOK III.

FROM THE DEATH OF THE EMPEROR THEODOSIUS I TO THE
PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY THE GREAT. A.D. 395-590.

CHAPTER I.

ARCADIUS AND HONORIUS.—ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSY.— ST. JOHN
CHRYSOSTOM.

Theodosius left two sons,—Arcadius, aged eighteen, and Honorius, who was only eleven years of age; the elder succeeded to the sovereignty of the West, and the younger to the sovereignty of the East, and after this division the empire in its full extent was never again united. The reigns of these imbecile princes were full of calamity. Themselves incapable of governing, each of them was subject to a succession of too powerful ministers and generals. Of these, Stilicho alone, the general of Honorius, possessed the qualities which were requisite for the support of the empire. In 403 he defeated Alaric the Goth at Pollentia, in Liguria; but five years later, at the very time when his abilities were most urgently needed to meet a renewal of the Gothic invasion, he fell a victim to the arts of a rival, Olympius. Rome was thrice besieged by the Goths. The first siege was raised by the payment of a large ransom; the second resulted in Alaric's setting up as emperor a puppet, Attalus, whom he afterwards deposed in disgust at his incapacity; in the third, the city was taken and sacked. Throughout this period we read of revolts in various provinces, of insurrections of the barbarians who had been admitted within the Roman territory, and of invasions by fresh hordes from the countries beyond. These invasions fell more especially on the western division of the empire. In 404, Honorius, finding himself exposed to the Goths at Milan, removed to Ravenna, which for the next three centuries continued, throughout all the changes of government, to be regarded as the capital of Italy.

In 408, Arcadius was succeeded by his son Theodosius II, a child seven years old. The young prince was at first under the guardianship of Anthemius, and from 414 under that of his sister Pulcheria, who for nearly forty years held the virtual sovereignty of the east. Honorius reigned till 423.

The weakness of the government, the irruptions of the barbarians, and the changes in the administration, prevented the adoption of any sustained and uniform policy for the suppression of paganism. Both in the east and in the west laws were repeatedly issued for the abolition of sacrifices, and for the confiscation of such allowances and endowments as had hitherto been left to the heathen priesthood; but the necessity of frequent re-enactment shows, no less than the occasional relaxations of these laws, that they were very imperfectly executed. It is a significant circumstance that heavy penalties are often threatened against magistrates who should neglect to enforce them; as if the government knew that there were many among its local officers from whom in such a cause it could not expect any willing service. In 408, under the administration of Olympius, Honorius published a law by which all but the

professors of orthodox Christianity were excluded from employment about the court. But it is said that Generid, commander of the troops at Rome, one of the barbarian chiefs on whose arms the degenerate Romans then depended, indignantly cast away the ensigns of his command, refused any exemption which should not extend to other heathens, and terrified the emperor into a hasty repeal of the enactment. In the east, however, similar laws were passed both by Arcadius and by the younger Theodosius.

Towards the end of the fourth century a tale was current among the pagans, that St. Peter had by magical arts discovered that Christianity was to last for 365 years, and was then to perish. The period was completed in 398, and the hopes of the heathen party had risen high; but they were disappointed, and other disappointments followed. The barbarian leader Radagaisus, who, as being himself a heathen, had engaged their sympathies, was overthrown by Stilicho. When Alaric first laid siege to Rome, the pagan members of the senate ascribed the calamities of the empire to the neglect of the rites by which their fathers had obtained the favour of the gods, and had raised their country to its height of glory. It is said that some Tuscan soothsayers, who professed to have saved Narni from the invader by drawing down lightnings for his discomfiture, undertook to deliver Rome in the same manner through the use of incantations and sacrifices. Even the bishop, Innocent, is stated by a heathen writer to have consented to the experiment, provided that it were made in secrecy, preferring the safety of the city to his own opinion. The Tuscans, however, insisted, as an essential condition, that the rites should be performed with all form and publicity, in the name of the state and with the attendance of the senate; and as the senators refused to give this kind of sanction to idolatry, the soothsayers were dismissed. This tale has probably no other foundation than that the pagans wished to take advantage of the public danger in order to attempt a restoration of their religion. Attalus, although baptized into Arianism, courted them by re-establishing the ancient rites; but their joy was soon checked by his deposition.

The barbarian irruptions were, in truth, greatly injurious to paganism. There was no instance of barbarians embracing the old religion of Greece or Rome; they either adhered to the superstitions of their own ancestors, or adopted some form of Christianity. Alaric and his Goths, who were Arians, directed their wrath against heathen temples even more zealously than the Christians of the empire. It is from Alaric's invasion of Greece that the suppression of the Eleusinian mysteries is dated. In the capture of Rome temples were attacked, while churches were revered and those who sought a refuge in them were spared; and some, at least, of the Gothic soldiers manifested in their behaviour towards the defenseless some influence of the religion which they professed. The Christians saw the vengeance of God in the calamities which fell on Rome; they had a story that Alaric, while on his march, was entreated by a holy monk to spare the city, and answered that he did not go of his own will, but that One was continually urging him forward to take it. The pagans, on their side, referred all the miseries of the time to Christianity—a theory which St. Augustine combated in many sermons, and in refutation of which he undertook his great work “Of the City of God”, written between the years 412 and 426. With the same view Orosius, a Spaniard, at Augustine's desire, drew up about 417 a compendium of universal history, in which he argued that earlier ages had been as calamitous as his own, and had been the more wretched in so far as they were without the remedy of true religion.

Paganism yet lingered long. In the east, Theodosius, in a law of A.D. 423, affects to question whether it still had any adherents; but the doubt is refuted by clear evidence of facts. The chief strength of the old religion, however, lay in the west. In some districts its spirit was still so powerful, that Christians who attempted to execute the laws against temples and idols were killed by the exasperated heathens. In many places where the religion of the gospel was professed, the old tutelary gods still held their position; and besides the great infusion of a pagan spirit into the Christianity of the time, many purely heathen ideas and usages were yet retained among Christians. The conformity of proselytes was often merely outward; for, as the

adherents of the old religion were not generally disposed either to suffer for its sake, or to forego the advantages which were connected with a profession of the new faith, many of them submitted to be baptized, and afterwards, when occasion served, again declared themselves pagans. Hence arose the necessity of those frequent enactments against apostasy which would appear unaccountable if the apostates had ever been really Christians.

Africa was a chief stronghold of paganism, and there the distractions of the Donatistic schism told in its favour. St. Augustine advised a gentle mode of dealing with the worshippers of idols as most likely to be effectual. "First", he says, "we endeavour to break the idols in their hearts. When they themselves become Christians, they will either invite us to the good work of destroying their idols, or will anticipate us in it. Meanwhile we must pray for them, not be angry with them". He complains that Christians took part in heathen ceremonies and rejoicings. A council held at Carthage, in 399, solicited the emperor to suppress certain banquets which were among the principal means of keeping up the old religion; and also to order the destruction of all remains of idolatry, together with the temples which were in rural places. The government was not yet prepared for such measures; in the same year orders were issued that the public rejoicings should be celebrated, although without sacrifices or superstition, and that such of the temples as contained no unlawful things should be left uninjured. But nine years later, in a law intended for the whole empire, the banquets were forbidden, and the bishops were authorized to suppress all monuments of idolatry. Such of the temples as were not ornamental in their architecture were demolished. It was ordered that those in cities or suburbs should be applied to public uses; many were shut up, and remained vacant until the Christians took possession of them and converted them into churches.

The old Roman aristocracy, which had clung to the religion of its forefathers more from pride than from conviction, was scattered by the taking of Rome. Many of its members emigrated to their possessions in Africa, Egypt, or elsewhere, and the pagan interest suffered in consequence. But in the rural parts of Italy—notwithstanding the law of the year 408, already mentioned, by which landlords were ordered to destroy temples on their estates—the ancient worship subsisted, until at a later time it was followed into its retreats and extirpated by the labour of the monks.

The abolition of the gladiatorial shows at Rome, against which Christian teachers had long inveighed and pleaded in vain, is referred to the reign of Honorius. When the emperor, after the victory of Pollentia, was celebrating a triumph with games of this kind, Telemachus, an eastern monk, who had made a journey to Rome for the purpose of protesting against them, leaped into the arena, and attempted to separate the combatants, but was stoned to death by the spectators, who were enraged at this interference with their amusement. The emperor acknowledged that such a death deserved the honours of martyrdom, and, with the willing acquiescence of his people, whose fury had soon given way to repentance, he abolished the inhuman spectacles.

The disputes as to the opinions of Origen, which had begun during his lifetime, continued after his death. The martyr Pamphilus, in conjunction with Eusebius of Caesarea, wrote a defence of him. In the great controversy of the fourth century, his name was frequently mentioned, and the tendency of his doctrines was much disputed; for, while the Arians wished to claim his authority, and some of their extreme opponents, such as Marcellus of Ancyra, styled him the father of Arianism, his orthodoxy was maintained by St. Athanasius and other champions of the catholic faith. So long as Arianism and the doctrines connected with it engrossed all attention, the opinions of Origen on other subjects did not come into question. His writings exercised an important influence among the teachers of the eastern church; but, although these were in general content to draw instruction from him, without regarding him as faultless, there were two extreme parties, by one of which he was rejected as a heretic, while the other was unreservedly devoted to him. Thus, while the monks of Nitria found in his works provision for their mystic and spiritualizing turn of mind, Pachomius

warned his disciples against Origen as the most dangerous of seducers, whose doctrines would conduct the reader to perdition.

In the west Origen was known only by name, but the general impression was unfriendly to him. Jerome attempted to introduce him more favourably by translating some parts of his writings and embodying them in commentaries on the Scriptures. In a letter written during his residence at Rome, he speaks with enthusiastic praise of the “indefatigable Alexandrian”, and says that he had been condemned at Rome, “not for the novelty of his doctrines, not for heresy, as mad dogs now pretend against him, but because his enemies were unable to endure the glory of his eloquence and learning”. After his final retirement to Bethlehem, Jerome renewed an acquaintance of earlier days with Rufinus, a native of the diocese of Aquileia. Rufinus had lived eight years in Egypt, where he visited the monks, studied under the blind Didymus, and suffered in the persecution of Valens. He had now settled on the Mount of Olives in company with Melania, a noble and pious Roman widow, and had been ordained presbyter by John, bishop of Jerusalem. Jerome became very intimate with him, and celebrated his virtues in terms which are even extravagant; and the friends agreed in admiration of Origen.

In the year 393, a pilgrim from the west, named Aterbius, arrived at Jerusalem, where, as he had been accustomed to hear the name of Origen connected with disrepute, he was astonished at finding that it was held in high honour. In a frantic manner, according to Jerome, he charged Rufinus with Origenism, and, knowing the intimacy which existed between the two, he included Jerome in the accusation. Jerome, keenly sensitive to his reputation for orthodoxy, disavowed the imputation with great eagerness, saying that he had read Origen only in the same way as he had read the works of heretics; while Rufinus refused to have any communication with his accuser, and confined himself to his own house until Aterbius had left Jerusalem.

Soon after this affair, Jerusalem was visited by Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia (formerly Salamis), in Cyprus, and metropolitan of that island. Epiphanius had been educated as a monk, and was then more than eighty years of age. He was a man of vast reading, which extended to the Greek, Syriac, Hebrew, Egyptian and Latin languages, and he enjoyed an extraordinary popular fame for sanctity, so that miracles and prophecies were ascribed to him; but both his conduct and his remaining works prove him to have been injudicious, weak, vain, narrow-minded, and obstinate. In his work on Heresies, he had spoken very strongly against Origen, whom his character and his education alike unfitted him to appreciate; and he was connected by friendship with Jerome, who had spent some time with him in Cyprus while on his way from Rome to the east.

Epiphanius, on his arrival at Jerusalem, accepted the hospitality of the bishop, John, and behaved with courtesy to Rufinus. The Origenistic question had not been mentioned between him and his host, when Epiphanius, in preaching at the church of the Resurrection, broke out into a violent invective against Origenists, which was evidently intended to reflect on the bishop. Jerome reproaches John with having indecently expressed his impatience by looks and gestures, and states that he sent his archdeacon to beg that the preacher would not pursue the subject. As the two bishops proceeded to the church of the Cross, where another service was to be held, it was difficult to make way through the multitudes who crowded round Epiphanius, kissing his feet, touching the hem of his garment, and holding out children to receive his blessing. These displays of reverence, it is said, excited the envy of John, and at the service which followed he preached against anthropomorphism, apparently with an intention of charging Epiphanius with that error, which was not uncommon among the extreme opponents of Origen. The old man, when it came to his turn to speak, declared that he approved all which had been said by John; that he condemned anthropomorphism; and in return he required that John should anathematize Origenism.

The dispute thus commenced became more and more vehement. Epiphanius, in high displeasure on account of a sermon which John had preached, left Jerusalem and repaired to Bethlehem. He afterwards wrote to Jerome's monks, charging them to break off communion with their bishop; and in the diocese of Eleutheropolis he forcibly ordained Paulinian, brother of Jerome, to the offices of deacon and presbyter, for the purpose of ministering to the monks of Bethlehem. John strongly protested against this invasion of his episcopal rights, and a fierce controversy followed, which involved questions of doctrine, discipline, and personal conduct. The errors attributed to Origen were classed under eight heads. He was charged with heretical views on the relations of the Divine Persons; with strange and unsound opinions as to the pre-existence of souls, the salvation of the devil and evil spirits, the resurrection of the dead, the condition of man before and after the fall; and with singular allegorical misinterpretations of Scripture, extending even to the denial of its literal truth. Jerome attacked Rufinus and John with all his acrimony. He complained that the bishop did not fairly meet him; that he attempted to answer only three out of the eight charges, and that, instead of discussing the question of doctrine, he dwelt continually on the irregularity of Paulinian's ordination. It was in vain that Archelaus, count of Palestine, and Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, attempted to interpose as mediators; but at length, as Rufinus was about to leave the Holy Land in 397, he and Jerome went through a solemn form of reconciliation at the altar of the church of the Resurrection.

The quarrel, however, was soon revived. Rufinus took up his abode at Rome, where a friend, who was engaged on a work against astrology, inquired of him what were Origen's opinions on that subject—being himself unacquainted with Greek. On this Rufinus translated the Apology of Pamphilus, and Origen's own treatise *De Principiis*, the most questionable and suspected of all his writings. The translation (by which alone the greater part of the book is now known) was made on an extraordinary principle. As Origen had himself complained that his works were falsified, Rufinus assumed that the suspicious passages were the interpolations of heretics, and altered them so that they might accord with his own views of orthodoxy, and with other passages of the author's writings. In answer to the presumption of falsification, Jerome well remarked that Pamphilus and Eusebius had not used any such plea in their defence of Origen; nor was it justifiable by such means to reduce Origen to consistency with himself, inasmuch as he not only may have varied in opinion during his long life, but is known to have held that the difference in character between exoteric and esoteric teaching would warrant a difference of statement. After having avowedly subjected the text to his violent editorial process, Rufinus somewhat inconsistently adjured readers and copyists, in the name of God and by the thought of the resurrection and of eternal fire, to make no omission, addition, or change of any kind in the reformed *De Principiis*.

Jerome, whose old fondness for Origen had been invidiously mentioned by Rufinus in his preface, was urged by his friends Pammachius and Oceanus to exhibit the Alexandrian in his true character by means of a more faithful translation; and he complied with their desire. In a letter to those who had suggested the task, he earnestly disclaimed the suspicion of Origenism. "I praised him" (he says) "as an interpreter, not as a dogmatic teacher; for his genius, not for his faith; as a philosopher, not as an apostle... If you believe me, I never was an Origenist; if you do not believe me, I have now ceased to be one". The question now was, not whether certain opinions were sound, but whether Origen had held them, and whether his admirers continued to hold them, notwithstanding all protestations contrary.

Finding that, although his explanations were satisfactory to Pope Siricius and to other Italian bishops, his position at Rome was rendered intolerable through the influence of Jerome, Rufinus retired to Aquileia, bearing with him a letter of recommendation from Siricius, who died shortly after (Nov. 26, 398).

The next bishop of Rome, Anastasius, was solicited to take up the subject by Theophilus of Alexandria, who had now declared himself against Origenism; while at home

he was stimulated by the importunities of Marcella and others (chiefly pious and noble ladies), who were under the direction of Jerome. In consequence of these applications, Anastasius summoned Rufinus to Rome; and, on his alleging that family reasons detained him at Aquileia, the bishop, without pronouncing against Rufinus himself, condemned Origen and the translations from his works— declaring that, until these appeared, he had neither known who Origen was nor what he had written. The letter which contains this judgment also mentions an imperial order (of which nothing is otherwise known) against reading the Alexandrian's writings.

Jerome and Rufinus carried on a war of angry apologies and counter-apologies, in which their old familiarity was remembered only as affording the means of reproaching each other with the sayings and the actions of former days. Augustine was so distressed by witnessing such a dispute between men of advanced age and of great reputation for learning and piety—ancient friends, too, and fellow-students of Scripture,—that, in writing to Jerome himself, and on the supposition that his representations were correct, he could only express his sorrow at the unseemly spectacle. Jerome in one of his tracts assumes a tone of seeming moderation and gentleness. He entreats Rufinus to let the matter drop; if (he says) they had erred in youth, they ought to be wiser in age, and to rejoice in each other's improvement; but, with an inconsistency not unusual in controversialists who advise moderation, he insists that the difference shall be ended on his own terms—by his opponent's joining in abjuration of Origen.

Rufinus appears to have been at length weary of the contest, and ceased to write. He was driven from Aquileia by the troubles of Italy, and once more set out with Melania for the Holy Land, but died by the way in Sicily—having seen along the opposite coast the fires of the devastation by Alaric's army. Jerome at a later time spoke of him by the name of Grunnius (the grunter); and in his preface to Ezekiel he refers to his opponent's death in terms which indicate an undiminished rancour : “The scorpion is buried under the soil of Sicily, with Enceladus and Porphyry; the many-headed hydra has ceased to hiss against us”.

In another quarter the Origenistic controversy involved the fate of one of the most eminent men who adorned the ancient church.

John, who for his eloquence has received the name of Chrysostom (or Golden-mouthed), was born at Antioch about the year 347. While very young he lost his father, a military officer of rank, and was left to the care of a pious and truly admirable mother, Anthusa. He became a pupil of the famous rhetorician Libanius, but was preserved by an unintermitted study of the Scriptures from the dangers to which the faith of Christian youths were exposed in the pagan schools and so strongly was his master impressed by his talents, that on being asked, many years after, to name a successor for himself in his chair, he answered that John would have been the worthiest, if the Christians had not stolen him. At the age of twenty Chrysostom began to practise at the bar; but his conscience took offence at the arts which were common among the advocates of Antioch, and he resolved to devote himself to a religious life. He now received baptism from the bishop, Meletius; and, as Anthusa's earnest and pathetic entreaties restrained him from fulfilling his wish to rush at once into monastic retirement, he was ordained a reader, and continued to reside with her, in the practice of a strict asceticism, until her death, after which he withdrew to the mountains near Antioch. Here he spent four years in a monastery, and had lived for two years as a hermit in a cave, when sickness, brought on by his austerities, compelled him to return to the city. He was ordained deacon in 381, and while a member of that order he wrote his dialogue *On the Priesthood*, which, notwithstanding all the difference of circumstances, still retains a high value and popularity as a manual of pastoral duty. In 386 Flavian ordained him presbyter, and appointed him chief preacher at Antioch. In this office, his eloquence excited immense admiration.

Sometimes his sermons were carefully prepared; at other times they were altogether extemporal; sometimes he combined the two methods, —departing from his intended plan so as to take advantage, with singular readiness and felicity, of any topic which the moment might suggest. His diction is clear and flowing, his illustrations are copious, varied, and apposite; he is distinguished by good sense, and by a knowledge of the heart, learnt rather from his own inward experience than through intercourse with others. In his expository discourses, which extend over the greater part of the New Testament, with some books of the Old, he adheres to the literal sense of Scripture, and never loses sight of a practical application. Among the most celebrated of his other homilies are those On the Statues, delivered on occasion of the sedition in which the statues of Theodosius and his family were thrown down at Antioch. While the inhabitants were in trembling expectation of some fearful punishment, and while the aged Flavian was absent on a mission of intercession to the emperor, Chrysostom daily preached to anxious multitudes in a tone of solemn and awakening eloquence. The pulpit triumphed over the theatres and the circus, to which the people of Antioch were usually devoted; and the preacher endeavoured to make the terror and excitement of the time become the foundation of a lasting reform.

When Chrysostom had been nearly twelve years preacher at Antioch. the see of Constantinople fell vacant by the death of Nectarius, in September 397. The possession of so eminent a dignity excited much ambition; candidates resorted to discreditable intrigues and solicitations, and party spirit ran high. At length the emperor Arcadius was requested to put an end to the confusion by nominating a bishop; and his choice was directed to Chrysostom through the influence of the eunuch Eutropius, who, on a late journey in Syria, had listened with admiration to the great orator's eloquence. Perhaps the minister may have reckoned on benefiting his own reputation by so laudable an exercise of his patronage; perhaps, too, he may have hoped to secure the bishop's subservience by establishing a hold on his gratitude. As there was reason to apprehend that the people of Antioch might break out into tumult if their preacher were openly taken away from them, Chrysostom was decoyed by the count of the East to a place without the city, and thence was privately sent off to Constantinople.

In order that his appointment might have all the advantage of solemnity, a council was summoned on the occasion. Theophilus of Alexandria, on being required to take the chief part in the consecration of the new bishop, hesitated, from jealousy of the precedence lately assigned to Constantinople over his own see, and from a wish that the vacancy should be filled with one of the Alexandrian clergy; for it is said that his skill in physiognomy had warned him at the first interview that he must not expect to find a tool in Chrysostom. Eutropius, however, frightened the Egyptian primate into compliance, by producing a schedule of charges against him, and threatening to bring him to trial for his misdemeanours; and Chrysostom was consecrated on the 26th of February 398.

The eloquence which had won for him the admiration of Antioch was no less effective at Constantinople. The multitudes of the capital flocked to hear him, and were zealous for his cause in his after trials; and among the well-disposed of the higher classes (especially among pious ladies), his influence soon became very powerful. Much of his attention was engaged by the Arian heresy, which, notwithstanding the severity of the penal laws, continued to lurk among the Greeks, while it was the professed creed of the Gothic barbarians, who were now numerous and formidable at Constantinople. With a view of converting these to orthodoxy, he ordained clergy of their own race, gave up one of the churches for a service in their native language, and himself often preached there, his words being rendered into Gothic by an interpreter. When Gainas the Goth, who was at the time predominant at Constantinople, demanded a church for the exercise of Arian worship, Chrysostom alone dared to meet him with a firm denial at a conference in the emperor's presence, and obliged Arcadius to refuse; and by conduct so strikingly contrasting with that of the pusillanimous court he won the respect of the barbarian himself. While thus zealous for the suppression of error within his

own sphere, the archbishop also laboured for the propagation of the gospel by sending missions to the unconverted Goths and Scythians; and by obtaining an imperial warrant for the destruction of the temples in Phoenicia, which was executed at the expense of his female friends, he contributed to the extirpation of the ancient idolatry.

His influence was beneficially exerted to heal the schism of his native city. On the death of Paulinus, who had been acknowledged as bishop of Antioch by Egypt and the west, his party consecrated Evagrius; but this bishop did not long survive, and they were again left without a head. Through the intervention of Chrysostom, in the first year of his episcopate, both Innocent of Rome and Theophilus were persuaded to acknowledge Flavian, who thereupon inserted the names of both Paulinus and Evagrius in the diptychs of his church. Thus the later separation—that which Lucifer had occasioned by consecrating Paulinus—was brought to an end, although some remains of the old Eustathian party continued to exist without any bishop. The schism was eventually terminated by the conciliatory measures of Alexander, bishop of Antioch, in 415.

But as Chrysostom's new position was more conspicuous than that which he had formerly held, it also exposed him to dangers from which he had until now been exempt. Although he possessed in very large measure such a knowledge of the heart as fitted him to be a wise practical teacher of religion, he was wanting in that acquaintance with the world, and in that understanding of individual character, which are necessary for the administration of important office, and are nowhere more necessary than in high ecclesiastical office. His temper was naturally warm, and the opposition which he met with in his endeavours at reform provoked him to expressions of anger, which both raised up enemies and supplied them with weapons against him.

Reform was indeed very necessary. Nectarius, having grown old in the habits of secular rank, did not greatly alter them after his sudden promotion to the episcopate; and under him the clergy of Constantinople in general fell into a style of easy living, while some of them were even scandalous in their conduct. Chrysostom sold the rich carpets and handsome furniture which had belonged to his predecessor; he even sold some of the marbles and other ornaments of the churches, in order to obtain funds for the establishment of hospitals and for other charitable purposes; he expended the whole of his own income on such objects, and was indebted for maintenance to a pious widow, Olympias. Partly from a distaste for general society, and partly from feeble health, he always took his meals alone—neither giving nor accepting hospitality; and to those who wished to engage him in idle conversation, he plainly intimated that it was tedious to him. The contrast between such a way of life and that of the former bishop was naturally noted to his disadvantage, and became the ground for charges of pride, moroseness, and parsimony. The bishops who visited Constantinople no longer found the episcopal palace open to them; for Chrysostom thought this unnecessary, since there were so many of the faithful among whom he supposed that they might be sure to find a welcome. Acacius of Berrhoea, in Syria, was so provoked by the insufficiency of the accommodations which had been provided for him on a visit to the capital, that he is said to have exclaimed, "I will season his pot for him!"

Chrysostom attempted to introduce an improvement among his clergy by enforcing simplicity of life and rousing them to activity in their calling. He deposed some of them on charges of murder and adultery, and interfered with the practice of entertaining "spiritual sisters". The institution of services at night, for the benefit of persons unable to attend those of the day, gave deep offence to some clergymen, whose ease was infringed on by the imposition of additional duties. It would appear that, in the manner of his dealings with his clerical brethren, the bishop was too much influenced by his archdeacon Serapion, a proud, violent, and unpopular man, who is reported to have told him that the only way of managing them was "to drive them all with one stick". Among the monks, too, there were many who regarded the archbishop with an unkindly feeling; for he made it no secret that in proportion to his love for

the monastic life was his indignation against the strolling and greedy pretenders who disgraced it; and he excited much wrath, both among the monks and among the clergy, by advising Olympias not to bestow her bounty indiscriminately.

While his popularity as a preacher excited envy, his eloquence sometimes hurried him into the use of expressions which were liable to misconstruction. Thus he was reported to have said in a sermon, "If thou sin and repent a thousand times, come hither". There can be no doubt that the intended meaning of the words was innocent (if indeed they were used at all); but Sisinnius, the Novatianist bishop—who with the severe notions of his sect as to penance somewhat incongruously combined the reputation of a wit and a handsome style of dress and living—took occasion from them to write a book against him.

Chrysostom also drew enmity on himself by the unsparing manner in which he attacked the prevailing vices—extending his rebukes even to the court. The rapacity which the empress Eudoxia exercised in order to support her eunuchs provoked him not only to remonstrances in private, but to public censures.

Eutropius was disappointed in his hope of a subservient bishop, and had frequent disputes with Chrysostom. The victims of the favourite's extortions often took refuge in churches, and he produced from the feeble emperor a law abolishing the privilege of sanctuary. But soon after, Eutropius himself was suddenly overthrown; whereupon he fled in terror to the cathedral, and laid hold on the altar for protection. Chrysostom withstood the soldiers who were sent to seize the fallen minister; and on the following day, when the church was crowded by a multitude of people, such as was usually assembled only at Easter, he discoursed on the instability of human greatness. While Eutropius lay crouching under the holy table, the archbishop reminded him of his former opposition to the very privilege from which he was then seeking his safety, and entreated the congregation to intercede for him both with the emperor and with God. This address—evidently intended to disarm the anger of the hearers by exhibiting the abject condition of Eutropius—was misrepresented as an exultation over his calamity; and at the same time offence was taken on account of the protection which Chrysostom had offered to the eunuch. The archbishop was even arrested, and carried before the emperor; but he fearlessly asserted the right of the church to shelter the wretched, and the claim was acknowledged, although Eutropius, by leaving the sanctuary, again exposed himself to his enemies, and in consequence of his rashness was put to death.

In the last days of the year 400, Chrysostom set out for Ephesus. Antoninus, bishop of that city, had been accused of selling ordination to bishoprics, and of other offences, but had died before the charges could be satisfactorily examined and the Ephesian clergy requested the intervention of the archbishop of Constantinople. Six bishops were convicted of having bought their office from Antoninus, and were deposed. Chrysostom ordained a new bishop for Ephesus, and on his way homewards he deposed several unworthy bishops, and transferred some churches from sectaries to the Catholics. Some of these acts were afterwards brought against him as having been done in excess of his jurisdiction; and in the meantime, Severian, bishop of Gabala in Syria, a celebrated preacher, whom he had left in charge of his flock, had been busily endeavouring to supplant him. Chrysostom, on being informed of this by the archdeacon Serapion, with whom Severian had quarrelled, forbade him to preach in Constantinople. Severian withdrew from the city, but was recalled by the empress, who effected a reconciliation between him and the archbishop. But the desire of vengeance rankled in Severian's breast, and there were many others whom Chrysostom had offended—clergy, monks, courtiers, wealthy ladies, and even the empress herself. Acacius of Berrhoea (whose dissatisfaction has been already mentioned), and Antiochus, another Syrian bishop, made common cause with Severian. They endeavoured, by inquiries at Antioch, to discover some ground of accusation in the archbishop's earlier life; and, although in this their malice was disappointed, they soon found an unexpected opportunity of gratifying it.

Theophilus succeeded Timothy at Alexandria in 385, and held the see until 412. He was able, bold, crafty, unscrupulous, corrupt, rapacious, and domineering. In the first controversy between Jerome and Rufinus, he had acted the creditable part of a mediator. His own inclinations were undoubtedly in favour of Origen; he had even deposed a bishop named Paul for his hostility to that teacher : but he now found it expedient to take a different line of conduct.

We have seen that, while the monks of Nitria were admirers of Origen, others among the Egyptian recluses held him in detestation. The latter class very generally fell into the error of anthropomorphism. Thus it is related of Serapion, an aged monk of great reputation for holiness, that, when he had with much difficulty been brought to understand the falsehood of this opinion, and while the friends who had argued with him were engaged in thanksgiving for the result, he suddenly cried out, in distress at missing the image which he had been accustomed to place before his mind in prayer—"Woe is me! You have robbed me of my God, and I know not whom to worship!". As it was the custom of the Alexandrian bishops, in issuing the annual letters by which the time of Easter was fixed, to annex some pastoral instructions on other subjects, Theophilus, in his paschal letter of 399, took the opportunity of denouncing anthropomorphism. On this the monks who held the doctrine exclaimed against the archbishop as a blasphemer, and a party of them rushed to Alexandria, with the intention, as was supposed, of killing him. But when Theophilus saluted them with the words "I behold you as if it were the face of God", they were pacified by his seeming agreement with their notions; at their desire he condemned Origen, and from that time he used the fanaticism of these monks, and the odium attached to the name of Origen, as instruments of his designs.

Among the most eminent of the Nitrian monks were four brothers, known as the "long" or "tall brothers"—Dioscorus, Ammonius (perhaps the same whose determined refusal of a bishopric has been noticed in the preceding chapter), Eusebius, and Euthymius. Theophilus conceived a high regard for these brothers; he compelled Dioscorus to accept the bishopric of Hermopolis, the diocese in which the Nitrian mountain was situated, and, having drawn Eusebius and Euthymius from their solitude, he employed them in the financial business of his church. But while thus engaged they made discoveries which greatly shocked them as to the means by which Theophilus obtained funds to gratify his passion for church-building; whereupon, fearing to endanger their souls by becoming his accomplices, they left Alexandria under pretext of a wish to return to their monastic life. Theophilus soon learnt that this was not their principal motive, and resolved that they should feel his vengeance.

About the same time Isidore, master of a hospital at Alexandria, who had been ordained presbyter by Athanasius, and was now eighty years of age, incurred the archbishop's enmity by opposing him in some intended iniquities as to money. Theophilus charged the old man with abominable offences, of which he professed to have received information eighteen years before, although the paper which contained it had been accidentally mislaid; and Isidore, knowing his persecutor's unrelenting character, sought a refuge in Nitria.

The archbishop excited the anthropomorphite monks against the objects of his hatred by representing these as Origenists; he procured from an Alexandrian synod a condemnation of them for Origenism and magic; he denounced the Nitrians to the governor of Egypt as insubordinate, invaded their solitude with soldiers and hostile monks, and committed great outrages—burning cells, destroying the books and other things which were found in them, and even killing some of the recluses. Dioscorus was violently dragged from his episcopal throne by Ethiopians, and about three hundred monks were driven from their retreat. The "long brothers" disavowed the opinions imputed to them, saying, like Rufinus, that these had been foisted by heretics into Origen's works. With more than eighty companions they fled into Palestine; and having been dislodged thence through the interest of Theophilus, they, with about fifty others, sought a refuge at Constantinople. Chrysostom, having ascertained from some Alexandrian clergy who were then in the capital that they were men of good repute,

provided them with a lodging in the buildings of the Anastasia, and wrote in their behalf to Theophilus; but, although he allowed them to join in the prayers of the church, he did not admit them to the communion of the Eucharist, lest the archbishop of Alexandria should be offended.

The delicacy of this behaviour, however, was fruitless. It was reported at Alexandria that Chrysostom had admitted the brothers to full communion; and Theophilus, animated not only by the Alexandrian jealousy of Constantinople, but by personal dislike of the man whom he had unwillingly consecrated to the see of the New Rome, angrily answered his letter by desiring him to respect the fifth Nicene canon, which ordered that all causes should be terminated in the province where they arose. He also sent some monks to accuse the refugees before the emperor. Chrysostom had earnestly dissuaded the brothers from carrying their complaints to the court; but on hearing of the step which their persecutor had taken, they addressed the empress as she was on her way to a church, and prayed her to grant an inquiry before a council into certain charges against Theophilus. Eudoxia was moved by their entreaties, and Theophilus was summoned to Constantinople : but as he delayed his appearance, his emissaries were examined by a prefect, and were condemned as false accusers to imprisonment, in which some of them died before their employer's arrival.

In the meanwhile Theophilus circulated a monstrous set of propositions, which he ascribed to Origen, and actively endeavoured to enlist supporters. Jerome, exasperated by his controversies with John of Jerusalem and Rufinus, eagerly lent his aid; he overwhelmed Theophilus with praises, and translated into Latin three of his paschal letters against Origen, with other documents relating to the controversy. Some years before, Theophilus had stigmatized Epiphanius as a heretic and schismatic, on account of the anthropomorphism which was imputed to him, and of his proceedings in the Holy Land; but he now applied to him, begging that he would join in the movement, and would write to Constantinople and elsewhere for the purpose of obtaining a general condemnation of Origenism. On this Epiphanius held a synod of Cypriot bishops, condemned the reading of Origen's works, and wrote to desire that Chrysostom would do the like; and, as Chrysostom took no step in the matter, the old man himself proceeded to Constantinople. Immediately after landing, he ordained a deacon, in defiance of the archbishop's rights. He refused the offers of honour and hospitality which Chrysostom pressed on him, and protested that he would hold no communication with him unless Origen were condemned and the "long brothers" were expelled. Chrysostom answered that he left both Origen and the brothers to the judgment of the council which had been summoned. Epiphanius then endeavoured, although with very little success, to obtain a declaration against Origen from the bishops who happened to be at Constantinople. An interview with the brothers, however, appears to have convinced him that the cause of his Egyptian ally was not altogether pure, so that without waiting for the expected synod, he embarked for Cyprus; and either on the voyage or soon after reaching home, he died, at the age of nearly a hundred years.

Theophilus at length set out for Constantinople, taking the circuitous way by land through Syria and Asia Minor. Although he had been cited as a defendant, and was expected to appear alone, he was attended by a train of Egyptian bishops, and had so assured himself of support that he declared his business to be the deposition of Chrysostom. He entered the city with great pomp, and took up his abode at a suburban palace belonging to the emperor, where he remained for three weeks, refusing all communication with Chrysostom, and strengthening his interest by bribery, hospitalities, solicitations, and such other means as were likely to be effectual with persons of influence. Arcadius, who was probably not in the secret of Eudoxia's policy, desired Chrysostom to proceed to a trial; but the archbishop declined, on the ground that offences committed in another province did not belong to his jurisdiction.

Theophilus, when he had matured his plans, summoned Chrysostom to appear before a synod at the Oak, a villa near Chalcedon, on the opposite side of the Bosphorus to

Constantinople. The president of this synod was the bishop of Heraclea, who, as metropolitan of the province within which the new dignity of Constantinople had been erected, was naturally disposed to lend himself to the humiliation of its occupant. A long list of charges, mostly false or grossly exaggerated, and concocted by Theophilus with the help of two deacons who had been deposed for serious crimes, was produced against Chrysostom. They related to faults in the administration of his church and its funds; to his conduct towards the clergy, in depriving some, severely reproving others, and the like; to his private habits of life; to ritual irregularities; to doctrines which he had vented, and expressions which he had used, in his sermons : but, although Origenism was the pretext for the Alexandrian bishop's whole proceedings, he did not venture to include it in the indictment. Chrysostom had with him forty bishops—a larger assemblage than the synod of his opponents, and more fairly composed, inasmuch as of the thirty-six bishops who met at the Oak all but seven belonged to the Egyptian province. He earnestly besought his partisans to avoid a rupture, even although it were necessary that he himself should be sacrificed for the sake of peace. Two bishops from the hostile synod entered the assembly, and in an insolent manner summoned Chrysostom to appear at the Oak. The bishops who surrounded him answered that Theophilus ought rather to come and take his trial before themselves; but Chrysostom professed himself ready to meet all accusations before the irregular tribunal, provided that his declared enemies, Theophilus, Acacius, Antiochus, and Severian, were not allowed to sit as judges. The citation was repeated a second and third time, but he continued to disregard it. After many hours had been spent in these fruitless communications, the bishops at the Oak received a message from the court, urging them to pronounce a decision; whereupon they condemned Chrysostom as contumacious, and added that he was also guilty of treason, but that, as that offence was beyond their jurisdiction, they left the punishment of it to the emperor. Arcadius did not proceed to the extent which this malicious sentence suggested, but contented himself with condemning the archbishop to deposition and banishment.

Chrysostom held himself bound not to abandon his post, unless compelled by force. He was anxiously guarded by his people for three days, until, hearing that the emperor intended to seize him, and dreading some serious tumult, he surrendered himself, and was immediately sent across the Bosphorus. The people, on learning that he was in custody, beset the palace with cries for their pastor, and in the course of the following night the city was shaken by an earthquake. The empress, alarmed both by the danger of an insurrection and by supernatural terrors, hastily dispatched a messenger to the archbishop, with a letter in which she assured him that she was guiltless of his banishment, and desired him to return. In the meantime the agitation at Constantinople was extreme. The entrance of Theophilus into the city was the signal for affrays between the populace and his Alexandrian sailors, which became so serious that he thought it well to retire; and Severian, who ventured to preach against Chrysostom, was forcibly driven out.

The archbishop's return was hailed with enthusiasm. The Bosphorus was covered with vessels of all sizes, which were crowded by multitudes eager to welcome him. It had been his intention to remain without the city until his deposition should be annulled by a council greater than that which had condemned him; but the excitement of the people, and a fear lest it should be turned against the emperor, induced him to proceed to the cathedral, where, yielding to the cries of the congregation, he took his seat on the throne, and delivered an extemporal address, in which the invasion of his church by the bishop of Alexandria was paralleled with the seizure and the forced restoration of Abraham's wife by the Egyptian king. Theophilus forthwith set out for Alexandria, covering his discomfiture by the pretext that his flock could no longer endure his absence.

Chrysostom's triumph appeared to be complete; but before two months had passed his enemies found a new ground for attacking him. A silver statue of the empress was erected near the cathedral, and was inaugurated with the unruly and somewhat heathenish rejoicings

which were usual on such occasions. The archbishop—after (it is said) having sent remonstrances to the court, which were intercepted by the way—expressed in a sermon his strong condemnation of the scenes which were taking place almost at the doors of his church, and his language was repeated, probably with malicious exaggeration, so that the empress was violently offended. The offence was increased by a sermon preached on the festival of the Beheading of St. John the Baptist, which is said to have opened with the words, “Again Herodias rages; again Herodias is agitated; again she requires the head of John”. It is incredible that Chrysostom could have meant to point these words at the empress; it is doubtful whether he used them at all; but his enemies either invented or misapplied them, and hopefully resumed their intrigues. Theophilus did not again venture to go to Constantinople, but from his own city directed the proceedings of Severian and his other allies.

At Christmas 403, Arcadius announced to the archbishop that he could not communicate with him until he had cleared himself of certain accusations. A synod was held early in the following year, and Chrysostom was charged before it with having violated the twelfth canon of Antioch (originally enacted against St. Athanasius) by resuming his see without ecclesiastical sanction after having been deposed by a council. His friends—for he had forty-two bishops on his side—replied that the canon did not apply to his case, and, moreover, that it was the work of heretics; one of them caused some confusion among the opposite party by proposing, in the emperor's presence, that those who wished to act on the canon should sign the creed of its authors. The objections, however, were overruled, and Chrysostom was condemned.

At the approach of Easter, Arcadius, urged on by the archbishop's enemies, intimated to him that, after having been sentenced to deposition by two synods, he must not enter the church. On Easter-eve, during the administration of baptism which was customary on that vigil, several of the churches were attacked by soldiers, who drove out the congregations—among them the women who were undress for baptism—and committed gross profanations. The candidates for baptism took refuge in the baths of Constantine, where the administration of the sacrament was continued, and, when driven thence, they repaired to a circus outside the walls, from which also they were dislodged it would seem, however, that Chrysostom was afterwards allowed to resume possession of the churches. Within a short space of time two attempts were made on his life by assassins. In Whitsun-Week the emperor sent him a mandate to leave the episcopal house. As it was evident that he must now yield to force, he took a solemn farewell of his friends. To each class he addressed suitable admonitions; he entreated that they would not despair for the loss of an individual, but would receive any bishop who should be appointed by general consent; and, while his mule was held in waiting at one door of the cathedral, in order to divert the attention of his people, who for weeks had guarded him day and night, he left the building by an opposite door, and gave himself up, declaring that he referred his cause to an impartial council.

The discovery of his removal from Constantinople produced a great excitement. Next day the cathedral and the splendid palace of the senate were burnt. Each party charged the other with incendiarism; but the Joannites (as Chrysostom's adherents were called), being obnoxious to the imperial government, were cruelly treated on account of the fire, and some of them were put to death. Among others, Olympias was questioned on suspicion of having been concerned in the fire. “My life hitherto” she said, “is an answer to the charge. One who has spent much on building churches is not a likely person to destroy them”. Arsacius, a man of eighty, brother to Nectarius, was appointed to the see of Constantinople, and, after having feebly held it for a year, was succeeded by Atticus. In the meantime the Joannites saw the vengeance of heaven in earthquakes and hailstorms, in the death of Eudoxia (Oct. 6th, 404), and in the calamities which befell other persons who had been conspicuous among the enemies of the expelled archbishop.

Chrysostom, after having been carried across the Bosphorus, was allowed to remain nearly a month at Nicaea. He earnestly pressed for an investigation of his cause, but in vain. It was in vain, too, that both he and his friends entreated that some endurable residence might be assigned as the place of his banishment. After a toilsome and tedious journey, in which he was in danger from robbers, and much more from fanatical monks, he reached Cucusus, among the ridges of Mount Taurus, the scene of the exile and death of his predecessor Paul. During his sojourn in this remote and wretched little town, he suffered from want of provisions, from the alternate excesses of heat and cold, from frequent sicknesses, in which it was impossible to obtain medicines, and from the ravages of Isaurian robbers, which at length compelled him to take shelter in the fortress of Arabissus. But the years of his banishment were fuller of honour and influence than any portion of his previous life. He kept up a correspondence with churches in all quarters; even the bishop of Rome, Innocent, who was strongly interested in his favour, treated him on terms of equality. From the bishop of Cucusus and his other neighbours he met with reverential kindness. Many pilgrims sought him out in his secluded abode, from a desire to express their veneration for him. He directed missionary labours in Persia and among the Goths while his friends at a distance supplied him with funds so amply, that he was not only able to support these missions and to redeem captives, but even had to request that their overflowing liberality might be directed into other channels. He wrote frequent letters of advice and consolation to the bishops and clergy who had been involved in his fall, and to his adherents at Constantinople, who were subjected to great severities for refusing to communicate with his intruded successors. The western emperor and the bishop of Rome joined in desiring that his cause should be again tried by an impartial council of the whole church; but the relations of the divisions of the empire towards each other were unfavourable to the success of the proposal, and some envoys who were sent from the west to the court of Arcadius were imprisoned and were treated with great indignity.

After Chrysostom had spent three years in exile, the interest which he continued to excite provoked his enemies to still more rigorous measures against him. He was sentenced to be removed to Pityus, a town on the extreme frontier of the empire, to the east of the Euxine; and in the summer of 407 he was carried off from Arabissus. On the journey his bodily ailments were renewed or aggravated by exposure to violent heat. At Comana, a city of Pontus (now Gumenek), he requested his conductors to halt, as he felt the approach of death. He exchanged his mean dress for the best which he possessed; he received the holy eucharist, and, after uttering the words, "Glory be to God for all things!" he expired as he added "Amen".

The Joannites remained a separate body for some years longer. Theophilus—although after Chrysostom's banishment he wrote a brutal book against him, which was eagerly translated into Latin by Jerome—advised Atticus to deal leniently with them. Alexander of Antioch (the same who succeeded in putting an end to the Eustathian schism) led the way in acknowledging the orthodoxy of Chrysostom by inserting his name in the diptychs of his church, and the example was followed elsewhere, until at length Atticus, at the urgent entreaty of the people and the court, and with a view to obtaining the communion of the west, consented to admit the name into the diptychs of Constantinople. By this act, and by the general observance of a moderate and conciliatory policy, he regained many Joannites to his communion and the schism was finally extinguished in 438, under the episcopate of Proclus, when the relics of the banished archbishop were translated from Comana. As the vessel which bore them approached the capital, the population, in numbers far greater than those which had welcomed the living Chrysostom's return from exile, swarmed forth over the Bosphorus in boats; and the emperor, Theodosius II, bending over the coffin, entreated the saint to forgive the guilt of Arcadius and Eudoxia.

But the see of Constantinople never recovered the wound which it had received in the banishment of Chrysostom. Its patriarchs, with few exceptions, were, from that time, little more than pliant officers of the court

CHAPTER II
ST. AUGUSTINE.—DONATISM.—PELAGIANISM.

The great light of the western church in his age was St. Augustine, a teacher of wider and more lasting influence than any since the apostles. The history of his earlier years is given by himself in the well-known "Confessions" where he solemnly acknowledges his errors, and magnifies the gracious Providence which had guided him through many perils and conflicts to truth and peace.

Augustine was born in 354, at Thagaste, an episcopal city of Numidia. His father, Patricius, a man of curial rank, but in indifferent circumstances, was then a heathen; but his mother, Monica, a devout and exemplary Christian, caused the boy to be admitted in infancy as a catechumen of the church. He tells us that, when alarmed by a sudden and dangerous illness in his childhood, he earnestly desired baptism, and that preparations were made for administering it; but as the danger passed over, it was considered better that the sacrament should be deferred, lest he should incur a heavier guilt by falling into sin after having received the baptismal grace. Patricius, although himself a man of loose habits, and careless of his son's moral and religious training, exerted himself even beyond his means to obtain for him a good literary education, in the hope that it would lead to some honourable and lucrative employment; and with this view Augustine, after having acquired the elements of learning at Thagaste, was sent to pursue his studies at the schools of Madaura and Carthage. It would seem that his abilities were conspicuous from an early age, but that his application of them was uncertain and capricious; he read the Latin poets with eager fondness, but disliked the study of Greek; and his boyish neglect of that language was but very imperfectly remedied in after life. At the age of seventeen, about the time of his removal to Carthage, he lost his father, who had at last been persuaded, as much by the discreet and gentle conduct of Monica as by her arguments, to embrace the Christian faith. A rich citizen of Thagaste, Romanian, assisted the widow to bear the expense of her son's education, and Augustine's talents promised to render him distinguished. But he had early fallen into dissolute courses, and at Carthage he took a concubine, by whom he became, at the age of eighteen, the father of a boy Adeodatus.

In his nineteenth year, the reading of Cicero's Hortensius awakened in Augustine a longing after a higher life; but on turning to the Scriptures in search of wisdom, he found them simple and uninviting, while he was attracted in another direction by the specious promises of the Manichaeans, their ridicule of submission to authority, and their speculations as to the origin of evil. This sect had made considerable progress during the course of the fourth century; it had profited by the dissensions of the church, and perhaps in a great degree by receiving accessions from the old and decaying gnostic parties. Although many laws spoke of it as more abominable than other heretical societies, and enacted penalties of especial severity against it, proselytism was actively carried on in secret, and the Manichean doctrines lurked even among the clergy and the monks. Augustine became a convert to these doctrines, and was a member of the sect from his nineteenth to his twenty-eighth year. But after a time he was startled and disgusted by observing the sensuality and hypocrisy of the "elect", who were bound to profess the most ascetic strictness, and also by the discoveries which he made as to the immoral and revolting maxims of the sectaries. He looked for a solution of his doubts to Faustus, a Manichean bishop of great fame, who was expected to visit Carthage; but, when

Faustus came, he found him to be not free from the usual inconsistency between profession and practice, and his discourse to be as empty as it was fluent and showy

Augustine had taught grammar and rhetoric, first at his native town and then at Carthage; but he found the disorderly habits of the Carthaginian students intolerable, and in order to escape from this annoyance—not (he assures us) from any desire of greater fame or profit — he removed to Rome in 383. Soon after his arrival he fell seriously ill; but he felt no inclination to beg for baptism, as in the sickness of his childhood. On his recovery, his dislike of Manichaeism was stronger than before, and for a time he was given over to the desolateness of universal scepticism. The prospect of earning a maintenance at Rome became doubtful; for he found that the Roman youth, although not so unruly as those of Africa, were apt to desert a professor without paying for the lectures which they had heard; and after a residence of about six months in the capital, he was glad to obtain an appointment as a public teacher of rhetoric at Milan.

Here he attended the sermons of Ambrose—not for the sake of religious instruction, but in order to ascertain whether the bishop’s eloquence deserved its fame. But by degrees the words of Ambrose produced an effect. Augustine found that the Manichean objections against the catholic faith were mostly founded on ignorance and misapprehension, the preacher’s allegorical explanations of the Old Testament showed him a way (although in truth a very dangerous way) by which he might escape from the difficulties of Scripture—“the letter that killeth”. Monica, who had strongly opposed his departure from Africa, rejoined him at Milan. She had watched his errors with deep anxiety and sorrow. Her prayers had been rewarded by visions which assured her that he would one day be converted; and, in the hope of bringing about the change, she had begged an aged bishop to converse with him. The bishop, a man of wisdom and learning, told her that it would be useless to argue with her son while flushed with the novelty of the Manichean doctrines, but that, if he were left to himself for a time, he could hardly fail to discover the vanity and impiety of the system; and he encouraged the hope by adding that he himself had been a member of the sect in his youth, but had seen reason to forsake its errors. Monica still continued to urge her petition, even with tears; but the bishop dismissed her with the assurance that it was “impossible that the child of those tears should perish”, and the words were treasured up as if they had been a voice from heaven. She had now the delight of finding her son no longer a Manichean, but a catechumen of the church; for he had resolved to resume that character until he could obtain some certainty of conviction; and she confidently expressed to him the hope of seeing him a catholic believer before her death. His baser passions, however, were not yet overcome.

Through various difficulties Augustine struggled onwards. He had found much support for his mind in the Platonic writings, while yet they failed to satisfy his cravings. He now devoted himself to the study of St Paul, with feelings far different from those which in his nineteenth year had led him to slight the simplicity of the Scriptures; and he found that the difficulties and seeming inconsistencies, which had once repelled him, vanished away. On hearing from one of his countrymen, who happened to visit him, some details as to the lives of Antony and other monks, and as to the monastic system (which until then had been utterly unknown to him), he was greatly impressed; the vileness of his own past life rose up before his mind in contrast, and excited violent agitations. One day, when unable, in the wild conflict of his thoughts, to bear even the society of his dearest friend, Alypius, he rushed forth into the garden of his lodging, cast himself down under a fig-tree, and, with a gush of tears, passionately cried out for deliverance from the bondage of his sins. While thus engaged, he heard, as if from a neighbouring house, the voice of a child singing repeatedly, “Take up and read”. He could not remember that such words were used in any childish game; he bethought himself of the impression made on St. Antony by the Scriptures which were read in church, and believed that he was himself now called by a voice from heaven. Returning to the house, he seized the volume of St. Paul’s epistles, and opened on the text, “Not in rioting and

drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying: but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof". From that moment Augustine felt himself another man; but, as he did not wish to attract notice by any display of the change, he continued to perform the duties of his professorship until the vintage vacation, when he resigned it, and retired into the country with his mother and some friends. On Easter-eve 387, he was baptized by St Ambrose, together with his son Adeodatus, and Alypius his countryman and pupil, whom he had formerly drawn into Manichaeism, and who eventually became bishop of Thagaste. In compliance with Monica's wishes, he soon after set out towards Africa; but at Ostia the pious matron died, rejoicing that the desire of her heart was fulfilled in the conversion of her son.

As his mother's death had done away with Augustine's motive for hastening his return to Africa, he now repaired to Rome, where he resided upwards of a year, and produced, among other works, two books on the contrast between catholic and Manichaean morality. Towards the end of 388 he resumed his journey, and, after short stay at Carthage, he settled at his native place, where he gave up his property to pious and charitable uses, and for nearly three years lived in studious and devotional retirement, which was shared by Alypius and other friends. His earlier history and his conversion, his sacrifice of worldly goods, his religious life and his writings, spread his fame far and wide, so that he was afraid to appear in any city where the bishopric was vacant, lest he should be forcibly seized and compelled to accept the dignity. He supposed himself, however, to be safe in accepting an invitation to Hippo the Royal (so called from having been anciently the residence of the Numidian kings), as the see was filled by Valerius; but as he was in church, listening to the bishop's sermon, Valerius began to speak of the necessity of ordaining an additional presbyter: whereupon the people presented Augustine, and he was forced to submit to ordination, Valerius admitted him to his confidence, and gave him a large share in the administration of the diocese. Being a Greek by birth, the bishop felt a difficulty in preaching in Latin, and was glad to relieve himself by employing Augustine as his substitute; and, although it was at first objected to, as a novelty in Africa, that a presbyter should preach in the presence of a bishop, the example was soon imitated in other dioceses. At the end of four years, Valerius, on the ground that his own age and infirmity rendered the assistance of a coadjutor necessary, desired that Augustine might be consecrated as his colleague in the see of Hippo; and Augustine was obliged to yield. Both he and Valerius were then ignorant that the eighth Nicene canon forbade the establishment of two bishops in the same city, except in cases where one was a reconciled Novatianist. Valerius did not long survive the appointment of his colleague.

Augustine held the bishopric of Hippo for five-and-thirty years, and, although the city was inferior in importance to many others, his genius and character caused him to be acknowledged, without any assumption on his own part, as the leader of the African church. The vast collection of his works includes treatises on Christian doctrine and practice, expositions of Scripture, controversial books against Manicheans, Donatists, Pelagians, and other sectaries, a great number of sermons, and upwards of two hundred and fifty letters, among which are many elaborate answers to questions of theology and casuistry. His greatest work, "Of the City of God" was written, as has been already mentioned, in consequence of the force with which the old pagan objection against Christianity, as the cause of public calamities, was urged after the capture of Rome by the Goths. The composition of this treatise was begun in 412 or 413, and was not finished until 426. In the first five books, Augustine meets the argument from the calamities of the times; in the next five, he argues against those who, while they allowed that paganism had not, in the days of its ascendancy, secured its votaries against temporal evils, yet maintained that it was availing for the next life; and in the remaining twelve books, he contrasts the two polities—the earthly and the *City of God*—in their origin, their course, and their end. Some defects of the work are obvious: as, that the reasoning is not always satisfactory; that much of what is said has no visible bearing on the

theme; that here, as elsewhere, Augustine is driven, by his want of acquaintance with the original languages, to evade questions as to the real meaning of Scripture, and to take refuge in allegories and forced applications. It is said, also, that the learning which appears so copious is in great measure borrowed from secondary sources. But on the whole this elaborate work, which is at once the last and most important of the apologies against paganism, and the first of professed treatises on the Church, deserves to be regarded as alike noble in the conception and in the execution.

The exemplary labours of Augustine in his diocese cannot be here detailed; but it is necessary to notice at some length the two principal controversies in which he was engaged—the sequel of that with the Donatists, and the new controversy which was occasioned by the opinions of Pelagius.

After their condemnation by Constans in 348, the Donatists remained in exile until the reign of Julian. As the edict by which that emperor recalled persons who were suffering on account of religion applied to such only as had been banished by his immediate predecessor, these sectaries could not benefit by it. They therefore presented a petition to Julian, expressing respect for his character and reliance on his justice in terms which were not only inconsistent with their former attitude towards the civil power, but afforded their opponents ground for reproaching them with flattery of the apostate and persecutor. The petition was successful, and they signalized their return from banishment by triumphant displays of intolerance. “If they obtained possession of a church which had been used by the Catholics, they washed the pavement, scraped the walls, burnt the altar, which was commonly of wood, melted the consecrated plate, and cast the holy Eucharist to the dogs”. The Donatists were now the stronger party in Numidia, and were powerful throughout the African provinces; but after the brief reign of Julian, they again became obnoxious to the government, and several laws were directed against them. Valentinian I, by an exception to his general policy of abstaining from interference with religion, enacted penalties against their practice of rebaptizing (A.D. 373). Gratian ordered, in 377, that their churches should be given up to the Catholics, and that any places where they should hold meetings should be confiscated; and in the following year, at the request of a Roman council, he expelled their bishop from Rome. These laws do not appear to have been rigidly executed; but in other ways the interest of Donatism suffered greatly during the latter part of the fourth century.

The working of the schismatical spirit produced many divisions in the sect—each little fraction maintaining that it alone retained the true baptism, and excommunicating all the rest. The most considerable separation took place after the death of Parmenian, who had succeeded Donatus as leader of the party, and for forty years had guided it with vigour and skill. In 392 he was succeeded by Primian, who soon after had a violent quarrel with a deacon named Maximian, and excommunicated him. The original history of the schism was now repeated by rival factions of the Donatists. Maximian found a new Lucilla in a wealthy lady. Primian was condemned by two councils,—the second consisting of more than a hundred bishops; he was declared to be deposed, and twelve bishops joined in consecrating Maximian to the see of Carthage. But without paying any regard to these proceedings, Primian assembled at Bagai a council of three hundred and ten bishops, by which Maximian was condemned. In pursuance of this sentence, Maximian and his consecrators were ejected from their churches by the assistance of the civil power, and in some cases not without violence and cruelty; while the other Maximianist bishops were invited to rejoin the communion of Primian within a certain time, with a promise that their baptism and orders should be acknowledged as valid. In this affair, every principle of the original schism was either violated by the victorious party or carried out to manifest absurdity by the vanquished; and the history of it supplied the catholic controversialists with weapons which they did not fail to turn to account.

The leader in the literary warfare against Donatism was Optatus, bishop of Milevis, who about 370, in answer to a book by Parmenian, ably exposed both the history of the

schism and the grounds on which its adherents professed to rest it. About the same time a grammarian named Tichonius, although himself a Donatist, did much to injure his party by a treatise in which he maintained that the church could not be confined to one corner, but must be diffused throughout the world; that the sins of the evil members do not cause a failure of God's promises to it; and that baptism administered without the true church might be valid. But Augustine became the most formidable and effective opponent of Donatism.

When ordained a presbyter, he found that the Donatists were a majority in Hippo, where he tells us, in illustration of the sectarian spirit, that their bishop would not allow any of his flock even to bake for their catholic neighbours. Augustine's first contribution to the controversy was a psalm or metrical piece, intended to furnish the less educated people with some knowledge of the question in a form which might assist the memory; it opens by setting forth the scriptural doctrine as to the mixture of evil with good in the visible church, sketches the history of the schism, and, after twenty parts, which begin with the successive letters of the alphabet, it concludes with exhortations to unity. This attack was followed up from time to time by treatises in answer to the most eminent Donatistic champions, and by letters to members of the sect, which are usually written in an admirable spirit of charity and courtesy. Augustine also endeavoured to bring the Donatists to conferences; but in this he rarely succeeded. Sometimes the refusal was rested on the ground that his dialectical skill would give him an unfair advantage; sometimes it was in a more insolent form—that the children of the martyrs could not condescend to argue with sinners and *traditors*. His attempts at conciliation were repelled by the obstinate bigotry of the sect. With a view to the common maintenance of discipline, he proposed that, when a person who was under censure of either community applied for admission into the other, it should not be granted except on condition of his submitting to penance; but although Augustine himself scrupulously observed this rule, he was unable to establish a mutual agreement in it, as the Donatists, for the sake of swelling their numbers, not only belied their profession by retaining notorious offenders in their communion, but indiscriminately received all sorts of proselytes.

The councils of the African Catholics made frequent reference to the Donatists, and generally in a moderate and conciliatory tone. They offered, even when impeded by decrees which had forbidden such concessions, to acknowledge the Donatist clergy in their orders and position. The clergy interposed to moderate the execution of the laws against the sectaries; and by various means—especially by making known the earlier documents of the schism—they gained many converts to the church. But the success of their exertions exasperated the fury of the circumcellions, who committed barbarous outrages against the catholic clergy, and rendered it unsafe for Catholics to live in country places; while the bishops of the sect were either afraid or unwilling to interfere or to grant redress. Augustine himself had a providential escape from a plot which had been arranged for waylaying him, and other bishops were so cruelly treated that the council of Africa, in 404, found it necessary to petition Honorius that the laws against heretics might be applied to the Donatists. The reports of the outrages which had been committed, and especially the evidence borne by the appearance of some of the sufferers, who presented themselves at the imperial court, provoked severer measures than those which the council had contemplated. The old edicts against the Donatists were revived and they were sentenced to heavy fines, to forfeiture of their churches, banishment of their bishops and clergy, and confiscation of any lands on which they might attempt to hold their worships. In consequence of this, the church received a large accession of converts, of whom it is probable that some were insincere, and that others, having inherited their Donatism, had until then professed it, not from any personal conviction of its tenets, but merely because they were held in terror by the circumcellions.

The law of February 405 was followed by others of like purport. On the death of Stilicho, the Donatists, pretending that these laws were his work and had expired with him, began to resume possession of churches and to renew their acts of violence. But the laws were

reinforced by fresh edicts, and such of the sectaries as should molest the Catholics were threatened with capital punishment. On this Augustine wrote to the proconsul of Africa, begging that the new law might not be executed to the full; if, he said, Donatism should be punished with death, the catholic clergy, who were the persons best acquainted with the proceedings of the Donatists, and most interested in restraining them, would shrink from giving information against them. In 410, Honorius, alarmed by the pressure of the barbarians, granted a general freedom of religion for Africa; but at the urgent request of the Catholics this indulgence was revoked, and banishment and even death were denounced against those who should hold heretical assemblies.

The Catholics now entreated the emperor to appoint a conference between the two parties. The request was granted—the willingness of the Donatists being presumed from their language on some former occasions—and Marcellinus, a “tribune and notary” (or secretary of state), was deputed to superintend the discussion. Marcellinus is highly praised for his piety and virtues by Jerome and by Augustine, and their eulogies appear to be justified by the patience, moderation, and judgment which he displayed in the execution of his commission. In the citation addressed to the Donatists, it was said that such of them as might be willing to attend the conference should in the meantime enjoy possession of their churches, with an exemption from all laws against the sect; that, whatever the result of the meeting might be, they should have liberty to return to their homes; but that, if the party should refuse to obey the summons, conformity to the catholic church would be forthwith enforced: and Marcellinus offered, if the Donatists objected to him as a judge, to associate with himself any person of equal or superior dignity whom they might choose.

Two hundred and eighty-six catholic bishops were gradually assembled at Carthage. The Donatists made a display of their strength by entering the city in a body, to the number of two hundred and seventy-nine, and asserted, but seemingly without truth, that in their absent brethren they had a majority over the Catholics. Their leader was Petilian, bishop of Cirta (or Constantine), who had formerly been eminent as an advocate, and, when a catechumen, had been forcibly baptized into the sect and raised to the episcopate. The Catholics announced that, if convinced of the church’s failure everywhere but in the Donatistic communion, they would submit without requiring an acknowledgment of their orders; but that, if they should be able to convince their opponents, the Donatist bishops and clergy should be acknowledged as such, and an arrangement should be made for the joint government of the churches. Although the former of these alternatives might have been offered without any risk, the second deserves the praise of a really liberal and conciliatory spirit.

The conference was held on the 1st, the 3rd, and the 8th of June 411. The first day was taken up by formalities—Petilian’s forensic skill being employed in raising technical difficulties for the purpose of evading the main subjects of dispute. The commissioner renewed his offer of admitting an assessor; but Petilian answered that, as the Donatists had not asked for the first judge, it was not their part to ask for a second. Marcellinus then proposed that each party should choose seven disputants, seven advisers, and four other bishops, who should see to the authenticity of reports and documents; and that, with a view to orderly discussion, no other persons than those representatives, with the secretaries and public officers, should be admitted to the place of conference. To this the Donatists objected, as they supposed themselves to be more numerous than their opponents, and wished to make a visible display of their superiority; but, after the lists of bishops on each side had been recited and carefully verified, the sectaries found it expedient to comply with the proposed arrangement. Between the reading of the two lists, Marcellinus desired the bishops to sit down. To this the leader of the Donatists replied, with an elaborate compliment to the commissioner, that, as our Lord stood before his judge, it was not for them to sit in the presence of so worshipful a person; and, as Marcellinus would not sit while the bishops stood, all parties remained

standing throughout the debated Among the catholic disputants were Aurelius of Carthage, Augustine, his friend Alypius, and his biographer Possidius.

At the next meeting Marcellinus again requested the bishops to seat themselves, whereupon Petilian produced another scriptural authority for refusing—namely, the words of the psalmist, “I will not sit with the wicked”. The second day was for the most part wasted in the same manner as the first; but on the third and last day, after fresh attempts at evasion and delay on the part of the Donatists, the real question came into discussion, and Augustine, who until then had spoken little, stood forward as the leader of the Catholics. It is noted as characteristic that, when he styled the Donatists “brethren”, Petilian protested against the term as injurious. Each party wished to throw on the other the burden of opening the case: the Donatists said that the Catholics were bound to do so, as having demanded the conference; the Catholics, that the Donatists were the accusers of the church, and therefore ought to state their charges. When Augustine entered on the history of the separation, the Donatists objected, and said that the matter ought to be determined by Scripture : to which the Catholics replied that they were willing to confine themselves to Scripture if their opponents would refrain from personal charges; but that, if Caecilian and others were attacked, the documents necessary for their justification must be admitted. Marcellinus decided that the acts relating to the commencement of the schism should be read; and eventually both the doctrinal question of the church’s purity and the historical question as to the origin of Donatism were discussed. The documents produced by the Donatists were shown to bear against their own cause; for it would seem that the sect had forgotten all such parts of its history as were unfavourable to it. They were at length forced to avow that they did not suppose the whole church to be limited to their own body in Africa, but only denied that their African opponents were in communion with the catholic churches beyond the seas. Marcellinus ended the conference by giving judgment against the Donatists. The promise of a safe conduct homewards was to be fulfilled to them, and a certain time was allowed, during which they might join the church on the terms which the Catholics had offered; but in case of their refusal the penal statutes against them were to be revived.

It is evident that, if a power of supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction had then been supposed to exist in the see of Rome, an affair such as that of the Donatists would not have been intrusted to a lay imperial commissioner. But on the other hand, the commission given to Marcellinus does not imply such a right or claim of jurisdiction on the part of the civil power as might perhaps be supposed if the circumstance stood by itself. The Donatistic controversy had arisen at the very time when Constantine began to show favour to the Christians; it was originally carried before the emperor by the sectaries; although doctrinal discussions as to the being of the church were afterwards introduced into it, it was at first merely a question of disputed facts; and it had continued to engage the attention of the emperors, not in its doctrinal aspect, but because the disorders of the circumcellions disturbed the peace of Africa. Thus it had been throughout regarded as especially belonging to the imperial cognizance, and the appointment of Marcellinus was a consequence of that view. Indeed, the arbitration which was urgently needed could not well have been obtained from ecclesiastical authority; since all the Africans were parties in the case, and there were difficulties, perhaps insuperable, in the way of referring it to a synod beyond the seas, while a reference to the bishop of Rome does not appear to have been thought of as an expedient which could be admitted to decide the question.

The Donatists asserted that they had been victorious in argument at the conference, and that Marcellinus was bribed by their opponents. They appealed to the emperor; but Honorius, without regarding the appeal, confirmed his commissioner’s judgment, and in the following year enacted severe penalties against the sect. All who should refuse to conform to the church were to be heavily fined, in proportion to their rank, and in case of continued obstinacy they were to forfeit all their property. Slaves and peasants were to be beaten into

conformity, and their masters, if they neglected to act on this order, were, “although Catholics”, to be liable to the penalties of Donatism. It was forbidden to harbour the sectaries; their bishops and clergy were to be banished, and the buildings and estates belonging to the body were to be confiscated. By another law, two years later, the penalties of the former were increased; the Donatists were deprived of the right of bequeathing property, and were subjected to a sort of civil excommunication. The African councils, however, still held out offers of conciliation, and the clergy, although they did not deny that such laws were justifiable, urged that the execution of them might be forborne or mitigated. In consequence of the measures of the government some Donatists were brought into the church, while others were driven to the frenzy of desperation. Their outrages became more violent than ever. Many committed suicide, which they supposed to be an expiation for all their sins; and to threaten it was a favourite expedient when they found themselves pressed by the Catholics. Gaudentius, a bishop, who had been one of the disputants at the conference, declared that, if he were forcibly required to join the catholic communion, he would shut himself up in a church with his adherents, set it on fire, and perish in the flames. It was against this zealot that Augustine wrote his last works in the Donatistic controversy, about the year 420.

Little is known of the Donatists after this time, although they were still occasionally noticed in imperial edicts. Under the Vandals their position was improved, but the sect soon dwindled into insignificance. Some remains of it, however, existed in the time of Gregory the Great, and it is supposed that it was not extinguished until the Saracenic invasion of Africa in the seventh century.

The Pelagian controversy was that as to which Augustine exercised the most powerful influence on his own age, and which has chiefly made his authority important throughout the succeeding times. The differences as to doctrine which had hitherto agitated the church originated in the east, and related to the Godhead; one was now to arise in the west, which had for its subject the nature of man and his relations to God. On these points there had as yet been no precise definitions; but it had been generally acknowledged that the nature of man was seriously injured by the fall of Adam, and needed the assistance of Divine grace. In the western church, from the time of Tertullian, it was declared that Adam had transmitted to his posterity an inheritance of sinfulness; but the Latin teachers, as well as those of the east, had maintained that the will was free to choose good or evil, to receive or to reject salvation. Augustine himself, in his earlier writings after his conversion, maintained against the Manichaeans the freedom of the will in preparing man for the reception of grace. Faith (he said) depends on man, although works are of God’s grace; the Divine election is spoken of by St. Paul as opposed to a foundation of works—not to a foundation of faith; and if there were no freedom, there could be no responsibility. As early as 397, however, he had come to regard faith also as an effect of Divine grace; and it would be more correct to describe Pelagianism as a reaction from Augustine’s doctrine than to invert this order, although Pelagianism became the occasion by which Augustine was urged to carry out his system into precision and completeness.

Pelagius was a Briton—the first native of our island who distinguished himself in literature or theology. His Greek or Latin name is traditionally said to be a translation of the British Morgan—sea-born. He is described as a monk, and it has been supposed that he belonged to the great monastery of Bangor; but the term most probably means only that he lived ascetically, without implying that he was a member of any monastic community. From his acquaintance with the Greek ecclesiastical writers it is inferred that he had resided in the east; and he has been identified by some with a monk of the same name who is mentioned in one of Chrysostom’s letters. About the end of the fourth century he took up his abode at Rome, where he became intimate with Paulinus of Nola and other persons of saintly reputation. Jerome in controversy expresses contempt for his abilities, and represents his habits as luxurious; but such aspersions are matters of course with Jerome, and, although

Orosius also charges Pelagius with luxury and excess, we may rather rely on the testimony of Augustine, who always spoke with high respect of his adversary's character for piety and virtue.

In his tone of thought Pelagius was rather oriental than western. The course of his religious life appears to have been steady—in striking contrast to the fierce agitations by which Augustine had been made to pass through so great a variety of experiences. His indignation was raised by the manner in which many persons alleged the weakness of human nature as an excuse for carelessness or slothfulness in religion; in opposition to this he insisted on the freedom of the will; and he is said to have expressed great displeasure at hearing a bishop repeat a well-known prayer of Augustine—"Give what Thou commandest, and command what Thou wilt". But, although he found adherents at Rome, both his age, which was already advanced, and his temper disinclined Pelagius from any public declaration of his opinions. In one of his works—an exposition of St. Paul's epistles, which has escaped the general fate of heretical books by being included through mistake among the writings of his enemy Jerome—there are many indications of his errors; but the objectionable opinions are there introduced in the way of discussion—not as if they were the author's own.

At Rome Pelagius became acquainted with Celestius, who, from an expression of Jerome, has been supposed to have been a Scot—*i.e.* a native of Ireland. Celestius was a man of family, had practised as an advocate, and had forsaken that profession for an ascetic life. Whether he learnt his opinions from Pelagius, or had adopted them from another teacher before the beginning of his acquaintance with Pelagius, is doubtful. Jerome bestows his customary abuse on Celestius; Augustine describes him as bolder and less crafty than his associate.

After the sack of Rome, the two friends passed into Africa, where Pelagius remained but a short time; and it does not appear that after this separation they ever met again, or even corresponded with each other. Celestius endeavoured to obtain ordination as a presbyter at Carthage, but was charged with heresy by Paulinus, who had formerly been a deacon of the Milanese church, and is known to us as the biographer of its great bishop. The matter was examined by a synod, before which Celestius was accused of holding that Adam would have died even if he had not sinned; that his sin did not injure any but himself; that infants are born in the same condition in which Adam originally was; that neither do all mankind die in Adam nor do they rise again in Christ; that infants, although unbaptized, have eternal life; that the law admitted to the kingdom of heaven even as the gospel does; and that before our Lord's coming there were men without sin. He defended himself by saying that he allowed the necessity of infant baptism; that the propositions generally, whether true or not, related to matters of speculation on which the church had given no decision; and that consequently they could not be heretical. The council, however, condemned and excommunicated him, whereupon he appealed to the bishop of Rome. No attention was paid to this appeal—the first which is recorded as having been made to Rome from another province; and Celestius, without attempting to prosecute it, left Carthage for Ephesus. Augustine was now drawn into the controversy. Although he tells us that he had occasionally seen Pelagius while at Carthage, it would seem that the two had not held any discussion, as the catholic bishops were then engrossed by preparations for their conference with the Donatists; nor had Augustine been present at the synod which condemned Celestius. But the progress of the new opinions soon drew his attention. He was induced to compose two tracts against them for the satisfaction of Count Marcellinus; and at the request of the bishop, Aurelius, he preached in opposition to them at Carthage.

In the meantime, Pelagius, expecting to find the east more favourable to his opinions than Africa, had taken up his abode in the Holy Land. He was at first on friendly terms with Jerome; but disagreements soon arose between them, and Jerome became his vehement opponents Augustine, little acquainted with the Greek writers, had spoken of the Pelagian

opinions as novelties of which there had been no example either among Catholics or among heretics; but Jerome traced them to the hated school of Origen and Rufinus.

Soon after his settlement in Palestine, Pelagius received an application which may be regarded as an evidence of the high reputation which he had attained—an urgent request from the mother of Demetrias, that he would write to her daughter on the occasion of her professing virginity; and in consequence of this he addressed a letter to Demetrias. He tells her that it is his practice in such matters to begin by laying down what human nature can do, lest, from an insufficient conception of its powers, too low a standard of duty and exertion should be taken; for, he says, men are careless in proportion as they think meanly of themselves, and for this reason it is that Scripture so often endeavours to animate us by styling us sons of God. The powers of man, like the faculties and instincts of all creatures, are God's gifts. Instead of thinking, with the vulgar, that the power of doing evil is a defect in man—instead of reproaching the Creator, as if He had made man evil—we ought rather to regard the enjoyment of free-will as a special dignity and prerogative of our nature. He dwells on the virtues of those who had lived before the Saviour's coming, and declares the conscience, which approves or reproves our actions, to be, "so to speak, a sort of natural holiness in our souls". In this letter Pelagius shows an earnest zeal for practical religion, with a keen discernment of the deceits which might arise on the one hand from an abuse of the doctrine of grace, and on the other hand from a reliance on formal exercises. But his peculiar tenets appear strongly; and perhaps the most remarkable feature in the letter is the evidence which it contains that the monastic idea of sanctity very readily fell in with the errors which have become distinguished by the writer's name.

In July 415 Pelagius was charged with heresy before John, bishop of Jerusalem, and a synod of his clergy, by Orosius, a young Spanish presbyter, who had lately come into the Holy Land with a recommendation from Augustine to Jerome. The accuser related the proceedings which had taken place at Carthage, and read a letter from Augustine. On this Pelagius asked, "What is Augustine to me?", but was rebuked for speaking so disrespectfully of a great bishop, by whom unity had been restored to the church of Africa. John, however, was inclined to befriend him; he invited him, although a layman, to take his seat among the presbyters, and exerted himself to put a favourable construction on his words. When Pelagius was accused of holding that men could live without sin, the bishop said that there was scriptural warrant for the doctrine, and cited the instance of Zacharias and Elisabeth, with others equally irrelevant; and, on receiving from Pelagius an acknowledgment that divine grace was necessary in order to living without sin, his judges were satisfied. Pelagius, in truth, used the term grace in such a manner that his professions sounded orthodox; while he really meant by it nothing more than the outward means employed by God for instruction and encouragement in righteousness—not an inward work of the Holy Spirit, influencing the hearts.

The inquiry was carried on under the difficulties that Orosius could not speak Greek, that the members of the council understood no Latin, and that the interpreter was either incapable or unfaithful; while Pelagius, being familiar with the languages and with the doctrinal peculiarities of both east and west, had an advantage over his accuser and his judges. Orosius therefore proposed that, as the question was one of Latin theology, and as the parties were Latins, it should be referred to the bishop of Rome; and to this John agreed—ordering Pelagius in the meantime to abstain from publishing his opinions, and his opponents to refrain from molesting him. It need hardly be observed that the reference to Rome involved no acknowledgment of the later Roman pretensions, but was merely a resort from judges unacquainted with the doctrines of the western church to a more competent tribunal—that of the highest bishop of the west.

In the end of the same year, two Gaulish bishops, Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, brought an accusation against Pelagius before Eulogius, metropolitan of Caesarea, who

thereupon summoned a synod December, of fourteen bishops to Diospolis (the ancient Lydda). When, however, this assembly met, one of the accusers was sick, and the other excused himself on account of his companion's illness; so that, as Orosius did not again appear, Pelagius was left to make good his cause without opposition. He disavowed some of the opinions which were imputed to him, and explained others (or explained them away) in a manner which the council admitted as satisfactory. The acts of the Carthaginian synod were read; whereupon Pelagius declined entering into the question whether Celestius held the doctrines there censured, but declared that he himself had never held them. And on being desired to anathematize the holders of these and other errors of which he had been suspected, he consented—professing, however, that he condemned them, not as heretics, but as fools. The council, little versed in western questions, and desirous to act with moderation, acknowledged the orthodoxy of the accused. For this Jerome stigmatized it as a “miserable synod”. Augustine, however, spoke of it more respectfully, and expressed his satisfaction that, although from defective information it had allowed Pelagius to escape, it had yet condemned his errors.

Pelagius was much elated by the result of this inquiry. In a book which he sent forth on the Freedom of the Will, and in his letters, he referred triumphantly to his acquittal by the bishops of Palestine; and he sent Augustine some documents which gave a partial representation of the affair. Augustine, however, was soon after furnished with more complete information by Orosius, who returned to Africa with a collection of papers on the subject; and synods were held there, which condemned Pelagius and Celestius. The African bishops wrote to Innocent, bishop of Rome, requesting that he would join in the sentence—apparently from a fear lest the Pelagian party at Rome should contrive to secure his favour by pressing on him the judgment of the eastern council. An application of this kind could hardly fail to be welcome to Innocent, and he readily complied with the request, taking occasion to accompany his consent with much swelling language about the dignity of his see. But, however desirous the Africans may have been to fortify themselves by the alliance of Rome, they throughout the affair treated with the Roman bishops on a footing of perfect equality.

Innocent died soon after, and was succeeded by Zosimus, who, as being a Greek, was disposed to look favourably on the suspected teachers. Celestius, who had been ordained at Ephesus, appeared again at Rome, where he made a profession of orthodoxy, and requested that his case might be once more examined, declaring that any speculations which he might have vented did not concern the faith. About the same time Zosimus received two letters addressed to his predecessor—the one in favour of Pelagius, from Praylius, who had lately succeeded to the bishopric of Jerusalem; the other from Pelagius himself, artfully vindicating his orthodoxy and stating his belief. By these letters, and by the personal communications of Celestius, Zosimus was won over, and after having held a council, at which Celestius disavowed all doctrines which the apostolic see had condemned, he wrote a letter of reproof to the Africans. He blamed them for having too readily listened to charges against men whose lives had always been correct, and for having exceeded the bounds of theological determination in their synods; he spoke strongly against the characters of Heros and Lazarus, whom he declared to be deposed from their sees; he stated that Celestius made frequent mention of grace; and he required that either the accusers should appear at Rome within two months, or the charges against Pelagius and Celestius should be abandoned. Paulinus, the original accuser, refused to obey this summons. Aurelius, with two synods (the second consisting of two hundred and fourteen bishops), replied that the condemnation which they had passed must stand until the objects of it should have clearly retracted their errors. The African bishops asserted their dependence of Rome; and a “plenary” African synod, of more than two hundred bishops, passed nine canons, which were afterwards generally accepted throughout the church, and came to be regarded as the most important bulwark against Pelagianism. These canons the council forwarded to Rome, telling Zosimus that he himself

had been hasty in his credulity, and exposing the artifices by which Celestius had disguised his errors. From this time Augustine spoke of the Pelagians no longer as brethren, but as heretics.

The civil power had now mixed in the controversy, probably at the solicitation of the Africans. An imperial rescript was issued, by which, after strong denunciation of Pelagius and Celestius, it was ordered that, if at Rome, they should be expelled; that persons suspected of holding their opinions should be carried before the magistrates, and, in case of conviction, should be banished. Zosimus, pressed by the court and by the anti-Pelagian party in his own city, found it expedient to change his tone. He professed an intention of re-examining the matter, and cited Celestius to appear before a council; whereupon Celestius fled from Rome. Zosimus then condemned the two heresiarchs, declaring that they might be readmitted to the church as penitents on anathematizing the doctrines imputed to them, but that otherwise they were absolutely and for ever excluded; he issued a circular letter, adopting the African decisions, and he required that this document should be subscribed by all bishops as a test of orthodoxy.

Nineteen Italian bishops refused, and were deposed. The most noted among them was Julian of Eclanum, a small town near Beneventum, who from this time became the leading controversialist on the Pelagian side. Julian was son of a bishop named Memorius, who was on terms of friendship with Augustine; he had married the daughter of a bishop, and the union had been graced with a nuptial poem by Paulinus of Nola : and it was perhaps before his deposition that he obtained reputation and influence by giving all that he possessed to the poor during a famine. Julian is described as a man of learning and acuteness, but too confident, and of endless diffuseness and pertinacity as a writer. The founders of the heresy, wishing to remain within the catholic communion, had studied to veil their errors under plausible language, and to represent the points in question as belonging not to theology but to philosophy. But Julian, with an impetuosity which Augustine ascribes to youth, disdained to follow such courses : he accused his own party of cowardice; he taxed the catholics with Manichaeism; he refused to accept any doctrine as scriptural which did not agree with his own views of reason, and declared that the very essence of Christianity was at stake,—that the God of the “traducianists” (as he styled those who held that sin was derived by inheritance) was not the God of the gospel, inasmuch as the character ascribed to him was inconsistent with the divine attribute of justice.

The Pelagians attempted to procure an examination of their case by a general council; whereupon Augustine told them that the matter had already been sufficiently investigated, and that the cry for a general council was only a proof of their self-importance. They repeatedly endeavored to obtain a reversal of the Roman decisions; they applied for an acknowledgment of their orthodoxy at Constantinople, Ephesus, Thessalonica, and elsewhere, and endeavored to bespeak the sympathy of the Greeks by representing the Catholics as Manicheans. But their exertions were all in vain; both ecclesiastical judgments and edicts of the secular power were directed against them. Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia—although he has been regarded as even the originator of the heresy —although he had written against Augustine’s views, and had sheltered Julian when banished from Italy—is said to have taken the lead in anathematizing the Pelagian tenets at a Cilician synod in 423 and they were condemned by the general council of Ephesus in 431—perhaps the more heartily because the party had been leniently treated by Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, who was the chief object of the council’s censure.

Pelagius himself disappears from history after the year 418, and, as he was far advanced in life, may be supposed to have died about that time. Nothing is known with certainty as to the end of Celestius and Julian. The founders of Pelagianism had made no attempt to form congregations separate from the church; and although Julian, in the heat of his animosity, had declared against communicating with those whom he branded as Manicheans,

he found it impossible to establish a communion of his own. Pelagianism, therefore, never became the badge of a sect, although its adherents, when detected, were excluded from the orthodox communion.

The fundamental question between Pelagius and his opponents related to the idea of Free-Will. By this term, Pelagius understood an unbiassed power of choosing between good and evil; and such a faculty he maintained that man has, since the power of choice is essential to responsibility, and there can be no sin or guilt unless where there is voluntary evil. Augustine, on the other hand, taught that freedom must be distinguished from the power of choice. God, he said, is free, although his nature excludes the possibility of his choosing or doing anything that is evil; hence a natural and necessary limitation to good is higher than a state of balance between good and evil; and such a balance cannot be, since the possibility of inclining to evil is a defect. Man is not free to choose between good and evil, but is governed either by grace or by sin. Our free-will, without grace, can do only evil; the direction of the will to good must be God's gracious gift. Grace does not take away freedom, but works with the will, whose true freedom is the love of that which is good.

Since Scripture undeniably refers all good to grace, Pelagius acknowledged this in words; but he understood the term grace in senses of his own, as meaning merely external gifts and benefits—the being and constitution of man; free-will itself; the call to everlasting happiness; the forgiveness of sins in baptism, apart from any influence on the later spiritual course; the knowledge of God's will, the law and the gospel; the example of the Saviour's life : and if he sometimes used the word to signify the influence of the Holy Spirit on the soul, he did not represent this influence as necessary to the work of salvation, but only as rendering it easier. Pelagius laboured to exclude from the notion of grace anything that might be inconsistent with free-will; Augustine, everything that might savour of merit on the part of man. Distinguishing three stages in good,—the capacity, the will, and the performance,—Pelagius referred the first to God's gift, but regarded the others as within the power of human nature. Augustine, on the contrary, refused to admit the idea of a grace bestowed according to the previous receptivity of the soul because this, as he thought, placed the determination in human merit. Grace must, by its very name, be gratuitous; the will to do good must be God's gift, as well as the capacity.

While Augustine held that the fall had injured man both spiritually and physically; that by communion with God Adam was enabled to live a higher life; that he might have avoided sin, and, if he had not sinned, would have been raised to perfection without tasting of death, even as the angels, after having borne their probation in a lower degree of grace, were endowed with that higher measure of it which lifts above the possibility of falling and confers immortality :—Pelagius maintained that man's original constitution was mortal; that Adam was originally placed as we are, and that we are not inferior to him. The passages in which St. Paul speaks of death as the punishment of sin, he interpreted as meaning spiritual death only. Augustine taught that in Adam all men sinned; that, in punishment of the first sin, sin is transmitted by generation to all mankind; that although, under the guidance of grace directing his free-will, man might live without sin, this sinless life has never been actually realized. Pelagius, on the contrary, supposed that Adam's sin did not affect his posterity otherwise than as an example; that there is indeed a deterioration of the race through custom of sinning, even as an individual man becomes worse through indulgence in sinful habits; that this comes to affect us like a nature, and has required occasional interpositions of the Divine mercy by revelations and otherwise; but that man had all along been able to live without sin; that some men had in fact so lived; and that, if this had been possible under the earlier dispensations—nay, even in heathenism—much more must it be possible for us under the gospel, which gives additional motives, higher rules of righteousness, and the light of a brighter Example. According to Pelagius, the saints of the Old Testament were justified by the Law; but Augustine held that in spirit they belonged to the New Testament; that they were justified

through faith in Christ, and through his grace which was bestowed on them by anticipation. Pelagius saw mainly in Christ nothing more than a teacher and a pattern. His death, although it was allowed to be efficacious for sinners, could not (it was supposed) confer any benefit on those who had no sin; the living union of the faithful with him was an idea as foreign to the system of this teacher as the union of the natural man with Adam in death. Pelagius, however, did not deviate from the doctrine of the church with respect to the Saviour's Godhead.

The practice of infant baptism, which was by this time universally regarded as apostolical, was urged against Pelagius. His opponents argued from the baptismal rites—the exorcisms, the renunciation of the devil, the profession of belief in the remission of sins. Why, they asked, should infants be baptized with such ceremonies for the washing away of sin, if they do not bring sin into the world with them? The Pelagians answered that infants dying in their natural state would attain “eternal life”, which they supposed to be open to all, whether baptized or not; but that baptism was necessary for the higher blessedness of entrance into “the kingdom of heaven”, which is the especial privilege of the gospel; that, as baptism was for all the means of admission to the fullness of the Christian blessings, the baptismal remission of sin must, in the case of infants, have a view to their future life on earth. Augustine taught that infants dying without baptism must fall under condemnation. As to the nature of this, however, he did not venture to pronounce, and his language respecting it varies; sometimes he expresses a belief that their state would be preferable to non-existence, but at other times his views are more severe. With respect to baptism, Augustine held that it conveys forgiveness of all past sins whatever, whether original or actual : that by it we receive regeneration, adoption, and redemption; but that there yet remains in us a weakness against which the regenerate must struggle here through God's help, and which will not be done away with until that further “regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory”. The doctrine of this remaining infirmity was represented by the Pelagians as disparaging the efficacy of the baptismal sacrament

Pelagius supposed that God had furnished man naturally with all that is needful for living without sin and keeping the commandments, and that the use of these gifts depends on our own will; Augustine, that at every point man needs fresh supplies of divine and supernatural aid. Pelagius understood justification to be merely the outward act of forgiveness; whereas Augustine saw in it also an inward purification through the power of grace. Grace, he held, does not constrain the will, but delivers it from bondage, and makes it truly free; he distinguished it into—(1.) the preventing grace, which gives the first motions towards goodness; (2.) the operating, which produces the free-will to good; (3.) the cooperating, which supports the will in its struggles, and enables it to carry its desire into act; and lastly, (4.) the gift of perseverance.

The existence of evil was a great difficulty which exercised the mind of Augustine. He thought that, as everything must be from God, and as He can only will what is good, therefore evil is nothing—not, as in the Manichaeian system, the opposite of good, but only the defect or privation of good, as darkness is the absence of light, or as silence is the absence of sound. It has, however, been remarked that the power which he ascribes to evil is hardly consistent with this idea of its merely negative quality—unless, indeed, his terms be understood in a meaning which they do not naturally suggest; and some of his arguments on this subject must appear (to ordinary readers at least) to be little better than a play on words.

Augustine in one of his early works had laid down that predestination is grounded on foreknowledge—an opinion which had been commonly held in the church. As his views on the subject of grace became developed, he had been led to teach a more absolute predestination; but it was not until the Pelagian controversy was far advanced that he set forth distinctly, and in connexion with the rest of his system, those doctrines as to predestination which have entered so largely into the controversies of later times. The occasion for his treating the subject was given by a report of serious dissensions which took place about the

year 426 at Adrumetum, where some monks, on the ground (as they supposed) of one of Augustine's epistles, disturbed their brethren by denying the freedom of the will and a future judgment according to works. On this Augustine wrote a letter in which he laid down the necessity of believing both in the Divine grace and in the freedom of the will. "If there be no grace of God", he asks, "how doth He save the world? if there be no free-will, how doth He judge the world?", and he devoted two treatises to the examination of the points in question. In these books he still maintained the freedom of man's will; but he held that this essential freedom was not inconsistent with the existence of an outward necessity controlling it in the prosecution of its desires. Our will, he said, can do that which God wills, and which He foresees that it will do; will, therefore, depends on the divine foreknowledge.

God had from eternity determined to rescue some of human kind from the misery brought on us by sin. The number of these is fixed, so that it can neither be increased nor diminished; even before they have a being, they are the children of God; if they deviate from the right way, they are brought back to it; they cannot perish. As God, being almighty, might save all, and as many are not saved, it follows that he does not will the salvation of all—a tenet which Augustine laboriously tried to reconcile with St. Paul's declaration that He "will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth" (I Tim. II. 4). The elect are supplied with all gifts which are requisite for bringing them to salvation, and grace works irresistibly in them. The ground of their election is inscrutable—resting on the secret counsel of God. He does not predestine any to destruction; for his predestination regards such things only as he himself works, whereas sin is not his work; but he knows who are not chosen and will not be saved. These perish either through unforgiven original sin, or through actual transgression. That they have no portion in Christ is no ground for impugning the Divine justice : for if God do not give grace to all, he is not bound to give it to any; even among men, a creditor may forgive debts to some, and not to others. "By giving to some that which they do not deserve, God has willed that his grace shall be truly gratuitous, and therefore real; by not giving to all, he shows what all deserve. He is good in benefiting the certain number, and just in punishing the rest. He is both good in all cases, since it is good when that which is due is paid; and just in all, since it is just when that which is not due is given, without wrong to any one". Those who are lost deserve their condemnation, because they have rejected grace either in their own persons or in that of the common father. Persons who are not of the elect may be baptized, and may for a time live piously, so that in the sight of men they are God's children; but they are never such in God's sight, since he foresees their end. If they go on well for a time, they are not removed from the world until, lacking the gift of perseverance, they have fallen away. That God gives to some men faith, hope, charity, but not perseverance, is astonishing; but it is not so much so as that, among the children of religious parents, he brings some to his kingdom by baptism, while others, dying unbaptized, are shut out; nor is it less wonderful that some perish through not having heard the gospel — (for "faith cometh by hearing") — than that others perish through not having received the gift of perseverance. And, since worldly gifts are variously bestowed, why should it not be so with this gift also? There are, however, differences of degree in the condemnation of those who are not elect; thus, although those who have never heard the gospel will not on account of their ignorance escape the eternal fire, their punishment will probably be less than that of sinners who have willfully rejected knowledge.

In this system there was much of a new and startling character—the doctrines of absolute predestination, of irresistible grace, of the limitation of Christ's benefits to the subjects of an arbitrary election. Augustine himself was able to look on these doctrines as encouragements to trust in God; he exhorted others to do the same, and teachers to set them forth in that light, without questioning as to the election of individuals, or driving any to despair through the apprehension of being hopelessly reprobate. But we cannot wonder that

they were regarded with alarm by many, both on account of the novelties of the theory and for the sake of practical consequences.

A middle party arose, which is known by the name of Semipelagian, originally given to it by the schoolmen of the middle ages. Its leader, Cassian of Marseilles, was a person of considerable note and influence. He is described as a Scythian—a term which has been variously interpreted, and notwithstanding which some authorities suppose him to have been a native of Gaul. He had been trained in a monastery at Bethlehem, and, after a long residence among the monks of Egypt (as to whose manner of life his works are a principal source of information), had been ordained a deacon by St. Chrysostom, after whose banishment he was entrusted by the clergy of Constantinople with a mission to Innocent of Rome. The occasion and the date of his settlement at Marseilles are uncertain; he had founded there a monastery for each sex, and had been raised to the order of presbyter. Unlike Pelagius, whose opinions he strongly reprobated, Cassian acknowledged that all men sinned in Adam; that all have both hereditary and actual sin; that we are naturally inclined to evil; and that for every good thing—the beginning, the continuance, and the ending—we need the aid of supernatural grace. But, although he maintained that grace is gratuitous—although he admitted that, in the infinite varieties of God’s dealings with men, the first call to salvation sometimes proceeds from preventing grace, and takes effect even on the unwilling—he supposed that ordinarily the working of grace depends on the determination of man’s own will; that God is the receiver of the willing, as well as the Saviour of the unwilling. As examples of those who are called without their own will, he referred to St. Matthew and St. Paul; for proof that in some cases the will precedes the call, he alleged Zacchaeus and the penitent thief,—as to whom he made the obvious mistake of regarding the recorded part of their story as if it were the whole. He held that God furnishes man’s nature with the seeds of virtue, although grace be needful to develop them; that Christ died for all men, and that grace is offered to all; that there is a twofold predestination—the general, by which God wills the salvation of all men, and the special, by which he determines the salvation of those as to whom he foresees that they will make a right use of grace and will persevere; that the notion of an irrespective predestination is to be rejected, as destructive of all motive to exertion, alike in the elect and in the reprobate, and as implying the gnostic error that there are species of men naturally distinct from each other; and that, in any case, predestination ought not to be popularly taught, inasmuch as the teaching of it might be mischievous, whereas the omission of the doctrine could do no practical harm. Faith and good works (it was said) although they do not deserve grace, are motives to the bestowal of it. Grace must work with our own will and endeavour; it may be lost, and is to be retained by man’s freewill—not by a gift of perseverance. God’s purpose and calling, according to Cassian, bring men by baptism to salvation; yet the benefits of the Saviour’s death extend to persons who in this life were never made members of him—their readiness to believe being discerned by God and reckoned to their credit. In like manner children who die in infancy are dealt with according to God’s foreknowledge of what they would have become if they had been allowed to live longer : those who would have used grace rightly are brought by baptism to salvation; the others die unbaptized.

These opinions found much favour in the south of Gaul, and reports of their progress were sent by two men, Prosper and Hilary to Augustine, who thereupon wrote two treatises, which his Jansenist biographer declares to be nothing less than inspired.

In these books he spoke of his opponents with high regard; he acknowledged the great and fundamental difference between them and the Pelagians; he treated them as being united with himself as to essentials, and he expressed a trust that God would bring them to the fullness of a sound belief. The further history of Semipelagianism will come under our notice hereafter.

During the last years of Augustine’s life, Africa was overwhelmed by a barbaric invasion; and the author of the calamity was one with whom he had long been on terms of

friendship,—the imperial general, count Boniface. Boniface had at one time been so deeply impressed by religious feeling that he would have entered a monastery but for the dissuasions of Augustine and Alypius, who told him that he might do better by living Christianly in his military station, and exerting himself for the safety of his country. He afterwards, however, married a second wife, of Arian family; and although she had professed Catholicism, it is said that the general, after entering into this connexion, declined both in faith and in morals.

Aetius, the rival of Boniface in power and in military distinction, basely endeavoured to undermine him. By representing him as engaged in treasonable designs, he persuaded Placidia, the sister of Honorius, who governed in the name of her son, the young Valentinian, to recall the general from Africa; and at the same time, by telling Boniface that his ruin was intended, he induced him to disobey the summons. Boniface fell into the snare, raised the standard of revolt, and invited to his assistance the Vandals, who about the year 420 had established themselves in the south of Spain. A large body of them, under the command of Gieserich or Genseric, passed into Africa, where they were joined by the Moors and by the fanatical Donatists—eager to take vengeance on the Catholics for many years of depression. The province was cruelly ravaged; the clergy in particular were marks for the enmity both of the Donatists and of the Arian invaders. Boniface, who had been urged by Augustine to return to his allegiance, was deeply distressed by the savage proceedings of his allies, and, by means of explanations with the court, he discovered the treachery of Aetius. Vainly imagining himself able to undo the mischief which he had caused, he requested the Vandals to withdraw from Africa, but was answered with derision, and found himself obliged to have recourse to arms as the only hope of delivering his country from the consequences of his imprudence. But his forces were unequal to the enemy; and, after having been defeated in the field, he shut himself up in Hippo with the remains of his army.

Augustine was indefatigable in his labours during the invasion. He continued a long and elaborate treatise against the Pelagian Julian of Eclanum; he wrote other controversial works, and endeavoured by letters of advice and consolation to support the minds of his brethren in their trials. His pastoral cares were increased by the multitudes of all classes who had sought a refuge within the walls of Hippo; and soon after the Vandals had laid siege to the town, he fell sick in consequence of his exertions. Wishing to secure his devotions from interruption, he directed that his friends should not be admitted to him, except at the times when medicine or food was administered. He desired that the penitential psalms should be hung up within his sight, and read them over and over with a profusion of tears. On the 28th of August, 430, he was taken to his rest.

CHAPTER III.

NESTORIANISM.

The younger Theodosius was carefully educated under the care of his sister Pulcheria, and throughout his life was directed by her influence. His character was mild, but feeble. The nature of his piety may be inferred from a story which Theodoret tells in commendation of it. An impudent monk, after having repeatedly met with a refusal in some application to the emperor, excommunicated him. When meal-time arrived, Theodosius declared that he would not eat until he were absolved, and sent to beg that the bishop of Constantinople would desire the monk to take off his excommunication. The bishop answered that no heed ought to be paid to such a sentence; but Theodosius could not be at ease until the monk was found and was prevailed on to recall it. Pulcheria vowed virginity, and persuaded her three sisters to join in the vow; the life and occupations of the imperial family resembled those of a monastic society.

In 421 Pulcheria provided her brother with a consort, Athenais, the orphan daughter of an Athenian rhetorician. The empress took the name of Eudocia, and gave birth to a daughter, Eudoxia, who, in 437, was married to the emperor of the west, Valentinian the Third. The mother then obtained leave to visit the Holy Land, where she expended immense sums on churches, monasteries, and hospitals; and on returning to Constantinople, she brought with her some relics which were regarded as exceedingly precious. But soon after her return, she fell into disgrace, probably in consequence of having aspired to counteract the ascendancy of Pulcheria, and the remainder of her days was spent in penitential retirement at Jerusalem.

The state of the Christians in Persia drew the empire into a war with that counMaruthas, a Mesopotamian bishop, after having laboured with much success among the Persians as a missionary, had been sent by Arcadius as an envoy to the king, Yezdegerd. While thus employed, he detected and exposed the arts by which the magi endeavoured to work on the superstitious feelings of the king; in consequence of his exertions, a complete liberty of religion was obtained for the Christians, and it was hoped that Yezdegerd himself would become a convert. But this state of things was reversed through the indiscretion of a bishop named Abdas, who destroyed a temple of the national religion. The king summoned him into his presence, mildly reproved him, and ordered him to restore the building, under pain of death and of retaliation on the Christian churches. As Abdas obstinately refused, the king found himself obliged to execute his threats, and in consequence of this affair his disposition towards the Christians was changed. Many of them were put to death with frightful tortures, and after some intermission during the last years of Yezdegerd, the persecution was renewed with greater violence under his successor, Bairam, or Vararanes. A The frontiers of Persia were guarded, lest the Christians should escape; but some of them made their way to Constantinople, and represented the sufferings of their community to the emperor. Theodosius refused to give up the fugitives; and a war ensued, which, after some years, was concluded in favour of the Romans. In the course of this war, Acacius, bishop of Amida, distinguished himself by a remarkable act of charity. Having learnt that seven thousand Persian captives were in his neighborhood, he called his clergy together, and, reminding them that the God of Christians had no need of cups or dishes, as being Himself all-sufficient, he proposed to sell the gold and silver vessels of the church. With the price he

ransomed the captives, and, after having entertained them until they were recovered from the effect of their privations, he sent them to the Persian king, as evidences of the real spirit of Christianity.

By the death of Theodosius, in 450, Pulcheria became in her own right empress of the east. Feeling, however, that a female reign was a hazardous novelty, she bestowed her hand on a nominal husband, Marcian, a senator sixty years of age; and his conduct amply justified the choice.

For some years the empire had been kept in terror by Attila, king of the Huns, who extorted humiliating submissions and concessions from Theodosius. Marcian resolved to deal more boldly with this enemy; he refused the tribute which his predecessor had paid, and Attila threatened vengeance. But before attempting to execute his purpose, the barbarian leader turned his arms against the empire of the west, where Aetius, after having effected the ruin of his rival Boniface, had gained an entire ascendancy, and for twenty years sustained with admirable vigour throne of the feeble and depraved Valentinian. Attila, at the head of an immense host, had penetrated as far as Orleans, spreading desolation along his course, when Aetius, who had been urged to action by Anian, bishop of that city, advanced against him with a force composed of Romans and allies, of whom the most important were the Visigoths of southern Gaul, under Theodoric, the son of Alaric. The Huns, who had already entered Orleans, were driven off. Attila was defeated in the great battle of the plains of Chalons, and was compelled to retreat across the Rhine. In the following year he invaded Italy; but the peninsula was saved from the apprehended ravages of his host by the mediation of Leo, bishop of Rome, who, with two high officers of the empire, waited on him in the neighborhood of Mantua, and persuaded him to retire on receiving a large sum of money. A few months later, the sudden death of the king, while employed in preparations for an attack on Marcian, and the consequent dissolution of the Hunnish monarchy, relieved both divisions of the empire from the fear with which he had inspired them.

In the year after the death of Attila, Valentinian, on a suspicion that Aetius aimed at the crown, stabbed him at an interview in the palace; and, having treacherously violated the wife of a senator named Maximus, he fell a victim to the vengeance of the husband, which was executed by two of the murdered general's adherents

On the death of Sisinnius, the successor of Atticus at Constantinople, a contest arose between the partisans of Philip of Side and Proclus. Both had been candidates in opposition to the late bishop; Proclus had since been consecrated by Sisinnius for Cyzicum, but, as the people of that city denied the right of the bishop of Constantinople to appoint their pastor, he had been unable to get possession of the see. The court, with a view to allay the strife of parties, resolved that the vacancy should not be filled by any of the Constantinopolitan clergy, and made choice of Nestorius, a presbyter of Antioch. Nestorius had been a monk; he was of blameless life, had some character for learning, and was celebrated for his fluent and sonorous oratory; while he is charged with pride, vanity, and an eager desire of popularity, which led him (it is said) to make an ostentatious display of sanctity in his behaviour, and to affect an ambitious and unsubstantial style in preaching. In addition to his personal reputation, the circumstance that he came from the same church with the revered Chrysostom rendered the nomination acceptable at Constantinople; and he was willingly elected by the clergy and people.

The new bishop entered on his office with a great display of zeal against heresy. Preaching in the cathedral on the day of his enthronement, he addressed the emperor—"Give me earth cleared of heretics, and I will give you the kingdom of heaven in return; aid me in subduing the heretics, and I will aid you to subdue the Persians!". The words were loudly applauded; but we are told that the wiser of the hearers conceived from them no favourable idea of the speaker's modesty and prudence.

This declaration of war was speedily followed up by deeds. Five days later the bishop attacked a meeting-house of the Arians; the congregation in despair burnt it down; the flames reached to other buildings, and Nestorius got the name of “the incendiary”. He also persecuted other sectaries, and procured from the emperor a severe law against them. Socrates particularly notices his proceedings against the Novatianists — a sect to which the historian himself inclined, and which Atticus had always spared, on the ground that they had suffered from the Arians in common with the catholics, and that, as their separation was so ancient, their agreement in the doctrine of the Trinity was a valuable witness to the orthodoxy of the church.

Nestorius himself was soon to fall under suspicion of heresy.

The schools of Alexandria and Antioch had been led, by their characteristic difference of tone, and by the necessity of opposing the several errors which more immediately pressed on each, to a diversity of view and expression on the subject of the Saviour’s incarnation. At Alexandria, where Arianism was the enemy to be combated, the Divinity was so strongly insisted on that language is found, even in the writings of Athanasius himself, which at a later time would have been a token of Eutychianism; as where he speaks of “not two natures, but one incarnate nature of God the Word”. Although the distinctness of the Godhead and the manhood was recognized, the natures were viewed in their union; and as the Person in whom they met was one, the properties of one nature were, in speaking of him, transferred to the other. Thus that which in strictness could belong only to his manhood, was predicated of him as God, since the personality was in his Godhead before he assumed the nature of man; “God” (it was said) “was born, suffered, redeemed us with his blood”. In the west, a doctrine resembling that with which the name of Nestorius was afterwards connected, had been broached by a Gaulish presbyter named Leporius, who also held questionable opinions as to original sin. Augustine, who succeeded in convincing him of his errors, illustrated the communication of properties in the Saviour by saying that we may speak of a “philosopher” as killed, dead, or buried, although it is in the body that such things befall the man, and not in that part of him to which the quality of philosopher belongs.

On the other hand, the Syrians—having to contend against Apollinarianism, with its denial of the Saviour’s entire humanity, and its consequent fusion of the Godhead and the manhood into a third something, different from either—were under a necessity of carefully distinguishing between the two natures. This method appears more scientifically correct than the other; but, in a school of rationalistic tendency (if the word may be used without conveying too strong an idea) it was likely to become dangerous. Diodore, afterwards bishop of Tarsus, and Theodore, afterwards bishop of Mopsuestia— the former Chrysostom’s master, the latter his fellow-student and friend—were distinguished as teachers in this school, and introduced a system of explaining Scripture by the aid of history, criticism, and philology, whereas until their time commentators had been divided between the merely literal and the allegorical methods. Diodore and Theodore, therefore, may be regarded as the forerunners of modern interpretation; but it would seem that with the merits of their system they combined an inclination to lower and improperly to humanize the meaning of holy writ. For nearly fifty years Theodore maintained the cause of the church in controversy with various classes of assailants, and throughout his life his orthodoxy was regarded as unimpeachable. He was, however, afterwards represented by some as the father both of Nestorianism and of Pelagianism, and his memory became the subject of disputes which widely disturbed the church. Nestorius has been described as a pupil of Theodore; but the description, if meant to imply a personal relation between the two, is probably incorrect. Nor is much faith to be given to a story that Nestorius, on his way to take possession of his see, visited the bishop of Mopsuestia, who was then near his end, and that during this visit he imbibed the opinions which are associated with his name.

The first outbreak of the Nestorian controversy was on the occasion a sermon in which Anastasius—a presbyter who had accompanied the bishop of Constantinople from Antioch, and was much in his confidence—attacked the use of the word *Theotokos* (bearer or mother of God), as applied to the blessed Virgin. Mary, he said, was human, and from man God cannot be born. The term thus called in question had been used in the preceding century by Eusebius of Caesarea, by Athanasius, the two Gregories, and others; the import of it was not to imply that the blessed Virgin communicated the Divine nature to the Saviour, but to affirm the union of Godhead and manhood in one Person, “because the Son of God took not to himself a man’s person, but the nature only of a man”. To the Syrians, however, the word appeared to involve the Apollinarian error of a confusion between the two natures; while the refusal of it by Anastasius suggested to his hearers at Constantinople the idea that the new bishop and his party maintained the mere humanity of the Redeemer — supposing the Spirit to have dwelt in Him only in the same manner as in the prophets.

Nestorius supported his friend by preaching a number of sermons, in which he brought forward quibbling and sophistical objections to the term *Theotokos*. If this expression were to be allowed (he said), the heathens might be excused for assigning mothers to their deities; the blessed Virgin ought in truth not to be styled *Theotokos*, but *Theodochos*, as having received God within her. Proclus, the late candidate for the see, preaching in the cathedral on a festival to which the subject was appropriate, eloquently asserted the use of *Theotokos* and his discourse was received with enthusiasm : when Nestorius rose and objected to the preacher's doctrine as confounding the two natures. He declared, however, that he did not refuse to use the word *Theotokos*, provided that it were rightly explained, so as not to deify the blessed Virgin herself; but if she were to be styled mother of God, the phrase must be balanced by also styling her mother of man—mother of the tabernacle prepared by the Holy Spirit for the habitation of the Divine Word. He therefore proposed to speak of her as *Christotokos* (mother of Christ)—a term which would denote her relation to Him who is both God and man. It may, he said, be affirmed that Christ has the attributes of either nature; but not that God was born, or that man may be adored.

The excitement at Constantinople was immense. Nestorius continued to preach on the subject in dispute, and was often interrupted in his sermons. Eusebius, an advocate, who afterwards became bishop of Dorylaeum, charged him with the heresy of Paul of Samosata, and openly placarded a parallel between the two systems. The monks and most of the clergy were against the bishop, and old jealousies connected with the election were revived among them; while the court supported him, and the majority of the people were as yet favourable to him, although many withdrew from his communion. He tells us that some of his opponents threatened to throw him into the sea; and from the petition of some monks against him we learn that he himself made liberal use of deposition, whipping, banishment, and other forcible means against such of them as were subject to his jurisdiction.

In the controversy which had thus arisen, as in the great controversy of the preceding century, the chief champion of orthodoxy was a bishop of Alexandria; but his character and policy remind us less of Athanasius than of his own uncle and immediate predecessor Theophilus.

Cyril had passed five years among the monks of Nitria; but his friend the abbot Isidore of Pelusium, a man of great piety and sincerity, tells him, in a letter written during this period, that, while he was praying in the desert, his heart was still fixed on the world. In 412, on the death of Theophilus, he was elected to the see of Alexandria after a contest with the archdeacon Timothy. In the administration of his office he showed himself covetous and rapacious; he left at his death a large property, amassed from the revenues of the church; he is even charged with simoniacal practices. The earlier years of his episcopate were marked by many displays of violence. He acquired for his see an amount of secular power such as had not till then been attached to any bishopric; he proceeded with great severity against the

Novatianists; he expelled the Jews from Alexandria on account of a bloody tumult in the theatre, and in consequence of this act he quarrelled with the prefect, Orestes. A legion of fanatical monks from Nitria descended on the city, and attacked the prefect; one of them, who had hit him with a stone, was executed for the offence, and was thereupon canonized by Cyril as a martyr. The coolness with which the prefect regarded the bishop after these scenes was ascribed by the populace to the influence of Hypatia, a beautiful and learned virgin, whose lectures in philosophy drew admiring crowds to Alexandria; and in this belief, a mob of parabolani and others, headed by a reader named Peter, attacked her in the street, dragged her from her chariot, hurried her into the cathedral church, and there barbarously murdered her. That Cyril had any share in the atrocity appears to be an unsupported calumny; but the perpetrators were mostly officers of his church, who had unquestionably drawn encouragement from his earlier proceedings; and his character deservedly suffered in consequence of their outrage.

Cyril had accompanied his uncle in the expedition to Constantinople which proved so disastrous to Chrysostom. He held out longer than any other metropolitan against the insertion of Chrysostom's name in the diptychs of the church, even when Atticus of Constantinople entreated him to yield for the sake of peace; nor, although he was at length persuaded to admit the name, and sometimes spoke respectfully of the great preacher's eloquence, did his feeling towards the memory of Chrysostom ever become cordial. And it is evident that the same desire to humble the newly-exalted see of Constantinople which had actuated Theophilus in his enmity to Chrysostom mixed also with Cyril's motives in his proceedings against Nestorius

The bishop of Alexandria was drawn into the controversy by finding that copies of Nestorius' sermons had been circulated among the Egyptian monks, and that many of these had consequently abandoned the term *Theotokos*. He denounced the novelty in his paschal letter of 430, and entered into a correspondence with Nestorius himself, in which both parties soon became angry, while he also opened a communication with some clergy and monks of Constantinople who were opposed to their archbishop. It would seem to have been in consequence of the irritation caused by Cyril's letters that Dorotheus, a bishop attached to Nestorius, on some occasion when the archbishop was seated on his throne, rose up in the cathedral, and loudly uttered an anathema against all who used the title Theotokos. Nestorius accused Cyril of having caused the disturbance which ensued at Constantinople. Some Alexandrians of worthless character, who were there, charged their bishop with various misdemeanours, which Nestorius threatened to bring before a general council. Cyril replied that he should rejoice if his affairs contributed towards the assembling of such a council, but that he would not allow his opponent to sit as one of his judges. He declared himself willing to sacrifice everything for the suppression of Nestorius' heresies and, in order to detach the court from the opposite party, he addressed a treatise on the orthodox faith to Theodosius, and another to Pulcheria and Eudocia.

Nestorius had more than once applied to Celestine, bishop of Rome, for information as to the Pelagians, some of whose leaders were then at Constantinople; but he had not received any answer. He now repeated his inquiries, and added some account of the new controversy which had arisen. Cyril also applied to Celestine, but more skillfully; for whereas Nestorius had addressed the Roman bishop as an equal, the bishop of Alexandria adopted a strain of deference, or rather subserviency, of which there had been no example on the part of any one among his predecessors. His representation of Nestorius' opinions procured from Celestine and a Roman synod a condemnation of the bishop of Constantinople as a heretic, with a letter announcing to him that he would be deposed and excommunicated, to unless within ten days after receiving it he should conform to the faith of Rome and Alexandria, and restore all whom he had deposed on account of the late disputes. Cyril was authorized to execute this sentence as plenipotentiary of the Roman bishop; and at the same time Celestine wrote to the

church of Constantinople, and to John, bishop of Antioch, denouncing the errors of Nestorius, and intimating the condemnation which was to be pronounced if the archbishop should persist in them.

Cyril also wrote to some eastern bishops, giving his statement of the controversy. From Acacius of Berrhoea (who was now a hundred and ten years old), from John of Antioch, and others, he received answers disapproving of what had been said by Nestorius, and more especially by Dorotheus, but entreating him to avoid an open breach. John, in the name of several other bishops, wrote to Nestorius, expressing full confidence in his orthodoxy, and advising him not to insist on unnecessary scruples as to the disputed term; and, as Nestorius had professed his willingness to adhere to the doctrine of the fathers, and to admit the word Theotokos in a certain sense, the patriarch of Antioch flattered himself that peace would be easily restored.

After some delay, Cyril forwarded the Roman letter to Nestorius, with one written in the name of an Alexandrian council, which summoned the bishop of Constantinople to forswear his errors, and concluded with twelve anathemas, which it required him to subscribe. To these Nestorius replied by a like number of counter-anathemas, which, in their turn, were answered at far greater length by Marius Mercator, a zealous layman from the west, who was then resident at Constantinople, and had already made himself conspicuous by his energetic opposition to Pelagianism. Of the propositions thus put forth on each side, while some are really contradictory of each other, others, in words studiously contrasted, express different sides of the same truth. The leading object of Cyril is to assert the unity of the Saviour's person, while that of Nestorius is to guard against a confusion of His natures. Cyril expressed the combination of natures by the term union; Nestorius, by conjunction. The Alexandrian anathemas produced a great commotion in the east, where they were regarded as doing away with the distinction of natures in the Saviour. John of Antioch wished that they should be generally condemned as Apollinarian, and treatises were written against them by Andrew, bishop of Samosata, and by Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus.

The last-named of these objectors was the most learned divine of whom the eastern church could in that age boast. He was born at Antioch about 390, and is supposed to have studied under Theodore of Mopsuestia, of whose writings he was certainly a diligent reader and a zealous admirer. About the year 420 he was elected to fill the see of Cyrus or Cyrrhus, in the Euphratensian province, where he laboured with great activity and success to extirpate the heresies with which his diocese had been infested,—often even exposing his life to danger from the fury of the Marcionites and other sectaries, who held possession of entire villages. His influence over his clergy is attested by the fact that in five-and-twenty years not one of them had appeared before a secular tribunal. Nor was his care for his people limited to spiritual things; he devoted the whole of his income to their benefit, erected bridges, baths, and other public buildings, and induced persons skilled in physic and other useful arts to settle at Cyrus. The variety of Theodoret's literary merit was extraordinary; it has been said of him that he equally well sustains the character of a commentator, a theologian, a historian, a controversialist, an apologist, and a writer on practical religion. Throughout the differences of his time he was the most eminent leader on the oriental side; but his moderation and fairness were ill appreciated amid the rage of party strife, and he suffered from the violence of opposite factions.

Finding himself beset by the patriarchs of Rome and Alexandria, Nestorius saw no other chance of escape from his difficulties than an appeal to a general council. Some of his opponents had already petitioned for such an assembly; and in November 430 Theodosius, in his own name and in that of the western emperor, issued orders for the meeting of representatives of the whole church at Ephesus. The time appointed was the following Whitsuntide, and in the meanwhile things were to remain as they were, so that the execution of the Roman decree was suspended. Each metropolitan was to bring with him so many of his

suffragans as he might think expedient—taking care that a number sufficient for the performance of the ordinary pastoral duties should be left. The citation addressed to Cyril was accompanied by a special letter from Theodosius, in which the patriarch was charged with pride, turbulence, assumption of rights which belonged to a general council alone, and with fondness for intruding into palaces, as if there were discord between relations, or as if he hoped to set them at variance. This last charge, which refers to the separate letter written by Cyril to Eudocia and Pulcheria, appears to indicate that the suspicion imputed to him was not without foundation. Of bishops below the degree of metropolitan, Augustine alone was honoured with an invitation by name; but, unhappily for the council, he had died some months before.

Nestorius arrived at Ephesus soon after Easter (April 19th), attended by sixteen bishops. Before Whitsuntide (June 7th), Cyril appeared at the head of fifty bishops, with a large train of sailors and other disorderly persons. About forty bishops were with Memnon, metropolitan of Ephesus, a man of unscrupulous character, who had a special motive for taking part with Cyril against the patriarch of Constantinople, inasmuch as the independence of his own ‘apostolical’ church was in danger from the neighborhood of the new capital. The African church was prevented by the Vandal invasion from sending any representative to the council; but Capreolus, of Carthage, wrote a letter, entreating that the fathers would not countenance any novelty. Celestine, of Rome, deputed two bishops and a presbyter to represent himself and “the whole council of the west”, with directions to guide themselves by Cyril’s judgment, and to consult the dignity of the apostolic see by acting as judges, not as disputants. These, however, had not yet reached Ephesus. Candidian, count of the domestics, was commissioned by the emperor to keep order. In obedience to his instructions, he commanded that all monks and lay strangers should leave Ephesus, and that no bishop should under any pretence absent himself until the business of the council should have been concluded. About two hundred bishops were assembled, but John of Antioch had not yet appeared. The beginning of his journey had been delayed, partly by the difficulty of collecting his suffragans, who were unable to leave their homes until after the octave of Easter, and partly by disturbances in his city on account of a scarcity; and the state of the roads, flooded by heavy rains, had obliged him to travel slowly, with the loss of many horses by the way. The bishops who were already at Ephesus, while waiting for the arrival of John and the orientals, engaged in frequent informal discussions, which tended rather to exasperate than to heal their differences. Nestorius declared that his life was in danger from the ruffians of Cyril’s train, and from the peasants who were at the beck of Memnon; while the opposite party complained against the soldiers who acted as a guard to the bishop of Constantinople.

On the 21st of June, Cyril, who, in virtue of the dignity of his see, assumed the presidency of the council, declared that he would wait no longer, although he had received a courteous letter from John, apologizing for his delay, and stating that he was within a few days’ journey of Ephesus. Nestorius was cited to appear before the council next day; he answered that he would attend when John should be present, or when summoned by Candidian. Theodoret and sixty-seven other bishops, of whom twenty-two were metropolitans, protested against proceeding to business without the presence of the Orientals. But the council met on the following day, in the church of St. Mary, where the Theotokos was believed to have been interred. Candidian attended, and, at the desire of the bishops, read his commission from the emperor. His request that four days might be allowed for the arrival of the Orientals was refused; and as the commission restrained him from entering into questions of doctrine, on the ground that these belonged to the bishops alone, he was—not without indignity, as he complains—obliged to leave the church, after protesting that anything which might be done in opposition to his directions should be of no effect. The bishops refused even to look at the memorial of their sixty-eight brethren. A second and a third citation were sent to Nestorius, but his guard prevented the delivery of them.

The council proceeded to the question for the consideration of which it had been summoned. After the recitation of the Nicene creed, Cyril's second letter to Nestorius was read, and the bishops severally expressed their high approval of it, as being conformable to the Nicene faith. The answer returned by Nestorius was then read; whereupon many of the bishops spoke in condemnation of it, and the whole assembly joined in uttering anathemas against the writer and his doctrine. Other documents followed; among them was Cyril's third letter to Nestorius—that containing the anathemas—which was received without any remark. By way of proof that Nestorius still adhered to his errors, reports were made as to language which he had used in conversation since coming to Ephesus: as that he had asked how he could give the name of God to a child two or three months old—a question which was understood as a denial of the Saviour's Godhead. A collection of extracts from earlier theologians was produced, in evidence of the true doctrine on the disputed points; and after it a number of passages from the writings of Nestorius were read amidst general disapprobation—the fathers stopping their ears at the occurrence of words which they considered blasphemous. A sentence of deposition against Nestorius was drawn up in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ whom he hath blasphemed; it was signed by a hundred and ninety-eight bishops, and, in token of the feeling which animated them, it was addressed to the patriarch as “a new Judas”. Cyril afterwards attempted to excuse the indecency and the glaring unfairness of these hasty proceedings by such pretences as that John of Antioch was not in earnest, that his delay was intentional, and that he was determined not to condemn one who had been promoted from among his own clergy. Perhaps the boldest of all the pleas was, that two Syrian metropolitans, who reached Ephesus on the day before the session, had answered some complaints of delay by expressing their patriarch's willingness that the council should be opened without waiting longer for him. This Cyril ventured to interpret as if the bishop of Antioch consented that the great question proposed for the council's judgment should be decided before his arrival.

Candidian was astonished on the following morning to find what had been done. He tore down the placard in which the deposition of Nestorius was announced; he issued an edict declaring the proceedings of the council to be null and void; he sent their placard to the emperor, with a letter strongly reflecting on the irregularities of Cyril and his associates. Nestorius also wrote to Theodosius, begging that an impartial synod might be assembled for the examination of his case; that each metropolitan should bring with him only two bishops—a regulation which, from the arrangement of the Egyptian patriarchate, would have left Cyril almost unsupported; and that not only monks and clergy, but all such bishops as were not so summoned, should be kept at a distance from the place of meeting.

On the 27th of June, John of Antioch, with fourteen oriental bishops, reached Ephesus. As they approached the city, a deputation from the council met them, and reported the transactions which had taken place. The patriarch was filled with astonishment and indignation. Immediately on reaching his lodgings, he held a council of the bishops who had accompanied him, with twenty-nine others who joined them. Candidian appeared, gave his account of the late session, and withdrew. The bishops then proceeded to consider Cyril's conduct, and the anathemas which he had published; they pronounced him guilty of turbulence, and of reviving the Arian, Apollinarian, and Eunomian heresies; they sentenced him and Memnon to deposition, and declared the rest of the two hundred to be separated from their communion until they should join in condemning the anathemas. The deputies of Cyril's party endeavoured to communicate with John, but were insulted, beaten, and repulsed by the soldiers of his guard. On receiving the report of this, and apparently before the decree of the orientals had reached them, Cyril and his synod declared John to be excommunicate until he should give an explanation of his behaviour. The orientals attempted to carry out their condemnation of Memnon by consecrating a bishop in his stead; but they were unable to gain entrance into a church for the purpose, and were beaten by a rabble of his adherents.

Reports of the proceedings at Ephesus got into circulation, and produced in many quarters an impression unfavourable to Cyril. Isidore of Pelusium, with his usual frankness, wrote to beg that he would act with fairness and deliberation, telling him that he was charged with seeking to disguise his private enmity against Nestorius under the name of a zeal for Christ, and that parallels were drawn between his conduct and that of his uncle Theophilus.

The emperor, on receiving Candidian's letter, wrote to the bishops who had condemned Nestorius, blaming them for having proceeded irregularly and on motives of personal malice, and forbidding them to leave Ephesus until the affair should be rightly settled. A reply was drawn up, in which they excused themselves for having acted without the presence of the Orientals, and begged that Candidian might be recalled as having shown partiality to their opponents, and that five of their number might be allowed to wait on the emperor. The acts of the council, revised by Cyril (perhaps not without some unfairness), were annexed to this letter. But Candidian prevented the papers from reaching the court, and the ways were so closely watched that the council, in order to communicate with Constantinople, was obliged to intrust a letter to a beggar, who carried it in a hollow staff. On the receipt of this missive a great agitation arose among Cyril's partisans. The monasteries of the capital poured forth their inmates, among whom the most conspicuous was Dalmatius, an abbot who for eight-and-forty years had been shut up within the walls of his retreat, refusing to leave it even when entreated by the emperor to take part in solemn processions on occasion of earthquakes. This recluse was now warned by a heavenly voice to go forth, and proceeded to the palace at the head of an immense multitude, which filled the air with the chant of psalms. The abbots were admitted into the emperor's presence. Dalmatius showed the letter from Ephesus; he set forth the grievances of the orthodox party, and asked whether it were better to adhere to a single impious man or to six thousand bishops, dispersed throughout the world, but represented by their metropolitans and brethren at Ephesus. Theodosius was moved, and said that the council had only to send some of its members to state its case. Dalmatius in answer explained the constraint in which the bishops were held, and obtained from the emperor an order that some deputies should be sent to the court. The crowd, which had been waiting in anxious expectation, received the abbots with enthusiasm as they left the palace. Monks carrying lighted tapers, and chanting the 150th Psalm, escorted them to a church, where Dalmatius ascended the pulpit, read the Ephesian letter, and gave a report of the interview with the emperor; after which the whole multitude joined in shouting anathemas against Nestorius.

Some bishops of Cyril's party were now allowed to go to Constantinople, where their representations and solicitations, seconded by heavy bribes, were so effective that the most influential persons about the court were gained to the Alexandrian interest.

The council, in the meantime, held its second session on the 10th of July, when the envoys from Rome appeared, and were received with marks of honour. At the third session, these envoys expressed their approbation of what had been done, and signed the deposition of Nestorius. The hostile parties remained at Ephesus, threatening and excommunicating each other, with equal pride, according to the expression of an ancient historian, and with a deplorable want of temper and decency on both sides. The emperor—supposing (it is said) that the depositions of Nestorius, and of his enemies, Cyril and Memnon, were all determined by the whole council—confirmed the sentences; John, count of the Sacred Largesses, who superseded Candidian as commissioner put the three bishops under arrest; and in August, consequence of Cyril's removal, Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, became president of the council. It was in vain that the commissioner attempted to mediate between the parties; he reported their mutual exasperation to his master, but laid the greater share of blame on the Cyrillians. The extreme heat of the summer, and the confinement within the walls of Ephesus, affected the health of many of the bishops, as well as of their attendants, and a considerable

number of deaths took place; while many, who had not made provision for so long an absence from their homes, were reduced to distress for the means of subsistence.

Dalmatius was again employed to represent the case of his friends to the emperor, and at length, at the request of both parties, a conference of eight bishops from each of the rival councils was held at Chalcedon, in the presence of Theodosius. The court was now against Nestorius,—partly influenced by Cyril's money, partly by Pulcheria, whom Nestorius had offended, partly by dread of the monks and of the populace. Before the arrival of the bishops at Chalcedon, the emperor issued an order that the patriarch, agreeably to a request which he had formerly made, should retire to a monastery near Antioch of which he had been an inmate before his elevation. Nestorius, in acknowledging the receipt of this order, professed himself willing to suffer for the truth, but expressed a wish that an imperial mandate should be issued for a general condemnation of the Egyptian anathemas.

The deputies at Chalcedon had five audiences of the emperor. The party of Cyril refused to enter into any argument, and insisted on the condemnation of Nestorius, while their opponents were equally bent on that of Cyril's anathemas; and, as it became evident that no reconciliation could be expected, Theodosius resolved to put an end to the council. The letter in which he announced his determination appears to show that he was rather overpowered by the influence of Cyril than convinced of the justice of his cause; he declares that he cannot condemn the Orientals, since no one had argued against them, and they had not been convicted of any error before him. By the same letter it was ordered that Cyril and Memnon should retain their sees; and in the month of September, Maximian, a monk of recluse and unambitious character, was consecrated as patriarch of Constantinople, in the room of Nestorius.

The council of Ephesus is received as the third general council, and its doctrine respecting the Saviour's person is a part of the catholic faith. But it would be vain to defend the proceedings of those by whom the true doctrine was there asserted; and there remains a question whether Nestorius was really guilty of holding the opinions for which it condemned him. Socrates, whose prejudices, were all against Nestorius, acquits him of any worse error than the use of improper language, into which the historian supposes him to have been led by a conceit of his own eloquence, and by a disregard of the writings of earlier divines. The great body of the Orientals who supported him at Ephesus are unimpeached in their character for orthodoxy. Perhaps, therefore, Nestorius, in using the words which gave colour to the charge of heresy, may in truth have meant only to guard against opposite errors which might have been inferred from the Alexandrian language, and which shortly after were actually put forth by Eutyches; and the most startling of his expressions may rather have been exaggerations, into which he was driven by irritation, than serious denials of the truths which they seemed to contradict. He steadily disavowed the more odious opinions which were imputed to him; he repeatedly expressed his willingness to admit the term Theotokos, provided that it were guarded against obvious abuses. The controversy more than once appeared to be in such a position that it might have been ended by a word of explanation : but an unwillingness on both sides to concede, and personal animosities, unhappily prolonged it.

The breaking up of the council left the parties greatly exasperated against each other. The Orientals, on their way homewards, held a synod at Tarsus, and after reaching Antioch they held a second. At these meetings they renewed the deposition of Cyril, and extended the sentence to the bishops who had appeared against them at Chalcedon, and had consecrated Maximian for Constantinople; while they declared that they would never consent to the deposition of Nestorius, that they were resolved to adhere to the Nicene faith, and resist the Egyptian anathemas. Theodoret, Andrew of Samosata, and others, wrote against Cyril, and kept up a correspondence with the friends of Nestorius at Constantinople. Many bishops were deprived, and the church was in a miserable state of distraction. Theodosius was anxious for peace, and after a time, by advice of Maximian, proposed that the bishops of Alexandria and

Antioch should meet at Nicomedia, to confer on the means of restoring it. Count Aristolaus, to whom the letters were intrusted, was charged to labour for a reconciliation of the parties; and the emperor wrote to beg the prayers of Symeon the stylite and the exertions of Acacius of Berrhoea in furtherance of his pacific intentions.

John of Antioch declined the conference on the ground of ill health, and also because he had been informed that there was a plot to waylay him. He consulted, however, with the bishops of his party, and it was agreed that, putting aside the personal question as to Nestorius, they would communicate with Cyril, on condition of his condemning his own anathemas and acknowledging the Nicene creed as a sufficient rule of faith. Cyril was urged from many quarters to accept these terms. He replied that he had written nothing but what was conformable to the catholic faith; that to condemn his own writings would be to deprive himself of the means of combating Nestorianism in future, but that he would give explanations of his former words, if the Orientals would accept the acts of the late council, the deposition of Nestorius, and the ordination of Maximian; that he acknowledged the sufficiency of the Nicene creed, but not in such a way as should exclude proper interpretations of it in points where it might be misrepresented by heretics; and in a letter to Acacius he stated his opinions in such a form that Theodoret declared him to be orthodox, and to have abandoned his former errors. The bishop of Antioch was disposed to an accommodation, and sent Paul, bishop of Emesa, to Alexandria, with instructions to promote it. The mission was successful. Cyril subscribed a creed which was substantially the same with one drawn up by Theodoret at Dec. 432. Ephesus; the envoy preached thrice at Alexandria with great applause, enlarging on the term Theotokos; and John agreed to sign the condemnation of Nestorius, and to approve the ordination of Maximian. On these terms Alexandria and Antioch were reconciled in April 433.

In the course of these transactions Cyril expended enormous sums in bribes (or *benedictions*, as they were styled), for the purpose of maintaining his interest at court. A letter from his archdeacon Epiphanius to Maximian of Constantinople is extant, in which it is stated that the Alexandrians groaned under the heavy imposts to which they had been subjected in order to provide the means of this corruption, and that nevertheless, a debt of 1900 pounds of gold had been contracted in the name of the church.

The accommodation was not satisfactory to the adherents of either side. Isidore of Pelusium and other friends of Cyril expressed surprise that he had agreed to admit two natures in the Saviour. He replied that, while in one sense he acknowledged two natures, in another sense he allowed only one; that the two natures are separate in conception, although united in the one person of Christ, and that their predicates are properly distinct—a statement which Nestorius himself would probably not have declined, and might in fairness have been invited to accept. On the other hand, Theodoret remonstrated with John against making peace on any terms but such as should secure the restoration of the deposed bishops and include all who had been in the same interest. That Cyril, after having proved himself orthodox by his late explanations, should require consent to the condemnation of Nestorius, was, he said, much the same as if a convert from Arianism were to insist on anathematizing those who had always been sound as to the doctrine of the Son's consubstantiality with the Father; he was still for a condemnation of Cyril's anathemas, and declared that he would rather suffer both his hands to be cut off than subscribe the condemnation of Nestorius. Others, among whom was Theodoret's metropolitan, Alexander, bishop of Hierapolis, an aged and venerable man, still refused to admit the orthodoxy of Cyril. Under the pretence that Alexander had forfeited or abdicated his rights as metropolitan, John of Antioch took it upon himself to ordain some bishops for the Euphratensian province; and the proceeding called forth a loud remonstrance, both as being an invasion of jurisdiction, and on account of the personal character of the new bishops. Nine provinces of the Antiochene patriarchate renounced communion with John, who

at length called in the aid of the secular power to eject such bishops as refused to accede to his agreement with Cyril.

Theodoret was prepared to withdraw into a monastery; but the urgent entreaties of his flock prevailed on him to seek an interview with John, and he agreed to retain his see on condition of being excused from condemning Nestorius or his opinions. Alexander, however, continued to resist all importunities; he declared that if all the dead were to rise and testify in favour of the Egyptian doctrines, he must yet follow the light of his own conscience, and reject them. It was in vain that Theodoret endeavoured either to mitigate the sternness of his resolution or to prevail with John that the law might not be enforced against a man so greatly revered; the aged bishop was ejected from Hierapolis, and was banished to the mines of Famothim, in Egypt, while his clergy and people displayed their grief at his removal by closing for a time all the churches of the diocese. Other recusant bishops were driven from their sees by military force, and by such means a general conformity was established throughout the east in the year 435 .

The original author of these commotions was, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Celestine with the emperor, allowed to remain nearly four years in his retirement at Antioch, where he was treated with great respect and enjoyed the correspondence of his friends. On the death of Maximian, in 434, the partisans of Nestorius demanded that he should be reinstated in the bishopric of Constantinople; and so serious was the danger of an outbreak that the emperor hastened to fill up the vacancy by nominating Proclus, who was installed while the late bishop was yet unburied. The demonstration at Constantinople may probably have served to bespeak attention to a representation which John of Antioch made in the following year, that Nestorius persisted in his blasphemies and was perverting many from the faith; whereupon an edict was issued, commanding that all the heresiarch's books should be burnt, that his followers should be called Simonians, "even as the Arians were styled Porphyrians by a law of Constantine of blessed memory", and that their meetings should be suppressed. His property was seized, and he was sentenced to be banished to Petra for life; but (apparently before this sentence had been executed) the place of his exile was changed to the Great Oasis. There he employed himself in composing a history of his troubles; but after a time he was carried off by the Blemmyes, a wild tribe of marauders who devastated the Oasis. The old man was dismissed by his captors as useless, and surrendered himself to an imperial officer in Egypt, who inhumanly caused him to be hurried from place to place until he sank under the treatment. A writer quoted by Evagrius relates that his tongue was eaten up by worms, and that so he "departed to everlasting torment", while other authors of kindred spirit are not content with less than a living putrefaction of the heresiarch's whole body.

Fresh discords broke out in the east on the subject of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodore of Tarsus. The memory of these teachers had some years before been attacked by Rabula, bishop of Edessa, who, after having acted with the Orientals at Ephesus, Easter, made himself conspicuous by the vehemence with which he espoused the opposite side. Now that Nestorianism was formally suppressed, Cyril resolved to make an attempt against the authority of Diodore and Theodore, whose writings were diligently read by the Nestorians since those of their nominal leader had been forbidden. The attempt was eagerly urged on by a strong monastic party; and Rabula with other bishops took part in it. Proclus of Constantinople extracted some propositions from the works of Theodore, and, without naming the source, proposed that they should be generally condemned; but the authorship was betrayed by some over-zealous agents, and the name of Theodore, which was generally revered throughout the east, excited a commotion. A synod of bishops, held at Antioch, while they approved of Proclus' doctrine, appealed to Theodosius against a condemnation of one who had done important services to the church; they said that the language quoted from Theodore had been used by him in controversy with Arians and Eunomians, and ought to be interpreted with a fair consideration of its object; and the emperor, in consequence of this

appeal, recommended that nothing should be done against the memory of men who had deserved well of the church and had died in its communion. Proclus withdrew from the affair, declaring that he had not intended any censure against the person of Theodore; and Cyril himself at length found it expedient to desist from the prosecution of his attempt, and to profess himself satisfied with the condemnation of Theodore's errors which was implied in the sentence against Nestorius. He afterwards wrote against Theodore, and was answered by Theodoret.

Although suppressed within the empire, Nestorianism found a refuge beyond its bounds. At Edessa there was a flourishing school of clergy for the Persian church. Its head, Ibas, was favourable to Nestorius, and translated some works of Diodore and Theodore into Syriac. Rabula, in 435, broke up the institution; but Ibas, on succeeding him as bishop, re-established it, and it continued to flourish until the reign of Zeno, by whom it was finally suppressed in 485. From this seminary Nestorianism was propagated in Persia and India; and the doctrine continued to exercise a powerful influence on the Christianity of the east

CHAPTER IV.

EUTYCHIANISM.—THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.— ADVANCE OF THE
ROMAN SEE.

When Dalmatius went to the palace of Constantinople for the purpose of representing the case of Cyril and the Ephesian council, one of the most remarkable persons among the multitude which accompanied him was Eutyches, abbot of a large monastery near the city. Like Dalmatius, he had at that time remained nearly fifty years within the walls of his retreat, and had resolved never to leave them; but he considered the peril of the faith a sufficient ground for breaking through his determination. Eutyches was generally revered for sanctity, and was highly regarded by Cyril on account of his zeal against Nestorianism : but he appears to have been a person of narrow understanding and of obstinate temper. He was himself soon to give name to a heresy which produced a longer controversy, more complicated dissensions, and a more disastrous schism than the errors which he so warmly opposed.

Notwithstanding the formal reconciliation which had been established, a difference of opinion, and mutual suspicions, continued to exist between the Egyptian and the Syrian schools. The Syrians considered the Egyptians to be tainted with Apollinarianism, and were in their turn regarded by them as Nestorians. The monks in general were violent against Nestorianism, which they were fond of imputing to their ecclesiastical superiors, and to all others who neglected to court their favour. Imperfectly understanding the system to which they professed to adhere, they exaggerated the Alexandrian forms of expression, and, under pretence of reverence for divine mysteries, made use of words which seemed to annihilate the Saviour's humanity. They spoke of it as absorbed in his Godhead, like a drop of honey in the ocean"; some of them were grossly Apollinarian in their language. Theodoret, perceiving that this tendency, even if it did not introduce positive heresy, must throw back Theology into the undefined state from which the writers and the councils of more than two centuries had been labouring to deliver it, wrote in 447 a dialogue in three books, entitled *Eranistes* (The Man of Scraps)—so called because he considered the opinions which he combated to be no new invention, but, like a beggar's coat, a patchwork of fragments collected from various quarters. The doctrines which he maintained in this work as to the unchangeableness, distinctness, and impassibility of the Redeemer's Godhead were made by his enemies the foundation for charging him with holding two Sons; and Theodoret, with Ibas of Edessa, and Irenaeus of Tyre, was marked out by the monastic party for special vengeance.

Dioscorus, who in 444 succeeded Cyril as bishop of Alexandria, is said to have borne a high character before his elevation, but afterwards showed himself violent, tyrannical, rapacious, and scandalously immoral. He had with him the favour of the court, and especially that of Chrysaphius, the eunuch who held sway over the feeble Theodosius; and he kept up an extensive correspondence with those monks in Syria and elsewhere who were ill affected towards their bishops. Dioscorus took offence at Theodoret for having signed a synodical letter of Proclus,—an act which, according to the Alexandrian bishop, implied an acknowledgment of the precedence of Constantinople, or even of its jurisdiction over the Syrian patriarchate; he charged him with Nestorian heresy, and, although Theodoret disavowed and condemned the errors imputed to him, he uttered an anathema against him. The secular power was set in motion against the bishop of Cyrus; in 447 or 448 an imperial edict was issued, which accused him of exciting disturbances by holding frequent meetings, and ordered him to confine himself to his diocese. About the same time Ibas was harassed

with accusations by the monastic party, but succeeded in making his peace. The Orientals attempted to vindicate their orthodoxy by sending a deputation to court, of which the result is not recorded.

A rumour arose that Eutyches, in the eagerness of his opposition to Nestorianism, had vented unsound opinions on the doctrine of the Incarnation. Domnus, bishop of Antioch, made a representation on the subject to Flavian of Constantinople, charging Eutyches with Apollinarianism and with confounding the Saviour's natures; but as the Syrian accusers lay under a suspicion of Nestorianism, the charge met with little or no attention. In 448, however, at a meeting of the local synod of Constantinople, which was attended by about thirty bishops, Eusebius of Dorylaeum (the same who had been the first to oppose Nestorius) denounced Eutyches as a heretic, stating that he had in vain endeavoured by private conference to convince him of his errors, and desiring that an inquiry should be made into the abbot's opinions.

Flavian, the successor of Proclus, knowing the powerful interests by which Eutyches was likely to be supported,¹ and dreading a general disturbance of the church, endeavoured to dissuade Eusebius from proceeding, but was obliged reluctantly to grant the investigation. At the first summons Eutyches refused to appear before the council, alleging his resolution not to quit his monastery; but he was told that this was no reasonable excuse, and was reminded of the part which he had taken in the Nestorian controversy. After repeated citations he made his appearance, attended by a large body of monks, and soldiers, whose protection he professed to think necessary for his safety, and accompanied by the patrician Florentius, who, by a remarkable innovation, was commissioned to assist at the trial on the ground that it was a question of faith, whereas in all previous controversies the imperial commissioners had been restricted to the regulation of external matters. On being questioned, Eutyches professed that he held the Nicene faith, and cited a prohibition which the council of Ephesus had uttered against the imposition of any other formulary. He said that there were two natures in Christ before his incarnation; he admitted, although with hesitation, the phrase that Christ is "consubstantial with us according to his flesh", as well as with the Father according to his Godhead. But his answers were equivocal and unsatisfactory. He stated that he held only "one incarnate nature of God the Word"—a phrase for which he referred to the authority of Athanasius and of Cyril. He professed an unwillingness to define, a reverence for Scripture, and a wish not to go beyond it; and he refused to anathematize the errors of which he was suspected, although he professed himself willing to accept in part the language opposed to them. The synod found his statements insufficient, and pronounced him guilty of renewing the errors of Valentinus and Apollinarius; he was sentenced to deprivation of his abbacy and to deposition from the priesthood; and he and all who should adhere to him were declared excommunicate. It would seem that there was some confusion in the proceedings of this council. Eutyches afterwards complained of it as unfair, and asserted that he had appealed from it to the judgment of Rome, Alexandria, and Jerusalem; but his appeal was not made in the form or at the time which were necessary to give it technical validity.

Eutyches busied himself in writing to bishops and others in all directions. By way of accounting for his refusal to acknowledge the two natures, he alleged that he was apprehensive of contravening the council of Ephesus by exceeding the definitions of the Nicene creed. He loudly complained of injustice, and urged that a general council should be summoned. His monks adhered to him in defiance of the sentence, and were put under a sort of interdict by Flavian for their contumacy; while Dioscorus, contrary to all canonical order, admitted Eutyches to communion, and acknowledged him both as a priest and as an abbot. But the condemnation which had been pronounced was received with general approval. Leo, bishop of Rome, a man of great ability and energy, who was bent on asserting all the real or imaginable privileges of his see, on receiving representations of the case from Theodosius and Eutyches, wrote to Flavian, professing surprise that he had not before reported it; but on

receiving the patriarch explanation and the acts of the late synod, he expressed his satisfaction with the decision. Theodosius attempted to bring about a reconciliation between Flavian and Eutyches, but his endeavours were ineffectual. The patriarch, in answer to a question as to his own faith, admitted the expression, “one nature of the incarnate Word”, on the ground that the person of Christ is one, and he anathematized Nestorius; but he would not allow the sufficiency of the Nicene creed to shelter Eutyches in the opinions which had been condemned. The opponents of Eutyches deprecated the assembling of a general council, as being unnecessary in so clear a case, and as likely to throw the whole church into confusion. The dominant eunuch Chrysaphius, however, favoured the proposal, and citations were issued, by which the chief bishop of each eastern diocese was required to take with him ten metropolitans and ten other bishops. The council was packed with gross unfairness. An imperial letter, after mentioning in a tone of disapproval the proceedings of Flavian against Eutyches, declared that the assembly had been summoned in order to root out the remains of Nestorianism—as if the later heresy were not in question. The bishops who had taken part in the judgment on Eutyches, and the Orientals who had been suspected of Nestorianism, were not to be allowed any voice; while Barsumas, a Syrian abbot, was to have a seat and the privileges of a bishop, as representing the malcontent monastic party. Theodoret was expressly forbidden to attend the council, unless his presence should be unanimously desired by its members. Two lay officers, the counts Elpidius and Eulogius, were commissioned to keep order, and to imprison any persons who might be refractory.

The council met in the same church at Ephesus in Aug. 8, which the third general council had sat eighteen years before. A hundred and twenty-six bishops were present at the opening. Dioscorus had with him a large train of monks and parabolani, and Barsumas appeared at the head of a thousand rabid monks, prepared to coerce the assembly by their violence. Leo, after having in vain endeavoured that it might be held in Italy, had excused himself from appearing, on the ground that the Roman bishops were not accustomed to attend councils beyond the seas, and also on account of the political troubles of his country. He deputed three legates as his representatives, and sent by them a document which, under the name of his *Tome*, or *Letter to Flavian*, became very famous in the controversy. In this the entireness and yet the distinctness of the two natures united in the Saviour were defined with an ability, a command of Scripture proof, and a copiousness of illustration for which it has been thought necessary to account by fables as to the circumstances in which Leo composed the letter, and by ascribing the final revision of it to the apostle St. Peter.

Dioscorus assumed the presidency of the council, in virtue of an imperial rescript. Next to him was placed the Roman legate, Julius; after whom were the bishops of Jerusalem and of Antioch, the regular order of their precedence being reversed; while Flavian was degraded from the position assigned to his see by the second general council, to the fifth place in the assembly. The proceedings were violent and disorderly from the beginning. Dioscorus turned out all reporters but those of his own party band, although Leo’s letter was received by the council, he contrived to prevent the reading of it. Eutyches presented a petition, giving his account of the previous transactions, and praying, not for his own restoration—for that he supposed to be secured by the Alexandrian acknowledgment of him—but for the punishment of his enemies. Flavian requested that the accuser, Eusebius of Dorylaeum, should be heard, but was rebuked by the commissioner Elpidius for interfering, and was told that the opponents of Eutyches had already had their opportunity of speaking at Constantinople. The acts of the Constantinopolitan synod were read, and whenever any one of its members was reported to have spoken of two natures, there were loud outcries from the monks and the multitude—“Nestorian! Tear him asunder! Burn him alive! As he divides, so let him be divided!”. It was agreed that Eutyches should be acknowledged as orthodox, together with his monks, who in insolent language demanded that Flavian should be punished as he had punished them. The prohibition which the council of Ephesus had passed against adding to the Nicene faith was

often appealed to; but with an evident perversion of its meaning, since it had not in reality been intended to exclude any explanation of articles in which the creed might be misrepresented. An anathema against Nestorius was proposed. Dioscorus desired that all who could not make their shouts heard should stretch out their hands in token of assent; and the anathema was pronounced amid cries of “Drive out, burn, tear, cut asunder, massacre—all who hold two natures”. Some of the bishops who had sat in the council of Constantinople quailed before the storm, and retracted the words which they had formerly used.

Dioscorus then demanded whether those who contravened the canons of the council of Ephesus and the Nicene creed did not deserve punishment, and, having received from the bishops an answer of assent, he produced a sentence against Flavian and Eusebius. Flavian protested against being judged by him, and gave into the hands of the Roman legates an appeal to Rome and the west. A number of bishops gathered round Dioscorus, and on their knees implored him to proceed no further; but disregarding their entreaties he exclaimed “Call in the counts!” and the proconsul of Asia entered, attended by soldiers and monks, with swords, clubs, and chains. The bishops in terror attempted to hide themselves in corners of the church or under benches; but they were dragged out, and with threats, abusive language, and blows were compelled to sign the condemnation of Flavian,—or rather a blank sheet, on which the sentence was afterwards to be copied. It is said that Dioscorus and Barsumas struck Flavian on the face, kicked him, and stamped on him; and, although the report of these savage acts may be an exaggeration, it seems to be certain that, in consequence of the treatment which he received in the council, the patriarch of Constantinople died within a few days, on his way to a place of banishment. Eusebius of Dorylaeum was deposed and imprisoned, but found means of escaping to Rome. Theodoret and Ibas, although confined to their own dioceses, were cited, and in their absence were condemned as heretics. Domnus, bishop of Antioch, who had weakly consented to the earlier acts of the council, was at last deposed on the charge of approving a Nestorian sermon, which was said (probably without truth) to have been preached in his presence by Theodoret. He retired into a monastery, and made no attempt to recover his see. One of the Roman legates had died on his way to the council. Of the survivors, it seems probable that the elder, Julius, bishop of Puteoli, was overpowered, and consented to the proceedings of Dioscorus, but the younger, Hilary, then a deacon, and afterwards Leo’s successor, met them with a spirited and resolute opposition, which so provoked the Eutychian party that he was obliged to abscond from Ephesus, and to travel by unfrequented ways to Rome.

Theodosius, by edicts which bore the name of the western emperor as well as his own, confirmed the decisions of the council, taxing the deposed bishops with Nestorianism, and ordering that their writings should be burnt, and that no one should give shelter to them or to their followers. In the face of these edicts, Leo with a Roman synod declared the proceedings at Ephesus invalid. The assembly, he said, was not a council, but a meeting of robbers—a name which was generally adopted and has continued to be used in designating it; and he applied, although in vain, to Theodosius for a fresh council, to be held in Italy. Early in the following year, a visit which Valentinian, with his wife and mother, paid to Rome—probably at the festival of St. Peter’s Chair—afforded the pope another opportunity of urging his cause. As the imperial party entered the church of the apostle, Leo appeared at the head of a large company of bishops, and, prostrating himself on the floor, represented with tears the miserable distractions of the oriental church, where Egypt, Thrace, and Palestine were arrayed against Syria, Pontus, and Asia; he implored Valentinian and the princesses to intercede with the eastern emperor that the sentences against Flavian and others might be annulled, and that a new general council might be assembled in Italy. To this prayer they assented, and they fulfilled their promise by writing to Theodosius and Pulcheria. But Theodosius was persuaded to reply that he had not innovated on the faith; that the proceedings of the late synod had been

fair; that it had produced excellent effects; and that the east was now united in the profession of the true doctrine.

The sudden death of Theodosius, which took place a few months later, was followed by important changes in ecclesiastical matters. Pulcheria had always been opposed to the Eutychian party, and had kept up a correspondence with Leo. The minister Chrysaphius was put to death. Marcian united with his empress in the wish to favour orthodoxy, and expressed his willingness to summon a general council. Leo desired that the assembly might be held in Italy, and that it might not discuss matters of faith—since these had been already sufficiently settled—but might limit itself to a consideration of the questions as to the bishops who had been condemned. In this the pope evidently aimed at the advancement of the Roman authority by obtaining an acknowledgment of his letter to Flavian as the standard of orthodoxy on the Incarnation. But Marcian also had an object in appointing a place of meeting within his own dominions; and to this determination he steadily adhered.

Anatolius, an Alexandrian, had been consecrated by Dioscorus for Constantinople, and requested the communion of Rome. As the see had become vacant by the death of Flavian, there was no irregularity in the appointment of his successor; Leo, therefore, expressed a willingness to acknowledge the new patriarch, if he would give a satisfactory statement of his faith, and would anathematize all who taught amiss on the subject of the Incarnation. The application of Anatolius was recommended by a letter from Marcian; and on signing the epistle to Flavian, he was admitted by Leo to communion.

The enemies of Theodoret had succeeded by means of bribery in procuring an imperial edict which ordered that his books should be burnt, and that no one should read them or give him shelter. He remained in retirement in a monastery at Apamea, from which he wrote to Leo, asking whether he ought to submit to the judgment of the Ephesian council, and begging for an acknowledgment of his orthodoxy, in proof of which he appealed to his numerous writings and to his labours for the faith. His case was examined by a council at Rome, and Leo granted him communion. In the beginning of 451, Marcian allowed the banished bishops to return from their exile; but he reserved the question of their restoration to their sees for the consideration of the general council, which was appointed to meet at Nicaea on the 1st of September.

Although Leo had been unable to contrive that the council should assemble in Italy, or to limit the subject of its discussions, he resolved to turn it to the best advantage. He had already sent a bishop and a presbyter into the east, on account of the negotiations with Anatolius and other bishops who desired his communion; and to these envoys he now added another of each order.

His instructions to the legates were in a very lofty style : they were to assume the presidency of the council; nothing was to be transacted except in their presence; they were not to admit Dioscorus to appear as a judge, but only as an accused person. These orders the legates endeavoured to carry out; but, although much was allowed to them, they were not permitted to exercise that uncontrolled supremacy which their master intended. The opening of the council was delayed for some weeks, and the place of meeting was altered to Chalcedon, in order that it might be held under the eye of the emperor, who had promised to be present if it were in his power, but was prevented by public business from leaving Constantinople. The number of bishops is traditionally stated at six hundred and thirty; the council itself reckons five hundred and twenty. All were from the east, with the exception of Leo's envoys, and of two African bishops, who, however, do not appear to have been commissioned as representatives of their brethren. The Roman legates and Anatolius of Constantinople sat as presidents of the clergy; but the real direction of the council was in the hands of the emperor's commissioners—nineteen civil officers, who had filled the highest dignities in the state.

The first session was held on the 8th of October, in the church of St. Euphemia, a martyr under Diocletian, which was built on a gentle eminence without the walls of Chalcedon. Evagrius describes with enthusiasm the beauties of the situation and prospect, and adds curious statements as to miracles customarily performed at the church by the blood and other relics of the patroness.

As soon as the members of the council had taken their places, the Roman legates rose, and, speaking in Latin, demanded that Dioscorus should not be allowed to sit as a judge; otherwise, they said, their instructions would oblige them to withdraw. The commissioners told them that, if they were to be judges, they must not make themselves parties; but, after some discussion, Dioscorus was desired to take a seat in the midst of the assembly, as a person under accusation. Eusebius of Dorylaeum then brought forward a petition charging Dioscorus with wrongs against himself, against the late bishop of Constantinople, and against the catholic faith—a document which had been presented to the emperor, and by him had been referred to the council. By desire of both Eusebius and Dioscorus, the acts of the Latrocinium (which included those of the Constantinopolitan synod against Eutyches) were produced, and the reading of them was begun. On the occurrence of Theodoret's name in the acts, the commissioners ordered that he should be called in. Immediately a terrible uproar arose. The Egyptian party protested that to admit him, "the master of Nestorius" would be against the faith and the canons—that it would be a betrayal of Christ, and a driving out of St. Cyril. "Away with the Jew!", they shouted, "Away with the blasphemer, the Nestorian!", while their opponents, with equal zeal, exclaimed that Dioscorus should rather be ejected with his train of Manicheans and murderers; so that the commissioners felt it necessary to remind the bishops of the decency due to their own character. Theodoret was at length allowed to take his seat—not, however, as a judge but as a plaintiff; and the reading of the Ephesian acts was resumed. While it was proceeding, Juvenal of Jerusalem, with the bishops of Palestine, left the position which they had taken up near the Egyptians, and removed to the opposite side of the church. Other bishops, who at Ephesus had acted with Dioscorus, followed, and were hailed by the Orientals with shouts of "Welcome, orthodox!". Even four of the Alexandrian primate's suffragans were among the deserters, and at last he was left with only thirteen Egyptian bishops to support him. But Dioscorus continued to bear himself with unabated pride and with undaunted resolution. He demanded that his case should not be separated from that of the others who had shared in his proceedings; he often, with bitter sarcasm, denounced the tergiversation of his former allies; he criticized the evidence with watchful acuteness; he told the members of the council that, in condemning him, they would condemn Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzum, Cyril, and all the orthodox fathers. He said that he acknowledged Christ to be "of two natures", but, on being pressed, he declined to use the form "in two natures", thus refusing to own that the distinction of natures had subsisted after the incarnation. He protested that he cared for nothing but God and his own soul.

Throughout the day there were continual outbursts of tumult, as passages occurred in the acts which excited the feelings of the hostile parties. Mutual anathemas were shouted forth against the asserters and the deniers of the two natures; the description of the scene might recall to our minds the tempests of modern republican assemblies rather than the ideal which we might have naturally formed of the church's greatest general council.

It was late before the reading of the first day's proceedings at Ephesus was finished. The commissioners then said it was enough for one day to have cleared the memory of Flavian and Eusebius; that the emperor was resolved to adhere to the faith of Nicaea and Constantinople; that if he agreed in their view of the matter, the leaders in the proceedings at Ephesus ought to be deposed; but they left the decision to the consideration of the bishops.

Dioscorus was committed to a guard, probably from an apprehension that he might secretly leave Chalcedon. At the third session of the council he was cited, but refused to appear, on the plea that he was under restraint; and when informed that he was at liberty to

attend the council, he renewed his refusal on other grounds—especially that the imperial commissioners were not then present in the assembly. Additional charges were preferred against him—chiefly affecting his administration of his office, and his private morals, which were so notoriously bad as even to afford themes for the ballad-singers of Alexandria; and, after he had been thrice summoned without appearing, the legates pronounced their sentence,—that, because of the misdemeanours proved against him (among which they included some which do not appear to have been mentioned in the previous proceedings)—for his behaviour at Ephesus, for having dared to excommunicate “the most holy and most blessed archbishop of the great Rome, Leo”, and for having disregarded the citations of the council, they, in the name of the Roman bishop and of St. Peter, with the council, declared him to be deprived of all sacerdotal office and dignity. Anatolius and other bishops gave their judgment in succession, and the condemnation was signed by about three hundred members of the council. Some of these specified particular charges as the grounds of their assent; many rested it on the contempt with which Dioscorus had treated the citation (and this was the main reason assigned in the notification of the sentence to himself); but the majority were content with professing to be guided by the opinion of the council, and very few made any reference to imputations on the faith of the accused. The condemnation was ratified by the emperor, and Dioscorus was banished to Gangra, in Paphlagonia, where he died in 454.

Leo had sent to the council a copy of his letter to Flavian, and it had also been recommended to the attention of the members by Marcian; but, while the pope wished it to be received without question, as a standard of doctrine on the Incarnation, the emperor regarded it as a document subject to examination and discussion, and was resolved that the faith should be settled by the authority of the council, not by the bishop of Rome. His commissioners, therefore, proposed at the second session that a definition as to the faith should be set forth. Cecropius of Sebastople and others demurred; the faith, they said, had already been secured by the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople, and by the letter to Flavian. These documents, and Cyril’s second letter to Nestorius, were then generally signed; but the imperial commissioners, resolved on carrying out their instructions, desired the bishops to adjourn for five days, and in the meantime to confer on the subject of a decree as to faith.

At the fourth session (the deposition of Dioscorus having taken place at the third) the commissioners again urged the proposal. The Roman legates repeated the objection which had been already made—that the letter to Flavian and the creeds were sufficient. The members of the council were then individually asked whether the letter were agreeable to the earlier documents, and replied that it was so. The thirteen Egyptian bishops who had adhered to Dioscorus entreated that they might not be required to subscribe the letter while the see of Alexandria was vacant; such, they said, was their subjection to their patriarch, that, if they should take it upon themselves to sign, their lives would not be safe on their return to Egypt. This prayer was seconded by the intercession of the commissioners, and, after a warm discussion, the Egyptians were allowed to remain at Constantinople until a new patriarch should be appointed to Alexandria. At this meeting the bishops unanimously requested that Juvenal of Jerusalem and the other metropolitans who had shared in the proceedings of the Latrocinium should be pardoned, on the ground that they had acted under constraint. The request was referred to the emperor, and, with his assent, the desired forgiveness was granted.

At the fifth session, a decree as to faith was produced, and was received with various expressions of feeling. But in the most critical point, instead of stating that Christ is “in two natures”, it used the expression “of two natures”. As Dioscorus had deposed Flavian for the doctrine conveyed in the former phrase, and had himself declared his willingness to agree to the other, the definition (which had probably been framed in accordance with the emperor’s wish to conciliate the Egyptian and monastic party) was obviously insufficient. The legates said that, unless the words were brought into agreement with Leo’s letter, they would return to Rome, and refer the matter to a western council. On this there were loud outcries against

Nestorianism. The great body of the bishops exclaimed that the decree was dictated by the Holy Spirit, and must not be altered. In answer to a remark by a commissioner, that Dioscorus had deposed Flavian for using the words "in two natures", Anatolius observed that Dioscorus had not been deposed for heresy, but for his excommunication of Leo and for his disobedience to the council's citations. The emperor was consulted as to the course which should be taken, and suggested that a committee of bishops should confer with Anatolius and the Roman legates. The general feeling of the assembly was still against any further discussion; there were exclamations that those who did not like the definition might "go off to Rome"; but on being reminded by the commissioners that Dioscorus had consented to the words "of two natures", and asked whether they preferred Dioscorus or Leo, the bishops agreed to reconsider the matter. Thus the decree was at length brought into its present form. It confirms the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople, and the decisions of the general council of Ephesus; it adopts Leo's letter to Flavian as a bulwark alike against Nestorianism and the opposite error; and while recognizing the sufficiency of the existing creeds, it defines, in opposition to the recent heresies, that Christ is "perfect alike in Godhead and in manhood; very God and very man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh; co-essential with the Father as to his Godhead, and co-essential with us as to his manhood; like to us in all things except sin one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, without confusion, change, division, or separation; the difference of the natures being in nowise taken away by reason of their union, but rather the properties of each nature being preserved, and concurring into one person and one hypostasis, not as it were divided or separated into two persons, but one and the same Son and only-begotten, God the Word".

At the next (which was the sixth) session, Marcian and the empress appeared, and were received by the bishops with loud acclamations, mixed with anathemas against Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus. The emperor made a speech, declaring his sanction of the decree of faith, and the document was generally subscribed.

Theodoret signed the decree as bishop of Cyrus, but had not yet been restored to his see. Although the Roman approval of his orthodoxy had been mentioned in the council, the fathers in the eighth session proceeded to an independent examination of his case. On appearing, he was received with violent outcries from many of the bishops, and was called on to anathematize Nestorius. He attempted to state his faith, declaring that the recovery of his bishopric was nothing to him in comparison of his reputation for orthodoxy. But the bishops would not listen to any explanation; and at length, after many vain attempts to overcome their clamour, he pronounced an anathema on Nestorius, with all who refuse the word Theotokos, or divide the two natures; whereupon he was acknowledged as orthodox and worthy of his see. Ibas was also, not without some difficulty, restored to the bishopric of Edessa. It might have been supposed that Theodoret intended his anathema against the errors which were popularly imputed to Nestorius, without implying that the imputation was just; but, if the notice of Nestorius in one of his latest works be genuine, it would appear that he had changed his opinion as to the heresiarch himself.

The number of the council's sessions is variously reckoned, from twelve to fifteen or more. Among its acts were two important regulations on the subject of ecclesiastical precedence and jurisdiction.

(1.) Agreeably to the principle of correspondence between the ecclesiastical and the civil division, Palestine had been subject to the bishop of Caesarea, the civil capital, as metropolitan. The see of Jerusalem was but an ordinary bishopric; yet, on account of the sacred associations connected with the place, it had always enjoyed something of a peculiar reverence. This undefined honour had been formerly sanctioned by the seventh Nicene canon, on the ground of custom and ancient tradition; and the importance of the holy city had since been increased by the growing practice of pilgrimage, which drew to it a vast confluence of visitors from all countries to which the Gospel had penetrated. Encouraged by these

circumstances, Juvenal conceived the ambitious idea of not only freeing himself from the superiority of Caesarea, but raising his see to the dignity of a patriarchate. His first attempt was made at the general council of Ephesus, where the bishop of Caesarea was absent, while John of Antioch, to whom both Caesarea and Jerusalem were perhaps subject, was obnoxious as being the chief of the rival assembly. Relying on these favourable circumstances, Juvenal went so far as to assert that Antioch ought to be directed and judged by Jerusalem; but his pretensions were checked by Cyril, and were not revived until after the Alexandrian bishop's death. At the Latrocinium, where he was again favoured by the absence of the bishop of Caesarea, and by the position of the Syrian patriarch Domnus (of whom, as we have seen, he took precedence in the assembly), Juvenal renewed his claims; and he had subsequently obtained rescripts in his favour from the emperor. The question now came before the council for final decision. Maximus of Antioch, although dissatisfied with the change, was disposed to agree to a compromise; and the fathers of Chalcedon assigned to Juvenal the dignity of a patriarch, with jurisdiction over Palestine, while Arabia and the second Phoenicia, which had been included in Juvenal's claim, were left to the patriarch of Antioch, and the bishop of Caesarea was allowed to retain the title of an honorary metropolitan.

(2.) The twenty-eighth canon related to the see of Constantinople. The eastern emperors had found it their interest to exalt the bishops of their capital, in opposition to the power of metropolitans on the one hand, and of the Roman bishop on the other; and the dignity and influence of the position had been continually increasing. An introduction by the bishop of Constantinople was necessary for such of his brethren as desired to be admitted into the imperial presence. He presided over the "home synod", a permanent although fluctuating assembly, which was composed of such bishops as had been drawn by their affairs to the residence of the court, and to which the emperors were accustomed to refer appeals in ecclesiastical matters. Although the canon of the second general council, which placed Constantinople next to Rome, did not bestow any jurisdiction, the bishops attempted to exercise patriarchal authority over Thrace, Asia, and Pontus; they claimed the right, not only of ordaining, but even of nominating, the metropolitans and inferior bishops of these dioceses; they even extended their interference into the patriarchate of Antioch, and became the general referees and arbitrators of the eastern church.

The twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon was intended as a compromise of the differences which had arisen from these pretensions. It ordered that the metropolitans only of the three dioceses should be ordained by the patriarchs of Constantinople, and that their ordination should not take place without a certificate of regular and undisputed election by their own suffragans. The canon recognized the privileges bestowed by the second general council on 'New Rome'; it referred these to the secular eminence of the city, declared that the privileges of the ancient capital itself rested on like grounds, and enacted that Constantinople ought "to be magnified in ecclesiastical matters even like the elder imperial Rome, as being next to it". The canon was signed by about a hundred and eighty bishops—many of those who supposed themselves to be aggrieved by it standing aloof.

On the following day, which was the last of the council, the Roman legates protested against it, as having been passed in their absence, and through a surprise practised on those who had been present. The charge of surprise was denied by the parties concerned; and the legates were reminded that they had been summoned to the meeting on the preceding day. They threatened to report the matter to their master; to which the commissioners replied by calmly telling them that it had been decided by the synod.

The emperor followed up the council by laws against the Eutychians, forbidding them to hold meetings, to ordain clergy, and to build churches or monasteries, and inflicting various disabilities on them. Leo, on receiving a report of the proceedings, expressed high approval of the decree as to faith, but no less indignation against the twenty-eighth canon. With a bold disregard of history, he denied that the precedence of sees had depended on the importance of

the cities in which they were. He asserted that the canon of the council of Constantinople had never been acted on or notified to the Roman see, although (besides other instances to the contrary) his own legates in the first session had supported the complaint of those who cried out against the degradation of Flavian from the second place at the Latrocinium. He pretended that the new canon contradicted the Nicene council by subjecting Alexandria and Antioch to Constantinople; and he declared it to be annulled by the authority of St. Peter. He loudly complained of the ambition of Anatolius, whom he charged with ingratitude for the favour shown by the Roman acknowledgment of him; he suspended intercourse with him, and threatened to excommunicate him. Finding, however, that, although it was the interest of both Marcian and the patriarch to be on friendly terms with Rome, his lofty pretensions had no effect on them, he affected, in 454, to regard some conciliatory words of Anatolius as a retractation of the conduct which had offended him; and the patriarch of Constantinople was readmitted to his correspondence. Although some of the more extravagant writers in the interest of Rome profess to suppose that Marcian abrogated the canon by an imperial law, there is no ground whatever for such a supposition, but it is certain that the canon, from the time of its enactment, was steadily enforced by the eastern court.

The canon in favour of Constantinople agreed with the tendency of the age to centre authority in the great sees by overpowering the independence of the lesser. In the same spirit which led the patriarchs of Constantinople to extend their jurisdiction over the neighbouring provinces, Alexander of Antioch had endeavoured, in the earlier part of the century, to assert a claim to the island of Cyprus, which had until then been “autocephalous” under its metropolitan, the bishop of Constantia or Salamis. He pretended that it had been originally subject to Antioch, but had withdrawn itself in the course of the preceding century, on account of the heresy and schism by which the mother church had been distracted, and which it had been reserved for Alexander himself finally to suppress. The claim, however, failed; the council of Ephesus—perhaps in some degree influenced by enmity against John, who had become the successor of Alexander—pronounced it inconsistent with the canons of Nicaea. But the dignity of the patriarchs generally had been on the increase. In some cases, they assisted bishops to obtain the title of metropolitans, on condition of subordination to themselves; sometimes they commissioned existing metropolitans to act as their vicars—an arrangement by which the metropolitan acquired an increase of power, but paid for it by the forfeiture of his independence.

The growth of the Roman influence during the earlier half of the fifth century was especially remarkable. As in the preceding century, controversies continued to arise in the east. From Chrysostom and Theophilus to Dioscorus and Anatolius, the bishops of the chief eastern sees were divided by enmities, and one of them after another was charged with heresy. In such circumstances they were driven to look towards Rome, not only as the principal church of the west, but as representative of all the western churches. Antioch and Alexandria were especially interested in courting its alliance, as a counterpoise to the new importance of Constantinople. The Roman bishops affected to regard such applications as appeals; while those who received favourable answers from Rome were eager to magnify them as authoritative judgments. The dignity of the Roman see rose in the eyes of men, through the exemption of its bishops from that personal share in the disputes, the intrigues, the scandals and calamities of the time which degraded the estimation of the eastern patriarchs; through the circumstance that, instead of themselves engaging in the altercations of councils, they were represented in those assemblies by envoys, who studiously held up the name of Rome as if it were entitled to overawe the whole hierarchy of the church. By the withdrawal of the western emperors to Milan and Ravenna, the bishops, to whom it would seem that the munificence of Constantine had made over the Lateran palace for their habitation, were left as the chief resident personages of Rome; and both the decay of the empire and the personal feebleness of its rulers contributed to the advancement of the ecclesiastical power. Thus favoured by

circumstances, the bishops of Rome, with growing pretensions and through various fortunes, pushed onwards to that ascendancy which their successors were destined in time to attain.

The Roman bishops had before denied that their precedence originated in the secular greatness of the city, and had professed to trace it to their alleged succession from St. Peter. This theory, in truth, resolves itself into the other, even according to the highest conception of the dignity conferred on St. Peter; since it is evident that the capital of the civilized world was the place in which the first of the apostles might naturally be supposed to fix his see. And, if there were any room for doubt, the question would be decided by the fact that the other churches which traced themselves to him were those of the two cities which came next in importance to Rome; and, further, that in ecclesiastical as well as in civil rank Alexandria took precedence of Antioch, although the foundation of the Egyptian see was referred to the agency of a disciple, whereas the Syrian see was believed to have been founded by the apostle himself. The derivation from St. Peter was, however, advanced as if it excluded the view which it thus really involves; and the claims founded on it became continually higher. For a time it was said that the prerogatives of Rome had been bestowed on it by the fathers, out of reverence for the chief of the apostles. But afterwards it was asserted that they were inherent in the Roman see—a doctrine which was hinted at by Celestine's legates in the council of Ephesus, but was first broadly maintained by Leo.

Innocent went beyond his predecessors in his assumptions. He laboured earnestly to subject independent metropolitans. Carrying out an usurpation which appears to have been begun by Siricius, he assumed jurisdiction over the churches of eastern Illyricum, and constituted the bishop of Thessalonica his vicar for the administration of that vast province—extending from Cape Taenarus to the Danube. He laid down the principle that the whole western church was bound to conform to the usages of Rome—a principle which so lately as the time of St. Ambrose had been utterly disallowed,—and he declared that, after the judgment of local bishops had been pronounced, an appeal lay to the Roman see, not only in such cases as had been contemplated by the council of Sardica, but in all “greater causes”. The lofty language of this bishop in receiving a communication from the Africans in the matter of Pelagius, the pretensions of his successor Zosimus in the same case, and the defeat of the latter in respect both of fact and of right, have already been mentioned. Yet in that affair Zosimus, although with little credit to himself, made an important step towards increasing the authority of his see; for his circular letter—the expression, not of his first independent opinion, but of that which had been forced on him—was the earliest instance in which a document emanating from Rome was proposed for general adoption as a standard of orthodoxy.

The Africans, although desirous of Innocent's cooperation in the Pelagian controversy, maintained their entire independence of him. In like manner, when an African presbyter named Apiarius appealed to Rome, during the episcopate of Zosimus, the African bishops denied that appeals from Carthage might be made to churches beyond the seas, since such appeals had been forbidden by the council of Nicaea and in the African code. Zosimus, however, claimed the right of entertaining appeals, by virtue (as he asserted) of a Nicene canon. Among the Africans the mention of this authority excited great surprise, as no such canon was known to them. They sent to the eastern patriarchs for authentic copies of the Nicene code, and, in notifying this step to Boniface, who in the meantime had succeeded Zosimus, they expressed a hope that they might no longer have cause to complain of the secular pride and arrogance of Rome. The canon proved to be one, not of the Nicene, but of the Sardican council, which was not regarded as of ecumenical authority, and moreover Zosimus had strained it far beyond its real meaning. Apiarius again appealed to Rome in the time of Celestine; when the African bishops altogether refused to admit any interference of foreign churches with the affairs of their province, and declared the holding of an opposite opinion to be a ground for excommunication.

Among the attempts of Celestine to extend the power of his see, his assumption of the right to depose a bishop of Constantinople was the most startling, as being that which went farthest beyond all precedent of former times. But the course of affairs prevented any result from this assumption, as the execution of Celestine's mandate was superseded by the summoning of a general council, and at that assembly Nestorius was deposed, not by the authority of the Roman letter, but after an examination of his case by the bishops who were present, in the exercise of their independent judgment. The advance of the Roman pretensions, however, was significantly shown at Ephesus; for whereas Innocent and Zosimus had been content to rest the claim of Rome to supreme judicature on the authority of "fathers" and councils, Celestine's representatives asserted it as a prerogative which St. Peter exercised through his successors.

The chief promoter of the Roman power in this period was Leo, who, in later times, has been styled the Great. Leo employed, in pursuit of his object, extraordinary genius, political skill, and theological learning. He raised the claims of the Roman bishop, as the representative of St. Peter, to a height before unknown. With that utter defiance of historical fact which afterwards became characteristic of his successors and their advocates, he declared the pretensions and the practices of his church to be matter of unbroken apostolical tradition— ascribing that venerable character to regulations introduced within the preceding half-century by Siricius, and even by still more recent bishops. Under such pretences he endeavoured to enforce the usages of Rome as a rule for the universal church; even telling Dioscorus, before their disagreement, that Alexandria ought to follow the Roman model, and giving as his reason, that it would be impious to suppose the disciple St. Mark to have varied from the rules laid down by his master St. Peter.

In the earlier years of his episcopate Leo exerted himself against various kinds of heretics,—as the Pelagians, the Manicheans (of whom many had been driven to Rome by the troubles of Africa, and who appear to have been convicted of gross depravity, as well as of errors in opinion), and the Priscillianists, who were still a considerable party in Spain. As to these last, it is to be noted that he expressly approved the execution of their founder, which, sixty years earlier, had excited the general disgust and indignation of the orthodox.

The calamities of the age removed from the path of Roman ambition the hindrance which had been opposed by the independent church of Africa,—a church distinguished far beyond Rome itself by the services which its members had rendered to theology and learning. The Africans, oppressed by the Arian invaders of their country, were glad to seek support from a connexion with Rome; and the interference which had been boldly rejected in the days of Zosimus, was admitted without objection at the hands of the later bishops. Leo extended his sway over Spain and Sicily, and in Gaul he interfered in a remarkable manner, with gross injustice to one of the most eminent men of the age.

Hilary, a monk of Lerins, had at the age of twenty-eight been obliged reluctantly to accept the metropolitan see of Arles, as successor to his former abbot, Honoratus, by whom he had been designated for the office. He became famous for his learning; for his zeal in executing discipline without respect of persons; for his charity towards the poor and captives; and for his unwearied labours and exertions in all the episcopal duties. Such was his eloquence, that his Lenten discourses, of four hours in length, were listened to with unflinching attention, although bodily weakness obliged the hearers to introduce the novelty of sitting while he preached, instead of standing, as had been usual during the delivery of sermons.

The sees of Arles and Vienne had formerly contended for precedence, and Zosimus had in 417 given a decision in favour of Arles, on the ground that it had been founded by Trophimus the Ephesian, who (he said) had been sent into Gaul by St. Peter. Hilary, at a synod held in 444, deposed a bishop named Celidonius, who thereupon complained to Leo that the bishop of Arles had exceeded his jurisdiction. Such an application could not but be welcome to Leo, since it furnished him with an opportunity for extending his power under the

pretext of defending the Gaulish bishops from oppression. Hilary did not acknowledge any right in the Roman bishop to receive such appeals; he made his way to the capital on foot, in the middle of winter, for the purpose of asserting his independence; and, in consequence of the unsatisfactory nature of his communications with Leo, he left Rome secretly and returned to his diocese. But Leo, with his usual boldness, declared that the apostolic see had always been accustomed to receive appeals from Gaul. He restored Celidonus; he pronounced a sentence depriving Hilary of the power to hold synods—a power which he represented as depending on a commission from Rome; and he procured from Valentinian a very remarkable law which is supposed to have been dictated by Leo himself. In this the emperor, after magnifying the privileges of the Roman see, censures Hilary for his insubordination; he declares the bishop of Rome to be rightful ruler of the whole church; he orders that no bishop, in Gaul or elsewhere, shall make any innovation on ancient custom; that the appointments of the Roman bishop shall be obeyed as laws by all others; and that any bishop who shall neglect a citation to the tribunal of the bishop of Rome shall be forcibly compelled to appear by the civil governor of his province. This unexampled law, however, was not universally obeyed, and Hilary appears to have retained his dignity until his death, four years later; after which Leo (who then styled him “of holy memory”), at the request of the Gaulish bishops, settled the rivalry of Arles and Vienne by a division of jurisdiction.

The power of assembling general councils was not yet claimed by the bishops of Rome, but was supposed to belong to the emperors. The council of Chalcedon, as we have seen, was summoned against the will of Leo, and in many respects it thwarted his wishes and disallowed his pretensions; yet in the event it contributed greatly towards the realization of his schemes. It was at Chalcedon that the legates of Rome for the first time obtained the presidency of a general council,—a position which could hardly have been refused to them when the dissensions of the eastern patriarchs had compelled the emperor to rely so largely on the orthodoxy and the judgment of the Roman bishop. The patriarch of Constantinople, indeed, was joined with them in the presidency, while neither he nor they had any privileges beyond other members of the council, and all were alike subject to the control of the imperial commissioners. But the part which the legates took in the assembly was afterwards greatly magnified by Leo, who usually spoke of them as having judicially decided matters respecting which they had only been allowed to give their opinion, and of which the decision had been pronounced by the voice of the council at large and the adoption of the letter to Flavian, as a standard of doctrine on the Incarnation (although it was not received in submission to Leo, but was subjected to the examination of the council), must have contributed not a little to exalt the authority of the Roman see in the estimation of Christians generally.

In his later dealings with the eastern church, Leo ventured on some remarkable innovations. It had been the practice of the great patriarchs to maintain representatives at Constantinople, for the purpose of watching over their interests in such matters as might be referred to the emperor. But whereas these representatives had always been chosen from the lower degrees of the hierarchy, Leo commissioned a bishop to act as his ordinary envoy. Although this bishop, Julian of Cos, belonged to another jurisdiction, Leo took it upon himself to authorize his absence from his diocese; and the object of the legation was evidently not so much to guard the interests of Rome as to overlook and coerce the patriarch of Constantinople. Leo went so far as to interfere with the internal concerns of that church by remonstrating with Anatolius against certain ordinations and appointments, and by exciting the clergy of the eastern capital to control their bishop in the administration of his office. It was natural that Anatolius should resent such interference; and a violent collision appeared to be inevitable, when the death of the patriarch, in 458, prevented the further progress of the quarrel.

We need not question that Leo conscientiously believed himself to be acting for the benefit, not of his own see only, but of the whole church. But neither respect for his great

merits nor charity in the construction of his motives must be allowed to blind us to his ambition and love of domination. In him we for the first time meet with something approaching to the papacy of later times; the conception is, in the main, already formed, although as yet but imperfectly realized.

A circumstance of different tendency must be mentioned before leaving this subject. After the death of Zosimus, in December 418, the possession of the see of Rome was for a time fiercely contested between Boniface and Eulalius, each of whom was consecrated by his partisans. Boniface was at length established by the emperor Honorius, who, apparently at the bishop's request, enacted that, when two persons should be chosen for the see of Rome, a new election should take place. And this was the origin of the important influence which temporal princes afterwards exercised in the election of the Roman bishops.

CHAPTER V.

FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE. CONVERSION OF THE BARBARIANS.
VANDAL PERSECUTION IN AFRICA.

WITHIN about twenty years from the death of Valentinian III the western empire had nine sovereigns. The first of these was Maximus, the senator whose vengeance had been fatal to his predecessor. His wife having died opportunely, he married the widowed empress Eudoxia; but his indiscretion in telling her that for her sake he had instigated the murder of her husband excited her disgust and indignation. In order to obtain revenge, she invited the Vandals from Africa; and her invitation was promptly answered. Within less than three months after Valentinian's death, Genseric, whose fleet had long been the terror of the Mediterranean coasts, appeared at the mouth of the Tiber.

Maximus, in attempting to escape from Rome, was stoned to death by the populace; and three days later the invader was (June 12, 455) before the walls. Leo, at the head of his clergy, went forth to confront for the second time a barbarian conqueror; he obtained a promise that the city should not be burnt, that the lives of the inhabitants should be spared, and that they should not be tortured for the purpose of discovering their treasures. Thus the bishop's intercession mitigated in some degree the horrors of the sack which followed; but the Vandals for fourteen days gave a loose to their lust and rapacity, and they returned to Africa laden with plunder, and carrying with them a multitude of captives, among whom were Eudoxia and her two daughters. The charity of Deogratias, bishop of Carthage, on this occasion, may be related in the words of Gibbon. "He generously sold the gold and silver plate of the church to purchase the freedom of some, to alleviate the slavery of others, and to assist the wants and infirmities of a captive multitude, whose health was impaired by the hardships which they had suffered in their passage from Italy to Africa. By his order, two spacious churches were converted into hospitals : the sick were distributed in convenient beds, and liberally supplied with food and medicines; and the aged prelate repeated his visits both in the day and night, with an assiduity that surpassed his strength, and a tender sympathy which enhanced the value of his services. Compare this scene", adds the historian, "with the field of Cannae, and judge between Hannibal and the successor of St. Cyprian".

The loss of Africa involved that of the revenues which the Roman nobles had drawn from their estates in that country, and the cessation of the supplies of corn on which the community had in great measure depended for its support. With a view of recovering the province, the emperor Majorian, a man of character and energy worthy of a better time, made war on Genseric in 457; and eleven years later, a vast armament, chiefly supplied by the eastern emperor Leo, was sent against the Vandal king : but the first of these expeditions was defeated through the treachery of barbarian allies, and the second through the incapacity of its commander, the emperor's brother-in-law, Basiliscus. Britain had already been abandoned by the Romans; Gaul and Spain were gradually occupied by barbarians of various races; and at length the imperial dominion was limited to a portion of the Italian peninsula. The last emperor of the west, Augustulus, was, in 476, compelled to resign his throne, and became a pensioner on the bounty of Odoacer, the first barbarian king of Italy.

In connection with the fall of the empire, the paganism of the west may be for the last time formally noticed.

Paganism had been combated in the east with severity and success. The younger Theodosius, as we have seen, professed to question whether any of his subjects continued to adhere to it; and, somewhat later, he ordered that the remaining temples should be dismantled, and purified by the sign of the cross. But in the west the old religion retained its hold longer. In cities, the pagans, when debarred from the public exercise of their worship, cultivated the household worship of the *lares* and *penates*, and celebrated their sacrifices privately, notwithstanding the imperial laws. And in the country the pagan rites were still performed without disguise, and without molestation on the part of those who were entrusted with the execution of the laws for their suppression. Maximus, bishop of Turin, about the middle of the century, remonstrates with Christian landowners for suffering their estates to be defiled with idolatry by the peasants; he describes and denounces the superstitious and disorderly celebration of the new year, which Christians had retained from the rites of Janus. Leo the Great speaks of some Christians who continued to worship the sun. Augury and other methods of divination continued to be practised. While Pagans ascribed the calamities of the empire to the suppression of their rites, Salvian, the Jeremiah of his age, and other Christians, regarded them as chastisements on account of the remains of idolatry which were still tolerated in Gaul, Africa, and elsewhere.

Pagans are occasionally mentioned as holding important positions in the state; even the emperor Anthemius (A.D. 467-472) is suspected of having favoured the old religion. Genseric's expedition against Rome was in one respect favorable to Christianity, inasmuch as, by carrying off a number of statues, and by stripping the capitol of its thickly-gilt bronze roof, he removed from the sight of the Romans objects which recalled to mind the religion of their forefathers. But in the very last years of the century, Gelasius, bishop of Rome, had to argue against the celebration of the lupercalia, which, although only the lowest of the people took part in it, found apologists among men of senatorial rank.

Theodoric the Goth, the conqueror of Odoacer, enacted the punishment of death against all who should practise any pagan rites. There is no evidence that this law was ever executed, nor perhaps was any pagan so firmly convinced of the truth of his religion as to brave death for the assertion of it; but from that time paganism ceases to appear in the light of history. Remnants of it, however, continued to lurk in most of the western countries; although both particular actions and popular customs which have been characterized as pagan are generally to be referred to a mixture of superstition with Christianity rather than to any intentional preference of heathenism; and although much confusion has been introduced by writers who speak of the deities of barbarous nations under the names of the Greek and Roman mythology.

(1.) As the empire of old Rome disappears from view, we begin to discern, not only the great spiritual power which will hereafter so largely engage our attention, but the origin of modern European states; and the appearance of the northern nations in civil history brings them into connection with the history of the church. The hosts which in succession poured down on the provinces of the empire soon embraced Christianity; but their creed was generally not that of the orthodox community. The missionaries who wrought on the Teutonic nations appear to have gone forth from among the Visigoths, whose lapse into Arianism has already been related; and in some cases, where the conversion was originally to the catholic faith, Arianism was afterwards adopted in its stead, as less perplexing to rude minds, as recommended by matrimonial or political alliances, and perhaps also because of its difference from the system professed by the rulers of Rome and Constantinople. Thus the Burgundians, on the Rhine, who, in consequence of having settled in a territory where Christianity had before prevailed, had become Christians about the year 413, exchanged Catholicism for Arianism half a century later; and the Suevi, in Spain, originally converted by the orthodox bishops of Lusitania, became Arians in 469. Genseric has been charged with having effected a

similar change among the Vandals; but it would seem that the accusation was invented for the purpose of making his name more odious, and that the Christianity of his nation was in reality Arian from the first. The conversion of barbarian tribes, unlike that of the Romans, usually began with the prince; and after his example the multitude pressed to the front. Among those who had been converted by such a process, it will be readily conceived that there was very little understanding of their new profession; that their Christianity was of a rude kind, and long retained a mixture of ideas derived from their old superstitions. Yet, with all its defects, both in doctrine and in morality, and although it held but a very imperfect control over the conduct of those who professed it, the Christianity of those nations did much to soften their ferocity, and greatly mitigated the sufferings of the more civilized races which they subdued.

(2.) The religious story of Britain is entitled to our especial attention. Yet a writer who undertakes a general compendium of church-history is bound, instead of exaggerating the proportion which that of his own country would rightly bear to the whole, to endeavor to preserve uniformity of scale, while he must refer his readers for further information to works which are expressly devoted to this portion of his subject.

During the fourth century, we find mention of British bishops as having attended the councils of Arles, Sardica, and Rimini; at the last of these it is said that three of them were compelled by poverty to accept an allowance from the emperor, which their brethren and the bishops of Gaul declined, lest it might interfere with the independence of their judgment. It is also argued (but perhaps with more of patriotism than of plausibility), that there were British bishops at the council of Nicaea. Although it would appear that Arianism was not unknown in our island, the orthodoxy of the British bishops throughout the Arian controversy is attested by the weighty evidence of Athanasius and Hilary.

Pelagius did not attempt to propagate his opinions in his native country; but, when proscribed elsewhere, they were introduced into Britain by one Agricola, and found so much acceptance that the clergy resolved to call in foreign aid, much in the same manner as their countrymen had been accustomed to invoke the help of the Roman legions for protection against the attacks of their northern neighbors. In consequence of an application from Britain, German, bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, bishop of Troyes, were deputed by a synod of Gaulish bishops to combat the growing heresy. Their preaching and their sanctity produced a great effect, which was seconded by an abundance of miracles. In a conference at St. Alban's they defeated the heretical teachers; and it is said that German obtained for the Britons a victory over the Picts and Saxons by directing an army, mostly composed of newly-baptized converts, to raise a loud shout of "Allelujah!". About eighteen years later, German was again invited to visit Britain, for the purpose of eradicating the remains of Pelagianism, which had begun to revive; and his labours were again successful.

The Romans, finding themselves unable to spare the forces necessary for a military establishment in Britain, had abandoned the island in the year 409. After their withdrawal, the government became gradually vested in the hands of a multitude of petty princes, and the moral condition of the inhabitants was such that the calamities which followed are represented as a righteous judgment on it. In 449, the Jutes Hengist and Horsa are said to have landed in the isle of Thanet. The Jutes, Angles, and Saxons poured in on the country, and by degrees got possession of all except the mountainous districts of the west. "Public and private buildings were alike destroyed", says Bede; "priests were everywhere murdered at the altar; bishops and their people were indiscriminately slaughtered with fire and sword, and there was no one to bury the victims of such cruelty. Some of the wretched remnant were seized on the mountains, and were butchered by heaps; others, worn out with hunger, surrendered themselves, and on condition that they should not be immediately put to death, embraced perpetual slavery for the sake of sustenance; some sorrowfully made for regions beyond the sea; others remained in

their country, and, in continual trembling and anxiety, led a life of poverty among mountains, forests, and lofty rocks”.

Some of the Britons found a refuge among the kindred inhabitants of Armorica; such of them as became serfs to the conquerors gradually lapsed into heathenism; while those who maintained their independence in Cornwall, Wales, or Cumberland, although they preserved their Christianity, lost their Roman civilization and the use of the Latin tongue. Britain was withdrawn from the view of the Roman world, and was for a time regarded as a land of mystery and fable.

(3.) Amid the fictions with which the early history of Scotland is overlaid, it appears to be pretty certain that Ninian preached in the beginning of the fifth century among the southern Picts, who inhabited the country between the Frith of Forth and the Grampians. This missionary is said to have been the son of a British chief, to have received his education at Rome, and to have afterwards visited St. Martin at Tours. Returning to his native country, he fixed his see in Galloway, where, with the aid of masons whom he had brought with him from Tours, he erected a church in honour of St. Martin. This building, being of white stone (whereas the British churches were usually of less durable materials), was distinguished by the name of Candida Casa, which became that of the see. Ninian’s labours may probably be dated between the years 412 and 432.

(4.) It is to the earlier half of the fifth century that the conversion of Ireland is usually referred. Although there had probably been some Christians in the island before that time, the accounts of bishops who are said to have previously flourished there are rejected as fabulous. Patrick, the “apostle of Ireland”, speaks of himself as having been born at a place called Bonaven, which by some writers is identified with Boulogne, while others suppose it to be a village which from him is called Kilpatrick, near Dumbarton. His original name is said to have been Succath. His father, Calphurnius, was of curial rank, and a deacon of the church; his grandfather, Potitus, was a presbyter. At the age of sixteen the youth was carried off as a captive to Ireland, where he was employed in tending sheep or cattle amid the loneliness of forests and mountains. In this occupation he was exposed to great miseries, but his soul was visited by thoughts to which it had before been a stranger; he prayed often, and his inward fervour rendered him insensible to the frost, the snow, and the rain. After six years of captivity he was delivered by means in which, according to his narrative, Providence takes the aspect of miracle, and returned to his native country. Years passed on; Patrick, according to some accounts, had travelled widely, and had studied under Martin of Tours and German of Auxerre; and he had been ordained a presbyter, when he felt himself called by visions to preach the Gospel in the land where he had been a captive. His friends opposed his design of casting himself among its savage people; one of them, who was most familiar with him, endeavored to prevent his consecration by divulging some act which Patrick had confided to him as having been committed under the age of fifteen thirty years before; but he resolutely broke through all hindrances, and was consecrated bishop of the Irish (A.D. 431)

Palladius, a deacon of the Roman church, but probably a native of Britain, had lately been consecrated by Celestine, and sent to labour among that nation, although rather with a view to the suppression of Pelagianism than to the conversion of the heathen as the primary object of his mission; but after a short stay he had withdrawn, and apparently had died in Scotland. Patrick was more persevering and more successful. He devoted the remainder of his life to the Irish denying himself the satisfaction of revisiting his country and his kindred, and labouring with great effect, although often exposed to perils from the hostility of the druids, and of the heathen princes, who slew many of his converts. The date usually assigned for the commencement of his mission is the same with that of Ninian’s death A.D. 432; the time of his own death has been a subject of dispute, but is most probably referred to the year 493.

(5.) In Southern Germany, where the church had been regularly organized in the time of the Roman dominion, the preservation of the faith through the changes and troubles of the age, and the conversion of the new masters of the country, were mainly due to the exertions of Severin, the “apostle of Noricum”. The origin of this missionary is unknown; he himself, as if from a feeling of humility, took pains to conceal it; but, although he came immediately from the east, the purity of his Latin was supposed to prove that he was a man of Italian birth, who, for the sake of spiritual perfection, had betaken himself to some oriental solitude.

Severin appeared in the region of Bavaria and Austria, shortly after the death of Attila (A.D. 454), and declared that he felt himself called by visions to forego his taste for a contemplative life, in order that he might labour among the people of those countries, which were then desolated by the barbarian invasions. The sight of his voluntary austerities encouraged the wretched inhabitants to endure the privations and other evils which for them were unavoidable; he gained a vast influence over all classes, and obtained from the richer the means of relieving those whose distress was greatest.

Severin declined consecration as a bishop, on the ground that he was sufficiently employed in the ministration to which he had dedicated himself; and in this he was aided by monks of whom he founded communities at Vienna, Juvavium (now Salzburg), Passau, and elsewhere. His venerable character and life awed the rude invaders, who at his suit often showed mercy to the helpless population; his presence was supposed to be a protection to the place of his abode, so that the inhabitants of the Roman towns on the Danube entreated him to reside among them by turns. His prayers were believed to prevail with heaven; the gifts of prophecy and miracles were ascribed to him. Among the instances of his prophetic foresight, it is related that, when visited by Odoacer, who had lately enlisted in the imperial guard, he discerned in the meanly dressed recruit the future king of Italy; and that he foretold the day of his own death, which took place in 482.

(6.) The most important conversion of the fifth century was that of Chlodowig or Clovis, who, from being king of the Salian Franks, with a narrow territory in the neighborhood of Tournay and Cambrai, became the founder of the great French monarchy. Clovis, who succeeded to his hereditary kingdom in 482, married in 493 Chrotochild or Clotilda, the daughter of Chilperic, a Burgundian prince who had adhered to the catholic faith while the rest of his family fell into Arianism, and having been deprived of his inheritance and of life by his Arian brother Gundobald, was popularly regarded by the catholics of Gaul as a martyr for the orthodox faith. Clotilda long and zealously urged her husband to embrace Christianity; but although, among other evidences, she represented to him the miracles for which the shrine of St. Martin, at Tours, was then famous, Clovis remained obstinate measuring the power of a deity by the prosperity of his worshippers, and supposing that the downfall of the Roman empire was a sufficient disproof of the religion which it had professed. The queen, however, prevailed with him to let their firstborn son be baptized, and, in the hope of producing an impression on Clovis, the rite was administered with extraordinary pomp; but the death of the child, which took place within a few days, furnished the king with a new argument against a change of religion. A second son was also baptized, and, as he too fell sick, Clovis expected the vengeance of the gods to show itself in a repetition of the elder brother’s fate; but at the earnest prayer of Clotilda, the prince recovered. The queen continued her attempts to convert her husband, but without success, until at length, when engaged with the Alemanni in the battle of Tolbiac, Clovis, finding himself in danger, invoked the aid of Christ, declaring that his old gods had failed him, and vowing to become a Christian if he should obtain the victory. The Alemanni were defeated; and at Christmas, 496, Clovis with three thousand of his warriors was baptized at Reims by the bishop, Remigius. The cathedral was sumptuously adorned, brilliant with the light of innumerable tapers, and filled with

perfumes of such sweetness that (as we are told) those who were present supposed themselves to be breathing the odours of paradise. As the king entered, amid the solemn chant of hymns, he was struck with awe, and, turning to Remigius, who held him by the hand, he asked whether this were the kingdom of heaven that had been promised to him?. “No”, replied the bishop; “but it is the beginning of the way thither”. The words of Remigius at the administration of the sacrament are famous “Sicambrian, gently bow thy neck; worship that which thou hast burnt, and burn that which thou hast worshipped”. And no less celebrated is the exclamation of Clovis when the bishop one day read to him the story of the Redeemer's passion : “Had I been there with my Franks, I would have avenged his wrongs!”

There is no reason for doubting that the conversion of Clovis was sincere, although it was certainly of no enlightened kind, and although, like that of Constantine (with whom the father of French history compares him), it failed to produce in him a consistent Christian life. Nor is its sincerity to be impeached because it proved favorable to the advance of his power; although in this respect the profession of catholic Christianity, as distinguished from Arianism, involved advantages which he was not slow to discern and to profit by. It secured for him the weighty influence of the clergy, who were bound to him by the tie of mutual interest; those of the south of Gaul, who had been persecuted by the Arian Euric, king of the Visigoths of Toulouse, with a bitterness in which the barbaric hatred of them as Romans was combined with religious intolerance, were ready to welcome an orthodox invader. When he was determined to make war on Euric's successor, Alaric, in the year 507, he gave the attack a character of religion, by declaring himself indignant that Arians should possess a part of the Gaulish soil; and the story of the war thus undertaken for the faith is embellished by the chroniclers with an abundance of miracles in his favour. While unscrupulous in the use of treachery and in profusion of blood for the removal of all who stood in the way of his ambition, he preserved the favour of the clergy by his liberality towards churches and monasteries.

His religious policy was chiefly directed by Remigius, who having been consecrated to the see of Reims in 461, at the age of twenty-two, retained it for seventy-two years; and by his advice Clovis, in the last year of his own life, summoned the first Frankish council to meet at Orleans.

At the time of his conversion Clovis was the only sovereign who professed the orthodox creed; for the other princes of the west were Arians, while the emperor Anastasius favoured the monophysites. Hence the kings of France derived the title of “Eldest Son of the Church”.

From the first invasion of Africa, the Arian Vandals cruelly oppressed the Catholics. When a deputation of bishops and clergy waited on Genseric for the purpose of representing the sufferings of their party, and of entreating that, although deprived of their churches, they might be allowed to live under the Vandal rule and to minister to the consolation of their brethren, he burst into a fury, told them that he did not wish to leave one of their name or race alive, and was with difficulty dissuaded from ordering them to be thrown into the sea. Many bishops and others were banished among the savage tribes of Africa; and here, as had often happened in similar cases, their exile became the occasion of spreading the Gospel to quarters which it had not before reached. After the death of Deogratias whose charity towards Genseric's Roman captives is rendered the more admirable by the depression which his own church was suffering no consecration of bishops was allowed in the province of Africa; and it is said that, in consequence of this prohibition, only three out of a hundred and sixty-four sees were found to be occupied thirty years after (A.D. 487). But Genseric, whose time and thoughts were chiefly employed on plundering expeditions abroad, was a less terrible scourge to the catholics than his son, Hunneric, who succeeded him in 477. In the beginning of his reign, Hunneric affected lenity towards them, and directed his severity against the Manicheans. These sectaries were in the habit of disguising themselves under the profession

of less obnoxious forms of religion; and the king had the mortification of finding that most of those whom he detected had professed to be members, and some of them even clergy, of his own sect having naturally preferred the safest communion as that to which they should ostensibly attach themselves. Hunneric was connected with the imperial family, by having married the captive Eudocia, daughter of Valentinian III and Eudoxia. At the intercession of her sister Placidia, and of the eastern emperor Zeno, he intimated to the Catholics of Carthage, in 481, that they were at liberty to choose a bishop : but he added the condition that the same privileges which he allowed them should be granted in the east to the Arians, with liberty to perform their services and to preach in whatever language they pleased; and he threatened that, if these terms were not observed, the new bishop and his brethren should be sent into banishment among the Moors. The elder Catholics dreaded such conditions, and declared themselves resolved rather to live still under the immediate government of Him who had hitherto protected them. But the eagerness of the younger brethren, who had never seen a bishop of Carthage, prevailed, and Eugenius was consecrated to the see.

The virtues of the new prelate made a general impression, which alarmed the Arian clergy; and at their suggestion, Hunneric issued an order that no person in a Vandal dress should be allowed to enter the churches of the Catholics. Eugenius declared that he could not comply with this order that God's house was open to all; whereupon officers of the government were stationed at the doors of churches, with instructions to scalp all Vandals of either sex who should attempt to enter. For a time, the king's attention was diverted from the persecution by anxiety to secure the succession to the throne for his son. With a view to this, he executed some of his nearest relations, burnt the patriarch of his own sect for the crime of being intimate with the objects of his jealousy, and put many others of the Arian clergy to the same horrible death. The Catholics in the meanwhile apprehended that his fury might probably be next turned on themselves; and visions and other omens are related as having foreshown the approaching trials.

An edict was issued that no one who did not profess Arianism should be employed about the court, or in the public service. The recusants were deprived of all their property, and were banished to Sicily and Sardinia; the possessions of bishops were confiscated; the virgins of the church were seized, and were savagely tortured in the hope of forcing from them an avowal of licentious intercourse with the bishops and clergy. Four thousand nine hundred and seventy-six Catholics bishops, clergy, and laity were condemned to banishment into Mauritania. Hunneric was entreated to spare one aged bishop, who was paralytic in body and imbecile in mind; but he replied that, if the old man could not ride to the place of exile, he should be dragged by wild oxen. The victims, after attempts had in vain been made to cajole them by a show of kindness, were treated with atrocious and loathsome barbarity. Many died on the way in consequence of the cruelty of their Moorish guards; and the survivors found their place of exile pestilential, and infested by venomous serpents.

The king now summoned both parties to a disputation at Carthage. Eugenius professed his willingness to argue, but said that, as the question concerned the whole church, he was not at liberty to engage in a conference without the consent of his brethren in other countries. The objection was advanced in the hope that the Catholics might thus have an opportunity of making their sufferings generally known, and that they might obtain the aid of disputants who not being subjects of Hunneric, might argue without fear of his vengeance; but the tyrant answered it by saying, "Make me master of all the world, and I will grant what you require"; and he banished many of the bishops and other Catholics who had the highest reputation for learning. The first of February, 484, was fixed on for the opening of the conference. At the Epiphany, it is said, a blind man was thrice charged by visions to go to Eugenius, when the bishop should be engaged in the benediction of the font, and to beg for the recovery of his sight. Eugenius after some hesitation performed the cure, by applying the baptismal water in the form of the cross; and the miracle, displayed in the presence of a large congregation, was

hailed by the orthodox with enthusiasm. The Arians, however, ascribed it to magic, and Hunneric, in order at once to terrify the Catholics and to weaken them for the intended disputation, burnt Laetus, one of the most learned members of their party, who had been long confined in prison.

On the appointed day, the Catholics, at their entrance into the place of conference, discovered the Arian patriarch, Cyrila, seated on a lofty throne; an arrangement of which they reasonably complained, as inconsistent with the equality and impartiality which ought to be observed at such meetings. Cyrila, finding them better prepared than he had expected, declined a disputation, on the plea that he could not speak Latin; Eugenius handed in a long profession of faith; and the meeting ended without any discussion

Hunneric followed up the conference by ordering that all the churches of the Catholics should be shut up in one day, and that their funds should be transferred to the Arians. He also issued an edict in which he charged the Catholics with disorderly behavior at the late meeting, and, after a recital of the penalties to which the Arians had been subjected by the imperial laws, he enacted that the Catholics within his dominions should be liable to the like. It was forbidden that any one should give them food or lodging, under pain of being burnt, with his house and family.

The bishops were then required to swear to the succession of the king's son Hilderic. Forty-six who refused, on the plea that Christians ought not to swear a plea which, as the historian of the persecution acknowledges, was intended only to serve as an excuse were sent to cut wood in Corsica; while those who complied, three hundred and two in number, were banished, and obliged to work in agriculture, as having broken the scriptural prohibition against oaths. Eighty-eight bishops were terrified or flattered into an abandonment of the catholic faith.

The barbarities which followed need not be here detailed. Victor of Vite states that the Arian clergy were more cruel than even the officers of the government; he tells us that they used to break into houses, sword in hand, and to force their baptism on the inmates of all ages, often during the night, and while the recipients of this strange sacrament were asleep. The most celebrated incident in the story of the persecution is the case of the confessors of Typasa. The Catholics of that town steadfastly refused to acknowledge an Arian bishop, and persisted in celebrating their rites; whereupon, by Hunneric's command, a number of them sixty, according to some accounts had their right hands amputated and their tongues cut out by the roots. Yet it is related that, by a miracle, they continued to speak as before; and Victor mentions, as a particularly well known member of their company, a subdeacon named Reparatus, who found a home in the palace of Constantinople.

While the persecution was at its height, Africa was laid waste by famine and pestilence, and Hunneric, after a reign of seven years and ten months, died by the same loathsome disease as Herod and other persecutors.

Amid the inconsistent accounts which are given of Hunneric's nephew and successor, Gundamund, it would appear that at first he followed the policy of the preceding reign, but that afterwards he allowed the Catholics to enjoy toleration. His brother, Thrasimund, who reigned from 496 to 523, was the ablest of the Vandal kings, and, unlike his race in general, was distinguished by a love of literature; but he was a bigoted Arian, and, after having in vain attempted to gain the catholics by bribery, laid snares for them, in order to obtain a pretext for persecution. Their sufferings were great during this reign. Thrasimund forbade the consecration of bishops, and sent two hundred and twenty members of the order into banishment for a breach of his prohibition. Among his victims was Eugenius of Carthage, who died in exile at Albi.

On the death of Thrasimund, Hilderic, the same to whom an oath of fidelity had been exacted by his father Hunneric, succeeded to the throne, after an exclusion of nearly forty years. His predecessor had compelled him to swear that he would make no change in the state

of religion; but Hilderic, a prince of gentle temper, thought it less sinful to break than to keep such an engagement, and granted the Catholics the free exercise of their religion.

The usurper Gelimer, in 530, revived the persecuting spirit of Arianism, but within four years the Vandal dominion was overthrown by the arms of Justinian's general, Belisarius. During the contest with the Vandals the most eminent controversialists on the catholic side were Vigilus, bishop of Tapsus (to whom some have ascribed the authorship of the Athanasian creed), and Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe.

CHAPTER VI.

MONOPHYSITISM.—JUSTINIAN.—THE THREE ARTICLES.
A.D. 451-566.

The council of Chalcedon was represented as Nestorian by its opponents, and the strife which it was meant to allay continued to distract the church. The name of Eutychians was soon superseded by that of Monophysites, *i.e.* maintainers of one nature only; for Eutyches himself fell into discredit, and those who rejected the late council were generally willing to anathematize him, on account of a sort of docetism which was imputed to him—an opinion that the body of our Lord was not truly human, but had descended from heaven.

The monophysites, on the contrary, maintained that the Saviour was “consubstantial with us, as touching his flesh”; while as to his soul they rejected the idea of an absorption of the manhood into the Godhead, and reverted to the formula “one incarnate nature”, acknowledging, moreover, that this one nature was twofold. In addition to the elder authorities on which they had hitherto relied, the monophysites were reinforced towards the end of the century by a forgery executed in Egypt—the mystical works ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite. These writings, although originally brought forward by a heterodox party, and although their essence is said to be not Christian, but neo-Platonic, were, with hardly a question, universally received as genuine, and retained their credit for a thousand years.

Juvenal of Jerusalem, on returning from Chalcedon, found that the see for which he had just achieved the patriarchal dignity was occupied by a turbulent monk named Theodosius, who was countenanced by Eudocia, widow of the emperor Theodosius II. For two years this intruder held possession of Palestine, being supported by monks and by a force of ruffians, who exercised a general system of terror, burning houses and monasteries, expelling bishops and clergy, and committing murders without restraint. At length, however, through the conciliatory policy of Marcian and Pulcheria, his chief supporters were drawn away from him. Juvenal resumed his bishopric, and after a time Eudocia, partly influenced by the persuasions of Symeon the Stylite, and partly by the calamities which had befallen her daughter and grandchildren in the Vandal expedition against Rome, was induced to rejoin the catholic communion.

At Alexandria Proterius was elected in the room of Dioscorus (A.D. 452), but found himself fiercely opposed by a powerful faction, which could only be kept down by a military force at the expense of much bloodshed. On the death of the emperor Marcian (457), the malcontents thought that their opportunity had at length arrived. Timothy named Elurus (the Cat), who, with Peter Mongus (the hoarse), had separated from the communion of Proterius, and had been excommunicated by him, raised a mob, and was consecrated by two deposed bishops. On Thursday before Easter Proterius was murdered in the baptistery of his cathedral; his body, after having been hung up in mockery, was dragged about the streets and cut in pieces; some of the multitude tasted his entrails; the remains were then burnt, and the ashes were scattered to the winds. The catholic clergy were expelled, and the other adherents of Proterius were persecuted.

The accession of Marcian’s successor, Leo, was rendered remarkable by his receiving the crown from the hands of the patriarch Anatolius,—the first instance of a solemnity which has become usual in Christian states. The new emperor, who before his elevation had been a military officer, began by publishing a confirmation of all that his predecessor had done in the

matter of religion. The Alexandrian differences were soon brought under his notice by some envoys of each party; whereupon he issued a requisition to the bishops of every province, and to the most eminent monks, desiring them to give their opinions on the council of Chalcedon and on the pretensions of Elurus. By this expedient Leo probably hoped to obtain a judgment equivalent to that of a general council, without risking the inconveniences connected with such assemblies. The result was an unanimous sentence against Elurus and in favour of the council; although some bishops of Pamphylia, while they admitted the correctness of the decisions of Chalcedon, and their utility for the defence of the faith, questioned the fitness of imposing them as terms of communion. Elurus was banished to Cherson; and another Timothy, an ecclesiastic of the catholic party (who is distinguished by the names of Salophaciolus and the White), was chosen in his stead, and for fifteen years governed the Alexandrian church with wisdom and moderation

Leo was succeeded in 474 by his grandson of the same name, the son of his daughter Ariadne by Zeno; but the child died within a year, and Zeno remained in possession of the throne. The private character of this emperor was stained by gross and shameless debauchery. His reign was disquieted by many rebellions, one which compelled him for nearly two years to give way to Basiliscus, the brother-in-law of Leo, —the same whose misconduct in the expedition against the Vandals of Africa has already been mentioned. Basiliscus, who was supported by the monophysite party, recalled Timothy Elurus from banishment, and restored him to the see of Alexandria; he also restored to Antioch Peter “the Fuller”, a monophysite, who had been twice expelled from the see in the reign of Leo; and he took it upon himself to issue an encyclic or circular letter, condemning the council of Chalcedon, and laying down definitions as to faith—the first document of the kind which had been put forth by any emperor. Timothy of Alexandria, Peter of Antioch, and, it is said, about five hundred other bishops, subscribed the edict. But Acacius, who in 471 had become patriarch of Constantinople, displayed on this occasion a vehemence which contrasts strongly with the courtly and equivocating policy of his ordinary conduct as to matters of religion. Perhaps, as has been suggested, Acacius may have been animated in his opposition to Basiliscus, not only by zeal for the faith of Chalcedon, but by a regard for the privileges which the council had bestowed on his see, and by attachment to the emperor to whom he had owed his elevation. He arrayed his person and his church in mourning, and by his preaching excited the monks and people of the capital against the usurper. Both Basiliscus and the patriarch sent envoys to Daniel the stylite, who had succeeded Symeon as the most revered oracle of the time. Warned by a vision, Daniel descended from his pillar, and appeared in Constantinople; he confirmed the orthodoxy of the council of Chalcedon by performing a number of miracles, denounced against Basiliscus the judgments of this world and of the next, and did not leave the city until the usurper, alarmed at the report that Zeno was approaching, and was supported by the whole catholic party, published a second edict, revoking his circular, anathematizing Eutyches as well as Nestorius, and approving the council of Chalcedon. It is said that Basiliscus fled for safety to a church, and that the patriarch, disregarding the example of his great predecessor Chrysostom, gave up the unhappy man to the relentless vengeance of Zeno.

Things were now again changed. Most of the bishops who had signed the circular of Basiliscus eagerly went over to the opposite party. Peter the Fuller was ejected from Antioch, and Elurus would have been ejected from Alexandria but that his advanced age promised a speedy vacancy in the see. On his death, which took place before the end of the year 477, Peter Mongus was irregularly consecrated as patriarch by two deprived bishops, if not by a single bishop. The emperor deposed, but did not banish him, and Timothy Salophaciolus was reinstated. This patriarch administered his office with a mildness which drew from the emperor admonitions to be more rigid in suppressing the meetings of the monophysites; while with these he was so popular that, on meeting him in the streets, they used to express their regard for him, and their regret at being obliged to stand aloof from his communion. On his

death, in 482, John Talaia, steward of the church, was elected to the patriarchate; but the emperor objected to him on account of his connexion with Illus, an officer who had lately revolted. Talaia was expelled, and took refuge at Rome; and Peter Mongus renewed his pretensions to the see of Alexandria.

The doctrines of the monophysites had by degrees been so greatly improved from the original Eutychianism that the idea of reconciling the party with the Catholics might now appear not unreasonable or hopeless. By the advice of Acacius, Zeno put forth a document bearing the title of Henoticon (or Form of Union), which was originally addressed to the Egyptian patriarchate, but was afterwards made a standard for other churches also. In this, the emperor, after alluding to the discords, the bloodshed, the destitution of the means of grace, and other unhappy consequences which had resulted from the late controversies, declares the creed of Nicaea and Constantinople to be the only baptismal creed, anathematizes Nestorius and Eutyches, and approves of Cyril's twelve anathemas. He states that Christ is "consubstantial with the Father as touching his Godhead, and with us as touching his manhood"; that "the miracles and the sufferings were of one and the same Person". He reprobates those who "divide, confuse, or introduce the notion of a phantasy"; he anathematizes "any one who thought or thinks anything to the contrary, either now or at document was composed in the belief that the doctrine of Chalcedon would of itself be received without objection in quarters where the name of the council was obnoxious"; and, while it avoided the expression "in two natures" and the confirmation of the council, it set forth those points of doctrine as to which both parties were agreed. But the care which was taken to consult the prejudices of the monophysites naturally rendered it objectionable to the Catholics; and the mention of Chalcedon, although only in a hypothetical form, appeared to go somewhat beyond a neutrality, as if a slight to the council were intended. At Rome, especially, no approbation was to be expected, inasmuch as the bishop had not been consulted on the occasion, and as there was no mention of Leo's letter to Flavian.

It was intimated to Peter Mongus, that, on condition of subscribing the Henoticon and of admitting the Proterians to communion, he might be allowed to hold the bishopric of Alexandria. To these terms he consented and the great body of the Catholics submitted to him, while the extreme Eutychians formed a separate sect, which, as being without a head, received the name of Acephali. Peter endeavoured to gain these by anathematizing the council of Chalcedon and the letter to Flavian; it is even said that with the same view he disinterred the body of Salophaciolus. In answer to a remonstrance from Acacius, he said that he had accepted the council of Chalcedon as containing no innovation on the faith, but he did not deny that he had acted with a tortuous policy. While Peter laboured by such means, but with very little success, to conciliate the Acephali, he exercised great severity towards such of the Catholics as refused to communicate with him.

Peter was received into communion by Acacius, and by Martyrius of Jerusalem; and the patriarch of Constantinople wrote in his behalf to Rome. But the interest of Rome had been already gained by the expelled bishop of Alexandria, John Talaia. Two successive popes, Simplicius and Felix, addressed letters in favour of him both to the emperor and to Acacius; but the patriarch in reply assured Felix that Peter was a rightly chosen and orthodox bishop, and Zeno threw out charges of perjury against John. Acacius won over two legates of Felix, and persuaded them to be present at a service in which the name of Peter was recited in the diptychs—an act by which they seemed to give the sanction of Rome to his tenure of the Alexandrian patriarchate. For this compliance the legates, on their return home, were tried before an Italian synod, which deposed and excommunicated them; and the synod proceeded to condemn Acacius, whom Felix had previously cited to appear at Rome and give an account of his communicating with Peter Mongus. The sentence was intimated to Acacius in a letter from Felix and other bishops, declaring him to be deposed, degraded, and separated from the number of the faithful, as having been condemned by the judgment of the Holy Spirit and by

apostolical authority, so that he should never be unloosed from the anathema pronounced against him. The Roman bishop would probably not have ventured on this unexampled proceeding, but that the reign of Odoacer in Italy had encouraged him to disregard the emperor of the east. The Greeks complained of the irregularity with which it was conducted as well as of the assumption which it involved. Acacius took no other notice of it than by removing the name of Felix from the diptychs of Constantinople.

The deposition of Acacius was announced by Felix to the clergy and people of Constantinople, and it was declared that all who should not separate from the patriarch were cut off from the communion of Rome. A great number of monks, including the Acoemetæ, a society of extraordinary repute for sanctity, preferred the connexion of Rome to that of their own bishop; so that division was thus introduced into the church of the eastern capital itself. The schism which ensued lasted five-and-thirty years, and the precipitancy with which the excommunication was pronounced was equalled by the rigour with which it was carried out—the bishops of Rome treating the whole east as heretical for refusing to break with Acacius, although he himself had not been charged with heresy, but only with the secondary offence of communicating with alleged heretics. Tillemont remarks on this occasion that later popes have been glad to invoke the intercession of saints whom, when alive, their predecessors rejected from communion.

Within a few years, the chief persons who had been concerned in the monophysite troubles were removed from the scene. The last days of John Talaia were spent in an Italian bishopric, which had been bestowed on him by Felix. Peter the Fuller—who in 485 had been established in the see of Antioch on signing the Henoticon, and had been acknowledged by his namesake of Alexandria, although Acacius evaded a recognition of him—died in 488; and Acacius in the following year. Fravitta, the successor of Acacius, held the patriarchate for only four months, and was succeeded by Euphemius, an orthodox bishop who renounced the communion of Peter Mongus, and was preparing for a contest with him, when the patriarch of Alexandria died. At the death of Zeno, in 491, the church, instead of having been united by his Henoticon, was divided into three great parties:—Antioch, under Palladius, and Alexandria, under Athanasius, were monophysite; Jerusalem was with Constantinople; while Rome and the west stood aloof.

Anastasius, on whom the daughter of Leo and widow of Zeno bestowed her hand and the empire, had already attained the age of sixty, and reigned twenty-seven years. Before his elevation he bore a high character for piety; and his general reputation is attested by the cry with which he was greeted—“Reign as you have lived!”. He was, however, suspected by the patriarch Euphemius, who refused to consent to his promotion, except on receiving a written assurance that no innovation should be attempted in the matter of religion, and that the council of Chalcedon should be maintained. It is said that some of the emperor’s relations were Arians and Manicheans; and by many writers he is charged with the errors of those sects, as well as with that of the monophysites, whose interests were favoured by the result, if not by the intention, of his policy. Yet his orthodoxy has been warmly defended; and his principle of action has been characterized as impartiality rather than indifference. Anastasius professed to aim at peace, and to abhor the idea that any who believed in Christ, and bore the name of Romans, should be vexed on account of their opinions. Evagrius tells us that under him the council of Chalcedon was neither openly preached nor wholly rejected; that the bishops took different courses with respect to it; and that the emperor, in his desire to check all innovation, ejected those who introduced into their dioceses a change in either direction. Throughout the reign the eastern patriarchates continued to be unquiet, and the Henoticon was the test generally prescribed—a test to which all but the extreme members of the opposite parties were willing to submit, but which had the disadvantage of being insufficient to insure harmony among those who subscribed it. The dissensions of the clergy among themselves compelled Anastasius to depart so far in practice from his principle of peace or indifference, that to the

Catholics he appeared a persecutor, and his name is marked with especial detestation by the orthodox historians. Tales of impiety, which savour strongly of fiction, are related of him; miracles and portents are said to have declared the wrath of heaven against him; and his end is described with fabulous circumstances of horror.

Euphemius of Constantinople was deposed and banished in 496; his successor, Macedonius, in 511 or 512. Although the ejection of Euphemius was ostensibly grounded on political charges, it is probable that in both cases the patriarchs had offended by refusing to enter into the policy of the court as to religion. Alexandria was held by a succession of bishops who rejected the council of Chalcedon, but were yet unable to reduce the Acephali to their communion. In the patriarchate of Antioch, the religious agitations of the time occasioned much tumult and bloodshed. Flavian, one of its bishops, was banished in 512, although, in order to clear himself from the charge of Nestorianism, he had gradually yielded to anathematize, not only Nestorius, but Diodore, Theodore, Theodoret, Ibas, and finally the council of Chalcedon. Elias of Jerusalem, who in like manner had made large concessions, was nevertheless deposed in the following year. Throughout the reign of Anastasius, Rome remained in separation from the east. The overtures from Euphemius and the emperor were met with unbending haughtiness by Gelasius, who filled the see from 492 to 496. The next bishop, Anastasius II, opened communications with Constantinople in a tone of conciliation; it is said that he was willing, for the sake of peace, even to admit that the name of Acacius should remain in the diptychs. But his death put a stop to the negotiation, and his successor, Symmachus, exchanged with the eastern emperor accusations of heresy and messages of defiance.

Severus, a monk who afterwards became patriarch of Antioch on the deprivation of Flavian, introduced at Constantinople an addition which Peter the Fuller had made to the *trisagion*—the words, “Who was crucified for us”. In consequence of this a serious collision took place between the Catholics and the monophysites of the capital, during the episcopate of Macedonius; but after his deposition one of still more alarming character arose. By order of the emperor, two prefects entered a church, ascended the pulpit or screen, and began to chant the *trisagion* with the Antiochene addition; whereupon a tumult ensued, many persons were killed, and a number of Catholics were committed to prison. On the following day a fresh conflict took place; and the disturbance came to its height on the occasion of a solemn procession, which took place on the third day. Timothy, the monophysite successor of Macedonius, had given orders that the new clause should be used. Those who obeyed him were met by bands of the catholic monks, chanting the *trisagion* in its old form; the parties fell to blows; the populace of the city mixed in the fray, and many lives were lost. Among the slain were a female recluse, and a monk who was suspected of having suggested the performance of the prefects to the emperor; the monk’s head was cut off, stuck on a pole, and carried in procession as that of an enemy to the Divine Trinity. Houses were sacked and burnt; the emperor’s pictures and statues were defaced and thrown down, and there were cries for a new emperor. Anastasius, then more than eighty years of age, withdrew from the city; but after three days he presented himself in the circus without the ensigns of sovereignty, when the multitude, by way of insult, received him by shouting the orthodox *trisagion*. He addressed them by the mouth of a herald, professing himself willing to abdicate, but reminding them that they could not all reign, and that they must make choice of one for their emperor. The people were moved by his words, and by the sight of his humiliation; and, after having promised to gratify them with the blood of the obnoxious prefects, he was allowed to resume the government.

The last years of the reign were disquieted by the insurrection of Vitalian, a Scythian or Gothic chief, who took arms for the catholic faith, devastated Thrace, and threatened Constantinople. He required that the banished orthodox bishops should be restored; that the council of Chalcedon should be acknowledged; that communion with Rome should be

resumed, and that a new general council should be called, at which the pope should assist. To these terms the emperor at length submitted; but the exorbitant demands of Hormisdas, the successor of Symmachus, prevented any accommodation between the east and the west during the lifetime of Anastasius. The emperor died in 518, and was succeeded by Justin, an aged soldier of Slavonic race, in whose name the government was really administered by his nephew Justinian. Vitalian after having been promoted to the highest offices by the new sovereign, was in the seventh month of his consulship treacherously assassinated at the imperial table; and Justinian is suspected of having contrived his murder.

Timothy, patriarch of Constantinople, had died a short time before the emperor Anastasius. When his successor, John, appeared in the cathedral on the first Sunday after the accession of Justin, he was greeted with loud outcries, that, since the Manichaean Anastasius no longer reigned, the council of Chalcedon should be confirmed, Severus of Antioch, with the rest of the “Manicheans”, should be expelled, and a reconciliation should be established with Rome. The new government was disposed to comply with the popular desire; Severus and other monophysites were deprived, and for the most part took refuge at Alexandria, where their party was so strong that the emperor did not venture to excite the unruly population by any attempt against it. But the concourse of monophysite teachers had the effect of producing or bringing to light differences among themselves; and many of them branched off into minor sects—such as Agnoetes, Aphthartodocetes, and Niobites—whose tenets and history need not be here detailed.

Fresh overtures were now made from Constantinople to Hormisdas of Rome, and all his demands were granted. The names of Acacius and of his four successors who had died during the schism, with those of the emperors Anastasius and Zeno, were removed from the diptychs. The orthodox confessors Euphemius and Macedonius were not distinguished from the heretical Fravitta and Timothy; but Acacius was more especially reprobated by an anathema. It was found, however, that many churches of the east were not so ready as that of Constantinople to abandon the memory of their late bishops; and, as Hormisdas required the sacrifice of all who had communicated with Acacius, the demand occasioned disturbances so serious that both the imperial government and the patriarch repeatedly entreated the pope to abate the rigour of his terms. Hormisdas at length agreed to empower the patriarch Epiphanius, the successor of John, to act for him in receiving the churches into communion. The matter was accommodated by the retention of certain names on the diptychs; and eventually Euphemius and Macedonius, with Flavian of Antioch, Elias of Jerusalem, and some others who had died during the separation, were acknowledged by Rome as saints. The Henoticon, without being formally repealed, from this time disappeared; and everywhere, except in Egypt, the council of Chalcedon was received.

About the same time that Anastasius ascended the throne of Constantinople, the sovereignty of Italy was transferred from the Herulians to the Ostrogoths. Theodoric, prince of the Amali, after having endangered the empire of Zeno, had received his permission to undertake the conquest of that country. He defeated Odoacer in three great battles, and, after having besieged him for three years in Ravenna, admitted him to a treaty on equal terms. But the Herulian king, on a pretended charge of conspiracy, was stabbed at a banquet—perhaps even by the hand of his colleague and rival—and the Goths became sole masters of Italy.

After the death of Odoacer, Theodoric reigned thirty- three years with vigour and in prosperity. His dominions extended as far as the Danube, and he put a bar to the extension of the Frankish conquests under Clovis. His wisdom and justice were exerted for the establishment of equality between the victorious and the conquered races, and, while he adhered to the Arian creed of his nation, he did not attempt to enforce it on others. “We cannot impose religion by command”, he said, “since no one can be made to believe against his will”. He employed Catholics as his ministers, and entrusted catholic bishops with the most important embassies; he acknowledged the orthodox clergy in their position, bestowed

munificent gifts on their churches, and, although unwilling to interfere in the internal concerns of the church, he exercised over the bishops of Rome a control which the later emperors of the west had through weakness allowed to escape from their hands. His toleration (as we have seen) did not extend to the allowance of pagan rites although he exerted a watchful care to preserve the monuments of Roman greatness; but it included the Jews, whom he steadily protected against the outrages of their Christian neighbours.

So long as Rome and Constantinople were separated by schism, Theodoric had no reason to distrust the loyalty of his catholic subjects. But the reconciliation of the churches, in the beginning of Justin's reign, suggested to him that the Romans might be tempted to look towards the east for deliverance from the sway of a barbarian conqueror; and in no long time his anger and alarm were excited by the measures which Justin took for the purpose of establishing unity of religion. In 523 the emperor issued edicts by which it was ordered that Manicheans should be capitally punished; that other heretics should not be allowed to celebrate their worship; and that, with Jews, Pagans, and Samaritans, they should be excluded from civil or military employment. The Gothic soldiery of the empire were, indeed, exempted from this law; but Theodoric was bent on securing, not only for his own nation but for the oriental members of his sect, the same freedom of religion which he allowed to his catholic subjects. He earnestly remonstrated with Justin by letter; and, as the reply was unsatisfactory, he despatched to Constantinople an embassy consisting of John, bishop of Rome, five other bishops, and four senators. It was the first time that a pope had visited the eastern capital. John was received with unbounded reverence; almost the whole population of the city poured forth to greet his arrival, bearing torches and crosses in their hands, and the emperor cast himself at his feet. The patriarch of Constantinople yielded him precedence, and Justin submitted to a new coronation by the hands of the successor of St. Peter. But on his return to Italy, John was cast into prison, where he soon after died. The reasons of his imprisonment are matter of uncertainty and dispute; the most probable opinion appears to be, that the bishop, although he successfully performed the other parts of the commission, had refused to ask that Arians who had professed Catholicism might be allowed to return to their heresy; and that the jealousy of Theodoric was also offended by the excessive honours which had been paid to him by the eastern court. The dread of conspiracy against his rule had exasperated the aged king to gloomy and relentless suspicion of his Italian subjects, which had already been fatal to two of the most distinguished among them,—Boethius and Symmachus. Boethius had filled the highest offices of the state; while his genius and the learning in which he was believed to surpass all his contemporaries had been displayed in works embracing an extraordinary variety of subjects and modes of composition—history, poetry, theology, philosophy, music, mathematics, astronomy, and other branches of physical science. He had long enjoyed the favour of Theodoric; but his character as a patriot, and perhaps also as a catholic, rendered his position hazardous, and the zeal with which he asserted the innocence of his friend Albinus, who was accused of a treasonable correspondence with the east, exposed him to a share in the accusation. A signature, which he declared to be forged, was produced as evidence against him; he was denied the opportunity of defending himself, and, a short time before the mission of John to Constantinople, was committed to a tower at or near Pavia, where he solaced himself by the composition of his famous books *On the Consolation of Philosophy*. After having been cruelly tortured, Boethius was beaten to death with clubs, and his father-in-law, the venerable chief of the senate, Symmachus, on an apprehension that the desire of vengeance might tempt him to treason, was soon after summoned to Ravenna and beheaded.

Theodoric himself did not long survive. It is said that, in indignation at the result of the mission to Constantinople, he went so far as to dictate an edict for the suppression of the catholic worship in Italy; although, if this statement be true, it is certain that the law was not carried into effect. But the feelings which the once just and tolerant king had aroused by the severities of his last days, are apparent from the stories connected with his death. Procopius

tells us that he was haunted by a frightful vision, in which remorse called up before his eyes the form of the murdered Symmachus; and a legend, to which the name of Pope Gregory the Great gave currency and credit, relates that a hermit on the island of Lipari saw the Arian persecutor cast by Symmachus and Pope John into the crater of the volcano, which was believed to be the entrance of hell.

In April 527, Justinian was formally associated with his uncle as a colleague, and in August of the same year he became sole emperor, at the age of forty-five. Among the secular events of his long reign, the wars in Italy and in Africa had an important bearing on the history of religion.

Among the Vandals of Africa, the possession of the means of luxury had speedily proved fatal to that purity of manners which Salvian at an earlier time had indignantly contrasted with the depravity of his brethren who professed a sounder faith. The valour of the barbarians was undermined by the temptations of sensual enjoyment; the usurper Gelimer was dethroned by the arms of the imperial general, Belisarius; and some years later, on a rebellion of the Vandals and Moors, the country was completely subjugated. After the first conquest the catholic church was restored to its ascendancy, although the bishops were reduced to one-half or one-third of their ancient number. It is reckoned that during the reign of Justinian Africa lost five millions of inhabitants; thus Arianism was extinguished in that region, not by an enforcement of conformity, but by the extermination of the race which had introduced and professed it.

The Ostrogoths of Italy, after the death of Theodoric, were distracted by factions and crimes. The military achievements of Belisarius and Narses in the peninsula threw a last and deceptive splendour over the power of the eastern empire. By these generals the Gothic kings, Vitiges (537-9), Totila (546-52), and Teias (553), were successively defeated, the invasions of the Franks and the Alemanni were repelled; and from the year 554, Narses, with the title of exarch, administered the government of Italy as a deputy of the emperor. The sufferings of the country during the revolutions of this period were greater than those which it has endured in any other of its calamities, whether earlier or later; the number of its inhabitants who perished by war, by famine, or in other ways, is supposed to have exceeded the whole of its modern population. With the Gothic monarchy, Arianism for a time disappeared from Italy.

Justinian lived strictly and spent much of his time in theological studies. He was fond of mixing in controversy and of acting as a regulator in religion, so that his subjects derided him for devoting himself to such matters, while he left the great political and military affairs of the empire to the management of his ministers and generals. He was munificent in his gifts for building churches and hospitals; but it is said that the means of this liberality were too commonly obtained by extortion, corrupt administration of justice, false accusations, and wrongful confiscation. The greatest architectural monument of his reign was the patriarchal church of the eternal Wisdom (St. Sophia). This church had been originally built by Constantine; it had been destroyed by fire at the time of Chrysostom's banishment, and, after having been then restored, was again burnt down in the tumult known by the name of Nika (532). Justinian rebuilt it at a vast expense and as he cast his eyes around the magnificent structure on the day of the dedication, after expressing his thankfulness to God who had permitted him to accomplish so great a work, (544), he exclaimed, "O Solomon, I have surpassed thee!". The dome of the dome church was afterwards shattered by an earthquake (557); but Justinian restored it with increased height and splendour, and performed a second dedication in the thirty-sixth year of his reign. The establishment of the cathedral was fixed by one of his laws at the number of 60 priests, 100 deacons, 40 deaconesses, 90 subdeacons, no readers, 25 singers, and 100 ostiaries and, ample as this provision may seem, the law was set forth as a check on the practice of bishops, who had been in the habit of ordaining clergy without any limit, and without considering whether the church had the means of supporting them.

To the reign of Justinian is referred the extinction of philosophical heathenism. The Neoplatonists had until then continued to teach at Athens. They were obliged outwardly to respect the religion of the state; but their esoteric doctrines were pagan, and their system, in its mysticism and in its pretension to intercourse with higher powers, bore a curious resemblance to the superstitions which were at the same time growing on the church. With a view to depriving paganism of its last support, Justinian in 529 ordered that the schools of Athens should be closed; whereupon Simplicius and six other philosophers, who were bereft of their occupation by the edict, feeling themselves insecure within the imperial territories, resolved to emigrate to Persia and seek the patronage of King Chosroes, of whose enlightenment they had heard exaggerated celebrations, and whose subjects had been described to them as faultless models of every social virtue. But although they were well received by the king, they found their expectations grievously disappointed, and sighed for their native country, to which they eagerly desired to return, even at the risk of encountering persecution. In a treaty with Justinian, Chosroes stipulated that they should be exempted from the penal laws against their religion; they lived unmolested during the remainder of their days, and left no disciples or successors.

In the same year with his order for closing the Athenian schools, the emperor enacted that all pagans and heretics should be excluded from civil or military office. They were allowed three months to choose between conformity and banishment; or, if permitted to remain without abjuring their errors, they were to be deprived of all civil privileges. A great mass of pretended conversions was the result; while the edict produced a serious insurrection among the Samaritans, and many sectaries, who abhorred the hypocrisy of changing their religion at the emperor's command, were driven by desperation to suicide. The most noted act of this kind was performed by some Montanists in Phrygia, who shut themselves up in their meeting-houses, set fire to them, and perished in the flames.

Although Justinian was a "synodite", or partisan of the council of Chalcedon, his wife Theodora, whom he raised to the position of a colleague in the empire, was a zealous monophysite. As her influence over her husband was unbounded in all other respects, it has been suggested that this division of theological interests may have been a matter of politic arrangement between the imperial pair. Theodora gathered round her a party of monophysites: she prevailed on Justinian to invite Severus, the expelled patriarch of Antioch, to the capital, and even promoted Anthimus, a secret enemy of the council of Chalcedon, to the patriarchate of Constantinople. In the year after this appointment, Agapetus, bishop of Rome, was obliged by the Gothic king Theodahat to undertake a mission to Constantinople, for the purpose of averting a threatened attack of Justinian. The mission failed of its political object; but at the request of the catholic party, Agapetus exposed to the emperor the heterodoxy of Anthimus, and obtained his deposition on the ground that he had been uncanonically translated from another see. Mennas, who was raised to the vacant chair, was consecrated by the pope, and soon after held a council, at which Anthimus, after an examination of his opinions, was found guilty of heresy and was excommunicated.

Agapetus died at Constantinople before the meeting of this council, and Vigilius, his archdeacon, who had accompanied him, was urged by Theodora to become a candidate for the papacy. The emperor promised to support him with influence and with money, if he would condemn the council of Chalcedon, and would communicate with Anthimus and other monophysites; but before he could reach Rome, a subdeacon named Sylverius, son of Pope Hormisdas, was elected. In the following year, while Belisarius was besieged in Rome by the Goths, Sylverius was summoned to appear before him. The general's wife, Antonina, who was reclining on a couch, while Belisarius occupied a place at her feet, reproached the pope for having entered into a treasonable correspondence with the enemy. His attempts at denial were overpowered by the production of written evidence; he was immediately stripped of the ensigns of his dignity, and was sent off by sea to the east, while Vigilius was elected in his

room, and paid for the interest of Belisarius two hundred pounds of gold. Sylverius, after having been banished to Patara, in Lycia, was sent back to Italy by Justinian, in order to a fresh investigation of his case; but through the contrivance of the intruder he was seized and carried off to the island of Palmaria (Palmarola), where he died of hunger. Although, however, Vigilus had thus delivered himself from his rival, his position was one of much difficulty and danger; for he had made a secret compact with Theodora to labour against the council of Chalcedon, while his public engagements bound him to an opposite line of conduct.

From about the year 520, the monasteries of Palestine had been agitated by disturbances on the subject of Origen's opinions, which were especially maintained by the members of the "New Laura" (a society founded by St. Sabbas, in the beginning of the century), while the other monks were for the most part violent anti-Origenists. There had been censures, expulsions, frequent affrays, and considerable bloodshed. The patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem were unable to allay the differences, and Justinian was well pleased to receive an appeal in the matter. He published a letter to the patriarch Mennas, censuring certain doctrines extracted or inferred from Origen's writings; he declared that these doctrines were borrowed from Plato and the Manicheans (apparently forgetting that Manes was later than Origen); and he desired the patriarch to bring the question before the home synod. By this body the opinions of Origen were again censured, and fifteen anathemas were pronounced against them. The imperial manifesto was subscribed by Vigilus and by the four patriarchs of the east; but the course of ecclesiastical politics now took a curious and unexpected turn.

Theodore Ascidas, a monk of Origenistic opinions, who had been appointed to the bishopric of Caesarea in Cappadocia, but usually resided at Constantinople, had acquired great influence over Justinian. By some process of casuistry, he prevailed on himself to sign the anathemas against Origen; but he felt the necessity of diverting the emperor's mind from the dangerous direction which it had taken. Knowing Justinian's anxiety to reduce the Acephali to conformity, Theodore told him that their opposition to the council of Chalcedon did not arise from repugnance to its doctrines, but from its acknowledgment of persons suspected of Nestorianism—such as Theodoret and Ibas; he therefore suggested that, by a condemnation of these bishops, with the reputed father of Nestorianism, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the prejudices of the party might be overcome, and they might be won to a reconciliation with the church. As for the objection to condemning persons who had died in the catholic communion, it was (he said) removed by the late precedent of the anathemas against Origen. By this suggestion Ascidas may have hoped not only to secure the important object of engaging the emperor in a new question, but doubly to gratify himself—as an Origenist, by proscribing the great master of literal interpretation, and as a monophysite, by striking a blow at the authority of the fourth general council.

The device was in so far successful that, instead of controversies as to Origenism and monophysitism, the general attention was soon occupied by a dispute whether certain writings a century old were favourable to Nestorianism. Justinian published an edict in which he condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia and his works, Theodoret's writings in favour of Nestorius and against Cyril, and a letter from Ibas to a Persian named Maris. This letter, written under great exasperation, severely reflected on Cyril; but its orthodoxy as to doctrine had been expressly acknowledged at Chalcedon. The emperor, however, contrived to reconcile his condemnation of the letter with his profession of respect for the council by the supposition that a forged document had been substituted for that which the fathers of Chalcedon had approved. It was required that the edict should be subscribed by all bishops. Mennas signed it with the stipulation that he should be at liberty to retract his signature if the bishop of Rome should refuse to concur—a reservation of which he did not afterwards avail himself. The eastern bishops in general submitted, although the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, with many others, showed much reluctance to subscribe; the few who refused were banished. But in Africa, where the old independent spirit of the church had been

exercised in opposition to the temporal power during the century of Vandal oppression, the proposal met with a lively resistance. The African bishops protested against reopening questions which the council of Chalcedon had settled, or condemning persons who had died in the communion of the church; and a like disposition to resist was displayed in other quarters. The commotions rose to such a height that Ascidas is said to have afterwards owned that he himself, and the Roman deacon Pelagius, who had been concerned in bringing the Origenistic question under the emperor's notice, deserved to be burnt alive as the authors of them.

Vigilius, alarmed by these events and by the temper of his own clergy, refused to sign the edict, and was obliged by the emperor (who probably apprehended a new division between the eastern and western churches) to repair to Constantinople, where he was detained upwards of seven years. His legate Stephen, with other ecclesiastics of the west, who were then at Constantinople, had broken off communion with Mennas, on the ground that the patriarch ought not to have acted in the matter, except, as had been before agreed, in concert with the pope. Vigilius at first refused to communicate with Mennas, but was persuaded to an agreement with him by Theodora, who died in the year after the pope's arrival; and he bound himself to Justinian by a secret written engagement to condemn the three articles—by which name the points in question as to Theodore, Theodoret, and Ibas were generally designated. The pope submitted the matter to a synod of seventy western bishops, which was held at Constantinople in 548; but as the African members steadily refused to lend themselves to his change of policy, it became evident that no favourable decision was to be obtained, and he broke up the assembly. Vigilius then endeavoured to gain the bishops individually, and sent forth a document known by the title of his *Judicatum*, in which he attempted to satisfy both parties—the Orientals, by condemning the three articles; the Latins, by professing that he did so without prejudice to the council of Chalcedon. But in the latter object he was utterly disappointed. An African synod, under Reparatus of Carthage, excommunicated him. The churches of Illyria and Dalmatia were roused to vehement opposition, and the commotion reached as far as Gaul and Scythia; even some of the pope's own deacons, who had accompanied him to Constantinople, charged their master with an abandonment of the council of Chalcedon, and returned to agitate the west against him. Facundus, bishop of Hermiane, in Africa, who had distinguished himself in the council of Constantinople, addressed to the emperor in 549 an able and spirited defence of the three articles. He maintained the orthodoxy of Theodore of Mopsuestia; he argued that he, Theodoret, and Ibas, could not be condemned without impugning the council of Chalcedon, and doing away with its authority against Eutychianism; and he plainly desired the emperor to take warning from a comparison between those of his predecessors who had left the decision of theological questions to the bishops, and those who had ventured to arrogate it to themselves.

The only means to which Vigilius could now look for deliverance from the perplexity in which he found himself, between the emperor's wishes on the one hand and the determined opposition of his western brethren on the other, was a general council; he therefore proposed that such an assembly should be summoned, and withdrew his *Judicatum* until it should meet. Justinian assented; but, apprehending that the pope might perhaps attempt some evasion under shelter of the council, he bound him by fresh obligations, which were confirmed by an oath on the nails of the holy cross and on the Gospels, to exert all his power for the advancement of the imperial designs. When, however, the emperor also put forth a long and detailed profession of faith, which he required the pope and other bishops to sign, Vigilius refused, threatened to excommunicate those who should comply, and with Datus, archbishop of Milan, who was especially strenuous in his refusal, took refuge in a church. A praetor was sent with a guard to seize him. The pope placed himself under the altar, and, while the soldiers attempted to drag him out by his feet, his hair, and his beard, he clung so firmly to the pillars that some of them gave way, and the table would have fallen on him if some clerks had not supported it. On this the spectators of the scandalous scene broke forth into loud outcries, in

which even some of the soldiers joined; and the praetor was shamed into desisting from his attempts Vigilus was induced by oaths of safety to leave the church, but, finding himself guarded by imperial soldiers in his lodging, he escaped with Datius and other companions by night to Chalcedon, and fled for sanctuary to the church of St. Euphemia—the same in which the general council had held its sessions exactly a century before. At length, after many overtures from the emperor, he was persuaded to return to Constantinople.

While Vigilus was in retirement at Chalcedon, the patriarch Mennas died, and the see of Constantinople was conferred on Eutychius, who had recommended himself to the emperor by discovering a scriptural precedent for the condemnation of deceased heterodox theologians—namely, the burning of the bones of idolaters by Josiah.

The fifth general council met at Constantinople in May 553. It was attended by a hundred and sixty-five bishops, including all the eastern patriarchs; but from the west there were only five African bishops. As the absence of Vigilus gave reason to apprehend a division in the church, he was repeatedly summoned, and was urgently requested by the other patriarchs to attend; but he obstinately refused—sometimes on the plea of illness, sometimes alleging that faith had not been kept with him in obtaining a fair representation of the western church. He sent to the emperor a paper signed by himself and sixteen other bishops, and designated by the title of *Constitutum*, in which he endeavoured to take a middle course, by condemning the writings which were in question, but without reflecting on the authors—even on Theodore of Mopsuestia. On this, Justinian caused the secret engagements which Vigilus had made with him to be laid before the council, and desired that the pope might be excluded from the diptychs—professing at the same time a wish to remain in communion with the Roman see; and the council acted accordingly. The three articles were condemned, and an anathema was pronounced against all who should defend them or should pretend that they were countenanced by the synod of Chalcedon. The memory of Theodoret and Ibas was spared; but Theodore was included in the same condemnation with his writings. The four earlier general councils were confirmed. The emperor's edicts relating to matters of religion were approved; but, except by this indirect implication, it does not appear that the opinions of Origen were censured or noticed.

Some months later, Vigilus—pressed by the censure of the council, frightened by the punishment of some who opposed it, and influenced also by the success of the arms of Narses, which had secured Italy to the emperor—made a humiliating submission to the decisions of the assembly, in which he ascribed his past difference of opinion to the craft of the devil; and he repeated this in a longer paper, withdrawing all his acts on the other side. The emperor then granted him permission to return to his see, and Vigilus set out for Rome; but on his way to the city, he died at Syracuse, on the 7th of June, 555. His archdeacon, Pelagius, succeeded him, through the influence of Justinian, who on this occasion for the first time assumed for the imperial crown the privilege of confirming the election; but—whether from the odium attached to him as a partaker in the late pope's policy, or because (according to another account) he was suspected of having contributed to the sufferings and death of Vigilus—Pelagius could not find more than two bishops willing to consecrate him. It is said that, in order to dissipate the suspicions which were entertained against him, he ascended the pulpit of St. Peter's, and swore on the Gospels and on the cross that he had had no share in causing the misfortunes of his predecessor.

Pelagius adhered to the late council, and, with the aid of Narses, enforced the acceptance of it by deprivation, banishment, and other penalties. But in the west—where the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia were unknown, where the reliance of the Nestorians on his name was not actually seen, and could not beget a prejudice against him, where the condemnation of Theodoret and Ibas was chiefly regarded as endangering the authority of the council of Chalcedon—the decisions of the fifth council were very generally resisted, even by those who were subjects of the empire. The bishops of the Italian diocese separated from

Rome on this account; and, although Milan and Ravenna were soon forced by the terror of the Lombard invasion to seek a reconciliation, the metropolitans of Aquileia, with the Istrian bishops, remained in separation for nearly a century and a half.

Among the variety of opinions which had sprung out of the monophysite controversy, was one broached by Julian of Halicarnassus, while a refugee at Alexandria in the reign of Justin. This teacher maintained that the Saviour's body was incorruptible; that it was exempt from death, even as Adam's body would have been, if he had retained his innocence that it was the same before as after the resurrection; that His hunger, thirst, weariness, and the like, did not necessarily arise from the constitution of His human nature, but were feelings to which He voluntarily subjected Himself. From their fancy of incorruptibility the followers of Julian were called *Aphthartodocetae*—a name which they retaliated on their opponents by that of *Phthartolatrae* (servants or worshippers of the corruptible). Justinian, in his extreme old age, fell into the opinions of Julian—probably through the influence of Theodore Ascidas; and in January 565 he published an edict asserting the aphthartodocetic doctrine, and required all bishops to subscribe it. Eutychius of Constantinople, who refused on the ground that it reduced the whole Incarnation to a mere appearance, was expelled for his contumacy. The eastern bishops for the most part professed that they would follow Anastasius of Antioch, whose character was held in general estimation; and this patriarch strongly maintained, with arguments from Scripture and from the belief of the church, that in all blameless affections the Saviour's body was like to ours. Anastasius was preparing for deprivation, and had composed a farewell letter to his flock, when the proceedings against the orthodox were brought to an end by the death of the emperor, at the age of eighty.

Monophysitism, when discountenanced by the emperors, continued to exist in countries beyond their dominions, and also among the populations of Syria and Egypt.

The Armenians had been under the Persian yoke since the year 369. After a long resistance to attempts at enforcing the magian religion on them, they had been allowed to preserve their Christianity. But they were still liable to persecution; and whereas a community of religion had formerly obtained for them the alliance of the Romans, they found that a Christianity different from that authorized by the emperors was a recommendation to the favour of their new masters. Interest, therefore, concurred with other motives in leading them to the adoption of a monophysite creed. At the synod of Thwin or Dovin, in 596, the Armenian church condemned the council of Chalcedon, and to this day it holds the aphthartodocetic doctrine as to the body of our Lord.

In Syria, where the monophysite bishops and clergy had been removed by exile, imprisonment, and other means of persecution, a monk named Jacob undertook the enterprise of preserving his party from extinction. With this design, he sought out some monophysite prelates who were imprisoned at Constantinople, and received from them consecration as bishop of Edessa, with a commission of general superintendence over the interests of their cause throughout the east. In the dress of a beggar, from which he derived the name of Al Baradai (the ragged), he travelled indefatigably over Syria and Mesopotamia—secretly reviving the zeal of the monophysites, organizing them into a combined body, and ordaining bishops and clergy for them. At his death, in 578, he left a large and flourishing communion, under a head who laid claim to the patriarchal throne of Antioch; and, although much diminished in importance, the sect still continues to exist. From Jacob al Baradai the monophysites of other countries, as well as of those in which he had laboured, derived the name of Jacobites.

On the death of Timothy, patriarch of Alexandria, in 537, a furious contest for the see arose between the monophysite parties of *corruptibilists* and *incorruptibilists*. The government of Justinian supported the *corruptibilist* Theodosius, but, after having given him the victory over his rival, Gaian, set him aside in favour of an orthodox monk named Paul. Although, however, the catholic patriarch obtained possession of the establishment, the monks

in general and the mass of the people were monophysites; and from Egypt the heresy was communicated to the daughter church of Abyssinia. The Catholics of Egypt were styled by their opponents Melchites (or imperialists); and an excited feeling of nationality was enlisted against the council of Chalcedon. In the course of the Alexandrian contests a great part of the city was burnt down, and they were attended by enormous bloodshed. It is said that at the installation of Apollinarius as patriarch, in 551, two hundred thousand persons were slain in one day;—a statement which, although doubtless exaggerated, must have had some frightful truth for its foundation. By these internal discords among the Christian parties of Egypt, the way was paved for the Saracen conquests of the following century.

CHAPTER VII.

SEMIPELAGIANISM.—MISSIONS.—DECLINE OF ARIANISM IN THE WEST.

It has been mentioned that the Semipelagian opinions became popular in Gaul, and that Augustine was induced by Prosper of Aquitaine and Hilary to write against them. The controversy was kept up with great zeal and activity by Prosper himself, who attacked the "Massilians" not only in treatises of the usual form, but in a poem of a thousand lines and in epigrams. In the year after Augustine's death, Prosper and Hilary went to Rome for the purpose of soliciting Celestine to issue a condemnation of Semipelagianism; and, in consequence of this application, the bishop wrote a letter to his Gaulish brethren, in which, while he highly eulogized Augustine, he censured such persons as pursued unprofitable inquiries and introduced novelties of doctrine. These expressions, however, were capable of more than one application, and the Semipelagians did not fail to turn them against the advocates of the Augustinian system. The abbey of Lerins, founded in the beginning of the fifth century by Honoratus, afterwards archbishop of Arles, was a chief stronghold of Semipelagianism. Vincent, a celebrated monk of that society, was perhaps the author of a direct attack on the doctrines of Augustine; it has even been supposed that his *Commonitory*, which came to be regarded as the very rule of orthodoxy, was written with a covert intention of proscribing them by its well-known tests of truth—antiquity, universality, and consent.

Having failed to effect the suppression of Semipelagianism by authority, Prosper continued to combat it vigorously with his pen. Both he and those who followed him on the same side were careful to mitigate such parts of the Augustinian system as might seem to be subversive of the obligation to religious living, or inconsistent with the ideas of the divine love and justice. Some of these points Prosper attempted to exempt from discussion by referring them to the secret things of God. "God (he said) has chosen the whole world out of the whole world, and all men are adopted to be His children out of all mankind". Every one who is rightly baptized receives forgiveness both of original and of actual sin; if such persons afterwards fall away to unbelief or ungodliness, they are condemned, not for their original sin, but for their own misdeeds—not through an irrespective reprobation, but because God foresaw that they would abuse their free-will. Predestination relates to such things only as are of God, and sin is not among these; we must not therefore say that He predestines to sin, but only that He predestines to punishment.

Semipelagianism still continued to prevail in Gaul. One of its most eminent champions was Faustus, a native either of Britain or of Brittany, who at the date of Vincent's *Commonitory* was abbot of Lerins, and in 456 was raised to the bishopric of Riez. He was famous for strictness of life, and for a power of eloquence which his contemporary Sidonius Apollinaris, bishop of Clermont, extols in hyperbolic terms. After having vainly endeavoured to convince a presbyter named Lucidus, who held extreme predestinarian opinions, Faustus, about the year 475, brought him before a synod held at Arles, where Lucidus was obliged to retract many of his doctrines, and to acknowledge that both grace and human exertion are requisite for obedience to the Divine will. The synod commissioned Faustus to write a confutation of the errors of Lucidus and his party; and another synod, held at Lyons, requested him to make some additions to the work, which thus had an appearance of sanction from the church of Gaul. It opens with a refutation of the grosser tenets of

Pelagianism, and then attacks the Augustinian system, which the writer charges with Antinomianism. Faustus, who had been banished by the Arian Euric, in 481, but recovered his see on that prince's death, three years later, died about 491-3, at a very advanced age. His memory was celebrated in his own country as that of a saint; but Avitus, bishop of Vienne, Caesarius, bishop of Arles, and Claudianus Mamertus, a presbyter of that city, wrote against his opinions; and soon after his death his writings were condemned by Pope Gelasius in a decretal epistle, which is memorable as containing the earliest Roman catalogue of forbidden books. The treatise of Faustus *On Grace and Free-will*, after a time found its way to Constantinople, where it excited much commotion among the brotherhood of Scythian monks.

These were already in correspondence with Caesarius, who held the see of Arles from 501 to 542, and was revered for the wisdom and charity which he displayed in the trying circumstances of his age and country, procured a condemnation of the Semipelagian tenets by the Gaulish bishops in a synod held at Orange in 529. In this judgment all that might startle or shock in the predestinarian doctrine was carefully avoided. The opinion of a predestination to sin and condemnation was rejected with abhorrence, and with the expression of a doubt whether it were really entertained by any one; while it was laid down that sufficient grace is bestowed on all the baptized—a doctrine incompatible with the notions of irresistible grace and absolute decrees. The decisions of Orange were soon after affirmed by another council at Valence, and in the year following they were ratified by Pope Boniface II. Thus, in so far as formal condemnation could reach, Semipelagianism was suppressed in the west. But the Conferences of its founder maintained their popularity, especially in the monasteries, and the opinions of Cassian were often really held where those of Augustine were professed.

The reigns of Justin the elder and Justinian witnessed the conversion of the Lazi, in Colchis, who thereupon forsook the Persian for the Roman alliance; of the Abasgi, near Mount Caucasus; and of the fierce nation of the Heruli, who had been allowed to cross the Danube in the time of Anastasius. The wild tribes about the river Don were also visited by missionaries. A powerful impression was made on the nomads of the east by Symeon the stylite and other ascetics whom they met with in the course of their wandering life; one Saracen chief was not only converted, but, having exchanged in baptism the name of Aspebethos for that of Peter, was consecrated to exercise a superintendence over his own and other tribes, under the title of “Bishop of the Camps”, and sat in the general council of Ephesus.

In some quarters the Catholics contended with the new sects in missionary exertion; but in the remoter regions the heretics were the more active. The monophysites, in addition to their gains in countries where orthodox Christianity had already been planted, converted Nubia from heathenism; while the preachers of Nestorianism found out new fields for their labour in the east. In the sixth century the Nestorian school of Nisibis was the only regular institution for the training of clergy. The sectaries who had been driven from the empire strengthened the kingdom of Persia by their immigration; their religious hostility to the Christianity of the emperors secured for them the countenance of the Persian monarchs; and Nestorianism was established as the only form of Christianity to be tolerated in Persia—thousands of Catholics and monophysites being slain for refusing to conform to it. Persian missionaries penetrated into the heart of Asia, and even into China, from which country two of them, in the reign of Justinian, introduced the silkworm into the Greek empire. Cosmas, a Nestorian of Egypt—originally a merchant and afterwards a monk, who from his expeditions into the east is known, by the name of Indicopleustes (the Indian voyager),—found Christians of his own communion, with bishops and clergy from Persia, in Ceylon, in Malabar, and elsewhere on the Indian coasts. As to Ceylon, however, he expressly states that the natives and their kings were still heathens; and on the whole it would seem that the Christianity of those regions extended as yet but little beyond the pale of the Persian commercial settlements.

There were religious wars between the Abyssinians and the Homerites or Hamyarites, a people of southern Arabia, who professed the Jewish faith; but the accounts of these wars are much embarrassed by inconsistencies and other difficulties.

In the west, the conquests of the Franks extended Christianity wherever they penetrated, and revived that which had been before planted in some districts—as, for example, along the course of the Rhine.

The religion of the western converts was too generally tainted both by their own barbarism and by the corruption of the worn-out nations with whose civilization they were brought into contact. Much of heathen superstition lingered in combination with Christianity; Gregory of Tours reports it as a popular saying in Spain, that “it is no harm if one who has to pass between heathen altars and God’s church should pay his respects to both”. Much vice was tolerated by the clergy, who, although their condition was highly prosperous, did not as yet feel themselves strong enough to check the passions of the great and powerful. The fate of Praetextatus, bishop of Rouen, who, in consequence of having offended the notorious Queen Fredegund, was stabbed in his cathedral at high mass on Easter-day, was a warning to such of his brethren as might be inclined to take a bolder line. The depravity of the Frankish princes, in particular, was frightful—perhaps even unparalleled in the records of history; and the tone which the bishop of Tours, although himself a good and pious man, employs in speaking of such characters, affords abundant proof that his own ideas were far from any high Christian standard. The evangelical principle of forgiveness for sin was abused to sanction licentiousness and atrocity. Fredegund, in instigating two of her servants to assassinate Sigebert, assured them that, if they lived, she would highly honour them, but if they perished in their attempt, she would give largely in alms for their souls; murderers were allowed to take sanctuary in churches, and might not be dragged out without an oath for the safety of their lives. Pretended miracles were wrought in vast numbers for the purpose of imposing on the credulous. Among the clergy themselves, from the bishops downwards, there was much of vice and even of crime; Fredegund, in one of her many murders, found two ecclesiastics to act for hire as the assassins. There was a natural tendency to rely on mere rites and outward pomp of worship; yet good men, such as Caesarius of Arles, were never wanting to assert the necessity of a really living faith and a thoroughly religious practice; and throughout all the evils of the time the beneficial effects of the gospel are to be traced in humane and civilizing legislation.

During the reign of Justinian’s successor, Justin II, Alboin, king of the Lombards, descended on Italy (563) with a host of adventurers collected from many nations and professing a variety of religions—heathenism, Arianism, and orthodox Christianity. The exarch Narses, who had been affronted by the emperor and superseded in his government, is supposed to have shared in inviting the Lombards, and, although he returned to his allegiance, death soon removed him from the path of the invaders. Justin was obliged to yield to them the north of Italy and a part of the centre; Pavia became the Lombard capital and about twenty years later the duchy of Beneventum was added to their territories. Arianism, which had been extirpated from Italy by the arms of Belisarius and Narses, was again introduced by the new conquerors : and it was among them that it remained latest as a national faith.

In Gaul, Arianism had given way to the progress of the Frankish power, which everywhere enforced orthodoxy by the sword. Clovis, as we have seen, made a zeal against heresy the pretext for his invasion of the Visigothic kingdom; and we are told that, when the walls of Angouleme had fallen down before him by miracle, he butchered the Gothic inhabitants for their misbelief. Sigismund, king of the Burgundians, who had become a convert to the catholic doctrine before his accession in 517, endeavoured, under the prudent guidance of Avitus, bishop of Vienne, to draw his subjects over after him, but among the Burgundians, as elsewhere, it was by the victory of the Franks that Arianism was suppressed. When the Gothic garrisons were withdrawn from the north of the Alps to encounter Belisarius

in Italy, the Goths ceded Provence to the Franks; the cession was afterwards confirmed by Justinian, and thus the heresy was expelled from that region.

In Spain, the Suevi, under Theodomir, returned to the catholic faith about a century from the time when their forefathers abandoned it. Amalaric, grandson of the great Theodoric, who had succeeded to the Visigothic dominions in Spain, and in Gaul westward of the Rhone, married Clotilda, a daughter of Clovis, and endeavoured, by very violent means, to convert her to Arianism. Her brother Childebert, roused to indignation by receiving from her a handkerchief stained with her blood, as a proof of the treatment to which she was subjected by her husband, made war on Amalaric, defeated, and killed him. Under the next king of the Visigoths, Theudis, the Catholics enjoyed a free toleration, with the liberty of holding synods; and the same policy was followed by his successors, until the latter part of Leovigild's reign. On the marriage of Hermenegild, son of this prince, with a daughter of Sigebert, king of the Austrasian Franks, the Gothic queen, Goswintha, who was grandmother to the young princess as well as stepmother to her husband, exercised great cruelty towards her in the attempt to seduce her from the orthodox faith. Hermenegild was banished from the court, and was soon after induced, by the persuasions of his wife, and of Leander, bishop of Seville, to become a catholic—a step which offended Leovigild, not only on religious grounds, but because there was room for apprehending political danger from the connexion into which the prince was thus brought with the catholic portion of his father's subjects. Hermenegild was consequently deprived of his share in the government. Supported by foreign princes of his new communion, he rebelled against his father; but the rebellion was suppressed, and Hermenegild, as he firmly refused to return to Arianism, and gave Leovigild reason to apprehend a renewal of his insurrection, was put to death. Leovigild had been provoked by his son's conduct to exercise severities against the Catholics. One of their bishops had apostatized, and had submitted to rebaptism; but the king, wishing to facilitate conversion to his heresy, had prevailed on an Arian council to acknowledge the baptism of the church. After the death of Hermenegild, he subdued the Suevi and united their kingdom to his own; and both in the old and in the new portions of his dominions the Catholics were under persecution until his death in 586. His son Recared, who then succeeded to the throne, avowed himself a catholic—the persuasives to his change of belief being, as in many other cases of this age, partly of a miraculous kind. Conspiracies were set on foot against him by the widowed queen Goswintha, and others of the Arian party; but he succeeded in suppressing them, and a synod of seventy bishops, held at Toledo in 589, established the catholic faith among his people. Thus, at the end of the period embraced in this book, the Lombards were the only nation who continued to adhere to Arianism.

While the British church was pent up in the mountains, and Saxon heathenism overspread the rest of the land, the church of Ireland was in a very flourishing condition. Columba, an Irish abbot of royal descent, after having founded monasteries in the north of Ireland, set forth with twelve companions in the year 563,—in obedience (it is said) to the command of a hermit, who had charged him to expiate by a life of exile and of missionary labour the part which he had taken in the sanguinary feuds of his countrymen. It has been supposed that he was invited into Scotland by Conall, king of the Dalriads, who was his kinsman; and in addition to gaining an influence over that prince and his successor Aidan, whose title he confirmed by a solemn coronation, he converted Brud, king of the northern Picts, whom he visited at his castle near Inverness. For thirty-four years Columba laboured indefatigably, both on the mainland and in the Hebrides, occasionally revisiting his native land, which he had never ceased to regard with passionate regret. His chief residence was in the island of Hy (afterwards called from him Icolumbkille or Iona), where he established a monastery which was long famous as a seat of religion and learning, and became the nursery of clergy whose labours extended not only over Scotland, but far into the southern division of Britain, and northwards to the Orkneys and the islands beyond—perhaps even to Iceland. The

abbots of Hy were at the head of a great society which had its monasteries both in Scotland and in Ireland; and out of respect for the memory of the founder, who had himself been only a presbyter, even the bishops of the district, by what Bede terms an “unusual arrangement”, were in some respects subject to them. Columba died at the age of seventy-six, in 597, the same year in which the Roman mission for the conversion of the English landed in the Isle of Thanet.

The British churches, in consequence of their remoteness and of the want of communication with Rome, retained some peculiarities which afterwards became subjects of controversy. Among these was the time of observing Easter; but although, like the quartodecimans of Asia, the Britons professed to derive their practice from St. John, they were not quartodecimans, inasmuch as they always celebrated the festival on a Sunday. British bishops had sat (as we have seen) in the council of Arles, and had doubtless concurred in its approval of the Roman rule as to Easter. Constantine, in his letter written after the Nicene council, had spoken of “the Britains” as agreeing with other countries in the paschal reckoning of Rome; and it is recorded that in the year 453 the British church conformed to an order of Leo the Great on this subject. It would seem, in truth, that the difference which is found at a somewhat later time between the British and the Roman usages arose from an adherence of the British to the earlier cycle of the Roman church itself, which had in the meantime been superseded at Rome by other and more accurate calculations.

CHAPTER VIII.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

During the period between the council of Chalcedon and the end of the sixth century, the influence of Alexandria and of Antioch declined. Such was the natural result of the differences by which those churches were distracted—with the frequent and bloody conflicts of their factions—the forcible expulsions and installations of bishops, who, instead of being shepherds over the whole community, could only be the chiefs of parties—and the variations of doctrine and policy between the successive occupants of the sees. In the meanwhile, Constantinople was advancing in authority and importance. The council of Chalcedon had conferred on it a right of receiving appeals from bishops or clerks against their metropolitans. By the help of Zeno, the patriarchs of Constantinople finally reduced the exarchate of Ephesus to subjection; and the deprivations of Alexandria and Antioch gave them repeated opportunities of exercising an apparent superiority over those elder churches, by consecrating patriarchs for them, and otherwise interfering in their concerns. The argument for the precedence of Rome, in so far as it was founded on the dignity of the ancient capital—(the only foundation of it which the east had ever acknowledged) —fell with the western empire. It has been supposed that Acacius conceived the idea of raising his see above Rome; and it seems at least probable that Constantinople might have successfully rivalled the power of the great western church, had not its bishops been placed at a disadvantage in consequence of their dependence on the court, and weakened by their quarrels with the emperors.

The bishops of Rome, as before, pursued in the main a steady course. They were still on the orthodox and victorious side in the controversies of the time; and thus their reputation and influence grew. They were invoked and courted by the various parties in the eastern disputes; the emperors themselves found their account in conciliating the bishops of Rome and using them as a check on the patriarchs of Constantinople. The wealth of the Roman see was increased by the acquisition of great estates, not only in Italy, but in other countries; and hence, in addition to gaining the natural influence of riches, the bishops were able, by means of the agents employed in the management of their lands, to keep a watchful eye on the ecclesiastical affairs of distant provinces, and to exercise a frequent interference in them. Even the heresy of the barbarians who overran the west was in its effects favourable to the power of the Roman see, inasmuch as, by everywhere presenting the same enemy, it tended to force the Catholics into combination and centralization, and prevented the breaking up of the church into separate nationalities.

In Italy the title of pope was now usually appropriated to the bishop of Rome, although in other countries of the west it continued to be bestowed on bishops in general until the time of Gregory VII. In eastern usage, it was commonly restricted to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria. Titles of more imposing sound, such as that of “ecumenical bishop”, were sometimes applied to the bishops of Rome,—chiefly by persons whose interest it was to flatter them; the first instance of this kind was at the council of Chalcedon, where the Alexandrian complainants against Dioscorus, wishing to enlist the Roman legates in their cause, styled Leo “ecumenical archbishop, and patriarch of the great Rome”. But such titles—originating among

Oriental, and in the inflation of oriental language—were not intended to be understood in that exclusive sense which the words might naturally convey to our minds. Thus the style of “ecumenical patriarch” was assumed by the bishops of Constantinople, who yet made no pretensions to dominion over the western church. And it was not supposed that there was any incompatibility between the titles, when, at the council under Mennas, which condemned the opinions of Origen, the bishops of Rome and Constantinople were each styled “archbishop and ecumenical patriarch”; or when Justinian addressed each of them as “head of all the churches”.

The Roman bishops extended their claims of jurisdiction—sometimes resting them on canons and imperial edicts, but more frequently on privileges alleged to be derived from St. Peter—with whom, however, St. Paul, the companion of his martyrdom and apostle of the gentiles, was still joined as having contributed to the foundation of the claim.

In the west, disputes which arose between bishops as to precedence and jurisdiction occasioned a frequent recourse to Rome, and advanced the idea of a supreme judicial authority in that see—the more so, because the contending parties were often subjects of different governments. A like effect followed from the applications which churches became accustomed to make to Rome for advice in cases of difficulty. These applications drew forth decretal epistles by way of answer; the applicants were glad to be assured that the substance of such replies was of apostolical tradition and of universal authority; and the pope came to be regarded as a general dictator in matters of this kind. About the middle of the sixth century, Dionysius Exiguus, a Roman monk of Scythian birth, collected the canons of the general and of the chief provincial councils, translating those which were in Greek, and including with them the decretal epistles of the Roman bishops, from Siricius downwards. The work became a standard of ecclesiastical law in the west; and it contributed largely to heighten the authority of the see whose decisions and advices were thus apparently placed on a level with the decrees of the most venerated councils.

Although, however, the Roman bishops not only became the highest judges of ecclesiastical matters in the west, but also claimed a right of watching over the faith of the whole church, the idea of a proper supremacy, such as that which was asserted in later times, was as yet unknown. The bishops of Rome still admitted those of the other great “apostolical” churches—Alexandria and Antioch—to be of the same grade with themselves. They did not pretend to be of a superior order to other bishops; nor did they claim a right of interfering with any diocese, except in case of the bishop's misconduct.

The relations of the Roman bishops with the civil power varied according to the political changes of the times. At the election of a successor to Simplicius, in the year 483, Basil, an officer of Odoacer, appeared, and, professing to act in accordance with advice given by the late pope to his master, expressed the king's surprise that such a matter had been undertaken without obtaining the royal license; he also proposed a regulation that no bishop of Rome should alienate any property belonging to the see, under pain of excommunication both for himself and for the purchaser. The result is not recorded; but there can hardly be a doubt that the barbarian king's emissary had an important influence on the choice of the new bishop.

Theodoric, in the earlier part of his reign, allowed the church a great liberty of self-regulation—considering that the schism which divided Rome from Constantinople secured him against any danger from correspondence between the clergy of his own dominions and their eastern brethren. On the death of Anastasius II, in 498, a violent contest for the pontificate took place between Symmachus and Laurence. The Arian king did not interfere until the matter was brought before him at Ravenna by the parties, when he decided that the see should belong to that bishop who had been first consecrated and had the larger number of adherents; and Symmachus was consequently established. In 502 this bishop held a synod, by which the interference of Basil at the election after the death of Simplicius was indignantly reprobated as an unwarrantable encroachment on the part of the laity. Theodoric allowed the

censure to pass without notice—being probably not unwilling to permit an attack on the memory of his rival, even at the expense of failing to assert the claims of the crown. In the following year, at the request of the partisans of Laurence, who had again made head, Theodoric appointed the bishop of Altino to act as “visitor” of the Roman church. The commissioner behaved (it is said) in an arbitrary and grossly partial manner, so as greatly to irritate the adherents of Symmachus. For the investigation of some serious charges which had been brought against Symmachus, Theodoric summoned a council of Italian bishops, which, from the place of its meeting at Rome, is known as the Synod of the Palm; and this assembly, after severely censuring the appointment of a visitor as an unwarranted novelty, pronounced Symmachus innocent, in so far as man's decision was concerned, and declared that, on account of certain specified difficulties, the case was left to the Divine judgment alone. The proposition which has been erroneously inferred from this as the opinion of the council—that the pope was exempt from all earthly judgment—was soon after maintained by Ennodius, bishop of Ticinum (Pavia), a partisan of Symmachus; and for the confirmation of the new pretension, acts of earlier popes were forged in a strain utterly contradictory to genuine older documents, such as the letters which had been addressed by the Roman clergy to the emperor Gratian.

On the renewal of intercourse between Rome and Constantinople, Theodoric, as we have seen, began to watch the church with a jealousy very opposite to the spirit of his earlier system. The mission of Pope John to Constantinople, with its consequences, has been related in a former chapter. Theodoric, in the month before his own death, nominated the successor of John, Felix IV, and during the remaining time of the Gothic rule in Italy the kings controlled the election of the popes.

Justinian, in his eastern dominions, aimed at reducing the bishops to a greater dependence on the court; and, as this policy was accompanied by professions of great reverence for them, with an increase of their dignities and privileges in some respects, the Greeks submitted to it without reluctance. The emperor not only interfered much in regulations as to matters of discipline, even the most important, but carried out largely the example first set by Basiliscus, of determining points of faith by edicts. His mandates in ecclesiastical matters were published by the agency of patriarchs, metropolitans, and bishops, in like manner as his edicts on secular subjects were issued through the various grades of lay officials. He attempted, without the sanction of a general council, to erect a sixth patriarchate, by bestowing on the bishop of his native place, Justiniana Prima or Lychnidus (Achrída), in Illyricum, a wide Jurisdiction, with privileges which were intended to be modelled on those of Rome. But the attempt proved abortive; the new patriarchs never obtained effectual acknowledgment of their pretensions, and, soon after the death of Justinian, the bishops of Lychnidus are found among those subject to the see of Rome.

On the conquest of Italy, Justinian began to deal with the bishops of Rome as he had dealt with those of Constantinople. He addressed them in flattering titles, and aimed at reducing them to the condition of tools. He made new and stringent regulations as to the confirmation of the pope by the civil power. According to the *Liber Diurnus* (a collection of forms which represents the state of things in those days, or shortly after) the death of a Roman bishop was to be notified to the exarch of Ravenna; the successor was to be chosen by the clergy, the nobles of Rome, the soldiery, and the citizens; and the ratification of the election was to be requested in very submissive terms, both of the emperor and of his deputy the exarch. The share which the laity had from early times enjoyed in the choice of bishops generally, was restricted by a law of Justinian, which ordered that the election should be made by the clergy and principal inhabitants of each city, to the exclusion of the great mass of the people, whose disorderly behaviour had too often afforded a pretext for the change.

The proceedings of Vigilius in the controversy as to the Three Articles—the humiliations which he endured—his vacillations, so utterly contradictory to the later Roman

pretensions—tended to lower the dignity and reputation of his see; and it was greatly weakened by the schism of Aquileia and other provinces. But, on the other hand, the Lombard invasion, in 568, had the effect of increasing the political power of the popes, as they were obliged, in virtue of their extensive property, to take a prominent part in the measures adopted for self-defence by the inhabitants of such portions of Italy as still belonged to the empire; while their services were requited by the emperors with the power of appointing to many offices, and with other civil privileges.

Condition of the Clergy.

In the course of the fifth and sixth centuries, a growing opinion as to the obligation of celibacy on the clergy had the effect of separating them more and more widely from other Christians. No general council ventured to prohibit the marriage of the clergy; that of Chalcedon assumes the existence of prohibitions, but does not itself lay down any such law with a view of binding the whole church. But local councils were continually occupied with the subject, and the bishops of Rome were steady in advancing the cause of celibacy. The general aim of the canons enacted during this time was to prevent clerical marriage altogether, if possible; to extend the prohibition to the inferior grades of the ministry; to debar the married from higher promotion; to prevent such clerks as were allowed to marry once from entering into a second union; to limit their choice to women who had never been married; to separate the married clergy from their wives, or, if they lived together, to restrain them from conjugal intercourse. These regulations belong chiefly to the western church—a greater liberty being apparently allowed in the east. But, as has been remarked in a former period, the frequency of such canons is itself a proof how imperfectly they were able to make way; and very many cases are recorded which show that the enforcement of them was found impracticable, and that a variety of usages in different places was largely tolerated. Thus Lupus, bishop of Troyes, and Euphronius of Autun, while mentioning the restraints which they placed on the marriage of ostiaries, exorcists, and subdeacons, are obliged to content themselves with saying as to the higher grades, to which the canons forbade marriage, that they endeavoured to avoid raising to them persons engaged in that state, or to enforce separation between the married clergy and their wives. And a witness of a more unfavourable kind to the resistance which such laws met with, is found in the fact that, in proportion as celibacy was enforced on the clergy, it became the more necessary to enact canons prohibiting them to entertain concubines or other "extraneous" female companions.

The marriage of the clergy is now the subject not only of canons, but of imperial laws. Honorius, in 420—perhaps at the suggestion of Boniface, bishop of Rome—enacted, in accordance with the Nicene canon, that the clergy should not have as inmates of their houses any women except their own nearest relatives; but it was allowed that such of the clergy as had married before ordination should retain their wives; "for" it was said, "those are not unfitly joined to clerks who have, by their conversation, made their husbands worthy of the priesthood". A century later, Justinian, by several enactments, forbade the promotion of persons who had children or grandchildren to bishoprics, on the ground that such connexions were a temptation to prefer the interests of kindred to those of the church; he confirmed all the ecclesiastical prohibitions of clerical marriage, and declared the issue of such marriages illegitimate, and incapable of inheriting property.

The privileges of the clergy in general were on the increase. Their immunities were confirmed and enlarged; the tendency of legislation was to encourage the bestowal of riches on the church, and to secure to it the permanent possession of all that had been acquired. The idea of expiating sin by money, and especially by liberality to the church, was now put forth more broadly than before; and it found the readier entrance among the Teutonic tribes from the circumstance that the system of compensating for crimes by fines had prevailed among

them before their conversion. Laws and canons were often found necessary to check the practice of obtaining ordination or spiritual dignities by money.

While the judgment of ecclesiastical matters belonged exclusively to the spiritual courts, the bishops had cognizance also of secular causes in which the clergy were concerned, although in these causes the parties were at liberty either to resort in the first instance to a secular tribunal, or to appeal from the bishop to the lay judge, whose sentence, if contrary to that of the bishop, might become the subject of a further appeal.

In criminal cases, the clergy were exempted from the jurisdiction of lay tribunals for slight offences, although it seems to be doubtful how far this exemption practically extended. Honorius, in 407, at the request of African councils, appointed lay “defenders” (*defensores*) of the church, whose business it was to watch over its privileges and to maintain its rights, so that the clergy should not be obliged to appear personally in secular courts. Justinian enacted that bishops should not be required to give evidence in courts; certain officers were appointed to wait on them for the purpose of taking their depositions, which were not to be made on oath, but on their mere word, with the Gospels lying before them. The bishops were charged with an oversight of prisoners, lunatics, minors, foundlings, and other helpless persons, and were furnished with the powers necessary for the exercise of it. They were also charged with a general supervision of public morals—thus, for example, it was their duty to check the practice of gaming. They were, in conjunction with the civil magistrates, to manage the appointment of the subordinate officers of government, and were, with the principal inhabitants of each city, to superintend public works, buildings, and establishments, as also the administration of the local revenues. They were to see that the civil governors and judges did their duty, while the governors in turn were to take care that the bishops should hold synods regularly, and should not alienate the property of the church; but whereas the prefect was not authorised to do more than admonish a bishop of his neglect, and, in case of his persevering in it, to report the matter to the emperor, the bishop had in some circumstances a right to supersede the prefect in his functions. The consequence of such regulations was, that the bishops advanced in political influence, and became more entangled in secular business; and that, agreeably to the object of Justinian's policy, they were reduced into a greater dependence on the emperor by becoming officers of the state.

The patronage of the churches in every diocese originally belonged to the bishop. The earliest exception to this rule was made by the first council of Orange, in 441, which enacted that where a bishop, for some special reason, had built a church within the diocese of another, he should, in consideration of his bounty, be allowed to appoint the incumbent. This privilege was extended to the laity in general by a law of Justinian, which enacted that anyone who should found a church, and should endow it with a maintenance for a clerk, might nominate a person who should be ordained to it. The bishops, however, were at liberty in such cases to refuse ordination, if the individual presented were unfit.

The power of the clergy in the west survived the system under which it had grown up. During the barbarian invasions, they often stood forward, and with effect, to intercede for their flocks. The conquerors found them established as a body important on account of their secular influence, as well as of the sacred nature of their functions. On the settlement of the new kingdoms, the church mediated between the victorious and the vanquished; it held up before the rude barbarians the idea of a law higher than human law—of a moral power superior to force—of a controlling and vindicating Providence. Few of the conquering race were disposed to enter into the ranks of the clergy; their ordination, indeed, was not allowed without the leave of the sovereign, lest the nation should be deprived of its warriors. The ministry of the church, unlike other paths to distinction, was open to the ability of the subjugated people, and through it they acquired a powerful influence over their conquerors. The clergy were the sole possessors of learning; they were the agents of civilization, the reformers of law, the authorized protectors of the weak; they superintended the administration

of justice; they were often employed as envoys and peacemakers between princes. Some had the reputation of miracles; others were venerable and formidable as holding the possession of miraculous shrines—such as that of St Martin at Tours. Riches flowed in on them; tithes were enforced by canons, and large donations of land—a kind of property which increased in value as the people advanced in civilization—were bestowed on them. In order to secure the influence of bishops and abbots, kings endowed their churches and monasteries with estates, to which the usual obligation of military service was attached, and in no long time some of the ecclesiastical holders began to discharge such duties in their own persons. Gregory of Tours mentions with horror the warlike achievements of two brothers belonging to the episcopal order, Salonius and Sagittarius; but the feeling of the indecency of such things was gradually blunted among the Franks. The political importance and the territorial wealth of the bishops gave them the rank of counsellors to the sovereign; and in that character their abilities and knowledge often won for them an influence exceeding that of all others. Hence in France a system of mixed ecclesiastical and secular councils grew up, which for a time superseded the purely spiritual synods.. Thus while the bishops gained in secular power, the metropolitan jurisdiction was weakened by the disuse of the ancient provincial assemblies, as well as by the circumstance that, in the new partition of the country, the province of a metropolitan might be divided between different kingdoms ;b and the king came to be regarded as the highest judge in ecclesiastical affairs as well as in others.

The clergy, like the other Romanized subjects of the Frankish monarchy, continued to be governed by the Roman law. They retained all the privileges which it had conferred on them, and, as the conquerors were themselves ignorant of it, the bishops had a large share in the administration of the law among the Roman population in general. As the bishops rose, the other clergy, being of the conquered races, sank in relative position. Ordination, indeed, was regarded as emancipating them; but while priests to the laity, they were serfs to the bishops. The old relation of the bishop and his council disappears. The prelates treated their subject clergy with great rudeness, and their power over them became more despotic as the decay of metropolitans and the cessation of provincial synods deprived the clergy of all power of appeal except to the sovereign; canons of the time enact bodily chastisement as the penalty for some ecclesiastical offences, while other canons were found necessary to restrain the bishops from beating their clerks at pleasure. The clergy sometimes attempted to protect themselves by combining against their superiors; and such combinations are repeatedly forbidden by councils. The rude princes of Gaul often behaved with lawless violence in ecclesiastical affairs. The prerogative which Clovis had acquired by his merits towards the church was increased by his successors. The influence which the eastern emperors had exercised in appointments to the greater sees, and to the bishoprics of the cities which were places of imperial residence, was extended by the Frank sovereigns to all sees; it would seem that the vacancy of a bishopric or of an archbishopric was notified to the king, that his license was required before an election, and his confirmation after it. Councils repeatedly enacted that bishops should not be appointed until after election by the clergy and people, and with the consent of the metropolitan; but the election was often rendered an empty form by a royal nomination, and kings often took it on themselves to appoint and to depose bishops by their own sole power,—an usurpation which was facilitated by the connexion with the crown into which bishops were brought by the tenure of their estates. In such cases the royal patronage was often obtained by simony or other unworthy means, and was bestowed on persons scandalously unfit for the office; while the change in the manner of appointment combined with other influences to widen the separation between the bishops and the other clergy. The license of the sovereign, which under the empire was required for general councils only, was in Gaul necessary for all; the kings composed the councils at their own will, from larger or smaller districts, of a greater or less number of bishops, and with such mixture of laymen as they pleased; and not content with this, they made many regulations by their own authority in

matters concerning religion. The wealth of the clergy soon attracted their cupidity, and they endeavoured to get a part of it into their own hands by heavy taxation or by forcible acts of rapacity; but on such occasions, it is said, the property of the church was protected by the judicial infliction of sickness, death, or calamity on her assailants; and by tales and threats of such judgments the clergy were often able to ward off aggression.

Monasticism.

Monachism continued to increase in popularity during the fifth and sixth centuries: but when a system founded on a profession of rigour becomes popular, its corruption may be safely inferred. We have seen how in the controversies of the east the monks held all parties in terror—wielding a vast influence by their numbers and their fanatical rage. Justinian made several enactments in favour of monachism—as, for example, that married persons might embrace the monastic life without the consent of their partners, children without the leave of parents, and slaves without that of their masters. Monks more and more acquired the character of clergy, although it was usual in monastic societies that only so many of the members should be ordained as were necessary for the performance of religious offices, and some monasteries were even without any resident presbyter. Leo the Great forbids monks to preach, or to intermeddle with other clerical functions; and other prohibitions to the same effect are found. As, however, the monks had a greater popular reputation for holiness than the clergy, and consequently a greater influence over the people, it was the interest of the clergy rather to court than to oppose them.

The council of Chalcedon enacted that monasteries should be strictly under the control of the bishops in whose dioceses they were situated, and that no one should found a monastery without the bishop's consent; and orders of a like purport are found both among the canons of other councils and among laws of the emperor Justinian. The first country in which this principle was violated was Africa, where, about the year 520, many monastic societies, passing over the local bishops, placed themselves under the primate of Carthage or other distant prelates. Throughout the other countries of the west, the local bishop still had the superintendence of monasteries—in so far, at least, as the abbots and the clerical members were concerned, although some canons prevented his interference in the relations between the head and the lay brethren.

The revolutions of the west were favourable to monasticism. Monks, both by their numbers and by their profession of especial sanctity, impressed the barbarian conquerors. Their abodes, therefore, became a secure retreat from the troubles of the time; they were honoured and respected, and wealth was largely bestowed on them. But where the monastic profession was sought by many for reasons very different from those which its founders had contemplated—for the sake of a safe and tranquil life rather than for penitence or religious perfection—a strong tendency to degeneracy was naturally soon manifested. And thus in the earlier part of the sixth century there was room for the labours of a reformer.

Benedict, the great legislator of western monachism, was born near Nursia (now Norcia), in the duchy of Spoleto, about the year 480, and at the age of twelve was sent to study at Rome; but in disgust at the irregularities of his fellow-students he fled from the city at fourteen, and, separating himself even from his nurse, who had attended him, he lived for three years in a cave near Subiaco. The only person acquainted with the secret of his retreat was a monk named Romanus, who, having seen him in his flight, was led to take an interest in him; he furnished the young recluse with a monastic habit, and saved from his own conventual allowance of bread a quantity sufficient for his support, conveying it to him, on certain days, by a string let down to the mouth of the cave. At length Benedict was discovered by some shepherds; he instructed them and others who resorted to him, and performed a number of miracles. In consequence of the fame which he had now attained, he was chosen abbot of a

monastery in the neighbourhood; but his attempt at a reformation provoked its inmates, who, in order to rid themselves of him, mixed poison with his drink. On his making the customary sign of the cross, the cup flew to pieces; whereupon he mildly reminded the monks that he had warned them against electing a person of character and habits so unlike their own, and returned to his solitude. His renown gradually spread; great multitudes flocked to him, and even some members of the Roman nobility entrusted their children to him for education; he built twelve monasteries, each for an abbot and twelve monks. But finding himself disquieted by the persevering malignity of a priest named Florentius, who out of envy attempted to destroy him by calumny and by poison, he quitted Subiaco, with a few chosen companions, in the year 528. After some wanderings, he arrived at Monte Cassino, where, on a lofty height overlooking the wide valley of the Liris, Apollo was still worshipped by the rustics, and a grove sacred to the pagan deities continued to be held in reverence. The devil attempted to check him by various prodigies; but Benedict triumphed over such obstacles, cut down the grove, destroyed the idol of Apollo, and on the site of the altar erected an oratory dedicated to St. John the Evangelist and St. Martin—the germ of the great and renowned monastery which became the mother of all the societies of the west. Here he drew up his ‘Rule’ about the year 529—the same year in which the schools of Athens were suppressed, and in which the Semipelagian doctrine was condemned by the council of Orange.

The severity of earlier rules—fitted as they were for the eastern regions in which monachism had originated, rather than for those of the west into which it had made its way—had become a pretext for a general relaxation of discipline throughout the western monasteries, while, on the other hand, it had given occasion for much hypocritical pretension. Benedict, therefore, in consideration of this, intended his code to be of a milder and more practical kind—suited for European constitutions, and variable in many respects according to the climate of the different countries into which it might be introduced.

Every Benedictine monastery was to be under an abbot, chosen by the monks and approved by the bishop. The brethren were to regard their head as standing in the place of Christ, and were therefore to yield him an obedience ready, cheerful, and entire; while the founder was careful to impress on the abbots a feeling of responsibility for the authority committed to them, and the duty of moderation in the exercise of it. The monks were to address the abbot by the title Dominus; in speaking to each other they were not to mention the names of the individuals, but were to use the titles of father (*nonnus*), or brother, according to their relative age; the younger were to make way for their elders, to rise up to them, to resign their seats to them, to ask their blessing, and to stand in their presence, unless permitted by the seniors to sit down. Such priests or other clergymen as might be in a monastery, whether specially ordained for its service or admitted at their own request, were not to claim any precedence on account of their orders, and were to be subject to the abbot, like the other brethren. Next in order to the abbot, there might be a prior or provost (*propositus*); but as, in some monastic societies, where the prior was appointed by the bishop, he assumed an air of independence towards the abbot, the Benedictine provost was to be chosen by the abbot, and was to be subject to him in all things. Benedict, however, preferred that, instead of a prior, the abbot should be assisted in his government by elders or deans (*decani*). With these he was to consult on ordinary occasions, while for important matters he was to take counsel with the whole community.

Parents might devote their children to the monastic life. Candidates for admission into the order were required to submit to probation for a year, in the course of which the Rule was thrice read over to them, and they were questioned as to their resolution to abide by it. At their reception they laid on the altar a written vow of steadfastness, amendment, and obedience, which those who were unable to write signed with their mark. The first of these articles was an important novelty; for whereas formerly, although persons who forsook the monastic for the married state were liable to censures and penance, their marriage was yet allowed to

continue, the introduction of the Benedictine rule led to the practice of forcibly separating monks who married from their wives, and dragging them back to their monasteries. All the property of the novice, if not already distributed to the poor, was to be given to the monastery, and a strict community of goods was to be observed by the monks. Their beds were to be often searched, and, if any one were found to have secreted anything as his peculiar property, he was to be punished; nor were presents or letters to be received, even from the nearest relation, without permission of the abbot, who was authorized, at his own pleasure, to transfer any gift to some other person than the one for whom it was intended.

A distinctive feature of the Benedictine system was the provision of ample occupation for the monks,—especially of manual labour, which in the western monasteries had as yet been little practised. They were to rise for matins at two hours after midnight to attend eight services daily, or, if at a distance from the monastery, to observe the hours of the services and they were to work seven hours. The whole Psalter was to be recited every week in the course of the services. Portions of time were assigned for committing psalms to memory, for the study of Scripture, and for reading Cassian's *Conferences*, lives of saints, and other devout and edifying books. At meals, a book was to be read aloud, but no conversation was to be held; and in general there was to be little talk. Each monk, except the cellarer, and those who were engaged in "greater duties", was required to act as cook in turn, for a week at a time. At dinner there were to be two sorts of cooked *pulmentaria*, "that they who cannot eat of the one" (said Benedict) "may perchance be refreshed by the other". These *pulmentaria* included grain and vegetables dressed in various ways; some authorities extend the word to eggs, fish, and even to birds, inasmuch as four-footed beasts are only specified as forbidden. A third dish, of uncooked fruit or salad, might be added where such things were to be had. Each monk was allowed a small measure of wine; because (as Benedict remarked), although monks ought not to taste wine, it had been found impossible to enforce such a rule. A pound of bread was the usual daily allowance; but all such matters were to be arranged at the discretion of the abbot, according to the climate and the season, the age, the health, and the employment of the monks. Flesh was forbidden, except to the sick, who, while they were to be carefully tended, were required to consider that such service was bestowed on them for God's sake, and not in order that they might be encouraged in "superfluity". Hospitality was enjoined towards strangers, and especially towards the poor, "because in them Christ is more especially received"; even the abbot himself was required to share in washing the feet of guests. The dress of the monks was to be coarse and plain, but might be varied according to circumstances. They were to sleep by ten or twelve in a room, each in a separate bed, with their clothes and girdles on. A dean was to preside over each dormitory, and a light was to be kept burning in each. No talking was allowed after compline—the last service of the day.

The monks were never to go out without permission, and those who had been sent out on business were forbidden to distract their brethren by relating their adventures on their return. In order that there might be little necessity for leaving the monastery, it was to contain within its precincts the garden, the mill, the well, the bakehouse, and other requisite appurtenances. The occupation of every monk was to be determined by the abbot; if any one were disposed to pride himself on his skill in any art or handicraft, he was to be forbidden to practise it. Monks were to sell the productions of their labour at a lower price than other men—a regulation by which Benedict intended to guard against the appearance of covetousness, without, probably, considering how it might interfere with the fair profit of secular persons, who depended on their trades for a livelihood.

In punishments, the abbot was directed to employ words or bodily chastisement, according to the character of the culprit. For the lighter offences the monks were punished by being excluded from the common table, and obliged to take their meals at a later hour, or by being forbidden to take certain parts in the service of the chapel; while those who had been guilty of heavier transgressions were entirely separated from their brethren, and were

committed to a seclusion in which they were visited by the most venerable members of the society, with a view to their consolation and amendment.

Gregory the Great, in his account of Benedict, ascribes to him a multitude of miracles and prophecies. Among other things, it is related that the Gothic king Totila, wishing to have an interview with the saint, made trial of his penetration by sending to him an officer dressed in the royal robes; but that Benedict discovered the device, and afterwards foretold to Totila the course of his successes, with his eventual ruin.

Before the death of the founder, which took place in 543, the Benedictine system had been established in Gaul, Spain, and Sicily, and in no long time it absorbed all the monachism of the west—being the first example of a great community spread through various countries and subject to one rule, although without that organised unity which marked the monastic orders of later times. Its ramifications were multiplied under a variety of names; and, although precluded by their vow of obedience from altering their rule, the later Benedictines were able, by means of a distinction between the essential and the accidental parts of it, to find pretexts for a departure in many respects from the rigour of the original constitutions. In addition to the spiritual discipline which was the primary object of their institution, the monks employed themselves in labours which were greatly beneficial to mankind. They cleared forests, made roads, reduced wastes into fertility by tillage, and imparted the science of agriculture to the barbarians; they civilized rude populations, and extirpated the remains of heathenism. Although St. Benedict had not contemplated the cultivation of learning in his monasteries—an object which was first recommended to monks by his contemporary Cassiodore—it was found to agree well with the regular distribution of time which was a characteristic of the system. During the troubled centuries which followed, learning found a refuge in the Benedictine cloisters; the monks transcribed the works of classical and Christian antiquity, and were the chief instruments of preserving them. They taught the young; they chronicled the events of their times; and, in later ages, the learning and industry of this noble order have rendered inestimable services to literature.

Rites and Usages

In matters connected with worship, the tendencies of the fourth century were more fully carried out during the two which followed, by the multiplication and the increased splendour of ceremonies, the gorgeous and costly decoration of churches, and the addition of new festivals

The reverence paid to saints rose higher; their intercession and protection were entreated, their relics were eagerly sought after, and extravagant stories were told of miracles wrought not only by such relics themselves, but by cloths which had touched them, and by water in which they had been dipped. Churches were dedicated to saints and angels; whereas there had originally been only one altar in every church, additional altars in honour of the saints were now erected in the churches of the west; and, although the preachers of the time were careful to distinguish between the honour paid to saints and that which belongs to God alone, some of them openly avowed that the saints and their days held in the Christian system a like place to that which had formerly been assigned to the gods of paganism and to their festivals. The presbytery of churches was elevated by the construction of a crypt, of which the upper part rose above the level of the nave, with a grating in front, through which was seen the tomb of the patron saint. In praying to the saints, as formerly to the heathen deities, it was usual for their votaries to promise that, if they would grant the petitions addressed to them, their altars should be richly adorned, and candles should be burnt in their honour; but to threaten that otherwise the altars should be stripped and the lights extinguished. Sometimes, it is said that threats of this kind were the means of obtaining miraculous aid; although, if no such effect followed, the worshippers were generally afraid to execute them. When petitions

had been put up in vain to one saint, they were transferred to another. In cases of difficulty, the advice of the saints was asked, sometimes by prayer, to which an answer was vouchsafed in visions; sometimes by laying a letter on the grave or altar which contained the relics of the saint, with a paper for the expected answer, which, if the saint were propitious, was given in writing, while otherwise the paper was left blank.

Relics of scriptural personages continued to be found. Of this a remarkable instance occurred in the year 487, when Peter the Fuller, then patriarch of Antioch and strong in the favour of Zeno, revived the claim of jurisdiction over Cyprus which had been disallowed by the general council of Ephesus. Anthimus, bishop of Constantia and metropolitan of the island, a sound catholic, was summoned to appear at Constantinople, and answer the monophysite patriarch's claims. On the eve of his departure from Cyprus, the bishop was visited in his sleep by St. Barnabas, who discovered to him the resting-place of his remains. The body of the apostle was found accordingly, and with it a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, written by the hand of St. Barnabas himself. Fortified by this discovery, Anthimus proceeded to Constantinople, and met the apostolical pretensions of Antioch by the miraculous proof that his own church also could boast an apostolic origin. The emperor gladly admitted the claim, and expressed great delight that his reign had been distinguished by so illustrious an event; whereupon Peter returned discomfited to Antioch, and the autocephalous independence of Cyprus was established beyond all controversy.

Spurious relics were largely manufactured. Lives of recent saints were composed, and were largely embellished with miraculous recitals. Saints of older date were supplied with biographies written in a like spirit of accommodation to the prevailing taste; and imaginary saints, with suitable histories, were invented.

The Nestorian controversy had a very important effect in advancing the blessed Virgin to a prominence above all other saints which had been unknown in earlier times. When the title of Theotokos had been denied to her, Cyril, Proclus, and the other opponents of Nestorius, burst forth in their sermons and writings into hyperbolic flights in vindication of it, and in exaltation of the Saviour's mother. In this Eutychians vied with Catholics; the monophysite Peter of Antioch was the first who introduced the name of the Virgin into all the prayers of his church. Churches were dedicated to her honour in greater numbers than before; thus it seems probable that the first church which bore her name at Rome was the basilica of Pope Liberius, founded by and originally styled after him, which Sixtus III rebuilt with great splendour in the year after the council of Ephesus, and which, among the many other Roman churches of St. Mary, is distinguished by the title of Major. Justinian invoked the aid of St. Mary for the prosperity of his administration; Narses never ventured to fight a battle unless he had previously received some token of her approval. The idea of a female mediator—performing in the higher world offices akin to those labours of mercy and intercession which befit the feminine character on earths—was one which the mind of mankind was ready to receive; and, moreover, this idea of the blessed Mary was welcomed as a substitute for some which had been lost by the fall of polytheism, with its host of female deities. The veneration of her, therefore, advanced rapidly, although it was not until a much later period that it reached its greatest height.

The religious use of images and pictures gained ground. Figures of the blessed Virgin—in some cases throned, and with the infant Saviour in her arms—were now introduced into churches. It was during this time that stories began to be current of authentic likenesses of the Saviour, painted by St. Luke or sent down from heaven; and of miracles wrought by them in healing the sick, casting out devils, procuring victory against enemies, and the like. The use of images obtained more in the east than in the west. Leontius, bishop of Neapolis in Cyprus, at the end of the sixth century, eloquently defends the worship of them, in token of honour towards those whom they represent; and he speaks of miraculous images from which blood trickled. On the other hand, Xenaias or Philoxenus, a bishop of the Syrian

Hierapolis, who was notorious as a monophysite in the early part of the century, ejected all images out of churches.

To the festivals of general observation was added in the sixth century that of the Presentation, which in the east had the name of Hypapante, from the meeting of the Holy Family with Symeon in the temple. The first celebration of this festival at Constantinople was in 542. The Annunciation was also probably celebrated in the sixth century, as it was fully established in the next. In most countries it was kept on the 25th of March, although in Spain and in Armenia other days were chosen, in order that it might not interfere with the Lenten fast. These festivals, although having the Saviour for their primary object, fell in with the prevailing tendency to exalt the mother of his humanity; and hence it was that, after a time, the title of "The Presentation in the Temple" was superseded by that of "The Purification". The Nativity of St. John the Baptist (June 24) appears to have been also now generally observed—the more naturally because midsummer was marked by festival rites both among the Romans and among the northern nations. It is mentioned by the council of Agde, in 506, with Easter, Christmas, Epiphany, Ascension-day, and Pentecost, as belonging to the class of chief festivals, which persons whose ordinary worship was performed in "oratories" were required to celebrate in the churches of their cities or parishes.

The earliest witness for the observance of Advent in the Latin Church is Maximus of Turin, in the fifth century. The season was regarded as penitential; fasting was prescribed for three days in each week, and the council of Lerida, in 524, enacted that no marriages should be celebrated from the beginning of Advent until after the Epiphany. It would seem that at Rome the number of Sundays in Advent was five, although afterwards reduced to four; while at Milan, Spain, and in Gaul the season extended to six weeks, beginning on the Sunday after Martinmas, from which it was styled the 44 Quadragesima of St. Martin. In the east also it lasted forty days, although the observance of it was less strict than in the west. The fast of the Rogation days, with its litanies and processions, was instituted by Mamercus, bishop of Vienne, during a time of distress and terror among his people, occasioned by the last eruptions of the volcanoes of Auvergne, about the middle of the fifth century; and the observance of it was soon adopted elsewhere, although it was not established at Rome until the pontificate of Leo II, about the year 800. The fasts of the four seasons, out of which has grown the observance of the Ember weeks, are mentioned by Leo the Great and other writers of the time. But the ordination of clergy was not as yet connected with these seasons; for although Gelasius prescribes that it shall be limited to certain times of the year, the times which he mentions do not exactly agree with the Ember weeks.

In the doctrine of the sacraments no alteration is to be noted during this period. With respect to the Eucharist, however, writers and preachers became more rhetorical in their language, so that some of their expressions might, if they stood alone, imply the later doctrine of the Roman church. But that no one as yet doubted the continued subsistence of the elements in their own nature, while a higher virtue was believed to be imparted to them by the consecration, appears from other expressions which are clear and unequivocal. Chrysostom, in a letter written during his exile, distinctly lays down that, while the consecrated bread is dignified with the name of "the Lord's body," yet the nature of the bread itself remains unchanged; and the illustration which he draws from this, as to the union of natures in the person of the Redeemer—an illustration obviously inconsistent with the more modern teaching of Rome—was continually repeated in the course of the controversies which followed.

The practice of communicating in one kind only was of so much later introduction in the church, that it would be premature to advert to it here, but for the decided language in which it was condemned by Gelasius I:—"A division of the one and the same mystery", he declares, "cannot be made without great sacrilege". It is needless to refute, or even to characterize, the explanations which writers in the Roman interest have devised in order to

evade this prohibition—by restricting the words of Gelasius to the priests alone, or by saying that, as they were directed against the Manicheans, they relate to those sectaries only, and have no application to Catholics, inasmuch as these do not abhor the reception of the eucharistic cup.

Canons were now found necessary to enforce the reception of the Lord's supper. Thus the council of Agde, held under the presidency of Caesarius of Arles, in 506, enacted that no secular person should be accounted a Christian unless he communicated at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide. The same council ordered that the people should not leave the church until after the priest's benediction and the first council of Orleans, in 511, directed that they should remain until the solemnity of the mass should be finished, after which they were to depart with a blessing. The meaning of these canons appears to be, that those who did not intend to communicate were to retire after a blessing, which (as may be seen in the Mozarabic and Gallican liturgies) intervened between the consecration and the administration of the sacrament; so that a formal sanction was thus given to a practice which at an earlier time had provoked the denunciations of Chrysostom and other writers. In connection with this was introduced a custom of giving to non-communicants, as if by way of substitute for the Eucharist, portions of the bread offered at the altar, which were blessed by the priest, and were designated by the name of *Eulogiae*.

In the penitential discipline of the western church, an important change was introduced by Leo the Great. Until his time, penance had been public, and the offence of each penitent was read aloud from a written record; but Leo, with a view (as he professed) to removing an impediment which might deter many from repentance, declared such exposures to be unnecessary; "for", he writes, "that confession is sufficient which is made, first to God, and then also to the priest, who approaches as an intercessor for the sins of the penitent". The effect of this was to abolish the ordinary performance of public penance, and to substitute for it the practice of secret confession only.

Decline of Learning.

From the middle of the fifth century learning had been on the decline in the church, and towards the end of the sixth, hardly any other than ecclesiastical literature continued to be cultivated. "Alas for our days!" exclaimed the contemporaries of Gregory of Tours, "for the study of letters hath perished from among us, neither is there one found among the nations who can set forth in records the deeds of the present time". The barbarian invasions—the necessity in troubled times of directing all activity to practical purposes,—the extinction of paganism, with the consequent removal of the motive by which Christian teachers had been obliged to qualify themselves for arguing with learned adversaries—the dislike and scorn with which the monkish spirit regarded heathen literature and philosophy—all combined in producing this result. Even among the works of Christian authors, all but such as were of acknowledged orthodoxy were proscribed; and this also operated towards the discouragement of learning. Nor did the age produce any writer whose genius could triumph over its depressing and narrowing influences. The most distinguished of those who lived in the middle or towards the end of the century—such as Cassiodore and the encyclopedic Isidore of Seville—did for the most part little beyond abridging and compiling from the works of earlier authors and the popularity of their productions had the effect of throwing the originals into the shade.

Yet in this sad time—amid corruption of doctrine and of morals, while intellect degenerated, while learning sank, and civilization was overwhelmed—not only may we believe that the gospel was secretly and gradually fulfilling its predicted work of leavening the mass in which it had been hidden, but even on the very surface of things we can largely discern its effects. It humanizes barbarians, it mitigates the horrors of war and of slavery, it

teaches both to conquerors and to conquered something of a new bond superior to differences of race, it controls the oppression of brutal force by revealing responsibilities beyond those of this present world. We see the church not only bearing within it the hope of immortality, but rescuing the intellectual treasures of the past from the deluge of barbarism, and conveying them safely to later generations.

BOOK IV.
FROM THE ELECTION OF GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE DEATH OF
CHARLEMAGNE,
A.D. 590-814

CHAPTER I.
Gregory the Great, A.D. 590-604.—Columban, A.D. 589-615.

The end of the sixth century may be regarded as the boundary between early and mediaeval church history. The scene of interest is henceforth varied; the eastern churches, oppressed by calamities and inwardly decaying, will claim but little of our attention, while it will be largely engaged by regions of the west, unnoticed or but slightly noticed in earlier times. The gospel will be seen penetrating the barbarian tribes which had overrun the western empire, bringing to them not only religious truth, but the elements of culture and refinement, adapting itself to them, moulding them, and experiencing their influence in return. As Christianity had before been affected by the ideas and by the practices of its Greek and Roman converts, so it now suffered among the barbarians, although rather from the rudeness of their manners than from any infection of their old religions.

Yet throughout the dreariest of the ages which lie before us, we may discern the gracious providence of God preserving the essentials of the truth in the midst of ignorance and corruptions, enabling men to overcome the evil by which they were surrounded, and filling the hearts of multitudes with zeal not only to extend the visible bounds of Christ's kingdom, but also to enforce the power of faith on those who were already professedly His subjects.

Gregory, the most eminent representative of the transition from the early to the middle period, was born at Rome about the year 540. His family was of senatorial rank, and is said by some authorities to have belonged to the great Anician house; he was great-grandson of a pope named Felix—either the third or the fourth of that name. Gregory entered into civil employment, and attained the office of praetor of the city; but about the age of thirty-five he abandoned the pursuit of worldly distinctions, and employed his wealth in founding seven monasteries—six of them in Sicily, and the other, which he dedicated to St. Andrew, in his family mansion on the Caelian hill at Rome. In this Roman monastery he took up his abode, and entered on a strictly ascetic life, in which he persevered notwithstanding the frequent and severe illness which his austerities produced. About the year 577, he was ordained deacon, and was appointed to exercise his office in one of the seven principal churches of the city; and in 578, or the following year, he was sent by Pelagius II as his representative to the court of Tiberius II, who had lately become sole emperor on the death of the younger Justin. The most noted incident of his residence at Constantinople was a controversy with the patriarch Eutychius, who maintained the opinion of Origen, that the “spiritual body” of the saints after the resurrection would be impalpable, and more subtle than wind or air. Gregory on the contrary held, according to the doctrine which had been recommended to the western church by the authority of Augustine, that, if the body were impalpable, its identity would be lost; it

will, he said, be “palpable in the reality of its nature, although subtle by the effect of spiritual grace”. Tiberius ordered a book in which Eutychius had maintained his opinion to be burnt; and the patriarch soon after, on his death-bed, avowed himself a convert to the opposite view, by laying hold of his attenuated arm and declaring, "I confess that in this flesh we shall all rise again".

After his return to Rome, Gregory was elected abbot of his monastery, and also acted as ecclesiastical secretary to Pelagius. On the death of that pope, who was carried off by a plague in January 590, he was chosen by the senate, the clergy, and the people to fill the vacant chair. He endeavoured by various means to escape the promotion; but the letter in which he entreated the emperor Maurice to withhold his consent was opened and detained by the governor of Rome; miracles baffled his attempts to conceal himself; and notwithstanding his reluctance he was consecrated, in September 590.

The position which Gregory had now attained was one from which he might well have shrunk, for other reasons than the fear ascribed to him by an ancient biographer, “lest the worldly glory which he had before cast away might creep on him under the colour of ecclesiastical government”. He compares his church to an “old and violently-shattered ship, admitting the waters on all sides,—its timbers rotten, shaken by daily storms, and sounding of wreck”. The north of Italy was overrun, and its other provinces were threatened, by the Lombards. The distant government of Constantinople, instead of protecting its Italian subjects, acted only as a hindrance to their exerting themselves for their own defence. The local authorities had neither courage to make war nor wisdom to negotiate; some of them, by their unprincipled exactions, even drove their people to espouse the interest of the enemy. The inhabitants of the land had been wasted by war, famine, and disease, while the rage for celibacy had contributed to prevent the recruiting of their numbers. In many places the depopulated soil had become pestilential. The supplies of corn, which had formerly been drawn from Sicily to support the excess of population, were now rendered necessary by the general abandonment of husbandry. Rome itself had suffered from storms and inundations, in addition to the common misfortunes of the country. So great were the miseries of the time, as to produce in religious minds the conviction, which Gregory often expresses, that the end of the world was at hand.

Nor was the aspect of ecclesiastical affairs more cheering. Churches and monasteries had been destroyed by the Lombards; the clergy were few, and inadequate to the pastoral superintendence of their scattered flocks; among them and among the monks, the troubles of the age had produced a general decay of morals and disciplined. The formidable Lombards were Arians; the schism which had arisen out of the question as to the “Three Articles” continued to hold Istria and other provinces separate from Rome, and had many adherents in Gaul. In Gaul, too, the church was oppressed by the extreme depravity of the princes and nobles, and by the general barbarism of the clergy as well as of the people. Spain had just been recovered from Arianism, but much was yet wanting to complete and assure the victory. In Africa, the old sect of Donatists took occasion from the prevailing confusions to lift up its head once more, and to commit aggressions on the church. The eastern patriarchates were distracted by the Nestorian and Monophysite controversies; a patriarch of Antioch had been deprived, and the bishop of Rome had reason to look with jealousy on his brother and rival of the newer capital.

The collection of Gregory’s letters, nearly eight hundred and fifty in number, exhibits a remarkable picture of his extensive and manifold activity. And it is in this that their value mainly consists; for, although questions of theology and morality are sometimes treated in them, they do not contain those elaborate discussions which are found among the correspondence of Jerome and Augustine. Gregory had neither leisure nor inclination for such discussions; but his capacity for business, his wide, various, and minute supervision, his combination of tenacity and dexterity in the conduct of affairs, are truly wonderful. From

treating with patriarchs, kings, or emperors on the highest concerns of church or state, he passes to direct the management of a farm, the reclaiming of a runaway nun, or the relief of a distressed petitioner in some distant dependency of his see. He appears as a pope, as a virtual sovereign, as a bishop, as a landlords. He takes measures for the defence of his country, for the conversion of the heathen, for the repression and reconciliation of sectaries and schismatics; he administers discipline, manages the care of vacant dioceses, arranges for the union of sees where impoverishment and depopulation rendered such a junction expedient, directs the election of bishops, and superintends the performance of their duties. He intercedes with the great men of the earth for those who suffered from the conduct of their subordinates; he mediates in quarrels between bishops and their clergy, or between clergy and laity; he advises as to the temporal concerns of churches, and on such subjects he writes in a spirit of disinterestedness and equity very unlike the grasping cupidity which was too commonly displayed by bishops where legacies or other property were in question. In his letters to the emperors, although the tone is humble and submissive, he steadily holds to his purpose, and opposes everything which appears to him as an encroachment on the rights of the church.

Gregory lived in a simple and monastic style, confining his society to monks and clergy, with whom he carried on his studies. He endeavoured to provide for the education of the clergy, not indeed according to any exalted literary standard, but in such a manner as the circumstances of his time allowed. He introduced a new and more effective organization into his church. He laboured for the improvement of the liturgy, and gave to the canon of the mass the form which it still retains in all essential respects. He instituted a singing-school, selected music, and established the manner of chanting which derives its name from him. He superintended in person the exercises of the choristers; the whip with which he threatened and admonished them was preserved for centuries as a relic. The misconduct of persons who on account of their vocal powers had been ordained deacons had become scandalous; Gregory, with a council, attempted to remedy the evil, not by requiring a greater strictness of behaviour in the singers, but by enacting that the chanting should be performed by subdeacons, or clerks of the inferior orders. He laboured diligently as a preacher, and it was believed that in the composition of his discourses he was aided by a special inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who appeared in the form of a dove whiter than snow. When Rome was threatened in 595 by the Lombards under Agilulf, the pope expounded the prophecies of Ezekiel from the pulpit, until at length the pressure of distress obliged him to desist, as he found that in such circumstances his mind was too much distracted to penetrate into the mysteries of the book. "Let no one blame me", he says in the last homily of the series, "if after this discourse I cease, since, as you all see, our tribulations are multiplied: on every side we are surrounded with swords, on every side we fear the imminent peril of death. Some come back to us maimed of their hands, others are reported to be prisoners or slain. I am forced to withhold my tongue from exposition, for that my soul is weary of my life". In his last years, when compelled by sickness to withdraw from preaching in person, he dictated sermons which were delivered by others.

The wealth of his see enabled the pope to exercise extensive charities, which were administered according to a regular scheme. On the first day of every month he distributed large quantities of provisions, and among those who were glad to share in this bounty were many of the Roman nobility, who had been reduced to utter poverty by the calamities of the time. Every day he sent alms to a number of needy persons, in all quarters of the city. When a poor man had been found dead in the street, Gregory abstained for some time from the celebration of the Eucharist, as considering himself to be the cause of his death. He was in the habit of sending dishes from his own table to persons whom he knew to be in want, but too proud or too bashful to ask relief. He entertained strangers and wanderers as his guests; and his biographers tell us that on one occasion he was rewarded by a vision, in which he was informed that among the objects of his hospitality had been his guardian angel. At another

time, it is related, the Saviour appeared to him by night, and said to him, “On other days thou hast relieved Me in my members, but yesterday in Myself”.

Gregory found himself obliged to take an active part in political affairs. He desired peace, not only for its own sake, but as necessary in order to the reform and extension of the church. He laboured for it against many discouragements, and notwithstanding repeated disappointments by the breach of truces which had been concluded. He took it upon himself to negotiate with the Lombards, and, although slighted and ridiculed by the court of Constantinople for his endeavours, he found his recompense in their success, and in the gratitude of the people whom he had rescued from the miseries of war.

The property of the Roman see, which had come to be designated as the “patrimony of St. Peter”, included estates not only in Italy and the adjacent islands, but in Gaul, Illyria, Dalmatia, Africa, and even Asia. These estates were managed by commissioners chosen from the orders of deacons and subdeacons, or by laymen who had the title of *defensors*. Through agents of this class Gregory carried on much of the administration of his own patriarchate and of his communications with other churches; and, in addition to these, he was represented by vicars—bishops on whom, either for the eminence of their sees or for their personal merits, he bestowed certain prerogatives and jurisdiction, of which the pall was the distinctive badge. His more especial care was limited to the suburbicarian provinces, and beyond these he did not venture to interfere in the internal concerns of churches. By the aid of Gennadius, governor of Africa, the pope acquired a degree of authority before unknown over the church of that country. In Gaul and in Spain he had vicars: his influence over the churches of these countries was undefined as to extent, and was chiefly exercised in the shape of exhortations to their sovereigns; but he succeeded in establishing by this means a closer connexion with the Frankish kingdom than that which had before existed; and by thus strengthening his interest in the west, he provided for his church a support independent of the power of Constantinople.

In his dealings with the bishops of the west, he upheld the authority of St. Peter’s chair as the source of all ecclesiastical privileges—the centre of jurisdiction to which, as the highest tribunal, all spiritual causes ought to be referred. His agents, although belonging to the lower grades of the ministry, were virtually the chief ecclesiastical authorities within their spheres; we find that subdeacons are in this character empowered not only to admonish individual bishops, but even to convoke those of a whole province, to administer the papal rebuke to them, and to report them to the apostolical chair in case of neglect. When, however, the agents exceeded their general authority, and allowed causes to be carried before them without reference to the diocesan, Gregory admonished them to respect the rights of the episcopate. Yet notwithstanding this lofty conception of the authority of his see, and although he must unquestionably be reckoned among those of the popes who have most effectively contributed to the extension of the papal dominion, it would appear that in his own person Gregory was unfeignedly free from all taint of pride or assumption.

Gregory always treated the eastern patriarchs as independent. He spoke of the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch as his equals—as being, like himself, successors of St. Peter, and sharers with him in the one chair of the same founder; and, although he was involved in serious differences with the bishops of the eastern capital, these differences did not arise from any claim on the Roman side, but from a supposed assumption on the part of Constantinople. John, styled for his ascetic life “the Faster”, was raised to the patriarchate in 585, after having struggled to escape the elevation with an appearance of resolute humility, which Gregory at the time admired, although he afterwards came to regard it as the mask of pride. In 587 a great synod of eastern bishops and senators was held at Constantinople for the trial of certain charges against Gregory, patriarch of Antioch. Over this assembly John presided, in virtue of the position assigned to his see by the second and fourth general councils; and in the acts he assumed, like some of his predecessors, the title of “ecumenical” (which the Latins rendered by universal) bishop. The meaning of this term, in Byzantine usage, was indefinite; there was

certainly no intention of claiming by it a jurisdiction over the whole church but Pelagius of Rome, viewing with jealousy the power of Constantinople, and apprehensive of the additional importance which its bishops might derive from the presidency of a council assembled for so important a purpose, laid hold on the title as a pretext for disallowing the acts of the assembly, although these had been confirmed by the emperor, and forbade his envoy to communicate with John.

Gregory, on succeeding Pelagius, took up the question with much earnestness. After repeated, but ineffectual, remonstrances through his apocriary, he wrote to the patriarch himself, to the emperor Maurice, and to the empress. To Maurice he urged that the title assumed by the patriarch interfered with the honour of the sovereign. He declared that John was drawn by his flatterers into the use of the “proud and foolish” word; that the assumption was an imitation of the devil, who exalted himself above his brother angels; that it was unlike the conduct of St. Peter, who, although the first of the apostles, was but a member of the same class with the rest; that bishops ought to learn from the calamities of the time to employ themselves better than in claiming lofty designations; that, appearing now when the end of the world was at hand, the claim was a token of Antichrist's approach. The council of Chalcedon, he said, had indeed given the title to the bishops of Rome; but these had never adopted it, lest they should seem to deny the pontificate to others. Gregory also wrote to Eulogius of Alexandria, and to Anastasius of Antioch, endeavouring to enlist them in his cause. To allow the title to John, he said, would be to derogate from their own rights, and would be an injury to their whole order. “Ecumenical bishop” must mean sole bishop; if, therefore, the ecumenical bishop should err, the whole church would fail; and for a patriarch of Constantinople to assume the proud and superstitious name, which was an invention of the first apostate, was alarming, since among the occupants of that see there had been not only heretics, but heresiarchs. These applications were of little effect, for both the Egyptian and the Syrian patriarchs had special reasons to deprecate a rupture of the church's peace, and to avoid any step which might provoke the emperor. Anastasius had been expelled from his see by the younger Justin, and had not recovered it until after an exclusion of thirteen years (A.D. 582-595), when he was restored on the death of Gregory; Eulogius was struggling with the difficulties of the monophysite schism : while to both of them, as being accustomed to the oriental use of language, the title of ecumenical appeared neither a novelty nor so objectionable as the Roman bishop considered it. Eulogius, however, reported that he had ceased to use it in writing to John, as Gregory had directed, and in his letter he addressed the bishop of Rome himself as “universal pope”. “I beg”, replied Gregory, “that you would not speak of directing; since I know who I am, and who you are. In dignity you are my brother; in character, my father. I pray your most sweet holiness to address me no more with the proud appellation of universal pope, since that which is given to another beyond what reason requires is subtracted from yourself. If you style me universal pope, you deny that you are at all that which you own me to be universally. Away with words which puff up vanity and wound charity!”.

John of Constantinople died in 595, leaving no other property than a small wooden bedstead, a shabby woollen coverlet, and a ragged cloak,—relics which, out of reverence for the patriarch's sanctity, were removed to the imperial palace. His successor, Cyriac, continued to use the obnoxious title; but Gregory persevered in his remonstrances against it, and, although he accepted the announcement of Cyriac's promotion, forbade his envoys at Constantinople to communicate with the new patriarch so long as the style of ecumenical bishop should be retained.

A.D. 595-603. MAURICE AND PHOCAS.

During his residence at Constantinople, Gregory had been on terms of great intimacy with Maurice, who at that time was in a private station. But since the elevation of the one to the empire, and of the other to St. Peter's chair, many causes of disagreement had arisen. Maurice favoured John personally; he represented the question of the patriarch's title as trifling, and was deaf to Gregory's appeals on the subject. He often espoused the cause of bishops or others whom Gregory wished to censure, and reminded him that the troubles of the time made it inexpedient to insist on the rigour of discipline. By forbidding persons in public employment to become monks, and requiring that soldiers should not embrace the monastic life until after the expiration of their term of service, he provoked the pope to tell him that this measure might cost him his salvation, although, in fulfilment of his duty as a subject, Gregory transmitted the law to other bishops. Moreover, there were differences arising out of Gregory's political conduct, which the exarchs and other imperial officers had represented to their master in an unfavourable light. Thus the friendship of former days had been succeeded by alienation, when in 602 a revolution took place at Constantinople. The discontent of Maurice's subjects, which had been growing for years, was swelled into revolt by the belief that, for reasons of disgraceful parsimony, he had allowed twelve thousand captive soldiers to be butchered by the Avars when it was in his power to ransom them. The emperor was deposed, and the crown was bestowed on a centurion named Phocas, who soon after caused Maurice and his children to be put to death with revolting cruelties, which the victims bore with unflinching firmness and with devout resignation. The behaviour of Gregory on this occasion has exposed him to censures from which his apologists have in vain endeavoured to clear him. Blinded by his zeal for the church, and by his dislike of the late emperor's policy, he hailed with exultation the success of an usurper whom all agree in representing as a monster of vice and barbarity; he received with honour the pictures of Phocas and his wife, placed them in a chapel of the Lateran palace, and addressed the new emperor and empress in letters of warm congratulation. Encouraged by the change of rulers, he now wrote again to the patriarch Cyriac, exhorting him to abandon the title which had occasioned so much contention. Phocas found it convenient to favour the Roman side, and for a time the word was given up or forbidden. But the next emperor, Heraclius, again used it in addressing the bishops of Constantinople; their use of it was sanctioned by the sixth and seventh general councils; and it has been retained to the present day.

Gregory was zealous in his endeavours to extend the knowledge of the gospel, and to bring over separatists to the church. He laboured, and with considerable, although not complete, success, to put an end to the schism of Aquileia and Istria, which had arisen out of the controversy as to the "three articles" and the fifth general council. In order to this purpose, he was willing to abstain from insisting on the reception of that council: the first four councils, he said, were to be acknowledged like the four Gospels; "that which by some was called the fifth" did not impugn the council of Chalcedon, but it related to personal matters only, and did not stand on the same footing with the others. By means of this, view he was able to establish a reconciliation between Constantius, bishop of Milan, an adherent of the council, and Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, although the queen persisted in refusing to condemn the three articles. The influence of this princess was of great advantage to the pope, both in religious and in political affairs. According to the usual belief, she was daughter of the prince of the Bavarians, and had been trained in the catholic faith. It is said that on the death of her husband, the Lombard king Authari, her people desired her to choose another, and promised to accept him as their sovereign; and her choice fell on Agilulf, duke of Turin, who out of gratitude for his elevation was disposed to show favour to her religion, and to listen to her mediation in behalf of the Romans. The statement of some writers, that Agilulf himself became a catholic, appears to be erroneous; but his son was baptized into the church, and in the middle of the seventh century Arianism had become extinct among the Lombards.

Towards those who were not members of the church Gregory was in general tolerant. That he urged the execution of the laws against the Donatists, is an exception which the fanatical violence of the sect may serve to explain, if not even to justify. He protected the Jews in the exercise of their religion, and disapproved of the forcible measures by which some princes of Gaul and Spain had attempted to compel them to a profession of Christianity. When a bishop of Palermo had seized and consecrated a synagogue, Gregory ordered that, as after consecration it could not be alienated from the church, the bishop should pay the value of it to the Jews. On another occasion, when a convert from Judaism, having been baptized on Easter eve, had signaled his zeal by invading the synagogue of Cagliari on the following day, and placing in it his baptismal robe, with a cross and a picture of the blessed Virgin, he was censured for the proceeding, and it was ordered that the building should be restored to the rightful owners. Sometimes, however, Gregory endeavoured to expedite the conversion of Jews by holding out allowances of money or diminution of rent as inducements, and by increasing the rent of those who were obstinate in their misbelief; and, although he expressed a consciousness that conversion produced by such means might be hypocritical, he justified them by the consideration that the children of the converts would enjoy Christian training, and might thus become sincere believers in the gospel.

Gregory endeavoured to root out the remains of paganism which still existed in some parts of Italy and in the islands of Sardinia and Corsica. He wrote in reproof of landowners—some of them even bishops—who allowed their peasants to continue in heathenism, and of official persons who suffered themselves to be bribed into conniving at it. Sometimes he recommended lenity as the best means of converting the pagan rustics; sometimes the imposition of taxes, or even personal chastisement.

But the most memorable of Gregory's attempts for the conversion of the heathen had our own island for its scene. It is probable that many of the Britons who had become slaves to the northern invaders retained some sort of Christianity; but the visible appearance of a church no longer existed among them, and the last bishops within the Saxon territory are said to have withdrawn from London and York into Wales about the year 587. The zeal of religious controversy has largely affected the representations given by many writers of the subject at which we have now arrived. Those in the Roman interest have made it their object to narrow as much as possible the extent of the British Christianity, to disparage its character, and to reflect on the British clergy for their supineness and uncharitableness in neglecting to impart the knowledge of salvation to their Saxon neighbours. And while some Anglican writers have caught this tone, without sufficiently considering what abatements may fairly be made from the declamations of Gildas and from the statements of ancient authors unfriendly to the Britons; or whether, in the fierce struggles of war, and in the state of bondage which followed, it would have been even possible for these to attempt the conversion of their conquerors and oppressors—other protestants have committed the opposite injustice of decrying the motives and putting the worst construction on the actions of those who were instrumental in the conversion which proceeded from Rome.

It will be enough to allude to the familiar story of the incident which is said to have first directed Gregory's mind towards the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons—the sight of the fair-haired captives in the Roman market, and the succession of fanciful plays on words by which he declared that these *Angles* of *angelic* beauty, subjects of *Aella*, king of Deira, must be called from the ire of God, and taught to sing *Alleluia*. Animated by a desire to carry out the conversion of their countrymen, he resolved to undertake a mission to Britain, and the pope (whether Benedict or Pelagius) sanctioned the enterprise; but the people of Rome, who were warmly attached to Gregory, made such demonstrations that he was obliged to abandon it. Although, however, he was thus prevented from executing the work in person, he kept it in view until, after his elevation to the papal chair, he was able to commit it to the agency of others.

Ethelbert had succeeded to the kingdom of Kent in 568, and in 593 had attained the dignity of Bretwalda, which gave him an influence over the whole of England south of the Humber. About 570, as is supposed, he had married a Christian princess, Bertha, daughter of Charibert, king of Paris, and the saintly Ingoberga

As a condition of this marriage, the free exercise of her religion was secured for the queen, and a French bishop, named Luidhard, or Letard, accompanied her to the Kentish court. It is probable that Bertha, in the course of her long union with Ethelbert, had made some attempts, at least indirectly, to influence him in favour of the gospel; perhaps, too, it may have been from her that Gregory received representations which led him to suppose that many of the Anglo-Saxons were desirous of Christian instruction, and that the Britons refused to bestow it on them. In 595, during an interval of peace with the Lombards, the pope despatched Augustine, provost of his own monastery, with a party of monks, to preach the gospel in England; and about the same time he desired Candidus, *defensor* of the papal estates in Gaul, to buy up English captive youths, and to place them in monasteries, with a view to training them for the conversion of their countrymen. But the missionaries, while in the south of France, took alarm at the thought of the dangers which they were likely to incur among a barbarous and unbelieving people whose language was utterly unknown to them; and their chief returned to Rome, entreating that they might be allowed to relinquish the enterprise. Instead of assenting to this petition, however, Gregory encouraged them to go on, and furnished them with letters to various princes and bishops of Gaul, whom he requested to support them by their influence, and to supply them with interpreters.

In 597 Augustine, with about forty companions, landed in the Isle of Thanet. Ethelbert, on being apprised of their arrival, went to meet them; and at an interview, which was held in the open air, because he feared lest they might practise some magical arts if he ventured himself under a roof with them, he listened to their announcement of the message of salvation. The king professed himself unable to abandon at once the belief of his fathers for the new doctrines, but gave the missionaries leave to take up their abode in his capital, Durovernum (Canterbury), and to preach freely among his subjects. They entered the city in procession, chanting litanies and displaying a silver cross with a picture of the Saviour. On a rising ground without the walls they found a church of the Roman-British period, dedicated to St. Martin, in which Luidhard had lately celebrated his worship; and to this day the spot on which it stood, overlooking the valley of the Stour, is occupied by a little church, which, after many architectural changes, exhibits a large proportion of ancient Roman materials. There Augustine and his brethren worshipped; and by the spectacle of their devout and self-denying lives, and of the miracles which are said to have accompanied their preaching, many converts were drawn to them. Ethelbert himself was baptized on Whitsunday 597, and declared his wish that his subjects should embrace the gospel, although he professed himself resolved to put no constraint on their opinions.

Gregory had intended that Augustine, if he succeeded in making an opening among the Saxons, should receive episcopal consecration. For this purpose the missionary now repaired to Arles; and from that city he sent some of his companions to Rome with a report of his successes. The pope's answer contains advice which may be understood as hinting at some known defects of Augustine's character, or as suggested by the tone of his report. He exhorts him not to be elated by his success or by the miracles which he had been enabled to perform; he must reckon that these were granted not for his own sake, but for that of the people to whom he was sent. Having accomplished the object of his journey into Gaul, Augustine returned to England by Christmas 597; and Gregory was able to announce to Eulogius of Alexandria that at that festival the missionaries had baptized ten thousand persons in one day.

In the summer of 601 the pope despatched a reinforcement to the English mission. The new auxiliaries—among whom were Mellitus and Justus, successively archbishops of Canterbury, and Paulinus, afterwards the apostle of Northumbria—carried with them a large

supply of books, including the Gospels, with church plate, vestments, relics which were said to be those of apostles and martyrs, and the pall which was to invest Augustine with the dignity of a metropolitan. Gregory had written to Ethelbert, exhorting him to destroy the heathen temples in his dominions; but, on further consideration, he took a different view of the matter, and sent after Mellitus a letter for the guidance of Augustine, desiring him not to destroy the temples, but, if they were well built, to purify them with holy water, and convert them to the worship of the true God; thus, it was hoped, the people might be the more readily attracted to the new religion, if its rites were celebrated in places where they had been accustomed to worship. By a more questionable accommodation of the same sort—for which, however, the authority of Scripture was alleged—it was directed that, instead of the heathen sacrifices and of the banquets which followed them, the festivals of the saints whose relics were deposited in any church should be celebrated by making booths of boughs, slaying animals, and feasting on them with religious thankfulness.

About the same time Gregory returned an elaborate set of answers to some questions which Augustine had proposed as to difficulties which had occurred or might be expected to occur to him. As to the division of ecclesiastical funds, he states the Roman principle—that a fourth part should be assigned to the bishop and his household for purposes of hospitality; a fourth to the clergy; another to the poor; and the remaining quarter to the maintenance of churches. But he says that Augustine, as having been trained under the monastic rule, is to live in the society of his clergy; that it is needless to lay down any precise regulations as to the duties of hospitality and charity, where all things are held in common, and all that can be spared is to be devoted to pious and religious uses. Such of the clerks not in holy orders as might wish to marry might be permitted to do so, and a maintenance was to be allowed them. In reply to a question whether a variety of religious usages were allowable where the faith was the same—a question probably suggested by the circumstance of Luidhard's having officiated at Canterbury according to the Gallican rite,—the pope's answer was in a spirit no less unlike to that of his predecessors Innocent and Leo than to that of the dominant party in the Latin church of our own day. He desired Augustine to select from the usages of any churches such right, religious, and pious things as might seem suitable for the new church of the English; “for”, it was said, “we must not love things on account of places, but places on account of good things”. With respect to the degrees within which marriage was to be forbidden, Gregory, while laying down a law for the baptized, under pain of exclusion from the holy Eucharist, did not insist on the separation of those who from ignorance had contracted marriages contrary to his rule: “for”, he said, “the church in this time corrects some sins out of zeal, bears with some out of lenity, connives at some out of consideration, and so bears and connives as by this means often to restrain the evil which she opposes”. In answer to another inquiry, Augustine was told that he must not interfere with the bishops of Gaul beyond gently hinting to them such things as might seem to require amendment; “but”, it was added, “we commit to your brotherhood the care of all the British bishops, that the ignorant may be instructed, the weak may be strengthened by your counsel, the perverse may be corrected by your authority”.

It was Gregory's design that Augustine should make London his metropolitan see, and should have twelve bishops under him; that another metropolitan, with a like number of suffragans, should, when circumstances permitted, be established at York; and that, after the death of Augustine, the archbishops of London and York should take precedence according to the date of their consecration. But this scheme, arranged in ignorance of the political divisions which had been introduced into Britain since the withdrawal of the Romans, was never carried out. Augustine fixed himself in the Kentish capital, as London was in another kingdom; and his successors in the see of Canterbury have, although not without dispute from time to time on the part of York, continued to be primates of all England.

The bishops of the ancient British church were not disposed to acknowledge the jurisdiction which Gregory had professed to confer on his emissary. In 603, Augustine, through the influence of Ethelbert, obtained a conference with some of them at a place which from him was called Augustine's Oak—probably Aust Clive, on the Severn. He exhorted them to adopt the Roman usages as to certain points in which the churches differed, and proposed an appeal to the Divine judgment by way of deciding between the rival traditions. A blind Saxon was brought forward, and the Britons were unable to cure him; but when Augustine prayed that the gift of bodily light to one might be the means of illuminating the minds of many, it is said that the man forthwith received his sight. The Britons, although compelled by this miracle to acknowledge the superiority of the Roman cause, said that they could not alter their customs without the consent of their countrymen; and a second conference was appointed, at which seven British bishops appeared, with Dinoth, abbot of the great monastery of Bangor Iscoed, in Flintshire. A hermit, whom they had consulted as to the manner in which they should act, had directed them to submit to Augustine if he were a man of God, and, on being asked how they should know this, had told them to observe whether Augustine rose up to greet them on their arrival at the place of meeting. As the archbishop omitted this courtesy, the Britons concluded that he was proud and domineering; they refused to listen to his proposal that their other differences of observance should be borne with if they would comply with the Roman usages as to the time of keeping Easter, and as to the manner of administering baptism, and would join with him in preaching to the English; whereupon Augustine is said to have told them in anger that, if they would not have peace with their brethren, they would have war with their enemies, and suffer death at the hands of those to whom they refused to preach the way of life. In judging of this affair, we shall do well to guard against the partiality which has led many writers to cast the blame on the Romans or on the Britons exclusively. We may respect in the Britons their desire to adhere to old ways and to resist foreign assumption; in the missionaries, their eagerness to establish unity in external matters with a view to the great object of spreading the gospel: but the benefits which might have been expected were lost through the arrogant demeanour of the one party, and through the narrow and stubborn jealousy of the other.

Augustine is supposed to have died soon after the conference. Before his death he had consecrated Justus to the bishopric of Rochester, and Mellitus to that of London, the capital of Sacerct, nephew of Ethelbert, and king of Essex; he had also consecrated Laurence as his own successor, and he left to him the completion of the great monastery which he had begun to build, without the walls of Canterbury, in honour of St. Peter and St. Paul, but which in later times was known by the name of the founder himself. The threat or prophecy which he had uttered at the meeting with the Britons, was supposed to be fulfilled some years after, when Ethelfrid, the pagan king of Bernicia, invaded their territory. In a battle at Caerleon on the Dee, Ethelfrid saw a number of unarmed men, and on inquiry was told that they were monks of Bangor who had come to pray for the success of their countrymen. "Then", he cried, "although they have no weapons, they are fighting against us"; and he ordered them to be put to the sword. About twelve hundred, it is said, were slain, and only fifty escaped by flight.

Amidst the pressure of his manifold occupations, and notwithstanding frequent attacks of sickness, Gregory found time for the composition of extensive works. The most voluminous of these, the *Morals on the book of Job*, was undertaken at the suggestion of Leander, bishop of Seville, with whom he had made acquaintance at Constantinople, where the Spanish prelate was employed in soliciting the emperor to aid his convert Hermenegild. It cannot be said that Gregory's qualifications for commenting on Holy Scripture were of any critical kind; he repeatedly states that (notwithstanding his residence of some years at Constantinople), he was ignorant even of Greek, and the nature of his work is indicated by its title. From the circumstance that Job sometimes makes use of figurative language, he infers that in some passages the literal sense does not exist; and he applies himself chiefly to

explaining the typical and moral senses—often carrying to an extreme the characteristic faults of this kind of interpretation—strange wresting of the language of Scripture, and introduction of foreign matter under pretence of explaining what is written. He regards Job as a type of the Saviour; the patriarch's wife, of the carnally-minded; his friends, as representing heretics; their conviction, as signifying the reconciliation of the heretics to the church.

The *Morals* were greatly admired. Marinian, bishop of Ravenna, caused them to be read in church; but Gregory desired that this might be given up, as the book, not being intended for popular use, might be to some hearers rather a hindrance than a means of spiritual advancement.

The Pastoral Rule written in consequence of Gregory's having been censured by John, the predecessor of Marinian, for attempting to decline the episcopate, also contains some curious specimens of allegorical interpretation; but it is marked by a spirit of practical wisdom and by an experienced knowledge of the heart. It was translated into various languages; the Anglo-Saxon version was made by king Alfred, who sent a copy of it to every bishop in his kingdom for preservation in the cathedral church. In France it was adopted as a rule of episcopal conduct by reforming synods under Charlemagne and his son; and some synods ordered that it should be put into the hands of bishops at their consecration.

In his *Dialogues*, addressed to Queen Theodelinda, Gregory discourses with a deacon named Peter on the miracles of Italian saints. The genuineness of the work has been questioned, chiefly on account of the anile legends with which it is filled. But the evidence of the authorship is generally admitted to be sufficient; and it is to be noted to Gregory's praise that he repeatedly warns his disciple against attaching too much value to the miracles which are related with such unhesitating credulity. In the fourth book, the state of the soul after death is discussed. Peter asks why it is that new revelations are now made on the subject, and is told that the time is one of twilight between the present world and that which is to come; and that consequently such revelations are now seasonable. The doctrine of Purgatory is here advanced more distinctly than in any earlier writing. The oriental idea of a purifying fire, through which souls must pass at the day of judgment, had been maintained by Origen; but at a later time the belief in a process of cleansing between death and judgment was deduced from St. Paul's words, that "the fire shall try every man's work", and that some shall be saved "as by fire"; and it was supposed that by such means every one who died in the orthodox faith, however faulty his life might have been, would eventually be brought to salvation. St. Augustine earnestly combated this error, and maintained that the probation of which the apostle spoke consisted chiefly in the trials which are sent on men during the present life. He thought, however, that, for those who in the main had been servants of Christ, there might perhaps be a purging of their remaining imperfections after death; and, although he was careful to state this opinion as no more than a conjecture, the great authority of his name caused it to be soon more confidently held. Gregory lays it down that, as every one departs hence, so is he presented in the judgment; yet that we must believe that for some slight transgressions there is a purgatorial fire before the judgment day. In proof of this are alleged the words of our Lord in St. Matthew XII. 32, from which it is inferred, as it had already been inferred by Augustine, that some sins shall be forgiven in the world to come; and the doctrine is confirmed by tales of visions, in which the spirits of persons suffering in purgatory had appeared, and had entreated that the eucharistic sacrifice might be offered in order to their relief. A work in which religious instruction was thus combined with the attractions of romantic fiction naturally became very popular. Pope Zacharias (A.D. 741-752) rendered it into his native Greek; it was translated into Anglo-Saxon under Alfred's care, by Werfrith, bishop of Worcester; and among the other translations was one into Arabic.

Gregory has been accused of having destroyed or mutilated the monuments of ancient Roman greatness, in order that they might not distract the attention of pilgrims, and of having, from a like motive, burnt the Palatine library, and endeavoured to exterminate the copies of

Livy's *History*. These stories are now rejected as fictions invented during the middle ages with a view of doing honour to his zeal; but it is unquestionable that he disliked and discouraged pagan literature. In the epistle prefixed to his *Morals* he professes himself indifferent to style, and even to grammatical correctness, on the ground that the words of inspiration ought not to be tied down under the rules of Donatus. And in a letter to Desiderius, bishop of Vienne, who was reported to have given lessons in "grammar", he does not confine his rebuke to the unseemliness of such employment for a member of the episcopal order, but declares that even a religious layman ought not to defile his lips with the blasphemous praises of false deities. However this contempt of secular learning may be excused in Gregory himself, it is to be regretted that his authority did much to foster a contented ignorance in the ages which followed.

In other respects the pope's opinions were those of his age, controlled in some measure by his practical good sense. His reverence for the authority of the church may be inferred from his repeated declarations that he regarded the first four general councils as standing on the same level with the four Gospels. It has been argued from some passages in his works that he held the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Eucharist; but his words, although sometimes highly rhetorical, do not seem to affirm any other than a spiritual presence of the Saviour's body and blood in the consecrated elements.

After what has been said of his character and history, it is hardly necessary to state that Gregory was a zealous friend to monachism. He protected the privileges and property of monastic societies against the encroachments of the bishops, and in many cases he exempted monks from episcopal jurisdiction as to the management of their affairs, although he was careful to leave the bishops undisturbed in the right of superintending their morals. But, notwithstanding his love for the monastic life, he detected and denounced many of the deceits which may be compatible with asceticism; perhaps his disagreement with John the Faster may have aided him to see these evils the more clearly. With reference to the edicts of Justinian which had sanctioned the separation of married persons in order to enter on the monastic profession, he plainly declares that such an act, although allowed by human laws, is forbidden by the law of God. Nor, although he contributed to extend the obligation to celibacy among the clergy, was his zeal for the enforcement of it violent or inconsiderate; thus, in directing that the subdeacons of Sicily should in future be restrained from marriage, he revoked an order of his predecessor, by which those who had married before the introduction of the Roman rule were compelled to separate from their wives.

A veneration for relics is strongly marked in Gregory's writings. It was his practice to send, in token of his especial favour, presents of keys, in which were said to be contained some filings of St. Peter's chains. These keys were accompanied by a prayer that that which had bound the apostle for martyrdom might loose the receiver from all his sins; and to some of them miraculous histories were attached. The empress Constantina—instigated, it is supposed, by John of Constantinople, with a view of bringing the pope into trouble—asked him to send her the head, or some part of the body, of St. Paul, for a new church which was built in honour of the apostle. Gregory answered, that it was not the custom at Rome to handle or to dispose of the bodies of martyrs; that many persons who had presumed to touch the remains of St. Peter and St. Paul had been struck with death in consequence; that he could only send her a cloth which had been applied to the apostle's body, but that such cloths possessed the same miraculous power as the relics themselves. He added, that the practice of removing relics gave occasion to fraud, and mentioned the case of some Greek monks who, when called in question for digging up dead bodies by night at Rome, had confessed an intention of passing them off in Greece as relics of martyrs.

Two of Gregory's letters are addressed to Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, who, on finding that some images were the subjects of adoration, had broken them; and these letters have a special interest from their bearing on the controversy as to images which arose

somewhat more than a century later. The pope commends Serenus for his zeal, but blames him for the manner in which it had been displayed. He tells him that modesty ought to have restrained him from an action for which no bishop had given any precedent; that pictures and images serve for the instruction of those who cannot read books; and that for this purpose they ought to be preserved in churches, while care should be taken to guard against the worship of them.

Gregory's infirmities had long been growing on him. For some years he had been seldom able to leave his bed; he professed that the expectation of death was his only consolation, and requested his friends to pray for his deliverance from his sufferings. On the 12th of March 604 he was released.

While the conversion of the English was reserved for the zeal of Italian monks, a remarkable body of missionaries set out from the shores of Ireland. Their leader, Columban, born in the province of Leinster about 560, was trained in the great Irish monastery of Bangor, which, with the houses and cells dependent on it, contained a society of three thousand monks, under the government of its founder, Comgal. Columban resolved to detach himself from earthly things by leaving his country, after the example of Abraham, and in 589 he crossed the sea with twelve companions into Britain, and thence into Gaul. He had intended to preach the gospel to the heathen nations beyond the Frankish dominions; but the decayed state of religion and discipline offered him abundant employment in Gaul, and at the invitation of Guntram, king of Burgundy, he settled in that country. Declining the king's offers of a better position, he established himself in the Vosges, where a district which in the Roman times was cultivated and populous had again become a wilderness, while abundant remains of Roman architecture and monuments of the old idolatry were left as evidence of its former prosperity. Here he successively founded three monasteries—Anegray, Luxeuil, and Fontaines. For a time the missionaries had to endure great hardships; they had often for days no other food than wild herbs and the bark of trees, until their needs were supplied by means which are described as miraculous. But by degrees the spectacle of their severe and devoted life made an impression on the people of the neighbourhood. They were looked on with reverence by men of every class, and, while their religious instructions were gladly heard, their labours in clearing and tilling the land encouraged the inhabitants to exertions of the same kind. The monasteries were speedily filled with persons attracted by the contrast which Columban's system presented to the general relaxation of piety and morals among the native monks and clergy; and children of noble birth were placed in them for education.

The Rule of Columban was probably derived in great measure from the Irish Bangor. The main principle of it was the inculcation of absolute obedience to superiors, the entire mortification of the individual will—a principle which is dangerous, as relieving the mind from the feeling of responsibility, and as tending either to deaden the spirit, or to deceive it into pride veiled under the appearance of humility. The diet of the monks was to be coarse, and was to be proportioned to their labour. But Columban warned against excessive abstinence, as being “not a virtue but a vice”. “Every day”, it was said, “there must be fasting, as every day there must be refreshment”; and every day the monks were also to pray, to work, and to read. There were to be three services by day and three by night, at hours variable according to the season. The monastic plainness was extended even to the sacred vessels, which were not to be of any material more costly than brass; and, among other things, it is noted that Columban in some measure anticipated the later usage of the Latin church by excluding novices and other insufficiently instructed persons from the eucharistic cup. To the Rule was attached a Penitential, which, instead of leaving to the abbot the same discretion in the appointment of punishments which was allowed by the Benedictine system, lays down the details with curious minuteness. Corporal chastisement is the most frequent penalty. Thus, six strokes were to be given to every one who should call anything his own; to every one who should omit to say “Amen” after the abbot's blessing, or to make the sign of the cross on his

spoon or his candle; to every one who should talk at meals, or who should fail to repress a cough at the beginning of a psalm. Ten strokes were the punishment for striking the table with a knife, or for spilling beer on it. For heavier offences the number rose as high as two hundred; but in no case were more than twenty-five to be inflicted at once. Among the other penances were fasting on bread and water, psalm-singing, humble postures, and long periods of silence. Penitents were not allowed to wash their hands except on Sunday. They were obliged to kneel at prayers even on the Lord's day and in the pentecostal season. Columban warned the monks against relying on externals; but it may fairly be questioned whether his warnings can have been powerful enough to counteract the natural tendency of a system so circumstantial and so rigid in the enforcement of formal observances.

Columban fell into disputes with his neighbours as to the time of keeping Easter, in which he followed the custom of his native country. He wrote on the subject to Gregory and to Boniface (either the third or the fourth pope of that name), requesting that they would not consider his practice as a ground for breach of communion. In his letters to popes, while he speaks with high respect of the Roman see, the British spirit of independence strongly appears. He exhorts Gregory to reconsider the question of the paschal cycle without deferring to the opinions of Leo or of other elder popes; "perhaps", he says, "in this case, a living dog may be better than a dead lion". He even sets the church of Jerusalem above that of Rome : "You", he tells Boniface IV, "are almost heavenly, and Rome is the head of the churches of the world, saving the special prerogative of the place of the Lord's resurrection"; and he goes on to say that, in proportion as the dignity of the Roman bishops is great, so ought their care to be great, lest by perversity they lose it. Another letter on the subject of Easter is addressed to a Gaulish synod. He entreats the bishops to let him follow the usage to which he has been accustomed, and to allow him to live peaceably, as he had already lived for twelve years, amid the solitude of the forest, and beside the bones of his seventeen deceased brethren.

After a residence of about twenty years in Burgundy, Columban incurred the displeasure of king Theodoric II, by whom he had before been held in great honour.

Brunichild, the grandmother of Theodoric, according to a policy not uncommon among the queen-mothers of India in our own day, endeavoured to prolong her influence in the kingdom by encouraging the young prince in a life of indolence and sensuality. Columban repeatedly, both by word and by letter, remonstrated against Theodoric's courses : he refused to bless his illegitimate children, and, with much vehemence of behaviour, rejected the hospitality of the court, making (it is said) the dishes and drinking-vessels which were set before him fly into pieces by his word. The king, whom Brunichild diligently instigated against him, told him that he was not unwise enough to make him a martyr, but ordered him to be conducted to Nantes with his Irish monks, in order that they might be sent back to their own country. The journey of the missionaries across France was rendered a series of triumphs by the miracles of Columban and by the popular enthusiasm in his favour. On their arrival at Nantes, the vessel which was intended to convey them to Ireland was prevented by miraculous causes from performing its task; and Columban, being then allowed to choose his own course, made his way to Metz, where Theodebert II of Austrasia gave him leave to preach throughout his dominions. He then ascended the Rhine into Switzerland, and laboured for a time in the neighbourhood of the lake of Zurich. At Tuggen, it is said, he found a number of the inhabitants assembled around a large vat of beer, and was told that it was intended as a sacrifice to Woden. By breathing on it, he made the vessel burst with a loud noise, so that, as his biographer tells us, it was manifest that the devil had been hidden in it. His preaching and miracles gained many converts, but after a time he was driven, by the hostility of the idolatrous multitude, to remove into the neighbourhood of Bregenz, on the lake of Constance, where he found circumstances favourable to the success of his work. The country had formerly been Christian; many of its inhabitants had been baptized, although they had afterwards conformed to the idolatry of the Alamanni who had overrun it; and the Alamannic

law, made under Frankish influence, already provided for Christian clergy the same privileges which they enjoyed in France. Columban was kindly received by a presbyter named Willimar: he destroyed the idols of the people, threw them into the lake, and for a time preached with great success. But in 612 Theodebert was defeated by Theodoric, and Columban found it necessary to leave the territory which had thus fallen into the possession of his enemy. He meditated a mission to the Slavons, but was diverted from the design by an angel, and crossed the Alps into Italy, where he was received with honour by Agilulf and Theodelinda, and founded a monastery at Bobbio. At the request of his Lombard patrons, he wrote to Boniface IV on the controversy of the Three Articles. His knowledge of the question was very small: he had been possessed with opinions contrary to those of the Roman bishops respecting it; and perhaps this difference of views, together with the noted impetuosity of his character, might have led to serious disagreements, but that the danger was prevented by Columban's death in 615. In the preceding year he had refused an invitation from Clotaire II, who had become sole king of France, to return to his old abode at Luxeuil.

Both Luxeuil and Bobbio became the parents of many monasteries in other quarters. But the most celebrated of Columban's followers was his countryman Gall, who had been his pupil from boyhood, and had accompanied him in all his fortunes, until compelled by illness to remain behind when his master passed into Italy. Gall founded in the year 614 the famous monastery which bears his name, and is honoured as the apostle of Switzerland. He died in 627.

CHAPTER II.
MAHOMET.—THE MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY.
A.D. 610-718.

Phocas, after having earned universal detestation during a reign of eight years, was dethroned and put to death in 610, by Heraclius, son of the exarch of Africa. The new emperor found himself involved in a formidable war with Chosroes II, king of Persia. Chosroes had formerly been driven from his kingdom, had found a refuge within the empire, and had been restored by the arms of Maurice. On receiving the announcement that Phocas had ascended the throne, he declared himself the avenger of his benefactor; he invaded the empire, repeatedly defeated the usurper's disorderly troops, and had advanced as far as Antioch, which fell into his hands, immediately after the elevation of Heraclius. The war for which the murder of Maurice had been the pretext, did not end on the fall of his murderer. Chosroes overran Syria and Palestine; with one division of his force he conquered Egypt, and carried devastation as far as Tripoli, while another advanced to Chalcedon, and for ten years presented to the people of Constantinople the insulting and alarming spectacle of a hostile camp on the opposite shore of the Bosphorus.

Between the Avars on the European side and the Persians on the east, Heraclius was reduced to extreme distress. He had resolved to return to Africa, which had recovered much of its old prosperity, and was then the most flourishing province of the empire; but the patriarch of Constantinople obliged him to swear that he would not forsake those who had received him as their sovereign. At length, after having in vain attempted to appease Chosroes by offering to become his tributary, the emperor resolved on the almost desperate enterprise of carrying the war into the enemy's country. He raised a large sum of money by loans—borrowing the plate and other wealth of churches on a promise of repayment with interest. With this money he levied an army, and, having secured the forbearance of the Avars, he boldly made his way into the heart of Persia. In six brilliant campaigns he recovered the provinces which had been lost. Chosroes fled before him, and in 628 was deposed and put to death by his own son Siroes, who was glad to make peace with the Romans.

The war had on each side been one of religion. Chosroes was aided in his attack on Jerusalem by 26,000 Jews, collected from all quarters. On the capture of the city he destroyed churches, defiled the holy places, plundered the treasures amassed from the offerings of pilgrims during three centuries, and carried off into Persia the patriarch Zacharias, with the relic which was venerated as the true cross. It is said that 90,000 Christians were slain on this occasion, and that many of these were bought by the Jews for the purpose of butchering them. A great number of Christians, however, found safety by flying into Egypt, and were received with extraordinary kindness by John, patriarch of Alexandria, whose charities earned for him the title of "the Almsgiver". Heraclius, in his turn, retaliated on the religion of Persia by destroying its temples (especially that at Thebarnes, the birthplace of Zoroaster), and quenching the sacred fire. He restored the cross with great triumph to Jerusalem, and the event was commemorated by a new festival—the "Exaltation of the Cross". And the edict of Hadrian against the Jews was renewed—forbidding them to approach within three miles of their holy city.

While Chosroes was warring against the religion of the empire, a more formidable and more lasting scourge of Christendom had arisen in Arabia. The prevailing religion of that

country is said to have been founded on a belief in the unity of God; but this belief was darkened and practically superseded by a worship of the heavenly bodies, of angels and of idols, of trees and rocks and stones. The ancient sanctuary of the nation, the Caaba, or holy house of Mecca, contained a number of images answering to that of the days in the year. Other religions also existed in Arabia. Judaism had become the faith of some tribes; orthodox Christian missionaries had made converts; and members of various sects, such as Gnostics, Manichaeans, Nestorians, and Monophysites, had found in that country a refuge from the unfriendly laws of the empires. Thus there were abundant materials within the reach of any one who might undertake to become the founder of a new religious system.

Mahomet was born at Mecca in 570 or the following year. His temper was naturally mystical and enthusiastic; he was subject from an early age to fits, which were supposed to proceed from an influence of evil spirits; and in the course of his mental conflicts he was often reduced to a state of melancholy depression which suggested the thought of suicide. He appears to have become possessed with a ruling idea of the Divine unity, and with a vehement indignation against idolatry. Every year, according to a custom which was not uncommon among his countrymen, he withdrew to a cave in a mountain, and spent some time in religious solitude; and in his lonely musings, his mind, rendered visionary by his peculiar disease, was gradually wrought up to a belief that he was especially called by God to be an instrument for the propagation of the true faith, and was favoured with revelations from heaven. The Koran, in which his oracles are preserved, has much in common with both the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures; but it would seem that Mahomet was not acquainted with either the Old or the New Testament—that he rather drew his materials, more or less directly, from such sources as Talmudical legends, apocryphal Gospels, and other heretical writings, mixed with the old traditions of Syria and Arabia. His own account of the work was, that its contents were written from eternity on the “preserved table” which stands before the throne of God; that a copy was brought down to the lowest heaven by the angel Gabriel (whom Mahomet seems to have gradually identified with the Holy Spirit), and that the sections of it were revealed according as circumstances required. The charge of inconsistency between the different parts was guarded against by the convenient principle that a later revelation abrogated so much of the earlier revelation as disagreed with it. By way of proof that he had not forged these oracles, which are always uttered in the name of God himself, Mahomet repeatedly insists on the contrast between his own illiteracy and the perfection of the book, both as to purity of style and as to substance; he challenges objectors to produce any work either of men or of genii which can be compared with it. The portions of the Koran were noted down as they proceeded from the prophet's mouth; and after his death they were collected into one body, although without any regard to the order in which they had been delivered.

The religion thus announced was styled Islam—a word which means submission or resignation to the will of God. Its single doctrine was declared to be, that “There is no God but the true God, and Mahomet is his apostle”; but under this principle was comprehended belief in six points—(1) in God; (2) in his angels; (3) in his scriptures; (4) in his prophets; (5) in the resurrection and the day of judgment; (6) in God's absolute decree and predetermination both of good and evil. With these were combined four practical duties—(1) prayer, with its preliminary washings and lustrations; (2) alms; (3) fasting; (4) the pilgrimage to Mecca, which was said to be so essential that any one who died without performing it might as well die a Jew or a Christian. Judaism and Christianity were regarded as true, although imperfect, religions. Their holy books were acknowledged, and it would seem that Mahomet's original intention was rather to connect his religion with the elder systems than to represent it as superseding them. Jesus was regarded as the greatest of all former prophets, but, although his birth was represented as miraculous, the belief in his Godhead was declared to be an error; he was said to be a mere man, and his death was explained away, either on the docetic principle, or by the supposition that another person suffered in his stead. Mahomet asserted that he

himself had been foretold in Scripture, but that the prophecies had been falsified by those who had the custody of them; yet he and his followers claimed some passages of the extant Scriptures in his favour, such as the promise of the Paraclete, and the parable in which the labourers are spoken of as called at various times of the day — the final call being to the religion of Islam.

The conception of the Divine majesty in the Koran is sublime; the mercy of God is dwelt on in a very impressive manner. But the absence of anything like the Christian doctrine of the incarnation places an impassable gulf between the Creator and his creatures; there is no idea of redemption, of mediation, of adoption to sonship with God, of restoration to his image. The Divine omnipotence is represented as arbitrary, and as requiring an abject submission to its will. The duty of loving their brethren in the faith is strongly inculcated on the disciples of Islam; but their love is not to extend beyond this brotherhood; and the broad declarations which had held forth the hope of salvation, not only to Jews and Christians, but to Sabians, and to “whoever believeth in God and in the last day, and doeth that which is right”, were abrogated by later oracles, which denounced perdition against all but the followers of Islam. In other respects the new religion was unquestionably a great improvement on that which Mahomet found established among his countrymen, and, while it elevated their belief above the superstitious and idolatrous system to which they had been accustomed, it benefited society by substituting a measure of justice for rude violence, and by abolishing the custom of putting female infants to death. The general tone of its morality is rather austere than (as it has sometimes been styled) licentious instead of being condemned for his sanction of polygamy, Mahomet rather deserves credit for having limited the license which had before prevailed in this respect, although he retained an extreme and practically very mischievous facility of divorce; but it is one of the most damning traits in his character, that he declared himself to be exempt from the restrictions which he imposed on his disciples, and that he claimed for his laxity the sanction of pretended revelations.

On the merits of that enigmatical character it would be bold to give any confident opinion. The religious enmity by which it was formerly misrepresented appears to have little effect in our own time; we need rather to be on our guard against too favourable judgments, the offspring of a reaction against former prejudices, or of an affectation of novelty and paradox which in some cases appears to be not only deliberate but almost avowed. The latest and most complete evidence seems to prove that Mahomet was at first an honest enthusiast; as to the more doubtful part of his career, I must confess myself unable to enter into the views of his admirers; but I will not venture to judge whether he was guilty of conscious imposture, or was blindly carried along by the intoxication of the power which he had acquired and by the lust of extending it.

Mahomet had reached the age of forty before (in obedience, as he professed, to a heavenly vision) he announced himself as a prophet. At first he made proselytes slowly among his friends and near relations; he then by degrees attempted to publish his opinions in a wider circle. But his pretensions were disbelieved; he and his followers were persecuted by the Koreish, the tribe which was dominant in Mecca and had possession of the Caaba; and in 622 (the year in which Heraclius made his first campaign against the Persians) he fled to Yatrib (Medina), where he had already contrived to form a party, and was received as a prince and a prophet. This flight (Hegira) is regarded as the great era in the prophet's life, and is the foundation of the Mahometan chronology. Hitherto he had endeavoured to spread his doctrines by persuasion only; but now that he was possessed of force, he was charged by revelation to use it for the propagation of the faith. His oracles became fierce and sanguinary. From leading his little bands of followers to attack caravans of merchants, he went on, as his strength increased, to more considerable enterprises; and in 630 he gained possession of Mecca, cleansed the Caaba of its idols, erected it into the great sanctuary of Islam, and united all the tribes of Arabia under his own dominion and in the profession of his religion.

When his power had become considerable, Mahomet sent envoys to the emperor, to the king of Persia, and to other neighbouring princes, declaring his mission as “the apostle of God”, and requiring them to submit to the faith of Islam. Heraclius is said to have received the communication with respect; the Persian king contemptuously tore the letter in pieces; and Mahomet, on hearing of the act, exclaimed, “It is thus that God will tear from him his kingdom, and reject his supplications”.

The duty of fighting for Islam (for arms and not argument were to be the means for the conversion of all who should refuse to believe on a simple announcement of the faith) was binding on all its professors, except the sick and the feeble, the lame, the blind, and the poor; and, lest the believers should at any time rest satisfied with their conquests, Mahomet is said to have declared that wars for the propagation of the truth were not to cease until the coming of Antichrist. The fanaticism of the warriors was urged on by the inducements of rapine and of lust; for the limit which the Koran prescribed as to the number of concubines did not apply to captives or slaves. They were raised above regard for life by the conviction that they were doing God’s will, by the belief of an absolute and irresistible predestination, and by the insurance of bliss in paradise—a bliss which to the sensual offered unlimited gratifications with unlimited powers of enjoyment, while the martyrs and those who should die in the wars of the faith were moreover to be admitted to the transcendent and ineffable felicity of holding the face of God at morning and at evening. Thus animated, the Moslem armies went forth with an enthusiasm which nothing could check. Their immense sacrifices of life in bloody battles and in long sieges were repaired by an unfailling succession of warriors. Before the death of Mahomet, which took place at Medina in 632, Kaled, “the Sword of God”, had carried his arms into Syria. The energy of Heraclius was consumed by disease; Syria and Egypt, which he had reconquered from Chosroes, were again wrested from the empire by the new enemy. In 637 Jerusalem fell into the hands of the caliph Omar, who built a mosque on the site of the temple; and within a few years Persia, Khorasan, and part of Asia Minor were subdued. The internal quarrels of the prophet’s followers suspended the progress of conquest only for a time. For years they threatened Constantinople itself, although their attempts were unsuccessful, and ended in the caliph’s submitting to tribute; and before the end of the century they took Carthage and became masters of the African provinces (A.D. 698).

The progress of the Mahometan arms was favoured by the exhaustion of the empire and of Persia in the course of their recent wars. In Syria and Egypt the greater part of the inhabitants were Nestorians or Monophysites, depressed by the imperial laws, and ready to welcome the enemies of the Byzantine court as deliverers. And the conquerors, although indifferent to the distinctions of Christian parties for their own sake, were glad to encourage and to profit by this feeling. While they drove out the Greek orthodox from Egypt, and kept down the Melchites, they favoured the sects which were opposed to Rome and to Constantinople. While war was waged without mercy against idolaters, the “people of the book”—Jews and Christians—as professors of true, although defective, religions, were allowed to live as tributaries in the conquered lands. But the oppressions to which they were subjected, the advantages offered to converts, and perhaps the perplexity of controversies as to Christian doctrine, drew many away from the gospel to profess the faith of Islam.

About the same time when Mahomet began his public career, a controversy arose which continued for nearly a century to agitate the church.

Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, who is said to have been a Syrian, and connected by family with the Jacobite sect, had met with a letter ascribed to his predecessor Mennas, in which the Saviour was said to have “one will, and one life-giving operation”. Struck with the expression, he consulted Theodore, bishop of Pharan in Arabia, a man of whom nothing is known except in connexion with this controversy, but who, from the reference thus made to him, may be supposed to have enjoyed an eminent character for learning, and to have been as yet unsuspected of any error in doctrine; and as Theodore approved the words, the patriarch

adopted them, and had some correspondence with other persons on the subject. The doctrine thus started, which was afterwards known as Monothelism is summed up in some words from another of Theodore's writings—that "in the incarnation of our Saviour there is but one operation, whereof the framer and author is God the Word; and of this the manhood is the instrument, so that, whatsoever may be said of Him, whether as God or as man, it is all the operation of the Godhead of the Word". In opposition to this, it was contended that the faculty of willing is inherent in each of our Lord's natures, although, as his person is one, the two wills act in the same direction—the human will being exercised in accordance with the Divine.

Heraclius, in the course of his Persian wars, saw cause to regret the policy by which the Nestorians had been alienated from the empire, and to desire that the evils which were likely to result from the schism of the monophysites might be averted. With a view to a reconciliation, he conferred with some of their leaders—as Paul, the chief of the party in Armenia, and Athanasius, the Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, to whom it is said that he offered the catholic throne of that city on condition of accepting the council of Chalcedon. The monophysites had gradually become less averse from the substance of that council's doctrine; and Heraclius was led to hope that the schism might be healed if the catholics would grant that, although our Lord had two natures, yet He had only one will and operation. When in Lazica, in the year 626, the emperor related the course of his negotiations to Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, who, as the question was new to him, wrote to ask the opinion of Sergius. He was told by the patriarch in reply that the church had pronounced no decision on the point; that Cyril of Alexandria and other approved fathers had spoken of one life-giving operation of Christ, our very God; that Mennas had used similar expressions; that he was mistaken in supposing Leo the Great to have taught two operations, and that Sergius was not aware of any other authority for so speaking. Cyrus was convinced by this letter. Through the emperor's favour, he was soon after promoted to the patriarchate of Alexandria, and in 633 he effected the reunion of the Theodosians, a monophysite sect, with the church, by means of a compromise which was embodied in nine articles. In the seventh of these it was said that our Lord "wrought the acts appertaining both to God and to man by one theandric (*i.e.* divinely-human) operation"—an expression for which the authority of the writings ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite was alleged. The monophysites regarded the terms of union as matter of triumph. "It is not we", they said, "who have gone over to the council of Chalcedon; it is the council that has come over to us".

Sophronius, a learned monk, who was then at Alexandria, was greatly alarmed at seeing the articles. He uttered a loud cry, threw himself at the patriarch's feet, and, with a profusion of tears, implored him, by the Saviour's passion, not to sanction such Apollinarian doctrines. Cyrus proposed to refer the matter to Sergius, and the monk, furnished with a letter to the patriarch of Constantinople, proceeded to the imperial city. Although himself a monothelite, Sergius did not consider agreement in his opinion necessary as a condition of orthodoxy. In conversation with Sophronius, he dwelt on the importance of regaining the monophysites throughout the Egyptian patriarchate; he asked the monk to produce any express authority for speaking of two operations in Christ; and, as Sophronius could not do this, the patriarch obtained from him a promise to let the question rest. Sergius then wrote to Cyrus, desiring him to forbid all discussion on the subject, lest the late union of parties should be endangered.

In the following year, Sophronius became patriarch of Jerusalem. He seems to have felt that he was thus released from his promise—that the silence which might have been proper in a humble monk would be treachery to the faith in the occupant of a patriarchal throne. On hearing of his elevation, Sergius took the alarm, and without waiting for the formal announcement of it, wrote to Honorius of Rome, detailing the previous history of the question. The pope, in his answer, echoed the opinions of his correspondent; he not only

agreed with him as to the expediency of enforcing silence, but in a personal profession of monothelism :— “We confess”, he says, “one will of our Lord Jesus Christ, forasmuch as it is evident that that which was assumed by the Godhead was our nature, not the sin which is in it—our nature as it was created before sin, not as it was corrupted by transgression”. After discussing St. Paul’s words as to the will of the flesh and the will of the mind, he concludes that the Saviour had not the fleshly will; and he spoke of the question of two operations as a trifle fit only for grammarians. Sophronius in his enthronistic letter set forth very fully, and with great ability, the doctrine of the incarnation, with special reference to the controversy which had arisen. He admits the word *theandric*, but applies it to the joint action of both natures in the Divinely-human Person—an application different from that in which it had been used by Sergius and his partisans. Honorius obtained from the envoys who conveyed this letter to Rome a promise that their master would give up speaking of two wills, if Cyrus would cease to speak of one will; but the controversy was not to be so easily appeased.

The siege and capture of Jerusalem by the Arabs may be supposed to have soon after engrossed the attention of Sophronius; and he did not long survive. But before his death he led Stephen, bishop of Dor, the first of his suffragans, to Calvary, and there in the most solemn manner charged him, by the thoughts of the crucifixion and of the last judgment, to repair to Rome, and never to rest until he should have obtained a condemnation of the monothelistic doctrine!

The distractions of the church continued, and in 639 Heraclius, unwarned by the ill success of his predecessors in such measures, put forth, at the suggestion of Sergius, an edict composed by the patriarch, which bore the title of *Ecthesis*, or Exposition of the faith. After stating the doctrines of the Trinity and of the incarnation, this edict proceeded to settle the controversy by forbidding the discussion of the question as to one or two operations. All operation suitable either to God or to man (it was said) proceeds from the same one incarnate Word. To speak of a single operation, although the phrase had been used by certain fathers, caused trouble to some; to speak of two operations was an expression unsupported by any authority of approved teachers, and gave offence to many, as suggesting the idea of two opposite wills. The impious Nestorius himself, although he divided the person of the Saviour, had not spoken of two wills; one will was to be confessed, agreeably to the doctrine of the holy fathers, forasmuch as the Saviour’s manhood never produced any motion contrary to the inclination of his Godhead. Even if the *Ecthesis* had not in its substance been thus evidently partial to the monothelites, no satisfactory result could have been reasonably expected from a document which aimed at putting an end to differences by concealing them, or from a policy which, in silencing both parties, was galling to the more zealous, while it necessarily favoured the more subservient.

The *Ecthesis* was approved by councils at Constantinople under Sergius and his successor Pyrrhus, and at Alexandria under Cyrus. The patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem, suffering under the oppression of the Arabs, were in no condition to oppose it. But Honorius of Rome was dead : his successor, Severinus (whose pontificate lasted only two months, and was chiefly remarkable for the plunder of the papal treasures by the exarch of Ravenna), appears to have rejected the new formulary; and the next pope, John IV, with a council, certainly did so. Heraclius hereupon wrote to John, disowning the authorship of the *Ecthesis*; it had, he said, been drawn up by Sergius some years before, and he had only consented to issue it at the patriarch's urgent entreaty.

Heraclius died in February 641, leaving the empire jointly to Constantine, son of his first marriage, and Heracleonas, the offspring of his second marriage with his niece Martina. Constantine survived his father little more than three months, and Martina then attempted to rule in the name of her son; but the senate, backed by the army and by the inhabitants of the capital, deposed her and Heracleonas, as guilty of the death of Constantine, whose son, Constans II, was then set on the throne. On this revolution, the patriarch Pyrrhus, who was

regarded as an accomplice of Martina, thought it expedient to abandon his dignity, and sought a refuge in Africa. There he met with Maximus, a man of noble Byzantine family, who, after having been a secretary of state under Heraclius, had embraced the monastic profession, and became the ablest controversialist in opposition to monothelism. In 645, a disputation was held between the two, in the presence of Gregory, governor of the province, with many bishops and other eminent persons. Pyrrhus started with the proposition that, as the Saviour's person is one, He could have but one will; to which Maximus replied that, as He is both God and man, each of His natures must have its own proper will. The discussion was long, and was carried on with much acuteness; but, in addition to the superiority of his cause, Maximus had evidently the advantage in ability and in dialectic skill. At length Pyrrhus avowed himself convinced, and he accompanied Maximus to Rome, where the pope, Theodore, admitted him to communion, and treated him as patriarch of Constantinople. But Pyrrhus soon after went to Ravenna, and there (probably under the influence of the exarch, and in the hope of recovering his see) retracted his late professions. On hearing of this relapse, Theodore held a council, at which Pyrrhus was condemned and excommunicated; and in order to give all solemnity to the sentence, the pope subscribed it in the wine of the eucharistic cup, and laid it on the tomb of St. Peter.

Both John IV and Theodore had urged the successive emperors to withdraw the Ecthesis, which was still placarded by authority. In 648 Constans put forth a new formulary, which was intended to supersede the Ecthesis, and is known by the name of the Type (or Model) of faith. The tone of this document (which was drawn up by the patriarch Paul) is less theological than that of the Ecthesis, and more resembles that of an ordinary imperial decree. While, like the earlier edict, it forbade the discussion of the controversy and the use of the obnoxious terms on both sides, it did so without betraying an inclination to either party and it enacted severe punishments against all who should break the rule of silence.

Paul had carried on some unsatisfactory correspondence with Rome on the subject of the controversy, when at length Theodore, with a council, declared him excommunicate. On being informed of the sentence, the patriarch overthrew the altar of the papal chapel at Constantinople; he forbade the Roman envoys to celebrate the Eucharist, treated them with harshness, and persecuted their partisans. At this stage of the proceedings it was that the Type appeared; but notwithstanding the publication of it, the controversy raged more and more fiercely. Maximus was unceasing and indefatigable in his exertions to stir up opposition to the monothelite doctrines; and Rome was beset by applications from African councils, from Greece, and from other quarters, to act in defence of the faith.

In July 649 Theodore was succeeded by Martin, and in October of the same year the new pope held a synod, which, from having met in the basilica of Constant—the great patriarchal church adjoining the Lateran palace,—is known as the first Lateran council. It was attended by a hundred and five bishops, among whom was the archbishop of Ravenna. In the course of five sessions the history of the controversy was discussed, and the chief documents of it were examined. Stephen of Dor presented a memorial, praying that the errors of monothelism might be rejected, and stating the charge which the patriarch Sophronius had laid on him with regard to it. Passages from the writings of the leading monothelites were confronted with extracts from catholic fathers, and were paralleled with the language of notorious heretics. The Type of Constans was said to place truth and error on the same level, to “destroy the righteous with the wicked”; to leave Christ without will and operation, and therefore without substance and nature. The council declared that there are in the Saviour two natural wills and operations, the Divine and the human,—“the same one Lord Jesus Christ willing and working our salvation both as God and as man”. Among the contents of the twenty canons which were passed, the doctrine of two united wills and of two operations was laid down, and an anathema was uttered against all who should deny it. The expression “one theandric operation” was denounced, and anathemas were decreed against Theodore of

Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, and Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul of Constantinople, with the “most impious Ecthesis” and the “most impious Type”, which Sergius and Paul respectively had persuaded Heraclius and the reigning emperor to issue Martin followed up this council by announcing its decisions to the emperor, to the patriarchs, to the bishops of Africa, and to other important persons both in the east and in the west. The pope’s language throughout these letters is in a tone of extreme denunciation, although he may perhaps have thought to guard himself against the emperor’s resentment by professions of great reverence for his person, and by referring the Ecthesis and the Type to Sergius and Paul as their authors.

While the council was sitting, the exarch Olympius arrived at Rome, with instructions to enforce the signature of the Type, and if possible, to carry off the pope to Constantinople. He did not, however, execute his commission, probably because he meditated a revolt, and was willing to pay court to the papal party; and he was soon after killed in Sicily, on an expedition against the Saracens. Martin, notwithstanding the fresh provocation which he had given to the court, appears to have been left in peace for three years and a half, until a new exarch, Theodore Calliopas, appeared, who seized him and despatched him towards the eastern capital. The tedious journey lasted from the 19th of June 653 to the 17th of September in the following year. The pope was treated without any consideration for his office, his age, or the weakness of his health. Although his conductors often landed for recreation, he was never allowed to leave the vessel except at Naxos, where he remained a year on shore, but debarred from such comfort as he might have received from the visits or from the presents of his friends.

On reaching Constantinople he lay for a day on the deck, exposed to the mockery of the spectators who crowded the quay; and he was then removed to a prison, where he was confined six months. During this time he was subjected to repeated examinations, which, however, did not relate to charges of erroneous doctrine, but to political offences, such as an alleged connexion with Olympius, and even with the Saracens. He was treated with extreme cruelty; he was paraded about the streets as a criminal sentenced to death, and would probably have been executed but for the intercession of the patriarch Paul, who was then dying, and, on receiving a visit from the emperor, expressed his fear lest this unworthy usage of a bishop opposed to him might tell against him at the judgment-day. Martin, who had borne his trials with much dignity and courage, was then banished to Cherson, where he lingered for a time in want of the necessaries of life. Two letters are extant in which he pathetically complains of the neglect in which he was left by his flock, and by the many who had formerly partaken of his bounty. In this exile he died, in September 655.

Maximus, the most learned and most persevering opponent of monothelism, was carried to Constantinople with two disciples in the same year with Martin. The three were kept in prison until after the banishment of the pope, and were then brought to examination. Against Maximus also an attempt was made to establish a political crime by the charge of a connexion with Gregory, governor of Africa, who had revolted. But the accusations were chiefly of a theological or ecclesiastical kind. Among other things, it was imputed to him that he had offended against the imperial privileges by denying that the emperor possessed the priesthood; by uttering an anathema against the Type, which was construed into anathematizing the emperor himself; and by denying that the imperial confirmation gave validity to canons. To these heads he answered, that the emperor could not be a priest, inasmuch as he did not administer the sacraments, and was spoken of as a layman in the offices of the church; that his anathema against the Type applied only to the false doctrine which it contained; and that, if councils became valid by the emperor's confirmation, it would be necessary to receive the Arian councils to which such sanction had been given.

“Are you alone to be saved”, it was asked, “and are all others to perish?”

“God forbid”, he answered, “that I should condemn any one, or should claim salvation for myself only! But I would rather die than have on my conscience the misery of erring in any way as to the faith”.

Maximus and his companions were inflexible in their opinions, although kindness as well as severity was employed in order to influence them, and although they were pressed by the authority of the new pope Eugenius, who had complied with the wishes of the court. They were sent into exile at Bizya in Thrace; and, after having been there subjected to great severities, were again carried to Constantinople, where they underwent a fresh examination. Their invincible constancy was punished by the loss of their tongues and of their right hands; they were banished to Lazica; and after a time they were separated, for the purpose of adding to their sufferings. Maximus sank under the cruel treatment which he received in August 662; one of his disciples (who both bore the name of Anastasius) is said, notwithstanding his mutilations, to have still effectively served the faith, both by speech and by active correspondence, until his death in 666.

Constans II, by whose authority these barbarities were sanctioned, had put his own brother to death, and by this and other acts had provoked the detestation of his eastern subjects. Yielding to the general feeling, he withdrew from Constantinople in the year 663, and visited Rome, where he was received with great honour by the bishop, Vitalian. After having stripped off the brazen roof of the Pantheon (which had been a church since the reign of Phocas), and having plundered it and other churches of their precious ornaments, the emperor passed into Sicily, where he indulged his tyranny and vices without control, until in 668 he was murdered in a bath at Syracuse. The fate of pope Martin had disposed his successors, Eugenius and Vitalian, to peaceful courses, and the controversy smouldered until Adeodatus, the successor of Vitalian, again broke off communion with Constantinople; whereupon the patriarchs Theodore of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch excited a commotion by attempting to strike out of their diptychs the name of Vitalian, the only recent pope who had been commemorated in them.

The son and successor of Constans, Constantine IV, who is styled Pogonatus (the Bearded), was distressed by the divisions of the church, and resolved to attempt a remedy. He therefore wrote to Donus, bishop of Rome, desiring him to send some delegates to Constantinople for the purpose of conferring on the subjects in dispute. Before this letter arrived at Rome, Donus had been succeeded by Agatho, who on receiving it assembled a council. Among the hundred and twenty-five prelates attended, were Lombard primate Mansuetus of Milan, two Frankish bishops, and Wilfrid of York; the rest were subjects of the empire. Monothelism was condemned, and two prelates with a deacon were sent to Constantinople as representatives of the pope, bearing with them a letter to the emperor, which was intended to serve a like purpose with Leo's famous epistle to Flavian in the Eutychian controversy; while the council was represented by three bishops, with other clerks and monks. The pope in his letter expresses regret that the unquiet circumstances of Italy prevented the possibility of deep theological study, and professes to rely not on the learning of his deputies, but on their faithfulness to the doctrine of earlier councils and fathers.

Constantine now determined, instead of the conference which had been intended, to summon an ecumenical synod—by which term, however, it would seem that he meant nothing more than one which should represent the whole empire; for no subjects of other governments were present. This assembly—which is reckoned as the sixth general council, and third council of Constantinople—met in a room of the palace, which from its domed roof was styled *Trullus*. The sessions were eighteen in number, and lasted from the 7th of November 680 to the 16th of December in the following year. The emperor presided in person at the first eleven sessions and at the last; in his absence, the presidential chair was unoccupied. At the earlier meetings the number of bishops was small; but it gradually rose to nearly two hundred. Among them were the patriarch of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch (whose dignity, in

consequence of the Saracen conquest of his province, was little better than titular); while the sees of Alexandria and Jerusalem were represented by two presbyters. Twelve high officers of the empire and some monks were also present.

The proceedings were conducted with a decency and an impartiality of which there had been little example in former assemblies of the kind, and the emperor sustained his part in a very creditable manner. The principal documents of the controversy were read, and extracts from the writings of the monothelites were compared with passages intended to refute or to support them, or to prove their identity in substance with heresies which had been already condemned. At the eighth session the patriarch of Constantinople professed his adhesion to the views of Agatho and the Roman synod, and the bishops of his patriarchate followed the example. But Macarius of Antioch still maintained the doctrine of a single theandric will and operation—that as the mind moves the body, so in Christ the divine will directed the humanity. He produced a collection of authorities in favour of his opinion; but the council, after examining these, pronounced them to be spurious or garbled, or, where genuine, to be misapplied,—as when words which had really been used to express the relations of the Divine Persons in the Trinity were transferred to the relations of the Saviour’s Godhead and manhood. As the Syrian patriarch persisted in his opinion, declaring that he could not abandon it even on pain of being cut in pieces and cast into the sea, he was deposed and excommunicated, with a disciple named Stephen; and, while the emperor was hailed as a new Constantine the Great, a new Theodosius, a new Marcian, anathemas were loudly uttered against Macarius, as a second Apollinaris and Dioscorus. The fifteenth session was marked by a singular incident. An aged monk named Polychronius presented a confession of faith, and undertook to prove its correctness by raising a dead man to life. He said that he had seen a vision, in which a person of dazzling brightness and of terrible majesty had told him that whosoever did not confess a single will and theandric operation was not to be acknowledged as a Christian. The synod adjourned to the court of a public bath, and a corpse was brought in on a bier. Polychronius laid his creed on the dead man’s breast, and for a long time whispered into his ears; no miracle, however, followed. The multitude, who had been admitted to witness this strange experiment, shouted out anathemas against Polychronius as a deceiver and a new Simon; but his confidence in his opinions was unshaken by his failure, and the synod found it necessary to depose him.

The faith on the subject in dispute was at length defined. The monothelites were condemned as holding a heresy akin to those of Apollinaris, Severus, and Themistius; as destroying the perfection of our Lord’s humanity by denying it a will and an operation. The doctrine of the incarnation was laid down according to the earlier decisions of the church; and to this it was added,—“We in like manner, agreeably to the teaching of the holy fathers, declare that in Him there are two natural wills and two natural operations, without division, change, separation, or confusion. And these two natural wills are not contrary, as impious heretics pretend; but the human follows the divine and almighty will, not resisting or opposing it, but rather being subject to it; for, according to the most wise Athanasius, it was needful that the will of his flesh should be moved, but that it should be subjected to his divine will. As his flesh, although deified, was not destroyed by his Godhead, so too his human will, although deified, was not destroyed”. An anathema was pronounced against the chief leaders of the monothelites. The name of Honorius had been unnoticed by the Roman councils—a fact which significantly proves that, while desirous to spare his memory, they did not approve of the part which he had taken in the controversy. John IV, in his letter to Constantine, the son of Heraclius, had endeavoured to clear his predecessor by the plea that he had only meant to deny the existence of two contrary wills in the Saviour, “forasmuch as in his humanity the will was not corrupted as it is in ours”; and Maximus, in his conference with Pyrrhus, had been unwilling to give the monothelites the benefit of a Roman bishop’s authority. But the general council, after examining the letters of Honorius, declared that “in all things he had followed

the opinions of Sergius and had sanctioned his impious doctrines"; and the monothelite pope was included in its anathema.

The decisions of the council were confirmed by the emperor, and severe penalties were enacted against all who should contravene them. Pope Agatho died in January 682, while his legates were still at Constantinople; but his successor, Leo II, zealously exerted himself to procure the reception of the council by the churches of the west. In letters to the emperor, to the Spanish bishops, and to others, Leo expressed his approval of the condemnation of Honorius, on the ground that that pope, instead of purifying the apostolic church by the doctrine of apostolical tradition, had yielded its spotlessness to be defiled by profane betrayal of the faith.

The last two general councils, unlike those of earlier times, had confined themselves to matters of faith, and had not passed any canons relating to other subjects. In order to supply this defect, Justinian II, who in 685 succeeded his father Constantine Pogonatus, assembled a new synod, which is known by the name of Trullan, from having been held in the same domed hall with the general council, and by that of Quinisext, as being supplementary to the fifth and sixth councils. Its hundred and two canons were subscribed by the emperor and by the four eastern patriarchs; and immediately after the imperial signature, a space was left for that of Sergius, bishop of Rome. It does not appear whether Sergius had been invited to send special deputies to the council; his two ordinary representatives at Constantinople subscribed, and Basil, metropolitan of Gortyna in Crete, professed to sign as representing the "whole synod of the Roman church". But among the canons were six which offended the pope, as inconsistent with the rights or the usages of his church. The 2nd, in enumerating the earlier canons which were *exclusively* to be observed, sanctioned eighty-five under the name of apostolical, whereas Rome admitted only fifty; and it omitted many synods which were of authority in the west, together with the whole body of papal decretals. The 13th allowed those of the clergy who had married before their ordination as subdeacons to retain their wives. The 36th renewed the decrees of the second and fourth, general councils as to the privileges of the see of Constantinople. The 55th ordered that the "apostolical" canon which forbade fasting on any Saturday except; Easter-eve should be extended to Rome, where all the Saturdays of Lent had until then been fast-days. The 67th forbade the eating of blood. The 82nd prescribed that the Saviour should be represented in his human form, and not under the symbolical figure of a lamb. In contradicting Roman usages, the 13th and 55th canons expressly stated that they were such, and required the Roman church to abandon them; it would seem, indeed, as if the eastern! bishops were bent, as at Chalcedon, on moderating the triumph of Rome in the late doctrinal question by legislating on other matters in a manner which would be unpalatable to the pope; and the reception of these canons by the east only, where they were quoted as the work of the sixth general council, was the first manifest step towards the separation of the Greek and Latin churches.

On receiving the canons, Sergius declared that he would rather die than consent to them. The protospathary Zacharias was commissioned to seize him and send him to Constantinople. But a rising of the people, and even of the soldiery, who looked more to the bishop of Rome than to their distant imperial master, compelled Zacharias in abject terror to seek the protection of his intended prisoner. About the same time, the vices of Justinian, the exorbitant taxation which was required to feed his expenses, and the cruelties which were committed in his name by his ministers, the eunuch Stephen and the monk Theodosius, provoked a revolt, by which a general named Leontius was raised to the throne. From regard for the memory of Constantine Pogonatus, Leontius spared the life of Justinian; but the deposed emperor's nose was cut off (a mutilation which had become common in the east), and he was banished to the inhospitable Chersonese.

Leontius, after a reign of three years, was put down by Tiberius Apsimar, and was committed to a monastery. The Chersonites, in fear that the schemes which Justinian was

undisguisedly forming for the recovery of his throne might draw on them the suspicion and anger of the new emperor, resolved to put the exile to death or to send him to Constantinople; but the design became known to him, and he sought a refuge among the Chazars of the Ukraine, where he married a sister of the reigning prince. Even among these remote barbarians, however, he found that he was in danger from the negotiations of Apsimar; and his desperation urged him to attempt the execution of the design which he had seemed to have abandoned. While crossing the Euxine in a violent storm, his companions exhorted him, as a means of obtaining deliverance, to promise that, if restored to the empire, he would forgive his enemies. "May the Lord drown me here", he replied, "if I spare one of them!", and when his daring enterprise had been crowned with success, the vow was terribly fulfilled. Leontius was brought forth from his monastery; he and Apsimar were laid prostrate in the circus, and, as the emperor looked on the games, his feet pressed the necks of his fallen rivals, while the multitude shouted the words of the 91st Psalm—"Thou shalt tread upon the lion and the adder". The two were then dragged about the streets of the city, and at length were beheaded. All who had taken part in the expulsion of Justinian were mercilessly punished; many of them were tied up in sacks and were cast into the sea. The patriarch Callinicus, who had been driven by the tyrant's oppression to favour the rebellion of Leontius, was deprived of his eyes and nose, and was banished to Rome. For some unknown reason, Felix, archbishop of Ravenna, was blinded, deposed, and sent into exile in Pontus; and Constantine of Rome—the last of seven Greek refugees from the Mahometan conquests who successively filled the see—might well have trembled when in 710 he was summoned to Constantinople. Perhaps Justinian may have required the pope's presence with a view of enforcing the Trullan council on the west; perhaps he may have meant to secure his own authority in Italy against a repetition of such scenes as that which had taken place in the pontificate of Sergius. But Constantine's ready and courageous obedience appears to have disarmed the tyrant. Justinian received the pope as an equal; it is even said that, at the first meeting, he fell down and kissed his feet; and Constantine returned home with a confirmation of all the privileges of his church. It has been conjectured that these favours were not obtained without the pope's consenting to the canons of the quinisext council in so far as they were not directly contrary to the Roman traditions.

Justinian's abuse of his recovered power excited his subjects to a fresh rebellion, which began by an outbreak of the Chersonites, on whom he had intended to avenge by an exemplary cruelty the treachery which they had meditated against him during his exile. In 711 he was again dethroned and was put to death. His young son Tiberius, who had been crowned as Augustus, fled to the church of the Blachernae, hung the relics which were regarded as most sacred around his neck, and clasped the altar with one hand and the cross with the other; but a leader of the insurgents pursued him into the sanctuary, plucked the cross from him, transferred the relics to his own neck, and dragged the boy to the door of the church, where he was immediately slain. Thus ended the dynasty of Heraclius, about a hundred years after the accession of its founder.

The revolution raised to the throne an adventurer named Bardanes, who on his accession took the name of Philippicus. Bardanes was of a monothelite family, and his early impressions in favour of the heresy had been confirmed by the lessons of Stephen, the associate of Macarius of Antioch. It is said that, many years before, he had been told by a hermit that he was one day to be emperor; and that he had vowed, if the prophecy should be fulfilled, to abrogate the sixth general council. He refused to enter the palace of Constantinople until a picture of the council should have been removed; he publicly burnt the original copy of its acts, ordered the names of Honorius, Sergius, and the others whom it had condemned, to be inserted in the diptychs, ejected the orthodox patriarch Cyrus, and required the bishops to subscribe a monothelite creed. The order was generally obeyed in the east, but at Rome it met with different treatment. Pope Constantine refused to receive it; the people

would not allow the emperor to be named in the mass, nor his portrait to be admitted into a church, where instead of it they hung up a representation of the sixth council; and, on the arrival of a newly-appointed commander from Constantinople, an outbreak took place, which was only suppressed by the pope's interposition on the side of authority. Philippicus, after a reign of a year and a half, during which he had given himself up to extravagance and debauchery, was deposed and blinded. His successor, Anastasius, was a catholic; and John, who had been intruded into the patriarchate of Constantinople on the deprivation of Cyrus, now sued for the communion of Rome, professing that he had always been orthodox at heart, and that his compliance with the late heretical government had arisen from a wish to prevent the appointment of a real monothelite. The pope's answer is not known; but in 715 John was deprived, and Germanus, bishop of Cyzicum, was appointed to the patriarchal chair. Anastasius was dethroned in 716 by Theodosius III, and Theodosius, in the following year, by Leo the Isaurian, whose reign witnessed the commencement of a new and important controversy.

The readiness with which the formulary of Philippicus was received by the eastern bishops and clergy may be regarded not only as a token of their subserviency, but also as indicating that the monothelite party at that time possessed considerable strength. The public profession of monothelism, however, soon became extinct, its only avowed adherents being the Maronite community in Syria. A monastery, dedicated to a saint named Maron, stood between Apamea and Emesa as early as the sixth century; and in the end of the seventh it was under the government of another Maron, who died in 701. The name of Maronites, which originally belonged to the members of this monastery, was gradually extended to all the inhabitants of the district of Lebanon, a population chiefly composed of refugees from the Saracen conquests. Among these the monothelite opinions were held; and, while the other Christian communities of Syria had each its political attachment—the Jacobites being connected with the Mahometan conquerors, and the Catholics (or Melchites) with the emperor—the Maronites preserved their independence, together with their peculiar doctrines, under the successors of Maron, who styled themselves patriarchs of Antioch. Thus the community continued until, in the age of the crusades, they submitted to the Latin patriarch of Antioch, and conformed to the Roman church, which in later times has been indebted to the Maronites for many learned men.

CHAPTER III.

The Western Church, from the Death of Gregory the Great to the Pontificate of
Gregory the Second
A.D. 604-715.

The relations of the papacy with the empire during the period between the first and the second Gregories may in some degree be understood from the foregoing chapter.

The monothelite controversy for a time weakened the influence of Rome, both through the error of Honorius in favouring the heretical party and through the collisions between the papacy and the imperial power. But although Martin suffered severely in person for his proceedings in the council of Lateran, these proceedings—the assembling of such a synod without the emperor’s sanction, and the bold condemnation of his ecclesiastical measures—remained as important steps in the advance of the papal claims; and in no long time the authority of the Roman name was re-established by the sixth general council. At that council the title of ecumenical or universal bishop, which Gregory had not only denounced in others but rejected for himself, was ascribed to Agatho by his representatives, and the bishops of Rome thenceforth usually assumed it.

Agatho obtained from Constantine Pogonatus an abatement of the sum payable to the emperor on the appointment of a pope; and the same emperor granted to Benedict II that, in order to guard against a repetition of the inconveniences which had been felt from the necessity of waiting for the imperial confirmation, the pope should be consecrated immediately after his election. Yet the confirmation by the secular power still remained necessary for the possession of St. Peter’s chair, and disputed elections gave the exarchs of Ravenna ample opportunities of interfering in the establishment of the Roman bishops; if indeed the meaning of the edict for the immediate consecration of the pope were not that the exarch’s ratification should be sufficient, without the necessity of referring the matter to Constantinople.

The political influence of the popes increased in proportion as the emperors were obliged by the progress of the Saracens to concentrate their strength for the defence of their eastern dominions, and to devolve on the bishops of Rome the care of guarding against the Lombards. The popes now possessed some fortresses of their own, and from time to time they repaired the walls of Rome. The Italians came to regard them more than the sovereigns of Constantinople; and such incidents as the rising of the soldiery against the attempt to carry off Sergius, a similar rising in the pontificate of John VI, and the refusal of the Romans to acknowledge the authority of Philippicus, are significant tokens of the power which the bishops of Rome had acquired in their own city.

The desolation of the churches of Palestine by the Saracens, and the withdrawal of the patriarchs from Antioch and Jerusalem to the enjoyment of a titular dignity within the empire, furnished the popes with a pretext for a new interference in the affairs of the east. A bishop of Joppa had taken it on himself, perhaps with the imperial sanction, to fill up some vacant sees. In opposition to him, Theodore of Rome commissioned Stephen bishop of Dor (whose name

has occurred in the history of the monothelite controversy) to act as his vicar in the Holy Land. The execution of the commission was resisted by the influence of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch; but similar delegations were afterwards given by other popes, although it does not appear with what effect.

The differences between the popes and the court encouraged the archbishops of Ravenna to set up pretensions to independence, which they rested on the eastern principle that the civil importance of their city entitled it to such ecclesiastical dignity. The claim caused considerable difficulty to the popes, but was at length set at rest in 683 by Leo II, who obtained an imperial order that the archbishop should repair to Rome for consecration. The schism of Istria, which had arisen out of the controversy on the Three Articles in the middle of the sixth century, was, after many temporary accommodations, finally healed by Sergius in 698. But in the Lombard kingdom, although catholicism was established from the reign of Grimoald (A.D. 662-671), the church still remained independent of Rome, and the entire relations of the Lombards with the papacy were not of any cordial or satisfactory kind.

The history of the Spanish church for a century after its abjuration of Arianism consists chiefly in the records of its synods. These assemblies did not confine themselves to the regulation of ecclesiastical matters, but also took an active concern in the affairs of state. As the sovereignty was elective, the voice of the bishops was influential in the choice of kings; and the kings, who from the time of Recared were solemnly crowned by the chief pastors of the church, were naturally desirous to fortify their throne by the support of the clergy. Hence the bishops acquired very great political importance: they were charged with the oversight, not only of the administration of justice, but of the collection of taxes. By this relation between the ecclesiastical and the secular powers, the church became nationalized, and the connection with Rome, in which the catholic bishops had at first found a means of influence and strength, was gradually weakened during the lapse of time from the period of the reconciliation. Although Gregory had bestowed the pall on his friend Leander, bishop of Seville, no record is found of its arrival in Spain; later bishops of Seville do not appear to have applied for it; and the primacy of Spain was transferred by the royal authority from that city to the capital, Toledo.

The most eminent men of the Spanish church during this time were Isidore, bishop of Seville (Hispalensis), and Ildefonso (or Alfonso), bishop of Toledo. Isidore, the brother and successor of Leander, held his see from 595 to 636, and was a voluminous writer. His works, which are very miscellaneous in character, are little more than compilations, and are valuable chiefly for the fragments of earlier writings which are preserved in them. But his learning and genius were in his own day admired as extraordinary, and his fame afterwards became such that in the ninth century his name was employed to bespeak credit for the great forgery of the Decretals. Ildefonso, who filled the see of Toledo in the middle of the seventh century, distinguished himself in asserting the perpetual virginity of the Saviour's mother. His exertions are said to have been rewarded by her appearing in dazzling brightness over the altar of his cathedral, and presenting him with a magnificent vestment, to be worn at the celebration of the Eucharist on her festivals.

In the first years of the eighth century king Witiza forbade appeals to Rome, authorized the marriage of the clergy, and obtained for his measures the sanction of a synod held in Toledo in 710; and it is said that he threatened such of the clergy as should oppose these measures with death. This prince is described as a prodigy of impiety, tyranny, and vice; but it has been shown that the darkness of his reputation appears more strongly in later writers than in those who lived near his own time; and it has been conjectured that he may have only meant to prevent the recurrence of complaints against the immorality of the clergy by reviving the liberty of marriage, which had always existed during the Arian period of the Spanish church. But, whatever may have been his motives or the details of his acts, the effects of these were soon brought to an end by the Arab conquest of Spain, which dethroned his successor

Roderick. The mountaineers of the north alone retained their independence with their Christianity. The Christians who fell under the Mahometan dominion received the same humiliating toleration in Spain as elsewhere; and in their depressed condition they were glad once more to look for countenance to the see of Rome.

In France the disorders of the time tended to lessen the connection of the church with Rome. Such differences as arose were necessarily decided on the spot; and there is hardly any trace of intercourse with the papal see between the pontificates of the first and the second Gregories. The same troubles which led to this effect caused a general decay of discipline both among the clergy and in the monasteries. When men of the conquering race began to seek after the emoluments and dignities of the church—a change which is marked by the substitution of Teutonic for Roman names in lists of bishops from the seventh century—they brought much of their rudeness with them, and canons against hunting and fighting prelates began to be necessary

At the same time the weak and temporal influence by which such persons were attracted into the ranks of the clergy were continually on the increase. Vast gifts of land and of money were bestowed by princes on churches and monasteries, sometimes from pious feeling, sometimes by way of compromise for the indulgence of their vicious passions. Thus Dagobert, the last Merovingian who possessed any energy of character, by the advice of St Eligius, his master of the mint, enlarged a little chapel of St. Denys, near Paris, into a splendid monastery, furnished it with precious ornaments, the work of the pious goldsmith, and endowed it with large estates, which were partly derived from the spoil of other religious houses. This prince, “like Solomon”, says Fredegar, “had three queens and a multitude of concubines”; and the chronicler seems to consider it as a question whether his liberality to the church were or were not sufficient to cover his sins.

Another writer, however, not only speaks without any doubt on the subject, but professes to give conclusive information as to the fate of Dagobert. A hermit on an island in the Mediterranean, it is said, was warned in a vision to pray for the Frankish king's soul. He then saw Dagobert in chains, hurried along by a troop of fiends, who were about to cast him into a volcano, when he cries to St. Denys, St. Michael, and St. Martin, brought to his assistance three venerable and glorious persons, who drove off the devils, and, with songs of triumph, conveyed the rescued soul to Abraham's bosom.

On the reunion of the monarchy under Dagobert's father, Clotaire II, the bishops were summoned to an assembly of the *leudes*, and seventy-nine of them appeared at it. The laws passed by the joint consent of the spiritual and temporal aristocracies show traces of ecclesiastical influence, not only in the increase of clerical privileges, but in the humane spirit which pervades them. From that time bishops appear mixing deeply in political strife. Saints become conspicuous objects of general interest. The severity of their lives acquires for them reverence and power, but this power is exercised in the rude contentions of the age. One of the most famous of these saints, Leodegar (or Léger), bishop of Autun, may be mentioned by way of example. Leodegar was sprung from or connected with the most powerful families of the Frankish nobility. He acquired great credit with Bathildis, the saintly Anglo-Saxon who rose from the condition of a captive to be queen of Clovis II and regent of Neustria, and by her he was promoted from the abbacy of St Maixent to the see of Autun. He is celebrated for the austerity of his life, for his frequency in prayer, for his eloquence as a preacher, for his bounty to the poor and to his church, and for his vigilant administration of the episcopal office. But he appears as the political chief of a powerful party of nobles; he takes the lead in setting up and in dethroning kings; and, if he did not actually bear the title of mayor of the palace, he for a time exercised the power of the mayoralty in the Neustro-Burgundian kingdom. After various turns of fortune, Leodegar fell into the hands of his rival Ebroin, who caused his eyes to be put out—an operation which he bore with perfect calmness, singing psalms during the execution of it. Two years later, by order of Ebroin, he was exposed to tortures, his lips were cut off, his

tongue was cut out, and he was dragged over sharp stones with such violence that for a time he was unable to stand. Notwithstanding the loss of his organs of speech, however, the bishop was able to speak as well as before. His sufferings and his merits excited a general enthusiasm in his favour, and Ebroin in alarm resolved to rid himself of him by death. A great council of bishops was summoned, and Leodegar was accused before it of having been concerned in the death of Childeric II—a prince who had owed his throne to him, but had afterwards confined him in the monastery of Luxeuil, and had been put to death by the party with which the imprisoned bishop was connected. Leodegar firmly denied the charge, and referred to God as his witness. But his guilt was considered as certain; his robe was rent, in token of degradation from his order; and, although a bright light appeared around his head in attestation of his innocence and sanctity, he was beheaded by order of Ebroin. Leodegar was revered as a martyr, and is said to have performed innumerable miracles after death. Yet among his opponents also were some who are ranked in the number of saints—such as Dado or Audoen (Ouen), bishop of Rouen, the friend and biographer of St Eligius, Praejectus (Prix) of Clermont, and Agilbert of Paris. Ouen's part in the struggle is celebrated for the significant answer which he gave when consulted by Ebroin—"Remember Fredegund",—words which may have been intended only to recommend the imitation of that famous queen's readiness and decision, but which we can hardly read without thinking also of the unscrupulous wickedness by which her purposes were accomplished.

The Irish church, from which Columba had gone forth to labour in North Britain, and Columban in Gaul and Italy, was in these ages fruitful in missionaries, of whom many further notices will occur hereafter. But its internal history, however full of interest for the antiquarian inquirer, offers little that can find a place in such a narrative as this. It will be enough to mention here certain peculiarities of administration, which not only throw light on the condition of the Irish church, but serve also to explain the "unusual arrangement" of St. Columba's foundation at Iona, and to account both for the commonness of the episcopal title among the Irish missionary clergy and for the irregular character of their proceedings.

In the early Irish church it was held that the power of ordination belonged to the bishops alone; but the episcopate was merely a personal distinction, which conveyed no right of local jurisdiction. There was no limit to the number of persons on whom it might be conferred, and, like the chorepiscopi of other countries, they were consecrated by a single bishop. The position of Irish bishops, therefore, was widely different, both in spiritual and in temporal respects, from that of bishops elsewhere. As to rank, it would seem that not only abbots, but even anchorets and the lecturers of the church, sometimes took precedence of them. The care of the ecclesiastical property was from early times committed to officers who had the title of *Erenachs*; and, by a remarkable variation from the usual order of the church, the spiritual government was exercised by a class of persons who, as having succeeded to the churches of eminent early missionaries, were styled their *Coarbs* (or successors). These coarbs occupied positions which had originally been held by abbots; and, while some of them belonged to the episcopal order, the greater number were presbyters. The office of *erenach* was not transmitted from father to son, but according to the system of *tanistry*—a *tanist*, or successor, being chosen during the lifetime of each holder. The dignity of *coarb* was not originally restricted to particular families; but from the tenth century it seems to have become for the most part hereditary—passing from a deceased possessor to his brother, to his nephew, or (as the marriage of the clergy was usual in the Irish church) to his son. The *erenachs* were originally taken from the ranks of the clergy, but the office gradually fell into the hands of laymen; and at length—probably in consequence of the Danish invasions in the tenth century, when the power of defending the church's possessions became a chief qualification for ecclesiastical government—the laity were admitted to the office of *coarbs* also; so that, according to a complaint of St. Bernard, the church of Armagh was held by eight laymen in succession, and even instances of female *coarbs* sometimes occur.

The early history of Christianity in the various Anglo-Saxon kingdoms is marked by much similarity of circumstances. Missionaries meet with a friendly reception : the king, after some prudent hesitation, becomes a convert, but his successors relapse into heathenism; until, after a time, the throne is filled by a prince who had learned the truths of the gospel in exile, and the profession of the faith is restored. Matrimonial alliances exercise the same influence in the spreading of religion which had before been seen among the barbarian conquerors of Gaul, Spain, and Italy. Among the evidences by which the gospel was recommended, we find frequent mention of miracles, and not uncommonly the argument from temporal interest—the experience of the fruitlessness of serving the pagan deities, and the inference that they had no power to help or to punish.

In the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons two rival agencies were concerned—that of the Irish or Scottish, and that of the Roman party. Some of the differences as to usage between the Roman missionaries and the native clergy have already been mentioned—among them, the variation as to the time of Easter, produced by the adhesion of the Britons to a cycle which at Rome had long been obsolete. Another subject of contention was the form of the tonsure. It was not until monachism became popular that any tonsure was introduced; nor was it common among the western clergy until the sixth century. But a far earlier origin was now claimed for the fashions which contended in Britain. The Romans, who shaved the crown of the head, in imitation of the crown of thorns, deduced their practice from St. Peter while that of the Scots and Irish, who shaved the front as far as the ears, in the form of a crescent, was traced by its opponents to Simon Magus—a derivation which the Scots do not appear to have disputed, as they contented themselves with insisting on the virtues of some who had used their form of tonsure. The importance which the Irish attached to these varieties may be inferred from the statement of Laurence, the successor of Augustine at Canterbury, that an Irish bishop named Dagan refused, when in England, to partake of food with the Italian clergy, and even to eat under the same roof with them. Honorius and other bishops of Rome endeavoured to allay the dissensions by writing to the bishops of the national party. They succeeded in gaining the Irish, and even some of the Britons; but the Scots of the north continued obstinately to hold out.

Paulinus, the first archbishop of York, had, after the defeat and death of his convert Edwin of Northumbria, withdrawn into Kent with the widowed queen Ethelburga, a daughter of King Ethelbert, and spent his last years in the bishopric of Rochester, while the northern kingdom fell back into idolatry. Oswald, who in 635 ascended the Northumbrian throne, had been converted while an exile in Scotland, and, in undertaking the conversion of his subjects, naturally looked to the same church through which he had himself received his knowledge of the gospel. At his request a bishop was sent from Iona; but the missionary was a man of stern character, and, after a short trial, withdrew in anger and despair at the obstinacy of the Northumbrians. The fathers of Iona met in consultation, and he indignantly related to them the failure of his enterprise; when, after he had finished, one of the monks, in a gentle tone of voice, told him that he had proceeded wrongly, and ought rather to have condescended to the rudeness and ignorance of those to whom he had been sent. Immediately the brethren exclaimed that the speaker, Aidan, was right; that the method which he had suggested was the true one, and that he was himself the fittest person to execute it. He was forthwith consecrated as a bishop, and was recommended to Oswald, who (evidently with a reference to the insular nature of his old abode) assigned the island of Lindisfarne for his residence. Here Aidan established a system closely resembling that of Iona; the bishops, with their staff of clergy, living according to monastic rule in a community governed by an abbot. Oswald zealously assisted his labours in spreading the gospel; and, as Aidan was but imperfectly acquainted with the language of the country, the king himself, who had learned the Celtic tongue during his exile, often acted as interpreter while the bishop delivered his religious instructions.

Aidan's settlement at Lindisfarne was followed by a large immigration of Scottish missionaries into England. Bede—Roman as he is in his affections, and strongly opposed to their peculiarities— bears hearty witness to the virtues of these northern clergy—their zeal, their gentleness, their humility and simplicity, their earnest study of Scripture, their freedom from all selfishness and avarice, their honest boldness in dealing with the great, their tenderness and charity towards the poor, their strict and self-denying life. "Hence", he writes, with an implied allusion to the degeneracy of his own time, in those days the religious habit was held in great reverence, so that wheresoever any clerk or monk appeared, he was joyfully received by all as the servant of God; even if he were met with on his journey the people ran to him, and, with bended neck, were glad to be either signed with his hand or blessed by his mouth; and they diligently gave ear to his words of exhortation. And if perchance a priest came to any village, forthwith the inhabitants gathered together, and were careful to seek from him the word of life." Of Aidan himself the historian says that he thoroughly endeavoured to practise all that he knew of Christian duty; and that even as to the paschal question, while he erred in differing from the Catholics, he earnestly studied to unite with them in celebrating the great facts of our redemption through the passion, resurrection, and ascension of the Saviour. Aidan's successors were of like character. By them not only was Christianity spread over Northumbria, but other kingdoms, as Mercia and Essex, even to the northern bank of the Thames, were evangelized by missionaries who derived their orders immediately or more remotely from St. Columba's foundation at Iona.

But collisions with the Roman party were inevitable. Oswy, the brother and successor of Oswald, who had learnt his Christianity and had been baptized in Scotland, married a daughter of Edwin of Northumbria, named Eanfleda, who after her father's death had been carried by Paulinus into Kent, and there brought up among her mother's kindred. The royal pair adhered to the customs of their respective teachers; and thus, while Oswy was celebrating the Easter festival, the queen was still engaged in the penitential exercises of Lent. The king's eldest son and colleague, Aldfrid, strongly took up the Roman views, and expelled the Scottish monks from a monastery at Ripon in order to substitute Romanizers, under Wilfrid, a priest of Northumbrian birth, who, having become discontented with the customs of Lindisfarne, had been sent by Eanfleda's patronage to Rome, and had returned to his native country with a zealous desire to propagate the usages of the Roman church. The paschal question was discussed in a conference at Streaneshalch (Whitby), in the presence of Oswy and his son. On the part of the Scots appeared Colman of Lindisfarne, with Cedd, a Northumbrian, who had been consecrated as bishop by Aidan's successor Finan, and had effected a second conversion of Essex; and they were strengthened by the countenance of the royal and saintly abbess Hilda, in whose monastery the conference was held. On the other side stood Agilbert, a native of France, who had studied in Ireland, and had held the see of Dorchester in Wessex, with Wilfrid, whom the bishop, on the plea of his own inability to speak the language of the country fluently, put forward as the champion of Rome. Wilfrid argued from the custom of that church in which St. Peter and St. Paul had lived and taught, had suffered and had been buried. St. John, to whom the other party traced its practice, had, he said, observed it from a wish to avoid offence to the Jews; but the church which that apostle had governed had, since the council of Nicaea, conformed to the Roman usage; and neither St. John, nor even the founder of Iona, if alive, would maintain, in opposition to Rome, a practice which was observed only by a handful of insignificant persons in a remote corner of the earth. On Wilfrid's quoting our Lord's promise to bestow on St. Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, Oswy asked Colman whether these words had really been spoken to the apostle. The bishop assented, and owned, in answer to a further question, that he could not produce any such grant of authority to St. Columba. "I tell you then", said the king, "that Peter is the door-keeper, whom I will not gainsay, lest perchance, if I make him my enemy by disregarding his statutes, there should be no one to open the door of heaven to me". The Roman party was

victorious, and, while some of the Scots conformed, Colman and others withdrew to their own country.

The bishopric thus vacated was bestowed on Tuda, who had been already consecrated in the southern part of Ireland, where the Roman usages were established; and when Tuda, within less than a year, was carried off by a pestilence, Wilfrid was appointed to succeed him. But the zealous champion of Roman customs chose to take his title from York, which Gregory the Great had marked out as the seat of an archbishop, rather than from the Scottish foundation of Lindisfarne; and as the bishops of England were all more or less tainted by a connexion with Scottish or Irish orders, he was not content to receive his consecration at their hands. He therefore passed into France, where he was consecrated with great pomp by Agilbert, now bishop of Paris, and twelve other prelates. In his return to England the vessel in which he was embarked was stranded on the coast of Sussex. The savage and heathen inhabitants rushed down to plunder it, headed by a priest, who, "like another Balaam", stood on a rising ground uttering spells and curses. But the priest was killed by a stone from a sling; the crew repelled three attacks, and, as the assailants were preparing for a fourth, the returning tide heaved off the vessel, which then made its way prosperously to Sandwich. Wilfrid found that his scruples as to ordination had cost him dear; for during his absence the Northumbrian king had bestowed his bishopric on Ceadda (or Chad), who had been consecrated in England, and had entered on his see. Wilfrid, therefore, retired to his monastery of Ripon, where he remained for some years, except when invited to perform episcopal functions in a vacant or unprovided diocese.

In the year 664 (the same year in which the conference took place at Whitby) a great plague carried off the first native archbishop of Canterbury, Frithona, who on his elevation to the see had assumed the name of Adeodatus or Deusdedit. The kings of Northumbria and Kent agreed to send a presbyter named Wighard to Rome for consecration to the primacy; but Wighard died there, and pope Vitalian, apparently in compliance with a request from the kings, chose Theodore, a native of Tarsus, to take his place. Theodore was already sixty-six years of age. He was of eminent repute for learning; but as his oriental birth suggested some suspicions, his consecration was deferred until, by allowing his hair to grow for four months, he had qualified himself for receiving the Latin tonsure instead of the Greek. Theodore arrived in England in 669, and held his see for twenty-one years, with the title and jurisdiction of archbishop of all England; for York had had no archbishop since Paulinus. Under Theodore the churches of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, which until then had been independent of each other, were for the first time united; and in other respects his primacy is memorable in the history of the English church. The resort of English students to the monasteries of Ireland, as seminaries superior to any that could be found in their own country, was checked by the establishment of schools in which the learning and the science of the age were taught; and it is said that not only Latin, but the Greek primate's native tongue, was spoken as fluently as English. To Theodore has also been ascribed the division of England into parishes; and although this idea is now generally abandoned, it seems to be admitted that he may have paved the way for the parochial division by introducing the right of patronage, which had been established in his native church by Justinian.

The archbishop visited every part of the country. On reaching Northumbria, he inquired into the case of Chad, and disallowed his consecration—partly, it would seem, because it was not derived from a purely Roman source, and partly on account of Wilfrid's prior claims to the see. The bishop meekly replied, "If you judge that I have not received the episcopate rightly, I willingly retire from my office, of which, indeed, I never thought myself worthy, but which, although unworthy, I agreed to undertake for the sake of obedience to command". Theodore, struck with this humility, reordained him through all the grades of the ministry; and, while Wilfrid took possession of the Northumbrian diocese, Chad, after a short

retirement at the monastery of Lastingham, of which he had formerly been an inmate, was appointed by the king of Mercia, on the archbishop's recommendation, to the see of Lichfield.

Gregory's scheme for the ecclesiastical organization of England had never taken effect. The bishoprics had originally been of the same extent with the kingdoms, except that in Kent there was a second see at Rochester. Theodore was desirous of increasing the episcopate, and, in a council at Hertford, in 673, proposed a division of the dioceses; but, probably from fear of opposition, he did not press the matter. Soon after this council Wilfrid again fell into trouble. Egfrid, the son and successor of Oswy, was offended because the bishop, instead of aiding him to overcome the inclination of his first queen, Etheldreda, afterwards abbess of Ely, for a life of virginity, had encouraged her in it, and had given her the veil; and the king was further provoked by the suggestions of his second queen, who invidiously dwelt on Wilfrid's wealth, his influence, and the splendour of his state. The primate lent himself to the royal schemes, and not only disregarded the rights of Wilfrid by erecting the sees of Hexham and Sidnacester (near Gainsborough) within his diocese, but superseded him by consecrating a bishop for York itself, as well as bishops for the two new dioceses which had been separated from it. Wilfrid determined to seek redress from Rome. A storm, which carried him to the Frisian coast, saved him from the plots which, through Egfrid's influence, had been laid for detaining him in France; and he remained for some time in Frisia, where his labours were rewarded by the conversion of the king, with most of the chiefs and some thousands of the people. On his arrival at Rome, in 679, his case was investigated by pope Agatho with a council of fifty bishops. It was decided that, if his diocese were divided, the new sees should be filled with persons of his own choosing, and that those who had been intruded into them should be expelled; and Wilfrid was invited to take a place in the council against the monothelites, where he signed the acts as representative of the whole church of Britain.

The Roman council had denounced heavy penalties against all who should contravene its decisions; kings, in particular, were threatened with excommunication. But Egfrid, instead of submitting, imprisoned Wilfrid on his return from Italy, and only offered to release him, and to restore him to a part of his old diocese, on condition of his renouncing the papal statutes. The imprisonment lasted nine months, at the end of which Wilfrid was set at liberty through the influence of the queen, who had been smitten with dangerous illness for possessing herself of his reliquary. He now sought a field of labour at a distance from his persecutors—the kingdom of Sussex, the scene of his perilous adventure in returning from France many years before. Until this time the only Christian teachers who had appeared in Sussex were six poor Irish monks, who had a little monastery at Bosham, but made no progress in converting the inhabitants. The king, however, Ethelwalch, had lately been baptized in Mercia, and gladly patronized the new preacher of the gospel—even to the extent of compelling some of his subjects to receive baptism by force. The people of Sussex were indebted to Wilfrid for the knowledge of fishing and other useful arts, as well as of Christianity. He established a bishopric at Selsey, and extended his labours to the Isle of Wight, and into the kingdom of Wessex.

Theodore, at the age of eighty-eight, feeling the approach of death, began to repent of the part which he had taken against Wilfrid. He sent for him, begged his forgiveness, reconciled him with Aldfrid, the new king of Northumbria, and urged him to accept the succession to the primacy. Wilfrid professed a wish to leave the question of the primacy to a council; but he recovered the sees of York and Hexham, with the monastery of Ripon. The archbishop died in 690, and when the see had been two years vacant, was succeeded by Berctwald; and after a time Wilfrid was again ejected—partly for refusing to consent to certain statutes which had been enacted by the late primate. He withdrew into Mercia, where he remained until in 702 he was summoned to appear before a synod at Onestrefield, in Yorkshire. On being required by this assembly to renounce his episcopal office, and to content himself with the monastery of Ripon, the old man indignantly declared that he would not

abandon a dignity to which he had been appointed forty years before. He recounted his merits towards the church—saying nothing of his zealous labours for the spreading of the gospel, of his encouragement of letters, or of the stately churches which he had erected, but insisting on his opposition to the Scottish usages, on his introduction of the Latin chant and of the Benedictine rule, and again he repaired to Rome, while his partisans in England were put under a sort of excommunication. The pope, John VI, was naturally inclined to favour one whose troubles had arisen from a refusal to obey the decrees of Theodore except in so far as they were consistent with those of the apostolic see. And when, at Easter 704, the acts of Pope Agatho's synod against the monothelites were publicly read, the occurrence of Wilfrid's name among the signatures, with the coincidence of his being then again at Rome as a suitor for aid against oppression, raised a general enthusiasm in his favour. He would have wished to end his days at Rome, but by the desire of John VII, whose election he had witnessed, he returned to England, carrying with him a papal recommendation addressed to Ethelred of Mercia and Aldfrid of Northumbria. The primate, Berctwald, received him kindly; but Aldfrid set at nought the pope's letter, until on his death-bed he relented, and the testimony of his sister as to his last wishes procured for Wilfrid a restoration to the see of Hexham, although it does not appear that he ever recovered the rest of his original diocese. In 709 Wilfrid closed his active and troubled life at the monastery of Oundle, and was buried at Ripon, the place which, while living in the body, he loved above all others.

The Roman customs as to Easter and the tonsure gradually made their way throughout the British Isles. In 710 they were adopted by the southern Picts, in consequence of a letter addressed to king Naitan (or Nectan) by Ceolfrid, abbot of Jarrow. It was in vain that Adamnan, abbot of Iona, who had been converted to the Roman usages in Northumbria, attempted, in the last years of the seventh century, to introduce them into his monastery : but he was more successful among his own countrymen, the northern Irish, who at his instance abandoned their ancient practice about 697; and at length, in 716, Egbert, an English monk who had received his education in Ireland, induced the monks of St. Columba to celebrate the catholic Easter. The ancient British church adhered to its paschal calculation until the end of the eighth century, but appears to have then conformed to the Roman usage; and, if disputes afterwards arose on the subject, they excited little attention, and speedily died away.

Christianity had had a powerful effect on the civilization of the Anglo-Saxons, and through the exertions of Theodore, Wilfrid, and others, arts and learning were now actively cultivated in England. Benedict Biscop, the founder of the abbey of Wearmouth, who was the companion of Wilfrid in his first visit to Rome, brought back with him the arch-chanter John, by whom the northern clergy were instructed in the Gregorian chant, the course of the festivals, and other ritual matters. From six expeditions to Rome Benedict returned laden with books, relics, vestments, vessels for the altar, and religious pictures. Instead of the thatched wooden churches with which the Scottish missionaries had been content, Benedict and Wilfrid, with the help of masons from France, erected buildings of squared and polished stone, with glazed windows and leaded roofs. Wilfrid built a large structure of this kind over the little wooden church at York in which Paulinus had baptized the Northumbrian king Edwin, but which had since fallen into disrepair and squalid neglect. At Ripon he raised another church, which was consecrated with great pomp and ceremony; two kings were present, and the festivities lasted three days and nights. Still more remarkable than these was his cathedral at Hexham, which is described as the most splendid ecclesiastical building north of the Alps. Benedict Biscop's churches were adorned with pictures brought from Italy. Among them are mentioned one of the blessed Virgin, a set of scenes from the Apocalypse, representing the last judgment, and a series in which subjects from the Old Testament were paralleled with their antitypes from the New; thus, Isaac carrying the wood for his sacrifice corresponded to our Lord bearing the cross, and the brazen serpent to the crucifixion.

Monasteries had now been founded and endowed in great numbers. In some of them recluses of both sexes lived, although in separate parts of the buildings. Many ladies of royal birth became abbesses or nuns; and at length it was not unusual for English kings to abdicate their thrones, to go in pilgrimage to Rome, and there to end their days in the monastic habit. But among the Anglo-Saxons, as elsewhere, the popularity of monachism was accompanied by decay. Bede, in his epistle to Egbert, archbishop of York (A.D. 734), draws a picture of corruptions in discipline and morals, both among monks and clergy, which contrasts sadly with his beautiful sketch of the primitive Scottish missionaries. Among other things he mentions a remarkable abuse arising out of the immunities attached to monastic property. Land among the Anglo-Saxons was distinguished as *folkland* or *bocland*. The *folkland* was national property, held of the king on condition of performing certain services, granted only for a certain term, and liable to resumption; the *bocland* was held by book or charter, for one or more lives, or in perpetuity, and was exempted from most (and in some cases from all) of the duties with which the *folkland* was burdened. The estates of monasteries were *bocland*, and, so long as the monastic society existed, the land belonged to it. In order, therefore, to secure the advantages of this tenure, some nobles professed a desire to endow monasteries with the lands which they held as *folkland*. By presents or other means they induced the king and the *witan* (or national council) to sanction its conversion into *bocland*; they erected monastic buildings on it, and in these they lived with their wives and families, styling themselves abbots, but having nothing of the monastic character except the name and the tonsure.

Among the men of letters whom the English church (or, indeed, the whole church) produced in this age, the most celebrated is Bede. The fame which he had attained in his own time is attested by the fact that he was invited to Rome by Sergius I, although the pope's death prevented the acceptance of the invitation; and from the following century he has been commonly distinguished by the epithet of Venerable. Born about the year 673, in the neighbourhood of Jarrow, an offshoot from Benedict Biscop's abbey of Wearmouth, he became an inmate of the monastery at the age of seven, and there spent the remainder of his life. He tells us of himself that, besides the regular exercises of devotion, he made it his pleasure every day either to learn or to teach or to write something. He laboured assiduously in collecting and transmitting the knowledge of former ages, not only as to ecclesiastical subjects, but in general learning. His history of the English church comes down to the year 731,—within three years of his own death, which took place on the eve of Ascension-day 734, his last moments having been spent in dictating the conclusion of a version of St. John's Gospel.

Aldhelm, abbot of Malmesbury, and afterwards bishop of Sherborne, who died in 709, was distinguished as a divine and as a poet. And Caedmon, originally a servant of St. Hilda's abbey at Streaneshalch, displayed in his native tongue poetical gifts which his contemporaries referred to miraculous inspiration. The Anglo-Saxons were the first nation which possessed a vernacular religious poetry; and it is remarked to the honour of the Anglo-Saxon poets, that their themes were not derived from the legends of saints, but from the narratives of Holy Scripture.

During this period much was done for the conversion of the Germanic tribes, partly by missionaries from the Frankish kingdom, but in a greater degree by zealous men who went forth from Britain or from Ireland. Of these, Columban and his disciple Gall, with their labours in Gaul and in Switzerland, have been already mentioned.

(1) The conversion of the Bavarians has been commonly referred to the sixth century, so as to accord with the statement that Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, the correspondent of Gregory the Great, was a Bavarian princess, and had received an orthodox Christian training in her own land. But even if this statement be mistaken, it is certain that the Bavarians had the advantage of settling in a country which had previously been Christian (for such it was

even before the time of Severin); and the remains of its earlier Christianity were not without effect on them.

In 613 a Frankish council, in consequence of reports which had reached it, sent Eustasius, the successor of Columban at Luxeuil, with a monk of his society named Agil, into Bavaria, where they found that many of the inhabitants were infected with heretical opinions, which are (perhaps somewhat incorrectly) described as the errors of Photinus or Bonosus.

About the middle of the seventh century, Emmeran, a bishop of Aquitaine, was stirred by reports which reached him as to the heathenism of the Avars in Pannonia, to resign his see, with the intention of preaching the gospel in that country. Accompanied by an interpreter skilled in the Teutonic dialects, he made his way as far as Radaspona (Ratisbon), where he was kindly received by Theodo, duke of Bavaria. Theodo, who was already a Christian, represented to the bishop that the disturbed state of Pannonia rendered his undertaking hopeless; he entreated him to remain in Bavaria, where he assured him that his zeal would find abundant exercise; and when argument proved ineffectual, he forcibly detained him. Emmeran regarded this as a providential intimation of his duty; and for three years he preached with great diligence to the Bavarians. At the end of that time he set out for Rome, but it is said that he was pursued, overtaken, and murdered by the duke's son, in revenge for the dishonour of a sister, which the bishop, although innocent, had allowed the princess and her paramour to charge on him.

In the end of the century, Rudbert, bishop of Worms, at the invitation of another duke named Theodo, undertook a mission into the same country, where he baptized the duke, and founded the episcopal city of Salzburg on the site of the old Roman Juvavium. To the labours of Rudbert is chiefly due the establishment of Christianity in Bavaria. It would seem, however, that he eventually returned to his original diocese of Worms.

The Christianity of the Thuringians has, like that of the Bavarians, been referred to the sixth century. The country and its rulers were, however, still heathen, when, in the latter part of the seventh century, an Irish bishop named Kyllena or Kilian appeared in it at the head of a band of missionaries, and met with a friendly reception from the duke, Gozbert, whose residence was at Wurzburg. After a time, it is said, Kilian went to Rome, and, having been authorized by pope Conon to preach wheresoever he would, he returned to Wurzburg, where Gozbert now consented to be baptized. The duke, while yet a heathen, had married his brother's widow, Geilana; and, although he had not been required before baptism to renounce this union (which was sanctioned by the national customs), Kilian afterwards urged a separation as a matter of Christian duty. Gozbert was willing to make the sacrifice; but Geilana took advantage of his absence on a warlike expedition to murder Kilian, with two companions who had adhered to him. The bodies of the martyrs were concealed, but their graves were illustrated by miracles; and the vengeance of Heaven pursued the ducal house, which speedily became extinct.

The tribes to the north of France were visited by missionaries both from that country and from the British isles. Among the most eminent of these was Amandus, a native of Aquitaine, who was consecrated as a *regionary* (or missionary) bishop about the year 628, and laboured in the country near the Scheldt. The inhabitants are described as so ferocious that all the clergy who had attempted to preach to them had withdrawn in despair. Amandus was fortified with a commission from king Dagobert, which authorized him to baptize the whole population by force; but he made little progress until, by recovering to life a man who had been hanged, he obtained the reputation of miraculous power. In consequence of having ventured to reprove Dagobert for the number of his wives and concubines he was banished; but the king, on marrying a young queen, discarded the others, recalled Amandus, entreated his forgiveness, and, on the birth of a prince, engaged him to baptize the child. It is said that at the baptism, when no one responded to the bishop's prayer, the mouth of the little Sigebert, who was only forty days old, was opened to utter "Amen". Amandus, who preferred the life of

a missionary to that of a courtier, hastened to return to his old neighbourhood, where, although he had to endure many hardships, with much enmity on the part of the heathen population, and was obliged to support himself by the work of his own hands, his preaching was now very effectual. After a time his zeal induced him to go as a missionary to the Slavonic tribes on the Danube; but, as he was received by them with an indifference which did not seem to promise either success or martyrdom, he once more resumed his labours in the region of the Scheldt, and, on the death of a bishop of Maastricht, he was appointed to that see in the year 647. He found, however, so much annoyance both from the disorders of the clergy and from the character of the people, that he expressed to pope Martin a wish to resign the bishopric. Martin, in a letter which is significant as to the position of the Roman see, endeavoured to dissuade him from this desire. He requests Amandus to promulgate the decisions of the lateran synod against the monothelites, which had just been held, and, with a view to fortifying himself against the empire, he urges the bishop to aid him in strengthening the connexion of king Sigebert with Rome. Notwithstanding the pope's remonstrances, however, Amandus withdrew from his see, after having held it three years, and he spent the remainder of his days in superintending the monasteries which he founded.

About the same time with Amandus, and in districts which bordered on the principal scene of his labours, two other celebrated missionaries were exerting themselves for the furtherance of the gospel. One of these was Livin, an Irishman, who became bishop of Ghent, and was martyred about the year 650; the other was Eligius (or Eloy), bishop of Noyon. Eligius was originally a goldsmith, and, partly by skill in his art, but yet more by his integrity, gained the confidence of Clotaire II. He retained his position under Dagobert, to whom he became master of the mint, and coins of his workmanship are still extant. While yet a layman he was noted for his piety. The Holy Scriptures and other religious books always lay open before him as he worked; his wealth was devoted to religious and charitable purposes; he made pilgrimages to holy places; he built monasteries; he redeemed whole shiploads of captives—Romans, Gauls, Britons, Moors, and especially Saxons from Germanys—and endeavoured to train them to Christianity. Such was his charity that strangers were directed to his house by being told that in a certain quarter they would see a crowd of poor persons around the pious goldsmith's door; and already, it is said, his sanctity had been attested by the performance of many miracles. After having spent some time in a lower clerical office, he was consecrated bishop of Noyon in 640, his friend and biographer Audoen (or Ouen) being at the same time consecrated to the see of Rouen. The labours of Eligius extended to the neighbourhood of the Scheldt. The inhabitants of his wide diocese were generally rude and ferocious; part of them were heathens, while others were Christians only in name, and the bishop had to encounter many dangers, and to endure many insults at their hands² His death took place in the year 659.

Among the tribes which shared in the ministrations of Eligius were the Frisians, who then occupied a large tract of country. The successful labours of Wilfrid among them at a later time (A.D. 678) have already been mentioned; but the king whom he converted, Aldgis, was succeeded by a heathen, Radbod. Wulfram, bishop of Sens, at the head of a party of monks, undertook a mission to the Frisians. He found that they were accustomed to offer human sacrifices, the victims being put to death by hanging. In answer to the taunt that, if his story were true, the Saviour of whom he spoke could recall them to life, Wulfram restored five men who had been executed; and after this display of power his preaching made many converts. Radbod had allowed one of his children to be baptized, and had himself consented to receive baptism; but, when one of his feet was already in the font, he adjured the bishop in God's name to tell him in which of the abodes which he had spoken of the former kings and nobles of the nation were. Wulfram replied, that the number of the elect is fixed, and that those who had died without baptism must necessarily be among the damned. "I would rather be there

with my ancestors”, said the king, “than in heaven with a handful of beggars”; and, drawing back his foot from the baptistry, he remained a heathen.

But the chief efforts for the conversion of the Frisians were made by missionaries from the British islands. Egbert, a pious Anglo-Saxon inmate of an Irish monastery (the same who afterwards persuaded the monks of Iona to adopt the Roman Easter), conceived the idea of preaching to the heathens of Germany. He was warned by visions, and afterwards by the stranding of the vessel in which he had embarked, that the enterprise was not for him; but his mind was still intent on it, and he resolved to attempt it by means of his disciples. One of these, Wigbert, went into Frisia in 690, and for two years preached with much success. On his return, Willibrord, a Northumbrian, who before proceeding into Ireland had been trained in Wilfrid’s monastery at Ripon, set out at the head of twelve monks,—a further opening for their labours having been made by the victory which Pipin of Heristal, the virtual sovereign of Austrasia, had gained over Radbod at Dorstadt. Pipin received the missionaries with kindness, gave them leave to preach in that part of the Frisian territory which had been added to the Frankish kingdom, and promised to support them by his authority. After a time Willibrord repaired to Rome with a view of obtaining the papal sanction and instructions for his work, as also a supply of relics to be placed in the churches which he should build. On his return, the work of conversion made such progress that Pipin wished to have him consecrated as archbishop of the district in which he had laboured, and for this purpose sent him a second time to Rome. The pope, Sergius, consented, and instead of Willibrord’s barbaric name bestowed on him that of Clement. The archbishop’s see was fixed at Wiltaburg, and he appears to have succeeded in extirpating paganism from the Frankish portion of Frisia. He also attempted to spread the gospel in the independent part of the country, and went even as far as Denmark, where, however, his labours had but little effect. In his return he landed on Heligoland, which was then called *Fositesland*, from a god named *Forseti* or *Fosite*. The island was regarded as holy; no one might touch the animals which lived on it, nor drink, except in silence, of its sacred well: but in defiance of the popular superstition Willibrord baptized three converts in the well, and his companions killed some of the consecrated cattle. The pagan inhabitants, after having waited in vain expectation that the vengeance of the gods would strike the profane strangers with death or madness, carried them before Radbod, who was then in the island. Lots were cast thrice before any one of the party could be chosen for death. At length one was sacrificed, and Willibrord, after having denounced the errors of heathenism with a boldness which won Radbod’s admiration, was sent back with honour to Pipin. The renewal of war between Radbod and the Franks interfered for a time with the work of the missionaries. After the death of the pagan king in 719, circumstances were more favourable for the preaching of the gospel in the independent part of Frisia; and Willibrord continued in a course of active and successful exertion until his death in 739. Among his fellow-labourers during a part of this time was Boniface, afterwards the apostle of Germany.

CHAPTER IV.
ICONOCLASM. A.D. 717-775.

The gradual advance of a reverence for images and pictures, from the time when art began to be taken into the service of the church, has been related in the preceding volume. But when it had reached a certain point, art had little to do with it. It was not by the power of form or colour that the religious images influenced the mind; it was not for the expression of ideal purity or majesty that one was valued above another, but for superior sanctity or for miraculous virtue. Some were supposed to have fallen down from heaven; some, to have been the work of the evangelist St. Luke; and to others a variety of legends was attached. Abgarus, king of Edessa, it was said, when in correspondence with our Lord, commissioned a painter to take His likeness. But the artist, dazzled by the glory of the countenance, gave up the attempt; whereupon the Saviour himself impressed his image on a piece of linen, and sent it to the king. This tale was unknown to Eusebius, although he inserted the pretended correspondence with Abgarus in his history; and the image was said, in consequence of the apostasy of a later king, to have been built up in a wall at Edessa, until, after a concealment of five centuries, it was discovered by means of a vision. By it, and by a picture of the blessed Virgin, "not made with hands", the city was saved from an attack of the Persians. Cloths of a like miraculous origin (as was supposed) were preserved in other places; and many images were believed to perform cures and other miracles, to exude sweat or odoriferous balsam, to bleed, to weep, or to speak.

When images had become objects of popular veneration, the cautions and distinctions by which divines attempted to regulate this feeling were found unavailing. Three hundred years before the time which we have now reached, Augustine, while repelling the charge of idolatry which was brought against the church, had felt himself obliged to acknowledge that many of its members were nevertheless "adorers of pictures"; and the superstition had grown since Augustine's day. It became usual to fall down before images, to pray to them, to kiss them, to burn lights and incense in their honour, to adorn them with gems and precious metals, to lay the hand on them in swearing, and even to employ them as sponsors at baptism.

The moderate views of Gregory the Great as to the use and the abuse of images have been already mentioned.

But although, of the two kindred superstitions, the reverence for relics was more characteristic of the western, and that for images of the eastern church, the feeling of the west in behalf of images was now increased, and the successors of Gregory were ready to take a decided part in the great ecclesiastical and political movements which arose out of the subject.

Leo the Isaurian, who had risen from the class of substantial peasantry through the military service of Justinian II, until in 717 he was raised by general acclamation to the empire, was a man of great energy, and, as even his enemies the ecclesiastical writers do not deny, was possessed of many noble qualities, and of talents which were exerted with remarkable success both in war and in civil administration. In the beginning of his reign he was threatened by the Arabs, whose forces besieged Constantinople both by land and sea; but he destroyed their fleet by the new invention of the Greek fire, compelled the army to retire with numbers much diminished by privation and slaughter, and by a succession of victories delivered his subjects from the fear of the Saracens for many years.

It was not until after he had secured the empire against foreign enemies that Leo began to concern himself with the affairs of religion. In the 6th year of his reign he issued an edict ordering that Jews and Montanists should be forcibly baptized. The Jews submitted in hypocrisy, and mocked at the rites which they had undergone. The Montanists, with the old fanaticism of the sect whose name they bore, appointed a day on which, by general consent, they shut themselves up in their meeting-houses, set fire to the buildings, and perished in the flames.

From these measures it is evident that Leo seriously misconceived the position of the temporal power in matters of religion, as well as the means which might rightly be used for the advancement of religious truth. In the following year, after a consultation with his officers, he made his first attempt against the superstitious use of images. The motives of this proceeding are matter of conjecture. It is said that he was influenced by Constantine, bishop of Nacolia, and by a counsellor named Bezer, who had for a time been in the service of the caliph, and is described as an apostate from the faith. Perhaps these persons may have represented to him the difficulties which this superstition opposed to the conversion of Jews and Mahometans, who regarded it as heathenish and idolatrous : they may, too, have set before him the risk of persecution which it must necessarily bring on the Christian subjects of the caliphs. Leo had seen that towns which relied on their miraculous images had fallen a prey to the arms of the Saracens, and that even the tutelar image of Edessa had been carried off by these enemies of the cross. And when, by whatsoever means, a question on the subject had been suggested, the inconsistency of the popular usages with the letter of Holy Scripture was likely to strike forcibly a direct and untutored mind like that of the emperor. But in truth it would seem—and more especially if we compare Leo's measures against images with those which he took against Judaism and Montanism—that his object was as much to establish an ecclesiastical autocracy as to purify the practice of the church.

The earlier controversies had shown that the multitude could be violently agitated by subtle questions of doctrine which might have been supposed unlikely to excite their interest. But here the matter in dispute was of a more palpable kind. The movement did not originate with a speculative theologian, but with an emperor, acting on his own will, without being urged by any party, or by any popular cry. An attack was made on material and external objects of reverence, on practices which were bound up with men's daily familiar religion, and by means of which the sincere, although unenlightened, piety of the age was accustomed to find its expression. It merely proposed to abolish, without providing any substitute for that which was abolished, without directing the mind to any better and more spiritual worship; and at once the people, who had already been provoked to discontent by some measures of taxation, rose in vehement and alarming commotion against it. The controversy which had occupied the church for a century was now forgotten, and monothelites were absorbed among the orthodox when both parties were thrown together by an assault on the objects of their common veneration.

Leo would seem to have been utterly unprepared for the excitement which followed on the publication of his edict, and he attempted to allay it by an explanation. It was not, he said, his intention to do away with images, but to guard against the abuse of them, and to protect them from profanation, by removing them to such a height that they could not be touched or kissed. But the general discontent was not to be so easily pacified, and events soon occurred which added to its intensity. A Saracen army, which had advanced as far as Nicaea, was believed to have been repulsed by the guardian images of the city. A volcanic island was thrown up in the Aegean, and the air was darkened with ashes—prodigies which, while the emperor saw in them a declaration of heaven against the idolatry of his subjects, the monks, who had possession of the popular mind, interpreted as omens of wrath against his impious proceedings. The monastic influence was especially strong among the islanders of the Archipelago. These rose in behalf of images; they set up one Cosmas as a pretender to the

throne, and an armed multitude, in an ill-equipped fleet, appeared before Constantinople. But the Greek fire discomfited the disorderly assailants; their leaders were taken and put to death; and Leo, provoked by the resistance which his edict had met with, issued a second and more stringent decree, ordering that all images should be destroyed, and that the place of such as were painted on the walls of churches should be washed over.

The emperor, relying on the pliability which had been shown on some former occasions by Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, had made repeated attempts to draw him into the measures against images. But Germanus, who was now ninety-five years of age, was not to be shaken. He reminded Leo of the oath which he had taken at his coronation, to make no innovations in religion. It is said that in a private interview the patriarch professed a conviction that images were to be abolished, "but", he added, "not in your reign". "In whose reign, then?" asked Leo. "In that of an emperor named Conon, who will be the forerunner of Antichrist". "Conon", said the emperor, "is my own baptismal name". Germanus argued that images were meant to represent, not the Trinity, but the incarnation; that, since the Saviour's appearance in human form, the Old Testament prohibitions were no longer applicable; that the church had not in any general council condemned the use of images : and he referred to the Edessan impression of our Lord's countenance, and to the pictures painted by St. Luke. "If I am a Jonas", he said, "throw me into the sea. Without a general council I can make no innovation on the faith". He refused to subscribe the new edict, and resigned his see, to which his secretary Anastasius was appointed.

A serious disturbance soon after took place on the removal of a noted statue of the Saviour, which stood over the "Brazen Gate" of the imperial palace, and was known by the name of "the Surety". This figure was the subject of many marvellous legends, and was held in great veneration by the people. When, therefore, a soldier was commissioned to take it down, crowds of women rushed to the place, and clamorously entreated him to spare it. He mounted a ladder, however, and struck his axe into the face; whereupon they dragged down the ladder, and tore in pieces the man who had dared to assail the object of their reverence. The women were now excited to frenzy, and, having been joined by a mob of the other sex, rushed to the new patriarch's house with the intention of murdering him. Anastasius took refuge in the palace, and the emperor sent out his guards, who suppressed the commotion, but not without considerable bloodshed. "The Surety" was taken down, and its place was filled with an inscription, in which the emperor gave vent to his enmity against images

This incident was followed by some proceedings against the popular party. Many were scourged, mutilated or banished; and the persecution fell most heavily on the monks, who were especially obnoxious to the emperor, both as leaders in the resistance to his measures, and because the images were for the most part of their manufacture. Leo is charged with having rid himself of his controversial opponents by shutting up schools for general education which had existed since the time of the first Christian emperor, and even by burning a splendid library, with the whole college of professors who were attached to it.

But beyond the emperor's dominions the cause of images found a formidable champion in John of Damascus, the most celebrated theologian of his time. John, according to his legendary biographer, a patriarch of Jerusalem who lived two centuries later, was a civil officer, high in the service of the caliph of Damascus, when his writings against the emperor's measures provoked Leo to attempt his destructions. A letter was counterfeited in imitation of his handwriting, containing an offer to betray Damascus to the Greeks, and this (which was represented as one of many such letters) Leo enclosed to the caliph, with expressions of abhorrence against the pretended writer's treachery. The caliph, without listening to John's disavowals of the charge, or to his entreaties for a delay of judgment, ordered his right hand to be cut off, and it was exposed in the market-place until evening, when John requested that it might be given to him, in order that by burying it he might relieve the intolerable pain which he suffered while it hung in the air. On recovering it, he prostrated himself before an image of

the Virgin Mother, prayed that, as he had lost his hand for the defence of images, she would restore it, and vowed thenceforth to devote it to her service. He then lay down to sleep; the “Theotokos” appeared to him in a vision, and in the morning the hand was found to be reunited to his arm. The caliph, convinced of John’s innocence by this miracle, requested him to remain in his service; but John betook himself to the monastery of St. Sabbas, near Jerusalem, where the monks, alarmed at the neophyte’s great reputation, were perplexed how to treat him, and subjected him to a variety of degrading, and even disgusting, trials. But his spirit of obedience triumphed over all; he was admitted into the monastery, and was afterwards advanced to the order of presbyter.

Of the three orations in which John of Damascus asserted the cause of images, two were written before, and the third after, the forced resignation of Germanus. He argues that images were forbidden to the Jews lest they should fall into the error of their heathen neighbours, or should attempt to represent the invisible Godhead; but that, since the Saviour’s incarnation, these reasons no longer exist, and we must not be in bondage to the mere letter of Scripture. True it is that Scripture does not prescribe the veneration of images; but neither can we read there of the Trinity, or of the coessentiality, as distinctly set forth; and images stand on the same ground with these doctrines, which have been gathered by the fathers from the Scriptures. Holy Scripture countenances images by the directions for the making of the cherubim, and also by our Lord’s words as to the tribute-money. As that which bears Caesar’s image is Caesar’s, and is to be rendered to him; so, too, that which bears Christ’s image is to be rendered to Christ, forasmuch as it is Christ’s. That images are material, is no good reason for refusing to reverence them; for the holy places are material, the ink and the parchment of the Gospels are material, the eucharistic table, its vessels and its ornaments,—nay, the very body and blood of the Saviour,—are material. “I do not”, says John, “adore the matter, but the Author of matter, who for my sake became material, that by matter He might work out my salvation”. Images, he continues, are for the unlearned what books are for those who can read; they are to the sight what speech is to the ears. He distinguishes between that sort of worship which is to be reserved for God alone, and that which for His sake is given to His angels and saints or to consecrated things. He rejects the idea that, if the images of the Saviour and of the blessed Virgin are to be allowed, those of the saints should be abolished; if (he holds) the festivals of the saints are kept, if churches are dedicated in their honour, so too ought their images to be revered. He adduces a host of authorities from the fathers, with much the same felicity as his quotations from Scripture, while the story of Epiphanius and the painted curtain, which had been alleged by the iconoclasts, is set aside on the ground that the letter which contains it might be a forgery, or that Epiphanius might have intended to guard against some unrecorded local abuse; that the Cypriot bishop’s own church still used images, and that, in any case, the act of an individual does not bind the whole church. John denies that the emperor has any authority to legislate in ecclesiastical affairs :—“The well-being of the state”, he says, “pertains to princes, but the ordering of the church to pastors and teachers”; and he threatens Leo with scriptural examples of judgment against those who invaded the rights of the church.

In Italy the measures of Leo produced a great agitation. The allegiance of that country had long been gradually weakening. The exarchs were known to the people only as tax-gatherers who drained them of their money, and sent it off to Constantinople; for defence against the Lombards or other enemies, the Italian subjects of the empire were obliged to rely on themselves, without any expectation of effective help from the emperor or his lieutenant. The pope was the virtual head of the Italians; and the connexion which the first Gregory and his successors had laboured to establish with the Frankish princes, as a means of strengthening themselves against the empire, had lately been rendered more intimate by the agency of the great missionary Boniface. But the ancient and still undiminished hatred with which the Romans regarded their neighbours the Lombards weighed against the motives which might

have disposed the popes to take an opportunity of breaking with the empire; and Gregory II, although he violently opposed Leo on the question of images, yet acted in some sort the part of a mediator between him and his Italian subjects.

Gregory, on receiving the edicts against images, rejected them. The people of Ravenna expelled the exarch, who sought a refuge at Pavia. Liutprand, king of the Lombards, eagerly took advantage of the disturbances to pour his troops into the imperial territory, and, sometimes in hostility to the exarch, sometimes in combination with him against the pope, endeavoured to profit by the dissensions of his neighbours. One exarch was killed in the course of the commotions. The pope, hoping for the conversion of Leo (as it is said by writers in the Roman interest), restrained the Italians from setting up a rival emperor; and when Liutprand, in alliance with a new exarch, appeared before the walls of Rome, he went out to him and prevailed on the Lombard king to give up his design against the city. Thus far, therefore, it would appear that the emperor was chiefly indebted to Gregory for the preservation of his Italian dominions. But the relations between these potentates were of no friendly kind. It is said that repeated attempts were made by Leo's order to assassinate Gregory; perhaps the foundation of the story may have been that, as the pope himself states, there was an intention of carrying him off to the east, as Martin had been carried off in the preceding century. On the resignation of the patriarch Germanus, Gregory refused to acknowledge his successor, and wrote to Leo in a style of vehement defiance. He urges the usual arguments in behalf of images, and reproaches the emperor with his breach of the most solemn engagements. "We must", he says, "write to you grossly and rudely, forasmuch as you are illiterate and gross. Go into our elementary schools, and say, 'I am the overthrower and persecutor of images'; and forthwith the children will cast their tablets at you, and you will be taught by the unwise that which you refuse to learn from the wise". Leo, he says, had boasted of being like Uzziah; that, as the Jewish king destroyed the brazen serpent after it had existed 800 years, so he himself had cast out images after a like time; and the pope, without raising any question either as to Jewish or Christian history, makes him welcome to the supposed parallel. It would, he says, be less evil to be called a heretic than an iconoclast; for the infamy of the heretic is known to few, and few understand his offence; but here the guilt is palpable and open as day. Leo had proposed a council, as a means of settling the question; but he is told that the proposal is idle, inasmuch as, if a council were gathered, he is unfit to take the part of a religious emperor in it. To say, as he had said, "I am emperor and priest", might become one who had protected and endowed the church, but not one who had plundered it, and had drawn people away from the pious contemplation of images to frivolous amusements: emperors are for secular matters, priests for spiritual. The pope mocks at the threat of carrying him off to Constantinople; he has but to withdraw twenty-four furlongs from the walls of Rome into Campania, and his enemies would have to pursue the winds. Why, it had been asked, had the six general councils said nothing of images? As well, replies Gregory, might you ask why they said nothing of common food and drink; images are matters of traditional and unquestioned use; the bishops who attended the councils carried images with them. The emperor is exhorted to repent, and is threatened with judgments; he is charged to take warning from the fate of the monothelite Constans, and from the glory of that prince's victims, the martyrs Maximus and Martin.

The sequel of Gregory's proceedings is matter of controversy. Extreme Romanists and their extreme opponents agree in stating that the pope excommunicated the emperor, withdrew his Italian subjects from their allegiance, and forbade the payment of tribute—by the rightful exercise of apostolical authority according to one party; by an anti-Christian usurpation according to the other. But more temperate inquirers have shown that these representations are incorrect. The popes of that age made no pretension to the right of dethroning princes or of absolving subjects from their allegiance; Gregory, in his second letter, while he denies that the emperor is entitled to interfere with the church, expressly disclaims the power of interfering

with the sovereign : and the story as to the withdrawal of tribute seems to have grown out of the fact of a popular resistance to an impolitic increase of taxation. Although Gregory condemned iconoclasm, it appears that he did not pronounce any excommunication against the emperor; and even if he excommunicated him, the sentence would have been unheeded by the church of Constantinople. The utmost that can be established, therefore, appears to be, that, by raising a cry against Leo as a heretic and a persecutor, he rendered him odious to his Italian subjects, and so paved the way for that separation from the empire which followed within half a century.

In the following year Gregory II was succeeded by a third pope of the same name, for whom it was still held necessary that, before his consecration, the election should be confirmed by the exarch. Gregory III, a Syrian by birth, was zealous in the cause of images, and laboured to increase the popular veneration of them. He remonstrated with Leo against his iconoclastic proceedings, and held a council of ninety-eight bishops, which anathematized all the enemies of images, but without mentioning the emperor by name. Leo, indignant at the pope's audacity, imprisoned his envoys, and resolved to send a fleet to reduce Italy into better subjection. But the fleet was disabled by storms, and the emperor was obliged to content himself with confiscating the papal revenues (or "patrimony") in Sicily, Calabria, and other parts of his dominions, and transferring Greece and Illyricum from the Roman patriarchate to that of Constantinople.

Gregory III was succeeded in 741 by Zacharias, and Leo by his son Constantine, whose reign extended to the unusual length of thirty-four years. This prince (who is commonly distinguished by the name Copronymus, derived from his having in infancy polluted the baptismal font) is charged by the ecclesiastical writers with monstrous vices, and with the practice of magical arts; while his apologists contend that he was remarkably chaste and temperate. The characteristics which are beyond all controversy are his vigour, his ability, and his cruelty. In war he successfully defended his empire against Saracens, Bulgarians, and other enemies, and under him its internal administration was greatly improved.

The difficulties in which Constantine was involved by the Saracen war, and by the discontents arising out of the question as to images, encouraged his brother-in-law Artavasdus to pretend to the throne; it would seem, indeed, that he was almost forced into this course by the emperor's jealousy. Artavasdus appealed to the popular affection for images, and restored them in all places of which he got possession. He was crowned by the patriarch Anastasius, who, holding the cross in his hands, publicly swore that Constantine had avowed to him a belief that our Lord was a mere man, born in the ordinary way. Pope Zacharias acknowledged Artavasdus as emperor; but, after having maintained his claim for three years, the rival of Constantine was put down, and he and his adherents were punished with great severity. Anastasius was blinded, and was exhibited in the hippodrome, mounted on an ass, with his face towards the tail; yet after this Constantine restored him to the patriarchate—by way, it would seem, of proclaiming his contempt for the whole body of the clergy.

It is said that Constantine expressed Nestorian opinions, and a disbelief in the intercession of the blessed Virgin and of the saints. But if so, the words were spoken in conferences which were intended to be secret; and it was the emperor's policy to feel his way carefully before taking any public step in matters of religion. On the question as to images, he wished to strengthen himself by the authority of a general council, and summoned one to meet in the year 754, having in the preceding year desired that, by way of preparation, the subject should be discussed by the provincial assemblies of bishops. The see of Constantinople was then vacant by the death of Anastasius—a circumstance which may have tended to secure the ready compliance of some who aspired to fill it. The remaining three patriarchs of the east were under the Mahometan dominion, and Stephen of Rome disregarded the imperial citation. In the absence of all the patriarchs, therefore, the bishops of Ephesus and Perga presided over the council, which was held in a palace on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus, with the

exception of the final sitting, which took place in the church of the Blachernae. The number of bishops, although collected from the emperor's dominions only, amounted to three hundred and thirty-eight, and their decisions, after sessions which lasted from February to August, are described as unanimous—a proof rather of the subjection in which the episcopate was held than of any real conviction.

The assembled bishops professed to rest their judgment on the authority of the fathers, from whose writings extracts were read. They declared all representations made for religious purposes by the art of painter or sculptor to be presumptuous, heathenish, and idolatrous. Those who make such representations of the Saviour, it is said, either limit the incomprehensible God to the bounds of created flesh, or confound the natures, like Eutyches, or deny the Godhead, like Arius, or, with Nestorius, separate it from the manhood so as to make two persons. The Eucharist alone is declared to be a proper image of the Saviour—the union of the Divine grace with the material elements typifying that of the Godhead with his human form. All images, therefore, are to be removed out of churches. Bishops, priests, or deacons contravening the decisions of the council, whether by invoking images, by worshipping them, by setting them up, or by secretly keeping them, are to be deposed; monks and lay persons offending in like manner are to be excommunicated. But it was ordered that no one should deface or meddle with sacred vessels or vestments, under pretext of their being adorned with figures, unless by permission of the emperor or of the patriarch; and that no person in authority should despoil churches on this account, as had already been done in some instances. With a view perhaps of clearing themselves from the aspersions which were thrown on the emperor's faith, the bishops formally declared the lawfulness of invoking the blessed Virgin and the saints. And they pronounced anathemas against all religious art, anathematizing by name some noted defenders of images—Germanus, George of Cyprus, and John of Damascus, whom they designated by the name of *Mansour* loaded with a profusion of dishonourable epithets, and denounced with a threefold curse.

Fortified by the decisions of the council, Constantine now ordered that all images should be removed. For the religious paintings on church walls, he ordered that other subjects—such as birds and fruits, or scenes from the chase, the theatre, and the circus—should be substituted. He required the clergy and the more noted monks to subscribe the decrees of the synod and at a later time an oath against images was exacted from all the inhabitants of the empire. It does not appear that any of the bishops refused to comply; but the monks were violent and obstinate in their resistance, and the emperor endeavoured to subdue them by the most barbarous cruelties. The zeal of the monks in behalf of images provoked him even to attempt the extirpation of monachism by forcing them to abandon their profession. Thus we read that a number of monks were compelled to appear in the hippodrome at Constantinople, each holding by the hand a woman of disreputable character, and so to stand while the populace mocked at them and spit on them. The new patriarch, Constantine, whom the emperor had presented to the council as the successor of Anastasius on the last day of its meeting, was obliged publicly to forswear images, and, in violation of the monastic vows which he had taken, to attend the banquets of the palace, to eat and drink freely, to wear garlands, to witness the gross spectacles, and to listen to the indecent language and music, in which the emperor delighted. Monasteries were destroyed, converted into barracks, or applied to other secular uses. The governor of the Thracian theme, Michael Lachanadraco, especially distinguished himself by the energy of his proceedings against the monks. He assembled a great number of them in a plain, and told them that such of them as were inclined to obey the emperor and himself must forthwith put on a white dress and take wives; while those who should refuse were to lose their eyes and to be banished to Cyprus. Some of them complied, but the greater part suffered the penalty. Lachanadraco put many monks to death; he anointed the beards of some with a mixture of oil and wax, and then set them on fire; he burnt down monasteries, sold the plate, books, cattle, and other property

which belonged to them, and remitted the price to the emperor, who publicly thanked him for his zeal, and recommended him as an example to other governors. Relics were to some extent involved in the fate of images, although not so much as consistency might have seemed to require. Lachanadraco seized all which he found carried about the person, and punished the wearers as impious and disobedient. The relics of St. Euphemia, at Chalcedon, which even as early as the time of the fourth general council had been famous for miraculous virtue, and were believed to exude a fragrant balsam, were thrown into the sea, and the place where they had lately reposed was defiled. But it is said that they were carried by the waves to Lemnos, where visions indicated the spot in which they were to be found, and secured their preservation until more favourable times.

The monks, on their part, no doubt did much to provoke the emperor and his officers to additional cruelty by violent and fanatical behaviour. Thus, one named Peter “the calybit” made his way into the presence of Constantine, and upbraided him as a new Valens and Julian for persecuting Christ in His members and in His images. For this audacity Peter was scourged in the hippodrome, and was afterwards strangled. Another famous sufferer was Stephen, who had lived as a monk for sixty years. He boldly defied the emperor; he remained unshaken by banishment or tortures, and, by way of illustrating the manner in which insults offered to images might be supposed to affect the holy persons whom they represent, he produced a coin stamped with the emperor’s head, threw it on the ground, and trod on it. In consequence of this act he was imprisoned; but the sympathy of his admirers was displayed so warmly, that Constantine was provoked to exclaim, “Am I, or is this monk, emperor of the world?”. The words were caught up as a hint by some courtiers, who rushed to the prison and broke it open. Stephen was dragged through the streets by a rope tied to one of his feet, until he was dead, and his body was then torn in pieces, which were thrown into a place appropriated to the burial of heathens and excommunicate persons, of suicides and of criminals.

The patriarch Constantine, after all his compliances, was accused of having held treasonable communications with Stephen, and of having spoken disrespectfully of the emperor; and on these charges he was banished to an island, while Nicetas, an eunuch of Slavonic origin, was raised to the patriarchate in his stead. In the second year of his banishment, Constantine was brought back. After having been beaten until he could not walk, he was carried into the cathedral, where the accusations against him were read aloud, and at every count of the indictment an imperial functionary struck him on the face. He was then forced to stand in the pulpit, while Nicetas pronounced his excommunication; after which he was stripped of the pall, the ensign of his ecclesiastical dignity, and was led backwards out of the church. On the following day he was carried into the hippodrome; his hair, eyebrows, and beard were plucked out; he was set on an ass, with his face towards the tail, which he was compelled to hold with both hands; and his nephew, whose nose had been cut off, led the animal around, while the spectators hooted at and spat on the fallen patriarch. He was then thrown violently to the ground, his neck was trodden on, and he lay prostrate, exposed to the jeers of the rabble, until the games of the day were over. A few days later, some patricians were sent to question him in prison as to the emperor’s orthodoxy, and as to the decisions of the council against images. The patriarch, thinking to soothe his persecutors’ rage, expressed approval of everything. “This”, they said, “was all that we wished to hear further from thy impure mouth; now begone to cursing and darkness!”. The wretched man was immediately beheaded, and his head, after having been publicly exposed for three days, was thrown, with his body, into the same place of ignominy where Stephen had before been buried.

These details have been given as a specimen of the cruelties which are ascribed to Constantine Copronymus. To the end of his reign he was unrelenting in his enmity against the worshippers of images. In the year 775, while on a military expedition, he was seized with a

burning pain in his legs, which (it is said) forced from him frequent cries that he already felt the pains of hell. He died at sea, on his way to Constantinople.

CHAPTER V.

SAINT BONIFACE A.D. 715-755.

Among the missionary enterprises of the Anglo-Saxons had been some attempts to convert the nations of Northern Germany. Suidbert, one of the original companions of Willibrord, was consecrated in England during his master's first visit to Rome, and went forth to preach to the Boructuarians, who occupied a territory between the Ems and the Yssel; but the disorders of the country obliged him to withdraw from it, and he afterwards laboured on the lower Rhine. Two brothers named Hewald, and distinguished from each other by the epithets White and Black, are also celebrated as having penetrated into the country of the Old Saxons, and having there ended their lives by martyrdom. But no great or lasting missionary success had been achieved to the east of the Rhine in the lower part of its course until the time of Boniface.

This missionary, whose original name was Winfrid, was born at Crediton, in Devonshire, of a noble and wealthy family, about the year 680. It was intended that he should follow a secular career; but the boy was early influenced by the discourse of some monks who visited his father's house, and at the age of seven he entered a monastery at Exeter, from which he afterwards removed to that of Nutselle (Nutshalling or Nursling) in Hampshire. Here he became famous for his ability as a preacher and as an expositor of Scripture. He was employed in important ecclesiastical business, and had the prospect of rising to eminence in the church of his own country; but he was seized with an earnest desire to labour for the extension of the gospel, and, with two companions, he crossed the sea to Frisia, in the year 716. The state of things in that country was unfavourable for his design. Charles, who in later ages was called Martel, the son of Pipin of Heristal by a concubine, had possessed himself of the mayoralty of the palace in Austrasia, and was now engaged in war with Radbod of Frisia, who had made an alliance with Ragenfrid, the mayor of the Neustrian palace. The pagan prince had destroyed many churches and monasteries, and, although he admitted Boniface to an interview, he refused him permission to preach in his dominions. Boniface therefore returned to Nutselle, where the monks, on the occurrence of a vacancy in the headship of their house, were desirous to elect him abbot. But his missionary zeal induced him to withstand their importunities; and, having secured the appointment of another abbot, through the assistance of his bishop, Daniel of Winchester, he set out for Rome in the spring of 717. A letter from Daniel procured him a kind reception from Gregory II, who held many conferences with him during the following winter; and in 718 Boniface left Rome, carrying with him a large supply of relics, with a commission by which the pope authorized him to preach to the heathens of Germany wherever he might find an opportunity. After having surveyed Bavaria and Thuringia, he was induced by tidings of Radbod's death to go again into Frisia, where for three years he labored under Willibrord. The aged bishop wished to appoint him his successor; but Boniface declined the honour, on the ground that, as he was not yet fifty years old, he was unfit for so high an office, and that he must betake himself to the sphere for which the pope had especially appointed him. He therefore took leave of Willibrord, and passed into Hessa. Two local chiefs, Detdic and Dierolf, who, although professing Christianity, were worshippers of idols, granted him leave to establish himself at Amanaburg, on the Ohm (*Amana*), where in

a short time he reclaimed them from their heathenish practices, and baptized many thousands of Hessians. On receiving a report of this success, Gregory summoned Boniface to Rome, and, after having exacted a formal profession of faith, ordained him as a regionary bishop, at the same time binding him to the papal see by an oath, which was a novelty as imposed on a missionary, although, with some necessary changes, it was the same which had long been required of bishops within the proper patriarchate of Rome. Standing at the tomb of St. Peter, to whom the oath was addressed, Boniface solemnly pledged himself to obey the apostle, and the pope as his vicar; in no wise to consent to anything against the unity of the catholic church; in all things to keep his faith to the apostle, and to the interests of the Roman see; to have no communion or fellowship with bishops who might act contrary to the institutions of the holy fathers; but to check such persons, if possible, or otherwise to report them faithfully to his lord the pope.

The bishop received from the pope a code of regulations for the government of his church (probably the collection of Dionysius Exiguus); and, having learnt by experience the importance of securing the countenance of princes for missionary undertakings, he carried with him a recommendation from Gregory to Charles Martel, who, under the name of the effete descendants of Clovis, was the virtual sovereign of their kingdom. He was also furnished by the pope with letters to the nations among which his labours were to be employed. Charles Martel received the missionary coldly; such enterprises as that of Boniface had no interest for the rude warrior, nor were the clergy of his court likely to bespeak his favour for one whose life and thoughts differed widely from their own. Boniface, however, obtained from Charles the permission which he desired, to preach beyond the Rhine, with a letter of protection which proved to be very valuable

In Hestia and Thuringia, the countries to which he now repaired, Christianity had already been long preached, but by isolated teachers, and without any regular system. The belief and the practice of the converts were still largely mixed with paganism; Boniface even speaks of presbyters who offered sacrifices to the heathen gods. The preachers had for the most part proceeded from the Irish church, in which diocesan episcopacy was as yet unknown, and the jurisdiction was separate from the order of a bishop; they had brought with them its peculiar ideas as to the limitation of the episcopal rights; they were unrestrained by any discipline or by any regard for unity; they owned no subjection to Rome, and were under no episcopal authority. Boniface often complains of these preachers as fornicators and adulterers—words which may in some cases imply a charge of real immorality, but which in general mean nothing more than that the Irish missionaries held the doctrine of their native church as to the lawfulness of marriage for the clergy. He speaks, too, of some who imposed on the people by pretensions to extraordinary asceticism—feeding on milk and honey only, and rejecting even bread. With these rival teachers he was involved in serious and lasting contentions.

Among the collection of Boniface's correspondence is a letter from his old patron, Daniel of Winchester, containing advice for the conduct of his missionary work. The bishop tells him that, in discussions with the heathen, he ought not to question the genealogies of their gods, but to argue from them that beings propagated after the fashion of mankind must not be gods but men. The argument is to be urged by tracing back the genealogies to the beginning; by asking such questions as— "When was the first god generated? To which sex did this god belong? Has the generation of gods come to an end? If it has ceased, why? Is the world older than the gods? If so, who governed it before they existed?". The missionary must argue mildly, and must avoid all appearance of insult or offence. He must contrast the truth of Christianity with the absurdities of the pagan mythology. He must ask how it is that the gods allow Christians to possess the fairest places of the earth, while their own votaries are confined to cold and barren tracts; he is to dwell on the growth of the Christian church from nothing to the predominance which it has already attained.

It would seem, however, that Boniface rarely had occasion to enter into arguments of this sort, but was obliged to rely on others of a more palpable kind. He found that an oak near Geismar, sacred to the thunder-god Donar, was held in great reverence by the Hessians, and that the impression which his words made on the people was checked by their attachment to this object of ancestral veneration. He therefore, at the suggestion of some converts, resolved to cut down the tree. A multitude of pagans assembled and stood around, uttering fierce curses, and expecting the vengeance of the gods to show itself on the missionary and his companions. But when Boniface had hardly begun his operations, a violent gust of wind shook the branches, and the oak fell to the ground, broken into four equal pieces. The pagans at once renounced their gods, and with the wood of the tree Boniface built a chapel in honour of St. Peter.

After this triumph the success of his preaching was rapid. He founded churches and monasteries, and was reinforced by many monks and nuns from his own country, who assisted him in the labours of conversion and Christian education. Gregory III, soon after being raised to the papedom, in 732, conferred on him the pall of an archbishop; and when in 738 Boniface paid a third visit to Rome, he was received with the honour due to a missionary who had by that time baptized a hundred thousand converts. On his return northwards, he was induced by Odilo, duke of Bavaria, to remain for a time in that country, where he had already laboured about three years before. He found there a general profession of Christianity; but there was only one bishop, Vivilus by name; there was no system of ecclesiastical government; and, as in other parts of Germany, he had to contend with the rivalry of the irregular missionaries from Ireland. Boniface divided the country into four dioceses—Salzburg, Passau (which was assigned to Vivilus), Ratisbon, and Freising; and, having thus organized the Bavarian church, he returned to the more especial scene of his labours.

The name of Charles Martel is memorable in the history of the church and of the world for having turned back the course of Mahometan conquest. The Saracens of Spain had overrun the south of France, had made their way as far as the Loire, and were marching against Tours, with the intention of plundering the treasures which the devotion of centuries had accumulated around the shrine of St. Martin, when they were met by Charles, at the head of an army collected from many races—Franks, Germans, Gauls, men of the north, and others. His victory near Poitiers (although the slaughter has been greatly exaggerated by legendary writers) put a stop for ever to the progress of their arms towards the north; and while they were further weakened by internal dissensions, Charles, following up his advantage, succeeded in driving them back beyond the Pyrenees. But the vast benefit which he thus conferred on Christendom was purchased at a cost which for the time pressed heavily on the church of France. In order to meet the exigencies of the war, he seized the treasures of churches, and rewarded the chiefs who followed him with the temporalities of bishoprics and abbeys; so that, notwithstanding his great services to the Christian cause, his memory is branded by the French ecclesiastical writers as that of a profane and sacrilegious prince, and a synod held at Quiercy, in the year 858, assured one of his descendants that for this sin Eucherius, bishop of Orleans, had seen him tormented “in the lower hell”.

Boniface, although he found the name of the Frankish mayor a powerful assistance in his labours beyond the Rhine, was thwarted at the Frankish court by the nobles who had got possession of ecclesiastical revenues, and by the rude, secular, fighting and hunting bishops, who were most congenial to the character of Charles. In a letter to Daniel of Winchester, he complains of being obliged to have intercourse with such persons. The bishop in reply wisely advises him, on scriptural authority, to keep himself pure, and to bear with such faults in others as it may not be in his power to amend.

Both Gregory III and Charles Martel died in 741. The new pope, Zacharias, extended Boniface’s power by authorizing him to reform the whole Frankish church. The sons of Charles were glad to avail themselves of the assistance of Rome in a work of which they felt

the necessity; and from Carloman, who had succeeded to the mayoralty of Austrasia, while Pipin held that of Neustria, Boniface received an amount of support which he had hitherto in vain endeavoured to obtain. He now erected four bishoprics for Hesse and Thuringia; and in 742, at the request of Carloman (as he says), was held a council for the reformation of the church—the first Austrasian council which had met for eighty years. This council was for some years followed by others, collected from one or from both divisions of the Frankish territory. They were not, however, composed of ecclesiastics only, but were mixed assemblies of the national estates; and, while Boniface was acknowledged in his high office as the pope's commissioner, the decrees were set forth by the Frankish princes in their own name, and appointments which had been already made by the papal authority were again made, afresh and independently, by the secular power. Even the jurisdiction of Boniface over other bishops was thus granted anew to him. The canons of these assemblies were directed towards the establishment of order in the church, by providing for annual synods, by forbidding ecclesiastics to hunt, to hawk, to serve in war; by the enforcement of celibacy on the clergy; by subjecting the clergy to the bishops and discountenancing such as were under no regular discipline. An attempt was made to recover to their proper uses the ecclesiastical revenues which had been alienated by Charles Martel. The first council ordered their restoration, but this was not to be so easily effected. The council of the following year was reduced to attempt a compromise, by allowing that, in consideration of the wars and of other circumstances, the property should for a time be retained by the lay holders, but that for each *casata* a *solidus* should be paid to the ecclesiastical owners. But in the later councils the subject does not appear, and it would seem that the attempt was given up as hopeless. The councils also made enactments for the suppression of heathen practices, such as divination, the use of amulets, need-fire (*i.e.* the production of fire by the friction of wood and tow), and the offering of sacrifices, whether to the old pagan deities, or to the saints who with some converts had taken their place—practices of which some, with a remarkable tenacity, have kept their hold on the northern nations even to our own day.

In 742 Boniface laid the foundation of the great abbey of Fulda, through the agency of Sturmi, a noble Bavarian, whom he had trained up in his seminary at Fritzlar. The original intention was unconnected with educational or missionary plans—to provide a place for ascetic retirement. Sturmi and his companions were charged to seek out a remote and lonely position in the Buchonian forest, between the four nations to which their master had preached; and when they had chosen a suitable spot, on the banks of the river Fulda, they had to clear it by cutting down trees, which furnished them with materials for a little chapel. Sturmi was afterwards sent to Monte Cassino and other Italian monasteries, in order that he might become acquainted with the best monastic systems, and the rule established at Fulda was more rigid than that of St. Benedict. The monks were never to eat flesh; their strongest drink was to be a thin beer, although wine was afterwards allowed for the sick. They were to have no serfs, but were to subsist by the labour of their own hands. The new foundation soon became important, and was extended to purposes beyond those which Boniface had had in view. Princes and nobles enriched it with gifts of land, and both from the Frankish kings and from the popes it enjoyed special privileges; although grave doubts have been cast on the documents by which some of these are said to have been conferred, and especially on the grant by which Zacharias is represented as exempting it from all jurisdiction save that of the apostolic see.

Boniface continued to meet with difficulties. His scheme of a regular organization, by which bishops were to be subject to metropolitans, and these to the successor of St. Peter, did not find favour with the Frankish prelates. Of three on whom the pope intended to confer the pall, and who had been persuaded to apply for it, two afterwards refused it, probably in consequence of having further considered the obligations to Rome which it involved. And he still had to encounter the opposition of irregular or heretical teachers, whom he describes as

far more numerous than those of the catholic communion, and as stained in many cases with the most infamous vices.

Of these opponents the most noted were Adelbert and Clement. Adelbert was of Gaulish descent, and had obtained uncanonical consecration as a bishop from some ignorant members of the order. He is described as affecting extraordinary sanctity, and the accounts of him lead us to suppose him a person of fanatical character. He relied much on a letter which was written in the name of the Saviour and was said to have been sent down from heaven. He said that an angel had brought him some relics of surpassing sanctity from the ends of the earth. In opposition to the regular bishops and clergy, he held meetings in fields and at wells; and in such places he set up crosses and built little oratories. He opposed the practice of pilgrimage to Rome. He prayed to angels of names before unknown, such as Tubuel, Sabuoc, and Simiel. He is said to have disparaged the saints and martyrs, refusing to dedicate churches in their honour, while, with a self-importance which, however inconsistent, is certainly not without parallels, he dedicated them in his own name instead. A life of him, filled with tales of visions and miracles, was circulated; and—whether from vanity or in order to ridicule the relics which Boniface had brought from Rome—he distributed the parings of his own nails and hair among his admirers. These, it is said, spoke of his merits as something on which they might rely for aid; and, when they prostrated themselves at his feet, for the purpose of confessing their sins, he told them that it was needless—that he knew all things and had forgiven all their misdeeds, so that they might go home in peace, with the assurance of pardon.

While Adelbert gathered his sect in Austrasia, Clement was preaching in the German territory. Of this person, who was a Scot from Ireland, we are told that he set at nought all canons and all ecclesiastical authority; that he despised the writings of the most esteemed fathers, such as Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory; that he had two sons born in “adultery” (*i.e.* in wedlock), and yet considered himself to be a true Christian bishop; that he *hejudaicly* held marriage with a brother’s widow to be lawful; that he believed our Lord’s descent into hell to have delivered the souls of unbelievers as well as believers; and that on the subject of predestination he held horrible opinions contrary to the catholic faith.

Boniface brought the case of Adelbert before a Neustrian council at Soissons in 744, and obtained a condemnation of the heretic, with an order that the crosses which he had erected should be burnt. But in the following year Adelbert as well as Clement appear to have been in full activity. Boniface procured a censure of both from another council, and reported the matter for investigation to pope Zacharias, whom he requested to obtain from Carloman an order that they should be imprisoned and debarred from communication with all faithful Christians. In consequence of this application, the documents of the case were examined by a Roman synod, which sentenced Adelbert to be deposed, put to penance, and, in case of obstinacy, anathematized with all his followers; while Clement was to be forthwith subjected to deposition and anathema. Two years later, however, the two again appear; it would seem that, besides enjoying a great amount of veneration with the common people, who had persecuted Boniface for his proceedings against Adelbert, they even had some influence over Carloman himself; and it was probably in consequence of this that Zacharias now advised a course of dealing with them which is hardly consistent with the decided condemnation before passed on them. The further history of Clement is utterly unknown; as to Adelbert it is stated by a writer of questionable authority that he was imprisoned at Fulda, and made his escape from the abbey, but was murdered by some swineherds whom he met with in his flight.

Another person with whom Boniface came into collision was an Irish ecclesiastic named Virgil. Virgil, when ordered by him to rebaptize some persons at whose baptism the words of administration had been mutilated by an ignorant priest, appealed to Rome against the order, and Zacharias pronounced that the sacrament was valid, inasmuch as the mistake did not proceed from heresy, but only from grammatical ignorance. Some time after this,

Virgil was nominated to the see of Salzburg, when Boniface objected to him that he held the existence of another world below ours, with a sun, a moon, and inhabitants of its own. Zacharias condemned the opinion, and summoned Virgil to Rome, but it would seem that he was able to clear his orthodoxy, as he was allowed to take possession of Salzburg, and eventually attained the honour of canonization.

The German church had now advanced beyond that stage in which its primate might fitly be a missionary, without any determinate see. Boniface wished to fix himself at Cologne—probably with a view to Frisia, which, since the death of Willibrord, in 739, he had regarded as included within his legatine care; and to this he obtained the consent of the Frankish chiefs, and the sanction of Pope Zacharias. But before the arrangement could be carried into effect, events occurred which caused it to be set aside. In 744, the same year in which Cologne became vacant by the death of Raginfrid, Ceroid, bishop of Mentz (Mayence), was slain in a warlike expedition against the Saxons, and his son Gewillieb, who until then had been a layman of Carloman's court, was consecrated to the see. In the following year the new bishop accompanied the mayor of the palace to war, with a resolution to avenge his father's death; he discovered the Saxon by whose hand it had been caused, and, while the Frankish and the Saxon armies were encamped on opposite banks of the Weser, invited him to a conference in the midst of the stream. The two rode into the water, and at their meeting, the bishop stabbed the Saxon—an act which was the signal for a battle, in which the Franks were victorious. Gewillieb returned to his see as if he had done nothing inconsistent with his episcopal character; nor does it appear that any disapprobation of it was felt by Carloman or his nobles. But Boniface, after having so lately exerted himself to procure the enactment of canons against clerical warriors, now felt himself bound to enforce them, and submitted the case of Gewillieb to a council, which declared the bishop guilty of blood. Gewillieb yielded, resigned his see, and spent the remainder of his life in the enjoyment of some lesser benefices; and Boniface was unwillingly obliged by the Frankish nobles to accept the bishopric thus vacated as the seat of his metropolitan jurisdiction, instead of that which he had himself chosen. The pope acquiesced in the change, and subjected to him, as archbishop of Mayence, the dioceses of Worms, Speyer, Tongres, Cologne, and Utrecht, with all the nations of Germany which had received the gospel through his labours.

In 747 Carloman resigned his power, and became a monk on Mount Soracte, from which, on finding himself disquieted by the visits of his countrymen, he afterwards withdrew to Monte Cassino. This change, by which the whole power of the Frankish kingdom was thrown into the hands of Pipin, would seem to have operated to the disadvantage of Boniface. It has been very generally believed that he officiated at the coronation of Pipin at Soissons, when the mayor of the palace at length assumed the name of king (A.D. 752); but the evidence of this is open to some doubt, and it has even been argued that, instead of promoting, he opposed the revolution which transferred the crown from the descendants of Clovis to another dynasty. The duties of his office began to weigh heavily on him. He had still to struggle against much opposition on the part of bishops and clergy, while his labours were greatly disturbed by the frequent incursions of pagans, by whom he reported to Pope Stephen in 752 that thirty churches in his diocese had been burnt or demolished. He had, with some difficulty, obtained permission from Rome to nominate a successor to the see of Mayence when he should feel the approach of death, and, with Pipin's consent, he now raised to it his countryman and disciple Lull, who, however, had a much more limited authority than Boniface, and did not receive the pall until twenty years later.

It had been Boniface's intention to spend his last days in his monastery of Fulda, but he felt himself once more attracted to Frisia, the scene of his early labours. He again set forth as a missionary bishop, descended the Rhine, and, having consecrated Eoban to the see of Utrecht, laboured with his assistance among the Frisian tribes. Many thousands were baptized, and Boniface had appointed the eve of Whitsunday for the meeting of a large number of

converts at a place near Dockum, in order that he might bestow on them the rite of confirmation. But instead of the neophytes whom he expected, an armed band of pagans appeared and surrounded his tent. The younger members of his party were seizing weapons for defence, but he exhorted them to give up the thoughts of preserving the life of this world, and to submit to death in the hope of a better life. The pagans massacred the whole company—fifty-two in number. They carried off from the tent some chests which they supposed to be full of treasure, but which in reality contained books and relics; and it is said that, having drunk up a quantity of wine which they found, they were excited to quarrel about the division of the fancied spoil, and avenged the martyrs by almost exterminating each other. Eoban had shared the fate of Boniface, but their missionary labours were continued by Gregory, abbot of Utrecht, another disciple of the great missionary, and before the end of the century, the conversion of the Frisians was completed by Lebuin, Liudger, and others.

The body of Boniface was conveyed up the Rhine to Mayence, and thence, in compliance with a wish which he had often expressed, was carried to the abbey of Fulda; and, although no miracles are related of him during his lifetime (unless the destruction of the oak of Geismar be reckoned as an exception), it is said that his remains were distinguished by profuse displays of miraculous power, both on the way to their resting-place and after they had been deposited there. His name for ages drew pilgrims and wealth to Fulda, and he was revered as the apostle of Germany—a title which he deserved, not as having been the first preacher of the gospel in the countries where he laboured, but as the chief agent in the establishment of Christianity among the Germans, as the organizer of the German church. The church of Saxon England, from which he proceeded, was immediately, and in a more particular manner than any other, a daughter of the Roman. Teutonic by language and kindred, Latin by principles and affection, it was peculiarly fitted to act in the conversion of the German nations and to impress its converts with a Roman character. And this was especially the work of Boniface. He went forth to his labours with the pope's commission. On his consecration to the episcopate, after his first successes, he bound himself by oath to reduce all whom he might influence to the obedience of St. Peter and his representatives. The increased powers and the wider jurisdiction bestowed on him by later popes were employed to the same end. He strove continually, not only to bring heathens into the church, but to check irregular missionary operations, and to subject both preachers and converts to the authority of Rome. Through his agency the alliance naturally prompted by the mutual interest of the papacy and the Frankish princes was effected. And, whether he shared or not in the final step by which the papal sanction was used to consecrate the transference of the crown from the Merovingian to the Carolingian line, his exertions had undoubtedly paved the way for it. To him belongs in no small measure the authorship of that connexion with the northern rulers which encouraged the popes to disown the sovereignty of Constantinople; and, on the other hand, to him is to be traced the character of the German church in its submission to Rome from the time of the first council held under Carloman in 742.

But these facts afford no warrant for the charges brought against Boniface by writers of the last century. One who, after having passed his seventieth year, resigned the primacy of the Frankish church to set out as a simple missionary to the barbarous Frisians, with an expectation (as it would seem) of the violent death which he found, may safely be acquitted not only of personal ambition, but of having been a missionary of the papacy rather than of Christianity. His labours for the papacy were really performed because, trained as he had been under the influences communicated to his native church by Theodore and Wilfrid, he believed the authority of Rome to be the true means of spreading Christianity among the heathen, and of reviving it from decay in countries where it was already established. It may have been that in his zeal for unity he made too little allowance for the peculiar tempers and positions of men, or that he was sometimes guilty of injustice towards his opponents; nor can it be pretended that his opinions were in advance of the age in which he lived, whereas ingenious

conjecture may ascribe to the sectaries Adelbert and Clement all the spiritual enlightenment of modern Heidelberg or Berlin. But let it be considered how little such men, however highly they may be estimated, could have effected in the circumstances with which Boniface had to deal; how powerless such teaching, the offspring of their personal discoveries or fancies, must have been for the great work of suppressing heathenism; how distracting to the heathen must have been the spectacle of rival and discordant types of Christianity; how necessary the operation of one uniform and organized system must have reasonably appeared to Boniface, whether for the extension of the gospel or for the reform of the church, for an effective opposition to the rudeness, the violence, the lawless passions with which he had on all sides to contend. That Boniface ever used force as an instrument of conversion there is no evidence whatever; his earnestness in the promotion of education proves how thoroughly he desired that understanding should accompany the profession of belief. And that the knowledge which he wished to spread by his educational instructions was to be drawn from the Scriptures, of which he was himself a diligent student, appears from the eagerness with which he endeavoured to obtain as many copies as possible of the sacred books for the instruction of his converts. His letters and other writings give us the impression, not only of a great missionary, but of a man abounding in human feelings and affections.

Strenuous as Boniface was in the cause of the papacy, his conception of it was far short of that which afterwards prevailed. He regarded the pope as the supreme ecclesiastical judge, the chief conservator of the canons, the highest member of a graduated hierarchy, superior to metropolitans, as metropolitans were to ordinary bishops, but yet not as belonging to a different order from other bishops, or as if their episcopacy were derived from him and were a function of his. Much has been said of the strange questions on which he sometimes requests the pope's advice—as to the lawfulness of eating horseflesh, magpies, and storks; as to the time when bacon may be eaten without cooking, and the like. Such questions have been regarded as proofs of a wretched scrupulousness in themselves, and the reference of them to Rome has been branded as disgraceful servility. But—(besides that we are not in a condition to judge of the matter without a fuller knowledge of the circumstances)—it is easy to discover some grounds of justification against these charges. Thus the horse was a favourite victim of the gods among the northern nations, so that the eating of horseflesh was connected with the practice of heathen sacrifice. And the real explanation of such questions would seem to be, not that Boniface felt himself unable to answer them, or needed any direction from the pope, but that he was desirous to fortify himself with the aid of the highest authority in the church for his struggle against those remnants of barbaric manners which tended to keep up among his converts the remembrance of their ancient idolatry.

If Boniface's zeal for Rome was strong, his concern for religion and morality was yet stronger. He remonstrated very boldly against some regulations as to marriage which were said to have the authority of Rome, but which to him appeared to him immoral; he denied that any power on earth could legalize them. He remonstrated also against the Roman view which regarded "spiritual affinity"—*i.e.*, the connection formed by sponsorship at baptism—as a bar to marriage. He strongly represented to Zacharias the scandal of the heathenish rejoicings and banqueting which were allowed at Rome at the beginning of the year, and the manner in which persons who had visited Rome referred to these as a warrant for their own irregularities. He protested against the simoniacal appearance of the charges exacted for palls by the papal officials, whether with or without their master's knowledge. And, as a counterpoise to all that is said of Boniface's deference to popes, we must in fairness observe (although his assailants have not adverted to it) the tone of high consideration in which Zacharias answers him, and the earnestness with which the pope endeavours to vindicate himself from the suspicion of countenancing abuses—a remarkable testimony to the estimation in which the apostle of Germany was held. Nay, if an anonymous biographer may be believed, Boniface, towards the end of his life, protested against Stephen II for having, during his visit to France, consecrated

a bishop of Metz—an act which the archbishop regarded as an invasion of the metropolitanical privileges of Treves; and Pipin's mediation was required to heal the difference between the pope and him whom many writers have represented as the abject slave of Rome.

The spirit of unfair disparagement, however, has now passed away; and both the church from which Boniface went forth and the nations among which he ministered may well combine to do honour to his memory.

CHAPTER VI

PIPIN AND CHARLEMAGNE. A.D. 741-814.

The alienation which the iconoclastic controversy tended to produce between the Byzantine emperors and the bishops of Rome was increased by other circumstances. The nearest and most dreaded neighbours of the popes were the Lombards. The hatred with which the Romans had originally regarded these on account of their Arianism had survived their conversion to orthodox Christianity, and had been exasperated by political hostility. During the iconoclastic troubles, the Lombards, under Liutprand, appear by turns to have threatened the popes and to have affected to extend alliance and protection to them, with a view of using them as instruments for weakening the imperial influence in Italy. When that influence seemed to be irreparably injured by the course which events had taken, the Lombards overran the exarchate, and advanced to the walls of the pope's own city. In this extremity, Gregory III, after a vain attempt to obtain aid from Constantinople, resolved to call in new allies from beyond the Alps—the nation of the Franks, who had been catholic from the beginning of their Christianity, with whom he had lately formed a closer connexion by means of Boniface, and whose virtual sovereign, Charles Mattel, was marked out by his triumph over the Mahometan invaders of his country as the leader and champion of western Christendom. As, however, it was natural to suppose that the Frankish mayor would prefer the prosecution of his victories on the side of Spain to engaging himself in new quarrels elsewhere, the pope strengthened his petition for aid by the most persuasive gifts and proposals; he sent to Charles the keys of St. Peter's tomb, with some filings of the apostle's chains; it is said that he offered to bestow on him the title of consul or patrician of Rome, and even to transfer the allegiance of the Romans from the empire to the Frankish crown. A second and a third application followed soon after. The pope's tone in these is extremely piteous; but he endeavours to excite Charles against the Lombards by motives of jealousy as well as of piety.

Not only, he says, have they laid waste the estates of St. Peter, which had been devoted to the purposes of charity and religion, but they have plundered the apostle's church of the lights bestowed on it by the Frankish viceroy's ancestors and by himself; nay, Liutprand and his son Hildebrand are continually mocking at the idea of relief from the Franks, and defying Charles with his forces. It would seem that the letters were favourably received; but they produced no result, as the deaths of both Gregory and Charles followed within the same year.

In the room of Gregory, Zacharias, a Greek by birth, was chosen by the Romans, and was established in the papacy, without the confirmation either of the emperor or of the exarch—the first instance, it is said, of such an omission since the reign of Odoacer. By repeated personal applications to Liutprand, the pope obtained the forbearance of the Lombards and recovered some towns which they had seized. His relations with the empire are obscure; the state of affairs was indeed so unsettled that these relations were full of anomaly and inconsistency. But under his pontificate took place an event which produced an important change in the position of the papacy towards the Franks, and consequently in its position towards the empire. Pipin, whose accession, first to a portion of his father's power, and afterwards to the remainder, on the resignation of his brother Carloman, has already been

mentioned, now thought that the time was come for putting an end to the pageant royalty of the Merovingians. A confidential ecclesiastic, Fulrad, abbot of St. Denys and archchaplain of the court, was sent to Rome, with instructions to ask, in the name of the Frankish nation, whether the holders of power or the nominal sovereigns ought to reign. The answer of Zacharias was favourable to the wishes of those who proposed the question; and at the national assembly of Soissons, in the year 752, Pipin was raised aloft on a buckler, amid the acclamations of his people, and was crowned as king of the Franks, while the last of the long-haired Merovingians, Childeric III, was tonsured and shut up in the monastery of Sithiu.

The amount of the pope's share in this revolution, and the morality of his proceedings, have been the subjects of much controversy. Einhard, in the earlier part of the following century, speaks of the deposition as effected by the "command", and of the coronation as performed by the "authority", of the Roman pontiff: but (besides that this writer may have misapprehended the real course of the affair) a comparison of other passages will show that the meaning of his words is less strong than might at first sight appear, and is reconcilable with the facts which are otherwise ascertained. The matter really came before Zacharias in the form of a question from the Frankish estates; his answer was an opinion, not a command; and the sovereignty was bestowed on Pipin, not by the pope, but by the choice of his own countrymen, although the pope's opinion was valuable to him, as assisting him to supplant the nominal king, and yet throwing over the change an appearance of religious sanction which might guard it from becoming a precedent for future breaches of fealty towards Pipin's own dynasty. The view afterwards maintained by Gregory VII and his school—that the successor of St. Peter exercised on this occasion a right inherent in his office, of deposing sovereigns at will—is altogether foreign to the ideas of the time, and inconsistent with the circumstances of the case.

It is evident that the pope's answer was prompted rather by a consideration for his own interest in securing the alliance of Pipin than by any regard for strict moral or religious principle. Yet we should do Zacharias injustice by visiting it with all the reprobation which modern ideas of settled and legitimate inheritance might suggest. The question proposed to him was one which must have seemed very plausible in times when might went far to constitute right, and when revolutions were familiar in every state. The Frankish monarchy had been elective at first, and had never been bound down to the rule of strictly hereditary succession. It was held that any member of the royal house might be chosen king; thus Clotaire IV had been set up by Charles Martel in 717, and the deposed Childeric himself was a Merovingian of unknown parentage, whom Pipin and Carloman had found it convenient to establish in 742, after the nominal sovereignty had been five years vacant. It was also held among the Franks that kings might be set aside on the ground of incapacity. The only principle, therefore, which was violated in the transference of the crown was that which limited the choice of a sovereign to the Merovingian family; and, in order to cover this irregularity in the eyes of the nation, it was afterwards pretended that Pipin was himself a Merovingian. Moreover, by whatever means the change of dynasty may have been vindicated or disguised, it does not appear to have shocked the general moral feeling of the age; and this, although it will not suffice to justify Zacharias, must be allowed in some measure to excuse him.

Zacharias died in March 752, a little before or after the consummation of the act which he had sanctioned. Stephen, who was chosen in his room, did not live to be consecrated, and is therefore by most writers not reckoned in the list of popes, so that his successor, another Stephen, is sometimes styled the second, and sometimes the third, of that name. Aistulf was now king of the Lombards, and renewed the aggressions of his predecessors on Rome. Stephen, by means of splendid presents, obtained from him a promise of peace for forty years; but the treaty was almost immediately broken by Aistulf, who seized Ravenna and required the Romans to own him as their lord. The pope, in his distress, sent envoys to beg for aid from

the emperor, and in the meantime he affixed the violated treaty to the cross, and occupied himself in imploring the help of God by solemn prayers and penitential processions. But the mission to Constantinople proved fruitless; and when Stephen, relying on the success of his predecessor Zacharias in similar attempts, repaired to Pavia, in the hope of moving Aistulf by personal entreaties,—although he met with respectful treatment, he was unable to obtain any promise of forbearance. His only remaining hope was in Pipin, with whom he had opened a secret negotiation. He therefore resolved to proceed into France, and, as Aistulf endeavoured to dissuade him, the fear lest the Lombard should detain him by force added speed to his journey across the Alps. On hearing of the pope's approach, Pipin sent his son Charles—the future Charlemagne—to act as escort; and he himself, with his queen, the younger princes, and the nobles of his court, went forth a league from the palace of Pontyon-le-Perche to meet him. Stephen and his clergy appeared in sackcloth and ashes, and, throwing themselves at the king's feet, humbly implored his assistance against the Lombards. Pipin received the suppliants with marks of extraordinary honour; he prostrated himself in turn before the pope, and, holding the rein of his horse, walked by his side as he rode.

Stephen's stay in France was prolonged by illness, which compelled him to remain until the summer at St. Denys. During this time an unexpected opponent of his suit appeared in the person of the abdicated Carloman, who, at the instigation of Aistulf, had been compelled by the abbot of Monte Cassino to leave his monastic retreat for the purpose of urging his brother to refuse the desired assistance. But Stephen exerted his pontifical authority over the monk, and Carloman was shut up in a monastery July 28, at Vienne, where he died soon after. A second coronation, in which Pipin's sons were included, was performed at St. Denys by the pope's own hands; and in the hope of securing the new dynasty against a repetition of the movements by which its own royalty had been won, the Frankish nation was charged, under pain of excommunication, never to choose any other king than a descendant of him whom God and the vicar of the apostles had been pleased to exalt to the throne. Pipin was also invested with the dignity of patrician of Rome.

In the same year Pipin, although some of the Frankish chiefs opposed the expedition, and even threatened to desert him, led an army into Italy, and compelled Aistulf to swear that he would restore to St. Peter the towns which he had seized. But no sooner had the northern forces recrossed the Alps than the Lombard refused to fulfil his engagements, invaded the Roman territory, wasted the country up to the very walls of Rome, and laid siege to the city itself. As the way by land was blocked up, the pope sent off by sea a letter entreating his Frankish ally once more to assist him. Another and a more urgent entreaty followed; and finally the pope despatched at once three letters, of which one was written in the name of St. Peter himself—an expedient which may perhaps have been suggested or encouraged by the impression as to the character of the Franks which he had derived from his late sojourn among them. In this strange document the apostle is represented as joining the authority of the blessed Virgin with his own; supplication, threats, flattery are mingled; and, in consideration of the aid which is asked for the defence of the papal temporalities, assurances are given not only of long life and victory, but of salvation and heavenly glory—apparently without any reserve or condition of a moral kind. Whether induced by these promises or by other motives, Pipin speedily returned to Italy, besieged Aistulf in Pavia, and forced him as a condition of peace to make a large cession of cities and territory, which were transferred to the Roman see, and for the first time gave the pope the position of a temporal prince. Some Byzantine envoys, who were present at the conclusion of the treaty, urged that the exarchate should be restored to their master, to whom it had belonged before it was seized by the Lombards; but Pipin replied that he had conquered for St. Peter, and could not dispose otherwise of that which he had offered to the apostle. Yet it does not appear that the gift was one of independent sovereignty; for the territories bestowed on the pope were held under the Frankish crown, and, on the other side, the anomalies of the relation between the popes and the empire became now more

complex than ever. While Pipin was patrician of Rome by the pope's assumption of a right to confer the title—while the pope received from the Frankish king lands which the emperor claimed as his own—while Rome continued to be virtually separated from the empire by the consequences of the iconoclastic controversy—the popes were still regarded as subjects of the emperors, and dated by the years of their reign.

In 757 Stephen II was succeeded by his own brother Paul, who held the pontificate ten years. While Paul was on his death-bed, Toto, duke of Nepi, made his way into Rome, at the head of an armed multitude, forced some bishops hastily to ordain his brother Constantine through all the grades of the ministry, and put him into possession of the papal chair. The intruder had occupied it for thirteen months, when he was ejected by an opposite party, and Stephen III (or IV) was established in his stead. Constantine's partisans were subjected to the barbarous punishments usual in that age—such as the loss of the eyes or of the tongue; he himself, after having been thrust into a monastery by one faction of his enemies, was dragged out of it by another, was blinded, and in that condition was left in the public street.

A council was held under the sanction of Charles and Carloman, who had just succeeded their father Pipin in the sovereignty of the Franks and in the patriciate of Rome. Constantine was brought before this assembly, and was asked why he had presumed, being a layman, to invade the apostolic see. He declared that he had been forced into the office against his will; he threw himself on the floor, stretched out his hands, and with a profusion of tears entreated forgiveness for his misdeeds. On the following day he was again brought before the council, and was questioned about the “impious novelty” of his proceedings with a strictness which drove him to turn upon his judges by answering that it was not a novelty, and naming the archbishop of Ravenna and the bishop of Naples as having been advanced at once from a lay condition to the episcopate. At this reply the members of the council started from their seats in fury. They fell on the blind man, beat him violently, and thrust him out of the church in which their sessions were held. They then proceeded to annul the ordinations and other official acts which he had performed as pope, burnt the records of his pontificate, and denounced anathemas against any one who should aspire to the papacy without having regularly passed through the grade of cardinal priest or cardinal deacon. The new pope Stephen, with all the clergy and a multitude of the Roman laity, prostrated themselves, and with tears professed contrition for having received the Eucharist at the usurper's hands; and a suitable penance was imposed on them.

It was the interest of the popes to prevent the formation of any connexion between their Frankish allies and the hated Lombards. Stephen, therefore, was beyond measure disquieted when intelligence reached him, in 770, that Desiderius, the successor of Aistulf, had projected the union of his family with that of Pipin by a double tie—that he had offered his daughter in marriage either to Charles or to Carloman, and that their sister was engaged to Adalgis, son of the Lombard king. The pope forthwith addressed an extraordinary letter to the Frankish princes. As they were both already married, he tells them that it would be sin to divorce their wives for the sake of any new alliance. But moral or religious objections hold a very subordinate place in the remonstrance, while the pope exhausts himself in heaping up expressions of detestation against the Lombards, and in protesting against the pollution of the royal Frankish blood by any admixture with that “perfidious and most unsavoury” nation—a nation from which the race of lepers was known to originate. The epistle concludes with denunciations of eternal fire, and the pope states that, in order to give it all possible solemnity, it was laid on St. Peter's tomb, and the Eucharistic sacrifice was offered on it.

Charles, unmoved by this appeal, repudiated his wife and espoused the Lombard princess; but within a year—for what reason is unknown, but certainly not out of any regard to Stephen's expostulation—she was sent back to her father's court, and Hildegard, a lady of Swabian family, took her place as the consort of Charles.

In his relations with Stephen, Desiderius was studious to maintain a specious appearance of friendship, while he resisted or eluded all applications for the restoration of what were styled "the rights of St. Peter". On the election of Adrian as Stephen's successor, the Lombard king made overtures to him, and promised to satisfy all his demands, if the pope would visit him at Pavia; but the invitation was refused. Desiderius avenged himself by ravaging the borders of the papal territory, and Adrian invoked the aid of Charles. Carloman had died in 771, and Charles, without any regard to the rights of his brother's family, had united the whole of the Frankish dominions under his own rule. Desiderius, stimulated perhaps rather by his own daughter's wrongs than by a disinterested regard for justice, had espoused the cause of the disinherited princes, and had requested the pope to crown them, but Adrian, from unwillingness to embroil himself with Charles, and consequently to place himself at the mercy of the Lombards, had refused. Charles now readily listened to the petition of his ally. He asked Desiderius to give up the disputed territory, and offered him a large sum of money as compensation, while the pope sent repeated embassies to the Lombard king, and at last proposed to pay him the desired visit, on condition that Desiderius should first perform his part of the agreement by restoring the rights of St. Peter.

Desiderius, supposing that Charles must be fully occupied by his war with the Saxons, attempted to satisfy him with evasive answers, and even assured him that the papal territory had already been restored; but his representations had no effect on Charles, who in 773 invaded Italy, besieged him in Pavia, and overthrew the Lombard dominion. Desiderius was compelled to become a monk at Liege. His son Adelgis escaped to Constantinople, where, although the honour of the patriciate was conferred on him, Charles was able to prevent him from obtaining any effective aid for the recovery of his inheritance. Twelve years later, by a convention with the Lombard duke of Benevento, Charles became lord of the remaining part of Italy.

During the siege of Pavia in 774, Charles paid his first visit to Rome, where he arrived on Easter-eve. The magistrates were sent by the pope to meet him at the distance of thirty miles from the city. A mile outside the walls the soldiery appeared, with all the children of the schools, who bore branches of palm and olive, and hailed him with hymns of welcome. In honour of his patrician dignity, the sacred crosses were carried forth as for the reception of an exarch, and Charles, dismounting from his horse at the sight of them, proceeded on foot towards St. Peter's, where the pope and all his clergy were assembled on the steps and in the principal portico of the church. The king, as he ascended, kissed each step; on reaching the landing-place he embraced the pope, and taking him by the right hand, entered the building, while the clergy and monks loudly chanted Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord". He kept the festival season with a great appearance of devotion; he enlarged the donation which Pipin had made to the church, confirmed it by an oath, and solemnly laid the deed of gift on the apostle's tomb. The actual extent of his donation is, however, uncertain. It is said to have included not only the exarchate of Ravenna, but the dukedoms of Spoleto and Benevento, Venetia, Istria, and other territories in the north of Italy—in short, almost the whole peninsula—together with the island of Corsica; yet some of these had not as yet been acquired by the Franks, and in the event the papal rule seems to have been really limited to the exarchate, which was itself held not in absolute sovereignty, but in dependence on the Frankish monarchs. It would appear, therefore (if the report of the donation may be trusted), that Charles, in his gratitude for the opportunity of interfering in the affairs of Italy, professed to bestow on the pope spoils which had not at the time been fully won, and that he was afterwards indisposed to carry his promises into effect. The king visited Rome again in 781, and a third time in 787; and on each occasion the church was enriched by gifts, bestowed, as he professed in the language of the age, "for the ransom of his soul." His connection with Adrian was cemented not only by interest, but by personal regard, and on hearing of the pope's death, he is said to have wept for him as for a brother.

In 795 Adrian was succeeded by Leo III. The political condition of Rome for many years before this time is very obscure. According to some writers, it had been a republic, under the popes, from the date of Pipin's donation (A.D. 755); but against this view it has been urged that the letter of Adrian to the emperor Constantine and his mother, on occasion of the second council of Nicaea, proves that even so late as 785 the imperial sovereignty continued to be in some degree acknowledged. Although, however, the Byzantine rulers were now in agreement with Rome on the question of images, the older differences as to that question had produced a lasting estrangement; so that Leo, in announcing his election to Charlemagne, sent him the banner of Rome with the keys of St. Peter's tomb, and begged him to send commissioners for the purpose of administering to the citizens an oath of allegiance to the Frankish crown. Whether we regard this as an illustration of the relations which already existed between Rome and the Franks, or as a voluntary act, by which the pope, for the sake of gaining a powerful protector, placed himself and his people in a new relation of dependence—it proves both that the connection with the eastern empire was severed, and that, if Rome had for a time been independent, it was no longer so.

The promotion of Leo deeply offended some relations of Adrian who had occupied high positions in the papal government. They waited upwards of three years for an opportunity of gratifying their enmity; and at length, as the pope was conducting a procession through the streets of Rome, a party of his enemies rushed forth near the monastery of St. Sylvester on the Quirinal, dispersed his unarmed companions, threw him from his horse, and attempted to deprive him of his eyes and tongue. Whether from haste or from pity, they did their work imperfectly; but Paschal and Campulus, two of Adrian's nephews, who had been the chiefs of the conspiracy, dragged the wounded pope into the church of the monastery, threw him down before the altar, attempted to complete the operations which had been begun, and, after having beaten him cruelly with sticks, left him weltering in his blood. Notwithstanding all these outrages, Leo retained his sight and his speech; it was popularly believed that he had recovered them through the help of St. Peter. By the aid of his friends, he was enabled to escape from Rome; under the escort of the duke of Spoleto, a vassal of the Frankish king, he reached that city; and Charles, who was detained in the north by the Saxon war, on receiving a report of his sufferings, invited him to Paderborn, where he was received with great honour.

About the same time that Leo arrived at Paderborn, some envoys from Rome appeared there with serious charges against him. Charles promised to investigate these charges at Rome; and, after having sent back the pope with a convoy of two archbishops, five bishops, and five counts, who re-established him in his see, the king himself proceeded by slow and indirect journeys towards the city, where he arrived in the end of November 800. The inquiry into Leo's case was opened before an assembly of archbishops, bishops, abbots, and nobles; but no testimony was produced against the pope, and the prelates and clergy who were present declined the office of judging, on the ground of an opinion which had gradually grown up, that the successor of St. Peter was not amenable to any human (or rather perhaps to any ecclesiastical) judgment. On this Leo declared himself ready to clear his innocence by an oath; and on a later day he ascended the pulpit, and solemnly swore on the Gospels that he had neither committed nor instigated the offences which were laid to his charge. The conspirators who had been concerned in the assault on him were soon after tried, and, as they could make no defence, were condemned to death; but at the pope's request the sentence was commuted to banishment.

But between the purgation of Leo and the trial of his assailants an important event had taken place. On Christmas-day—the first day of the ninth century, according to the reckoning then observed in the west—Charles attended mass in St. Peter's, when, as he was kneeling before the altar, the pope suddenly placed a splendid crown on his head, and the vast congregation burst forth into acclamations of "Life and victory to Charles, crowned by God

emperor of Rome!”. Leo then proceeded to anoint Charles and his son Pipin, king of Italy, and led the way in doing homage to the new emperor. In conversation with his attendants, Charles professed great surprise, and even displeasure, at the coronation declaring that, if he had expected such a scene, not even the holiness of the Christmas festival should have induced him to go into the church on that day. There can, however, be little question that his elevation to the imperial dignity had been before arranged. Perhaps the idea had been suggested to him by a letter in which his confidential friend Alcuin spoke of the popedom, the empire, and the sovereignty of the Franks as the three highest dignities in the world, and pointed out how unworthily the imperial throne, the higher of the two secular monarchies, was then filled. On his way to Rome, the king had visited Alcuin at Tours; and he now received from him as a Christmas-gift a Bible corrected by the learned abbot's own hand, with a letter in which the present was said to be intended in honour of the imperial power. It may therefore be conjectured that the assumption of the empire had been settled between Charles and Leo during the pope's residence at Paderborn; or at least that Leo had there discovered the king's inclination, and that Alcuin had been for some time in the secret.

Yet we need not tax Charles with insincerity in his expressions of dissatisfaction after the coronation; rather, as dissimulation was no part of his general character, we may suppose that, while he had desired the imperial title, he was displeased at the manner in which it was conferred. He may have regarded the pope's act as premature, and as an interference with his own plans. He may have seen that it was capable of such an interpretation as was afterwards actually put upon it—as if the pope were able to bestow the empire by his own authority—a pretension altogether inconsistent with the whole spirit of Charlemagne's policy. Perhaps it had been the king's intention to procure his election by the Romans, and afterwards to be crowned by the pope, as the Greek emperors, after having been elected by the representatives of their subjects, were crowned by the patriarch of Constantinople; whereas he had now been surprised into receiving the empire from the pope, when the acclamations of the Romans did not precede, but followed or, the imposition of the crown by Leo. Although, however, the pope's act was capable of an interpretation agreeable to the claims of his successors in later times, such claims appear to have been unknown in the age of Charlemagne; and Leo, after having placed the crown on his brow, was the first to do homage to him as a subject of the empire.

By the coronation of Charles, Rome was finally separated from the Greek empire, and again became the acknowledged capital of the west, while the emperor was invested with the double character of head of western Christendom and representative of the ancient civilization

The Byzantine court was naturally offended by a step which appeared to invade its rights both of dignity and of sovereignty; but Charles, by a conciliatory policy, overcame the irritation : his imperial title was acknowledged by the ambassadors of Nicephorus in 812, and the Greek emperors addressed his son as emperor, although not of Rome, but of the Franks

The reign of Charles the Great, or Charlemagne, from the time of his father's death, extended to nearly half a century. His fame rests not only on his achievements as a warrior and as a conqueror, but on his legislation and administration both in civil and in ecclesiastical affairs; on his care for the advancement of learning, of commerce, of agriculture, of architecture, and the other arts of peace; on the versatility and capacity of a mind which embraced the smallest as well as the greatest details of the vast and various system of which he was the head. His wars, aggressive in their form, were essentially defensive; his purpose was to consolidate the populations which had settled in the territories of the western empire, and to secure them against the assaults of newer migrations. Carrying his arms against those from whom he had reason to apprehend an attack, he extended his dominions to the Eider and to the Ebro, over Brittany and Aquitaine, far towards the south of Italy, and eastward to the Theiss and the Save. The impression which he produced on the Greeks is shown by their proverb,“Have the Frank for thy friend, but not for thy neighbour”. His influence and

authority reached from Scotland to Persia; the great caliph Haroun al Raschid exchanged presents with him, and sent him by way of compliment the keys of the holy sepulchre; and, although the empire of Charlemagne was broken up after his death, the effect of its union remained in the connexion of western Christendom by one common bond. With so much that is grand and noble, there was, indeed, in Charlemagne not a little that deserves reprobation. The seizure of his brother's dominions to the exclusion of his nephews was an injustice altogether without excuse; his policy was sometimes stern, even to cruelty; and his personal conduct was stained by an excessive dissoluteness, which continued even to his latest years, and of which the punishment was believed to have been revealed by visions after his death. But with this exception, his private character appears such as to increase the admiration which is due to his greatness as a sovereign. He was in general mild, open, and generous; his family affections were warm, and his friendships were sincere and steady.

The wars of Charlemagne against the barbarians were not religious in their origin; but religion soon became involved in them. His conquests carried the gospel in their train, and, mistaken as were some of the means which were employed for its propagation, the result was eventually good. Of his fifty-three campaigns, eighteen were against the Saxons of Germany. Between this people and the Franks war had been waged from time to time for two hundred years. Sometimes the Franks penetrated to the Weser, and imposed a tribute which was irregularly paid; sometimes the Saxons pushed their incursions as far as the Rhine; and on the borders of the territories the more uncivilized of each nation carried on a constant system of pillage and petty annoyance against their neighbours. The Saxon tribes were divided into three great associations—the Westphalians, the Angarians, and the Ostphalians; they had no king, and were accustomed to choose a leader only in the case of a national war. Their valour is admitted even by the Frankish writers; the perfidy which is described as characteristic of them may in some degree be explained and palliated by the fact that they were without any central government which could make engagements binding on the whole nation.

The war with the Saxons lasted thirty-three years—from 772 to 805. In the first campaign, Charlemagne destroyed the great national idol called the Irminsul, which stood in a mountainous and woody district near Eresburg (now Stadtberg). The Saxons retaliated in the following year by attacking the monasteries and churches planted on their frontiers, killing or driving out the monks and clergy, and laying the country waste as far as the Rhine. Sturm, the successor of Boniface, was obliged to fly from Fulda, carrying with him the relics of his master. The Saxons associated their old idolatry with their nationality, and the gospel with the interest of the Franks.

A passage in the life of St. Lebuin has been connected with the origin of the Saxon war, but ought probably to be referred to a somewhat later date. Lebuin, an Englishman, had preached with much success and had built several churches among the Frisians about the Yssel, when an incursion of the neighbouring heathens disturbed him in his labours. On this he determined boldly to confront the enemies of Christianity in all their force, and, undeterred by the warnings of his friends, he appeared in his pontifical robes before the national assembly of the Saxons, which was held at Marklo, on the Weser. He spoke to them of the true God, he denounced their idolatry, and told them that, unless they would receive the gospel and be baptized, God had decreed their ruin by means of a powerful king, not from afar, but from their own neighbourhood, who would sweep them away like a torrent. The effect of such an address was to exasperate the Saxons violently; and it was with difficulty that some members of the assembly saved the zealous missionary from the rage of their brethren. The pagans burnt his church at Deventer, and in consequence of this outrage Charlemagne with the Franks, who were informed of it when met in council at Worms, resolved on an expedition against them.

The absence of Charlemagne on expeditions in other quarters, as in Italy or in Spain, was always a signal for a rising of the Saxons. After a time, as we are told by an annalist of

his reign, he was provoked by their repeated treacheries to resolve on the conversion or extermination of the whole race. In his attempts at conversion, however, he met with difficulties which it would seem that he had not expected. Whenever the Saxons were defeated, multitudes of them submitted to baptism without any knowledge or belief of Christian doctrine; but on the first opportunity they revolted, and again professed the religion of their fathers. The long war was carried on with much loss on both sides; on one occasion Charlemagne beheaded 4500 prisoners, who had been given up to him as having shared in the last insurrection; and this frightful bloodshed, instead of striking the expected terror into the barbarians, excited them to an unusually widespread and formidable rising in the following year. A chief named Widikind had thus far been the soul of the Saxon movements. After every reverse, he contrived to escape to Denmark, where he found a refuge with the king, who was his brother-in-law; and when his countrymen were ripe for a renewal of their attempts, he reappeared to act as their leader. But in 785, having secured a promise of impunity, he surrendered himself, together with his brother Abbo, and was baptized at Attigny, where Charlemagne officiated as his sponsor; and—whether an intelligent conviction contributed to his change of religious profession, whether it arose solely from despair of the Saxon cause, or whether his conversion was merely to a belief in that God whose worshippers had been proved the stronger party — his engagements to the king were faithfully kept. The Saxons were now subdued as far as the Elbe, and many of the fiercer idolaters among them sought an asylum in Scandinavia, where they joined the piratical bands which had already begun their plundering expeditions, and which were soon to become the terror of the more civilized nations of Europe.

Charlemagne proceeded to enact a law of extreme severity. It denounced the penalty of death against the refusal of baptism; against burning the bodies of the dead, after the manner of the pagans; against eating flesh in Lent, if this were done in contempt of Christianity; against setting fire to churches or violently entering them and robbing them; against the murder of bishops, priests, or deacons; against the offering of human sacrifices, and against some barbaric superstitions. All persons were to pay a tenth part of their “substance and labour” to the church. All children were to be baptized within a year from their birth, and parents who should neglect to comply with the law in this respect were to be fined in proportion to their quality. Fines were also enacted against those who should sacrifice in groves or do any other act of pagan worship. In the case of those offences which were punishable with death, the law did not admit the pecuniary commutations which are commonly found in the Germanic codes; but instead of them there was the remarkable provision, that, if any person guilty of such offences would of his own accord confess them to a priest, and express a desire to do penance, his life should be spared on the testimony of the priest. The rigour of this decree was unlike the general spirit of Charlemagne's legislation, nor was it intended to be lasting. After having been in force twelve years, the capitulary was modified by one of milder character, which again allowed the principle of composition for capital offences.

The conversion of the Saxons was urged on by a variety of measures. Gifts and threats were employed to gain them. Charlemagne offered them union with the Franks on equal terms, freedom from tribute, and exemption from all other imposts except tithes. Bishops were gradually established among them, monasteries were founded in thinly inhabited districts, towns grew up around these new foundations, and each became a centre for diffusing the knowledge of religion and of civilization. The Saxon youths who were received as hostages were committed to bishops and abbots for instruction; and by a strong measure of policy, ten thousand Saxons were in 804 removed from their own country into the older Frankish territory, where they became incorporated with the conqueror's original subjects.

A like system of extending the profession of the gospel with his conquests was pursued by Charlemagne in other quarters—as among the Frisians, the Wiltzes (a Slavonic

people north of the Elbe), the Bavarians, the Avars in Pannonia, and the Bohemians. Among the missionaries who were most distinguished in the work of conversion were Gregory, abbot of Utrecht; Liudger, a Frisian, who had studied under Alcuin at York, and became bishop of Mimigardeneford (Munster); Willehad, a Northumbrian, bishop of Bremen; Sturm, of Fulda, and Arno, archbishop of Salzburg. Ingo, who laboured in Carinthia, may be mentioned on account of the singular means which he took to convince the heathens of their inferior condition—admitting some Christian slaves to his own table, while for their unconverted masters food was set outside the door, as for dogs. The inquiries to which this distinction gave rise are said to have resulted in a great accession of converts.

But although the policy of Charlemagne did much to spread the profession of Christianity, the means which he employed were open to serious objection. The enforcement of tithes naturally raised a prejudice against the faith of which this payment was made a condition, and in 793 it even produced a revolt of the Saxons. Alcuin often remonstrated against the unwise exaction. He acknowledged the lawfulness of tithes; but how, he asked, would an impost which was ill borne even by persons who had been brought up in the catholic church, be endured by a rude and barbarous race of neophytes? Would the apostles have enforced it in such circumstances? When confirmed in the faith, the converts might properly be subjected to burdens of this kind; but until then, it would be a grievous error to risk the faith itself for the sake of tithes. In like manner he argued against the indiscriminate administration of baptism. Instruction, he said, should first be given in the great heads of Christian doctrine and practice, and then the sacrament should follow. Baptism may be forced on men, but belief cannot. Baptism received without understanding or faith by a person capable of reason, is but an unprofitable washing of the body. He urges that new converts should be treated with great tenderness, and that able preachers, of such character as may not bring discredit on their teaching, should be sent to instruct them.

During the latter part of the Merovingian period, learning had continually declined. A new era of intellectual activity now began. Charlemagne himself made earnest efforts to repair the defects of his early training. He began in mature age to learn the art of writing; but, although he practised diligently, he never attained facility in it, or, at least, he was unable to master the difficulties of the ornamental caligraphy on which the professional scribes of the time prided themselves. We are told that he became as familiar with Latin as with his mother tongue, and that, although he could not express himself with readiness in Greek, he was well acquainted with the language. The object of his endeavours was necessarily rather to revive the ancient Roman culture than to originate a new literature; yet, while he encouraged the study of the classic languages among his subjects, he did not neglect his native German; he laboured to raise it to the rank of a cultivated tongue by reducing it to a grammatical system, he collected its old heroic ballads, and gave Teutonic names to the winds and to the months. Nor, although his care for the German speech was little seconded in his own time, and although Latin had become the authorized language of the church, were the emperor's exertions in this respect without effect; for a vernacular literature now arose which had much influence on the education of the people. Among its remains are poems and hymns, metrical harmonies of the Gospels, and glosses on the Bible for the use of the clergy.

The instruments of the intellectual reform which Charlemagne contemplated were not to be found in his own dominions. He therefore sought for them from Italy and from the British islands, the only countries of the west in which the study of general learning was then pursued. The chief of these were Paul Warnefrid, a Lombard, Peter of Pisa, and—the most important for talents, for influence, and for the length of his labours among the Franks—Alcuin, a native of Northumbria.

Alcuin (or Albinus) was born about the year 735. After having studied in the cathedral school of York, under archbishop Egbert, brother of the Northumbrian king Eadbert, he was ordained a deacon, and became master of the school, which he raised to such reputation that

many foreigners resorted to it for instruction. He had already visited the Continent, when Eanbald, his old fellow-pupil, on being promoted to the see of York in 782, sent him to Rome for the purpose of bringing back the pall, the symbol of the archiepiscopal dignity which had been recovered for York by Egbert after having been suspended since the time of Paulinus. At Parma, Alcuin fell in with Charlemagne, who invited him to settle in France. With the permission of his own king and of Eanbald, he accepted the proposal; and was appointed to the mastership of the Palatine school, an institution which had existed under the Merovingians, and was now revived. This school accompanied the movements of the court. The pupils were the members of the royal family, with noble youths who belonged to the household, or had been permitted by the sovereign to partake of the education thus provided. Charlemagne himself, his sons, his daughters, and some of his courtiers, became the scholars of Alcuin. It has been supposed that they formed an academy, in which each bore the name of some ancient worthy; thus Charles himself is styled David, Alcuin is Flaccus, Angilbert (son-in-law of Charlemagne, and afterwards abbot of Centulles) is Homer. But the only evidence in favour of the supposition is the fact that such names are used in correspondence. Alcuin's instructions were given rather in the form of conversation than of lectures. He taught the seven sciences which were distinguished as liberal, and were afterwards classified under the titles of *Trivium* and *Quadrivium*—the Trivium consisting of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics; the Quadrivium comprising arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy; while above these two classes theology held a place by itself. Alcuin's writings on these subjects contain little of an original kind, and may be regarded as mere notebooks of his teaching. His other works are very various—commentaries on Scripture, liturgical treatises, tracts on the controversies of the age and on practical religion, poems, lives of saints, and a large collection of letters. They appear to be justly described as displaying more of labour than of genius, more of memory than of invention or taste, but in estimating the merit of the man we are bound to compare him with his contemporaries. His work was that of a reviver.

Alcuin was not only the instructor of Charlemagne in religion and letters, but his most confidential adviser in affairs of state. After having taught the Palatine school for fourteen years (with the interval of a visit to his native country), he became weary of a court life, and expressed a wish to retire to Fulda for the remainder of his days; but Charlemagne provided another retreat for him, by bestowing on him the abbacy of St. Martin at Tours, a monastery of great wealth, but then notorious for the disorderly character of its inmates; and with this he retained some other preferments which he had before received. Alcuin in some measure reformed the monks of St. Martin's, although an affray in which they were concerned towards the end of his life proves that the reformation was by no means perfect. He enriched the library of the abbey by importing books from England, and under his government its school attained great fame. We are told by his old biographer that he would not allow the pupils to read the "falsehoods" of Virgil, in which he had formerly delighted, and that when one of them secretly transgressed the rule, Alcuin by supernatural knowledge detected him. Among his scholars during this period were Raban Maur, afterwards abbot of Fulda and archbishop of Mayence, Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt, and other eminent men of the next generations. He kept up a frequent correspondence with Charlemagne on politics, literature, science, and theology; and (as we shall see hereafter) he continued to take part in the controversies of the time. From some expressions in his letters it appears that he was dissatisfied on account of the novelties introduced into the teaching of the Palatine school by his successor, an Irishman named Clement. At length he obtained the emperor's leave to devolve the care of discipline in each of his monasteries on younger men, and he died in 804.

Charlemagne was bent on promoting education among every class of his subjects. He urged his nobles to study, and loudly reproved those who considered their position as an excuse for negligence. The laity were required to learn the creed and the Lord's prayer,—in Latin, if possible, with a view to bringing them within the Roman influence. Fasting and

blows were sometimes denounced against any who should disobey. But it was found that the hardness of the task was regarded by many persons as even more formidable than such penalties; and it also appeared that many of the clergy were themselves unable to teach the forms in Latin. The reenactments and the mitigations of such rules sufficiently prove how difficult it was to carry them into execution. The clergy were charged to explain the creed and the Lord's prayer to their people, and sponsors at baptism were required to prove their acquaintance with both forms.

With a view to improve the education of the clergy, Charlemagne ordered in 769 that any clergyman who should disregard his bishop's admonitions to learn should be suspended or deprived. In 787 he issued a circular to all metropolitans, bishops, and abbots, complaining of the incorrect style which appeared in many letters addressed to him from monasteries. This want of skill in writing, he says, leads him to apprehend that there may be also an inability to understand the language of Scripture rightly; he therefore orders that competent masters should be established, and that study should be diligently urged on. Two years later he ordered that there should be a school in every cathedral and monastery, open not only to the servile class (from which the clergy were usually taken), but to the free-born; that instruction should be given in psalmody, music, grammar, and *computum* (a term which denoted the art of reckoning in general, but more especially the calculation of the calendar); and that care should be taken for the correct transcription of the service-books. He employed Paul Warnefrid to compile a book of homilies from the fathers, and published it with a preface in his own name. These homilies were arranged according to the ecclesiastical seasons. It seems to have been at first intended that they should be read in Latin, the language of both the church and the state; and that it was a concession to national feeling when councils of the emperor's last year directed the clergy, in using them, to render them into a tongue intelligible to the people—whether the “rustic Roman” of Gaul, or the Teutonic. As the manuscripts of the Scriptures had been generally much corrupted by the carelessness of copyists, Charlemagne, with Alcuin's assistance, provided for the multiplication of correct copies. While the pupils of the schools were employed in transcribing the less important books for churches, none but persons of mature age were allowed to write the gospels, the psalter, or the missal. Manuscripts were acquired for libraries from England, Italy, and Greece. Presbyters were before ordination to be examined as to their faith, as to their knowledge of the creed and the Lord's prayer, of the canons, the penitential, the gospels, the homilies, the public services, the rites of baptism and the Eucharist, and their power of instructing their flocks.

In addition to the education of the clergy, a new feature appears in the articles of Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, where it is ordered that in every parish the clergy should provide a school for free-born children as well as for serfs. The payment for instruction was to be only such as the parents of the pupils should freely give. The bishop also invites the clergy to send their relations to the monastic schools. But the attempt to establish parochial schools does not appear to have been carried far even in the diocese of Orleans, and there is no evidence of its having been imitated elsewhere.

Charlemagne paid much deference to the usages of Rome, as the most venerable church of the west. He obtained from Adrian the Roman code of canons (which was founded on the collection of Dionysius Exiguus), and in 789 he published such of them as he considered necessary for his own dominions. The Roman method of chanting had already been introduced into Gaul. Pope Paul had sent books of it to Pipin, and had endeavoured to procure its establishment; but although he was supported by Pipin in the attempt, the Gallican chant still prevailed. During Charlemagne's third visit to Rome, in 787, disputes arose between the Frankish and the Roman clergy on the subject of the liturgy and the chant. The Franks relied on the king's protection; but to their dismay he asked them, “Which is the purer—the stream or the source?”—a question which admitted but of one answer; and on this answer he acted. He carried back into France two skillful clerks to teach the Roman chant, and

stationed one of them at Metz, while the other was attached to the court. He also established the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great in the Frankish church; it is even said that, in his zeal for conformity to Rome, he endeavoured to suppress the Ambrosian forms at Milan, by destroying the service-books, or carrying them “as if into exile” across the Alps; but that miracles came to the rescue of the venerable ritual, so that Pope Adrian, who had instigated the attempt against it, was brought to acquiesce in the local use of it. Charlemagne paid special attention to the solemnity of divine worship. The great church which he built at his favourite place of residence, Aix-la-Chapelle, was adorned with marble pillars from Rome and Ravenna, and was furnished with vestments for all its clergy, down to the meanest of the doorkeepers. He diligently frequented the services of his chapel, both by day and by night, and took great pains to improve the reading and the singing; “for”, said Einhard, “he was very skilful in both, although he neither read publicly, nor sang, except in a low voice and together with others”. A biographer of more questionable authority tells us that he used to point with his finger or with his staff at any person whom he wished to read; and when thus ordered to begin, or when warned by a cough from the emperor to stop, the reader was expected to obey at once, without any regard to sense or to the division of sentences. Thus, it is said, all were kept in a state of continual attention, because each might be called on at any moment. No one could mark his own portion with his nail or with wax; and all became accomplished readers, even although they might be unable to understand the language and the matter. Charlemagne himself is said to have composed hymns—among them the “Veni Creator Spiritus”; but as to that hymn, at least, the statement appears to be groundless.

Charlemagne’s ecclesiastical legislation was carried on by his own authority. He regarded it as the duty of a sovereign to watch over the spiritual and moral well-being of his subjects; he alleges the reforms of Josiah as a scriptural precedent for the part which he took in the regulation of the church. Ecclesiastical subjects occupy more than a third of his capitularies. The ecclesiastical as well as the other laws were proposed in the assemblies which were held yearly in spring and in autumn, and which bore at once the character of synods and of parliaments. The clergy and the laity sat together or separately, as was most convenient, according to the nature of the subjects proposed to them. Discussion was allowed; but both the initiative and the decision belonged to the sovereign, and in his name the decrees were published.

The coronation of Charlemagne as emperor, although it did not add to the power which he before possessed over his subjects, invested him with a new and indefinite majesty. He was no longer the chief of a nation of warriors, but the representative of the ancient Roman traditions and civilization—the anointed head of western Christendom. The empire was to be a consecrated state, with the same ruler in ecclesiastical as in civil affairs, and this ruler directing all to the glory of God. In 802 an oath of allegiance to Charles as emperor was required of those who had already sworn to him as king; and whereas such oaths had not before been imposed among the Franks, except on persons who held office or benefice under the crown, all males above the age of twelve were now required to swear. The civil hierarchy in all its grades corresponded to the ecclesiastical; and forthwith a new system of commissioners (*Missi Dominici*) was set on foot. These were chosen partly from the higher ecclesiastics and partly from the laity. They were to be men superior to all suspicion, fear, or partiality; they were to make circuits for the inspection of both secular and spiritual matters; they were to control the local administrations; to take care of churches, of widows, orphans, and the poor; to exercise a censorship of morals; to redress wrongs, or to refer to the emperor such as were beyond their power; to see to the due execution of the laws which were passed in the national assemblies. In spiritual as well as in temporal affairs, the emperor was regarded as the highest judge, beyond whom no appeal could be made; in authorizing the canons of Adrian’s collection, he omitted that canon of Sardica which prescribed in certain cases a reference to the bishop of Rome. While he cultivated friendly relations with the popes, while

he acknowledged them as the highest of bishops, and often consulted them and acted on their suggestions, the authority by which these were enforced on his subjects was his own; nor did the popes attempt to interfere with the powers which he claimed. On the conquest of Italy, he assumed the same control over the ecclesiastical affairs of that country which he had been accustomed to exercise in his hereditary kingdom, and the popes submitted to him as their lord and judge. Lofty titles and flattering language were, indeed, often addressed by bishops and others of the Franks to the successors of St. Peter; but the real amount of the authority which these enjoyed during this period is to be measured by the facts of history, not by the exaggerations of rhetorical or interested compliment.

CHAPTER VII.

THE EASTERN CHURCH — CONTROVERSIES OF CHARLEMAGNE'S AGE
A.D. 775-814.

Constantine Copronymus was succeeded in 775 by his son Leo IV, who, although opposed to the worship of images, was of gentler and more tolerant character than the earlier princes of the Isaurian line. Although the laws of the iconoclastic emperors remained unaltered, the monks who had been persecuted and banished were now allowed to return; and a great excitement was raised by the reappearance of these confessors in the cause of the popular religion. The empress, Irene, was of an Athenian family noted for its devotion to image; she herself cherished an enthusiastic reverence for them, and, although her father-in-law Constantine had compelled her to forswear them, she appears to have thought that in so sacred a cause her oath was not binding. She now exerted her influence as far as she dared, and by her means some monks and other friends of images were promoted to bishoprics, although for the time they were obliged to conceal their opinions. For notwithstanding the general mildness of Leo's disposition, his feeling on the subject of images was strong; so that, when some of them had been found under Irene's pillow, he ordered certain great officers, who had been concerned in introducing them into the palace, to be flogged and tonsured; he put one of these officers, who had especially provoked him, to death; and he separated from the empress, although she denied all concern in the affair.

After a reign of four years and a half Leo died,—more probably by a natural consequence of the illness with which he had long been afflicted, than either by a miracle of judgment on his impiety, or (as some modern writers have supposed) by poison; and Irene was left in possession of the government, as guardian of her son Constantine VI, a boy only ten years old. The empress, however, felt that it was necessary to proceed with caution in carrying out her wishes. She was, indeed, sure of the monks and of the populace: but the authority of a council which claimed the title of ecumenical was against her; the great body of the bishops was opposed to images; and although the well-trying pliancy of the eastern clergy gave reasons for hoping that these might be gained, there was a strong iconoclastic party among the laity, while the soldiery adhered to the principles of the late emperor Constantine, whose memory was cherished among them as that of a brave and successful general. At first, therefore, Irene ventured no further than to publish an edict for general liberty of conscience. The monks who were still in exile returned, images were again displayed, and many tales of past sufferings and of miracles swelled the popular enthusiasm.

In August 784, Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, suddenly resigned his dignity, and retired into a monastery, where he was visited by Irene and some high officers of the empire. When questioned as to the cause of his resignation, he professed deep remorse for having consented to accept the patriarchate on condition of opposing the restoration of images; he deplored the condition of his church, oppressed as it was by the tyranny of the state, and at variance with the rest of Christendom; and he declared that the only remedy for its evils would be to summon a general council for the purpose of reversing the decrees of the iconoclastic synod which had been held under Constantine V. We need not seek for an explanation of the patriarch's motives in the supposition of collusion with the court. He may, like many others, have been sincerely attached to the cause of images, and, when seized with sickness, may have felt a real compunction for the compliances by which he had gained his elevation. And his death, which followed immediately after, is a strong confirmation of this view.

Irene summoned the people of the capital to elect a new patriarch. No one possessed of the requisite qualifications was to be found among the higher clergy, as the bishops were disaffected to the cause of images, while the abbots were too ignorant of the management of affairs to be fit for such promotion. The person selected by the court, (and, according to one writer, suggested by Paul himself,) was Tarasius, a secretary of state, a man of noble birth, of consular dignity, and of good personal reputation. The multitude, who had no doubt been carefully prompted, cried out for his election, and the few dissentient voices were overpowered. Tarasius with an appearance of modesty professed his reluctance to accept an office so foreign to his previous habits, and declared that he would only do so on condition that a general council should be forthwith summoned for the consideration of the all-engrossing subject. With this understanding he was consecrated; and Adrian of Rome, on receiving a statement of his faith, admitted him to communion, professing to consider the exigency of the case an excuse for the irregularity of his promotion.

A council was now summoned, and measures were taken to render it yet more imposing than the numerous synod by which images had been condemned under the last reign. The pope was invited to send representatives, if unable to attend in person. He deputed Peter, chief presbyter of his church, with Peter, abbot of St. Saba's, and furnished them with a letter, in which he hailed the emperor and his mother as a new Constantine and a new Helena, and exhorted them to repair the misdeeds of their predecessors by restoring images in the church. Some things of a less agreeable kind were added:—a demand for the restoration of all that the iconoclastic emperors had taken from St. Peter, remarks on the irregularity of raising a layman to the patriarchate of Constantinople, and objections to the title of ecumenical, which had been given to the patriarch in the imperial letter

As the empire was at peace with the Saracens, invitations were also addressed to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. But the bearers of these letters fell in with some monks, who, on learning the object of their journey, earnestly implored them to proceed no further, since any such communication from the empire would be sure to exasperate the jealousy of the Mahometan tyrants, and to bring additional oppressions on the church. The monks offered to send to the council two of their own number, whom they proposed to invest with the character of secretaries to the patriarchs; these, they said, would sufficiently represent the faith of the eastern church, and the personal attendance of the patriarchs was no more requisite than that of the Roman bishop. To this strange proposal the messengers agreed, and they returned to Constantinople with two monks named John and Thomas.

The council was to meet at Constantinople in the beginning of August 786. But during the week before the appointed day, the opponents of images held meetings for the purpose of agitation, and, although Tarasius ordered them to leave the city, many of them still remained. On the eve of the opening, there was an outbreak of some imperial guards and other soldiers belonging to the iconoclastic party; and on the following day a still more serious tumult took place. When Tarasius and other members of the council were assembled in the church of the Apostles, a multitude of soldiers and others, abetted by some iconoclastic bishops, broke in on them, and compelled them to take refuge in the sanctuary. The soldiers who were summoned to quell the uproar refused to obey orders. Tarasius ordered the doors of the sanctuary to be shut. The iconoclasts forced them; but, without being dismayed by the threatening appearance, the patriarch opened the council, and conducted its proceedings until a message arrived from Irene, desiring her friends to give way; on which the iconoclastic bishops raised a shout of victory. The empress allowed the matter to rest until, having lulled suspicion, she was able quietly to disband the mutinous soldiers and to send them to their native places; and in September of the following year, a synod of about 350 bishops, with a number of monks and other clergy, met at Nicaea, a place at once safer from disturbance than the capital, and of especially venerable name, as having been the seat of the first general council.

The first places of dignity were given to the Roman envoys, who had been recalled, after having proceeded as far as Sicily on their way homeward. Next to these was Tarasius, the real president of the assembly; and after him were the two representatives (if they may be so styled) of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. A number of civil dignitaries were also presents The first session took place on the 24th of September, and the business proceeded with great rapidity. Six sessions were held within thirteen days, a seventh followed a week later, and the final meeting was held at Constantinople on the 23rd of October.

From the beginning it was assumed that the purpose of the council was not to discuss the question of images, but to re-establish them as objects of worship; bishops who were known to be opposed to this design had not been invited to attend. The pope's letter was read at the second session, but with the omission of the reflections on Tarasius, and of the request that the rights of the Roman see might be restored. A number of bishops, who had taken part in the iconoclasm of the last reigns, came forward to acknowledge and anathematize their errors, and humbly sued for admission to communion. In answer to questions, some of them said that they had never until now had the means of rightly considering the subject; that they had been educated in error: that they had been deceived by forged and garbled authorities : or that they had been sealed up under a judicial blindness. Questions arose as to admitting them to communion, as to acknowledging them in offices to which they had been consecrated by heretics, and with respect to some, whether, as they had formerly been persecutors of the faithful, they ought not to be treated with special severity. The monks were throughout on the side of rigour; but the majority of the council, under the guidance of Tarasius, was in favour of a lenient course. The canons were searched for precedents; and a discussion ensued as to the application of these—with what class of heretics were the iconoclasts to be reckoned? Tarasius was for putting them on the footing of Manichaeans, Marcionites, and monophysites, as these sects had also been opposed to images; all heresies, he said, were alike heinous, because all did away with the law of God. The monastic party declared that iconomachy was worse than the worst of heresies, because it denied the Saviour's incarnation. But the majority was disposed to treat the penitents with indulgence, and they were received to communion. There were loud outcries against the iconoclasts, as atheists, Jews, and enemies of the truth; and when a proposal was made to call them Saracens, it was answered that the name was too good for them.

According to the usual practice of councils, authorities were cited in behalf of images, and the opposition to them was paralleled or connected with all sorts of heresies. The extracts produced from the earlier fathers are really irrelevant; for the images of which they speak were either scenes from sacred history, or memorial portraits (like that of Meletius of Antioch, which is mentioned by St. Chrysostom¹), and they afford no sanction for the practices which were in question before the council. A large portion of the quotations consisted of extracts from legendary biographies, and of tales of miracles wrought by images, to which some of the bishops were able to add similar marvels from their own experience. From time to time the reading of these testimonies was interrupted by curious commentaries from the hearers. Thus, after a passage from Gregory of Nyssa, in which he spoke of himself as having been affected to tears by a picture of the sacrifice of Isaac, a bishop observed, "The father had often read the history, but perhaps without ever weeping; yet, as soon as he saw the picture, he wept".

"If", said another, "so great a doctor was edified and moved even to tears by a picture, how much more would it affect lay and unlearned people!".

Many exclaimed that they had seen such pictures of Abraham as that which Gregory described, although it does not appear whether they had felt the same emotion at the sight.

"If Gregory wept at a painting of Abraham", said Theodore, bishop of Catana, "what should we do at one of the incarnate Saviour?".

"Should not we too weep," asked Tarasius, "if we saw a picture of the Crucifixion?" and his words were received with general applause.

A famous story, which had already served the uses both of controversial and of devotional writers, was twice read. An aged monk on the Mount of Olives, it was said, was greatly tempted by a spirit of uncleanness. One day the demon appeared to him, and, after having sworn him to secrecy, offered to discontinue his assaults if the monk would give up worshipping a picture of the blessed Virgin and the infant Saviour which hung in his cell. The old man asked time to consider the proposal, and, notwithstanding his oath, applied for advice to an abbot of renowned sanctity, who blamed him for having allowed himself to be so far deluded as to swear to the devil, but told him that he had yet done well in laying open the matter, and that it would be better to visit every brothel in Jerusalem than to refrain from adoring the Saviour and His mother in the picture. From this edifying tale a twofold moral was drawn with general consent,—that reverence for images would warrant not only unchastity, but breach of oaths; and that those who had formerly sworn to the iconoclast heresy were no longer bound by their obligations.

At the fifth session, the Roman legates proposed that an image should be brought in and should receive the adoration of the assembly. This was solemnly done next day; and at the same session the conclusions of the iconoclastic synod of 754 were read, each paragraph being followed by the corresponding part of a long refutation, which was declared to have been evidently dictated by the Holy Ghost.

At the seventh session, the decree of the council was read and subscribed. It determined that, even as the figure of the cross was honoured, so images of the Saviour and the blessed Virgin, of angels and of saints, whether painted or mosaic or of any other suitable material, are to be set up for kissing and honourable reverence, but not for that real service which belongs to the Divine nature alone. Incense and lights are to be offered to them, as to the cross, the gospels, and other holy memorials, “forasmuch as the honour paid to the image passeth on to the original, and he who adoreth an image doth in it adore the person of him whom it doth represent”. An anathema was pronounced against all opponents of images, and the signing of the decree was followed by many acclamations in honour of the new Constantine and Helena, with curses against iconomachists and heretics of every kind.

These outcries were repeated at the eighth session, when the members of the council appeared at one of the palaces of Constantinople, and both the emperor and his mother subscribed the decree. The council, which after a time came to be regarded both by the Greeks and by the Latins as the seventh general council, also passed twenty-two canons, chiefly relating to ecclesiastical and monastic discipline. It is to be observed that the images sanctioned at Nicaea were not works of sculpture, but paintings and other representations on a flat surface—a limitation to which the Greek church has ever since adhered; and that there is as yet no mention of representing under visible forms the Trinity, the Almighty Father, or the Holy Spirit.

Constantine VI grew up in the society of women and eunuchs, and in entire subjection to his mother. With a view, perhaps, of cutting off from the iconoclasts the hope of assistance from the west, Irene had negotiated for him a marriage with one of Charlemagne’s daughters; but soon after the Nicene synod, as the iconoclasts were no longer formidable, while she may have feared that such a connexion might endanger her own ascendancy, she broke off the engagement, greatly to the indignation of the Frankish king, and compelled her son against his will to marry an Armenian princess named Marina or Mary. Instigated, it is said, by some persons who professed to have discovered by magic that the empire was to be her own, she paved the way for a change by encouraging her son in cruelties and debaucheries which rendered him odious to his subjects, and especially to the powerful monastic party. At the age of twenty, Constantine resolved to throw off the yoke of his mother and her ministers; he succeeded in possessing himself of the government, and for some years the empire was distracted by revolutions, carried on with all the perfidy and atrocity which were characteristic of the later Greeks. Constantine was at length persuaded to readmit his mother to a share of

power, and she pursued towards him the same policy as before. He fell in love with a lady of her court, Theodote, and resolved to divorce his wife and to marry the object of his new attachment. The patriarch Tarasius at first opposed the scheme, but Constantine, it is said, threatened that, if the Church refused to indulge him, he would restore idolatry; and Tarasius no longer ventured to resist. Marina was shut up in a convent, and the second nuptials were magnificently celebrated in September 795. Some monks who vehemently objected to these proceedings, and went so far as to excommunicate the emperor, were treated with great cruelty. It has been supposed that Irene even contrived the temptation to which her son yielded; she at least beheld his errors with malicious satisfaction, and fomented the general discontent which they produced. By degrees she secured to her own interest all the persons who were immediately around him; and at length, when her scheme appeared to be matured, he was by her command seized at his devotions, was carried into the purple chamber in which he had been born, and was deprived of his eyesight with such violence that the operation almost cost him his life. Immediately after this, a fog of extraordinary thickness obscured the air and hid the sun for seventeen days. By the people of Constantinople it was regarded as declaring the sympathy of heaven with the horror generally felt at the unnatural deed by which Irene obtained the empire.

Irene reigned five years after the dethronement of her son. According to the Greek writers (whose testimony, however, is unsupported by those of the west), she was engaged in a project for reuniting the empires by a marriage with Charlemagne, when, in October 802, she was deposed by the secretary Nicephorus, and was banished to Lesbos, where she died within a few months.

Nicephorus, who is described as having surpassed all his predecessors in rapacity, lust, and cruelty, was bent on subjecting the hierarchy to the imperial power. He forbade the patriarch to correspond with the pope, whom he considered as a tool of Charlemagne; and he earned the detestation of the clergy by heavily taxing monastic and ecclesiastical property, which had until then been exempt, by seizing the ornaments of churches, by stabling his horses in monasteries, and by extending a general toleration to iconoclasts and sectaries. In 811 Nicephorus was killed in a war with the Bulgarians, and his son Stauracius, after a reign of little more than two months, was thrust into a monastery, where he soon after died of wounds received before his accession. On the deposition of Stauracius, his brother-in-law, Michael Rhangabe, was compelled to accept the empire, and images were again restored to honour. The iconoclastic party, however, continued to exist. An attempt was made by some of its members to set a blinded son of Constantine Copronymus on the throne; and on the alarm of a Bulgarian invasion, soon after the elevation of Michael, a very remarkable display of its spirit took place. While the clergy, the monks, and vast numbers of the people were deprecating the danger by processions and prayers, some iconoclastic soldiers broke open the mausoleum of the emperors, prostrated themselves on the tomb of Copronymus, and entreated him to save the state; and they asserted that, in answer to their prayers, he had appeared to them on horseback, and had gone forth against the barbarians; “whereas”, says Theophanes, “he dwells in hell with devils”. Although the motive of these men was more probably fraud than fanaticism—for, besides the story of the apparition, they pretended that the mausoleum had been opened by miracle—we may infer the existence of a strong attachment to the memory of Constantine among the party to which such an imposture could have been addressed with any hope of finding believers

Michael, although a man of estimable character, proved unequal to the government of the empire, and after a reign of two years he was deposed and tonsured, while a general named Leo was raised to the throne. Michael, who by a clemency unusual in such cases was allowed to retain not only his life but his eyesight, survived his dethronement thirty-two years.

While the decree of the second council of Nicaea established a reconciliation between Rome and Constantinople, and was gladly confirmed by the Pope, it met with a less

favourable reception north of the Alps. In the Frankish church a middle opinion on the subject of images had prevailed; as the eastern Christians had been led to cherish their images for the sake of contrast with their Mahometan neighbours, so the Franks were restrained from excess in this kind of devotion by the necessity of opposing the idolatry of the unconverted Germans. The question had been one of those discussed at a mixed assembly of clergy and laity which was held under Pipin at Gentilly in the presence of envoys from Pope Paul and of ambassadors from Constantine Copronymus; and, although their decision on this point is not recorded, there can be no reasonable doubt that it agreed with the general views of the national church.

Adrian, on receiving the acts of the Nicene council, sent a copy of them to Charlemagne, with an evident expectation that they would be accepted by the Franks. But the late rupture of the match between the king's daughter and the son of Irene had not tended to bespeak from him any favourable consideration of the eastern decrees; and his own convictions were opposed to them. He sent them to Alcuin, who was then in England; and it is said that the English bishops joined in desiring their countryman to write against the council. Alcuin made some remarks on the Nicene acts, in the form of a letter; and out of these probably grew a treatise in four books, which was put forth in the name of Charlemagne, and is known by the title of the Caroline Books. It has been commonly supposed that Alcuin, who returned to France in 793, was the chief author, but that he was assisted by other ecclesiastics, and that the king himself took part in the revision of the work. The tone of this treatise is firm and dignified. Although great deference for the apostolic see is professed, the writer resolutely maintains the Frankish view as to images, and unsparingly criticises the grounds alleged for the doctrine which was held in common by the east and by Rome. While the iconoclasts and the Byzantine council of 754 are blamed for overlooking the distinction between images and idols, their mistake is declared to be much less than that committed by the Nicene synod in confounding the use of images with the worship of them; the one error is ascribed to ignorance, the other to wickedness. Much is said against the style of language officially employed by the Byzantine court, which is censured as trenching on the honour due to God. The synod is blamed for having allowed itself to be guided by a woman, contrary to St. Paul's order that women should not be admitted to teach. Its pretension to be ecumenical is denied, on the ground that it neither was assembled from all churches, nor held the faith of the universal church; its claim to Divine sanction is also disallowed. It is said to be madness for one portion of the church to anathematise other portions in a matter as to which the apostles had not laid down any rule; and much more so when the opinions so branded are agreeable to the earlier councils and fathers. The passages which had been cited at Nicaea from Scripture and the fathers are examined, and are cleared from the abuse there made of them. The council is censured for having admitted many stories of a fabulous or apocryphal kind. The account of our Lord's correspondence with Abgarus is questioned; the legend of the monk and the unclean devil is strongly reprobated; doubts are expressed as to the truth of many miraculous tales; and it is argued that, even if the miracles were really wrought by the images, they would not warrant the worship of these. Remarks are made on expressions used by individual bishops at the council. Among these there is the important misrepresentation that Constantius, of Constantia in Cyprus, is charged with having placed the adoration of images on the same level with that of the Trinity, and as having anathematized all who thought otherwise; whereas in reality he had distinguished between the devotion paid to images and that which was to be reserved for the Trinity alone. The arguments advanced in behalf of images are discussed and refuted. The honours paid in the east to the statues of emperors had been dwelt on by way of analogy; but it is denied that this is any warrant for the worship of images,—“for what madness it is to defend one unlawful thing by another!”—and the conduct of Daniel in Babylon is cited as proving the sinfulness of the eastern practice. It is derogatory to the holy mystery of the Eucharist—to the cross, the symbol of our salvation and the sign of our

Christian profession—to the consecrated vessels, and to the sacred books,— that the veneration paid to these should be paralleled with the worship of images. The reverence due to relics, which had either been part of the bodies of saints or had been in some manner connected with them, is no ground for paying a like regard to images, which are the mere work of the artist, Christ and his saints desire no such worship as that in question; and, although the more learned may be able to practise it without idolatry, by directing their veneration to that which the images signify, the unlearned, who have no skill in subtle distinctions, will be drawn to worship that which they see, without thought of any object beyond it. The guilt of causing offence must rest, not on those who allow images and only refuse to worship them, but on those who force the worship on others. The only proper use of images is by way of ornament, or as historical memorials; it is absurd to say that they represent to us the merits of the saints, since these merits are not external. The right use of them for remembrance is strongly distinguished from the plea that it is impossible to remember God without them; those persons (it is said) must have very faulty memories who need to be reminded by an image—who are unable to raise their minds above the material creation except by the help of a material and created object. The king concludes by declaring to the pope that he adheres to the principles laid down by Gregory the Great in his letters to Serenus of Marseilles, and that he believes this to be the rule of the catholic church. Images are to be allowed, but the worship of them is not to be enforced; and it is forbidden to break or to destroy them.

These books (or perhaps the propositions which they were intended to enforce, rather than the treatise itself, were communicated to the pope, and drew forth from him a long reply. But the arguments of this attempt are feeble, and its tone appears to show that Adrian both felt the weakness of his cause, and was afraid to offend the great sovereign whose opinion he was labouring to controvert.

It is doubtful whether these communications took place before or after the council which was held, under the presidency of Charlemagne, at Frankfort, in 794. This council was both a diet of the empire and an ecclesiastical synod. Bishops were assembled from Lombardy and Germany as well as from France; some representatives of the English church, and two legates from Rome, were also present; and, at the king's suggestion, Alcuin was admitted to a place on account of the service which he might be able to render by his learning. The question of images was dealt with in a manner which showed that the council had no idea of any right on the part of Rome to prescribe to the Frankish church. The second canon adverts to “the late synod of the Greeks, in which it was said that those should be anathematized who should not bestow service or adoration on the images of the saints, even as on the Divine Trinity”. In opposition to this, the fathers of Frankfort refuse “both adoration and service of all kinds” to images; they express contempt for the eastern synod, and agree in condemning it. The passage especially censured by this canon is the speech wrongly ascribed in the Caroline Books to the Cyprian metropolitan Constantius, and the misrepresentation is probably to be charged on the defectiveness of the translation in which the Nicene acts were presented to the Frankish divines. But whatever the reason of it may have been, and however the members of the Frankfort council may have misapprehended the opinions of the Orientals, there is no ground for arguing from this that they did not understand and plainly state their own judgment on the questions.

Notwithstanding the opposition to his views on the subject of images, Adrian continued to cultivate friendly relations with Charlemagne; the political interest which bound Rome to the Franks was more powerful than his sympathy with the Greeks as to doctrine. The retention of Calabria and Illyricum, which had been taken from the Roman see by the iconoclastic emperors in the earlier stage of the controversy, alienated the popes more and more from the Byzantine rule, until in 800 the connexion with the east was utterly severed by the coronation of Charlemagne as the sovereign of a new empire of Rome.

Before proceeding to the question of images, the council of Frankfort had been occupied with the doctrine of Felix, bishop of Urgel in Catalonia, on the relation of our Lord's humanity to the Almighty Father. The term *adoption* had been applied to the incarnation by some earlier writers and in the Spanish liturgy; it appears, however, not to have been used in its strict sense, but rather as equivalent to *assumption*. The passages which Felix and his party produced from the fathers, as favourable to their view, spoke of an adoption of nature, of flesh, or of manhood; whereas they themselves made an important variation from this language by speaking of an adoption of the Son.

The adoptionists were charged by their opponents with Nestorianism, and in spirit the two systems are unquestionably similar. Yet the adoptionists admitted the doctrine which had been settled as orthodoxy for three centuries and a half: they made no objection to the term *Deipara* (or *Theotokos*), as applied to the mother of the Saviour's humanity; they allowed the union of natures in Him. The distinctive peculiarity of the party was, that, while they granted the communication of properties between the two natures, they insisted on distinguishing the manner in which the predicates of the one nature were given to the other; they regarded it as a confusion of the natures, and a virtual merging of the humanity, to say that Christ was proper and real Son of God, not only in his Godhead but in his whole person. He cannot, they said, be properly Son of God as to his human nature, unless it be supposed that the humanity and fleshly substance were derived from the very essence of God. The highest thing that can befall humanity is to be adopted into sonship with God: more than this would be a change of nature. Christ's humanity, then, is adopted to sonship; in one sense this adoption existed from the moment of his conception; in another, it began at his baptism, when he passed from the condition of a servant to that of a Son; and it was consummated in his resurrection. He cannot have two fathers in the same nature; in his humanity he is naturally the Son of David, and by adoption and grace the Son of God. By nature He is the "only-begotten" Son of God; by adoption and grace, the "first-begotten". In the Son of God the Son of man becomes very Son of God; but it is only in a *nuncupative* way, as was the case with those of whom He himself said that the Scripture "called them gods to whom the word of God came"; his adoption is like that of the saints, although it is after a far more excellent fashion. The adoptionists also pressed into their service texts which were in truth meant to set forth the reality of our Lord's manhood, and its inferiority to, or dependence on, his Divinity.

Felix of Urgel, who became noted as a chief assertor of this doctrine, was a man of great acuteness and learning; his reputation was such that Alcuin sought his correspondence, and, even after the promulgation of his heresy, continued to speak with much respect of his sanctity. The other head of the party, Elipand, bishop of Toledo, and primate of Spain under the Mahometan dominion, was far advanced in life when the controversy broke out. He appears to have been a man of violent and excitable temper, and very jealous of his dignity. His style is described as more obscure than that of Felix, and it is therefore inferred that he was more profound.

The early history of the adoptionist doctrine is unknown. It is probable that Felix was the originator of it, and perhaps he may have been led into it by controversy with his Mahometan neighbours, to whom this view of our Lord's humanity would have been less repulsive than that which was generally taught by the church. At least, it appears certain that, whether Felix was the author of the doctrine or not, it was he who did most to reduce it to a system. A correspondence took place between him and Elipand; and the primate employed the influence of his position in favour of the new opinion, which soon gained many adherents. The first opponents who appeared against adoptionism were Beatus, an abbot, and Etherius, bishop of Osma, who had formerly been his pupil. Elipand, in a letter to an abbot named Fidelis, denounced the two very coarsely; he even carried his intolerance so far as to declare that all who should presume to differ from him were heretics and slaves of Antichrist, and that as such they must be rooted out. Etherius and Beatus rejoined at great length in a book which

as to tone appears almost worthy of their antagonist. The pope, Adrian, now had his attention drawn to the controversy, and in 785 wrote a letter to the orthodox bishops of Spain, warning them against the new doctrine as an error such as no one since Nestorius had ventured on.

This letter, however, failed to appease the differences which had arisen. A council which is said to have been held against the adoptionists at Narbonne, in 788, is generally regarded as fictitious. In 792 Charlemagne summoned Felix (who was his subject) to appear before a council at Ratisbon, where the bishop abjured and anathematized his errors; but Charles, who in person presided at the council, appears to have doubted either the sincerity of his new profession, or his steadiness in adhering to it, and therefore sent him in chains to Rome, where he was imprisoned by order of the pope. Felix obtained his liberty by drawing up an orthodox confession of faith, to which he swore in the most solemn manner, laying it on the consecrated elements and on St. Peter's tomb. But on returning to Urgel, he again vented his heresy, and, in fear of Charlemagne's resentment, he fled into the Mahometan part of Spain. Elipand and other Spanish bishops wrote to Charlemagne and to the bishops of France, requesting that Felix might be restored to his see, and that measures might be taken for suppressing the opinions of Beatus, who was charged in the letters with profligacy of life, and was also styled a false prophet, on account of some speculations as to the fulfilment of the Apocalypse, into which he had been led by the oppressed condition of the Spanish church. These letters were forwarded by Charlemagne to the pope, who thereupon despatched a second epistle into Spain, denouncing the doctrine of the adoptionists, and threatening to excommunicate them if they should persist in it.

The council of Frankfort was held between the time of Charlemagne's application to Adrian and the receipt of the pope's answer. No representative of the adoptionist party appeared; but Alcuin, who had been summoned from England to take part in the controversy, argued against their doctrine, and the council in its first canon unanimously condemned it as a heresy which "ought to be utterly rooted out of the church". The Italian bishops gave their sanction to a treatise against adoptionism drawn up by Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileia; and this was sent into Spain, together with a letter from the bishops of Gaul, Aquitaine, and Germany to the Spanish bishops, and with one from Charlemagne to Elipand and his brethren. Alcuin addressed a tract against the adoptionists to the bishops of the south of France and also wrote in a respectful tone to Felix himself, urging him to give up the term adoption, which he professed to consider as the only point in which the bishop of Urgel varied from the Catholic faith. In consequence of this letter, Felix addressed a defence of his doctrine to Charlemagne, who thereupon desired Alcuin to undertake a formal refutation of the adoptionists. The abbot accepted the task, but stipulated that time should be allowed him to examine their citations with the help of his pupils, and begged that the book of Felix might also be referred to the pope, to Paulinus of Aquileia, and to other eminent bishops; if, he said, all should agree in their judgment on the point in question, it might be concluded that they were all guided by the same Holy Spirit.

Alcuin then produced a treatise in seven books—"these five loaves and two little fishes", as he styles them. The foundation on which he chiefly grounds his argument is the unity of the Saviour's person. Although Felix had not ventured to deny this, it is urged that in consistency he must do so, like Nestorius, since he divides Christ into two sons, the one real, the other nuncupative. The same person cannot be at once the proper and the adopted son of the same father; Christ alone has by nature that which we have through Him by adoption and grace. The Sonship is not founded on the nature, but on the person; the two natures do not form two sons, since they are themselves not separate, but inseparably united in the one Christ. The whole Christ is Son of God and Son of man; there is no room for an adoptive sonship. Christ was very God from the moment of his human conception. Felix, it is argued, had erred through supposing that a son cannot be proper unless he be of the same nature with the father; whereas the term proper does not necessarily imply identity of substance between

that which is so styled and that to which it is ascribed; as may be seen by our speaking of “proper names” and “proper [*i.e.* own] possessions”. A man is the proper son of his parents both in body and in soul, although the body only be of their seed; and in like manner Christ in his whole person, in manhood as well as in Godhead, is proper Son of God. But moreover (says Alcuin), the whole matter, being supernatural, cannot be fitly measured by human analogies. Christ is Son of God the Father, although his flesh be not generated of God; and to deny the possibility of this is to impugn the Divine omnipotence.

The censure of Frankfort was followed up by a council held at Friuli, under Paulinus of Aquileia, in 796, and by one which met at Rome under Leo III in 799. At Friuli it was laid down that the Saviour is “one and the same Son of man and Son of God; not putative but real Son of God; not adoptive, but proper; proper and not adoptive in each of his natures, forasmuch as, after his assumption of manhood, one and the same person is inconfusibly and inseparably Son of God and of man”. The Roman council also condemned the adoptionists, but with so little knowledge of the matter as to accuse them of denying that the Saviour had any other than a nuncupative Godhead.

In the meantime Leidrad, archbishop of Lyons, Nefrid, bishop of Narbonne, and Benedict, abbot of Aniane, were sent into the district in which Felix had spread his opinions. They laboured with much success in confutation of adoptionism, and, having met Felix himself at Urgel, they persuaded him by an assurance of safety to proceed into France, in order that he might answer for himself before a council, which was to be held at Aix-la-Chapelle. At Aix the adoptionist was confronted by Alcuin, who had been drawn from his retirement at Tours for the purpose. The discussion lasted for six days, and Felix at length professed to be convinced by some passages from the fathers which had not before been known to him. He retracted his errors, condemned Nestorius, and exhorted his clergy and people to follow the true faith. As, however, his former changes suggested a suspicion of his constancy, he was not allowed to return into his diocese, but was committed to the care of the archbishop of Lyons. Leidrad and his brother commissioners went again into Catalonia for the purpose of rooting out the heresy; and it is said by Alcuin that during their two visits they made 20,000 converts—bishops, clergy, and laity.

Elipand, not being a subject of Charlemagne, was more difficult to deal with than his associate. He now entered into controversy with Alcuin, whom he treated with his usual rudeness, reproaching him as the chief persecutor of Felix, and taxing him (among other things) with having 20,000 slaves, and with being proud of his wealth. Alcuin replied in four books, and the death of Elipand (whom some writers improbably represent as having at last renounced his heresy), followed soon after. Felix remained at Lyons with Leidrad, and afterwards with his successor Agobard. He occasionally vented some of his old opinions, but, when Agobard argued with him, he professed to be convinced. After his death, however, which took place in 818, it was found that he had left a paper containing the chief points of his heresy in the form of question and answer; and Agobard found himself obliged to undertake a refutation of this, in order to counteract the mischief which it was likely to produce, as coming from a person who had been much revered for sanctity. Although the adoptionist doctrine has been revived or justified by some writers of later times, it never afterwards gained any considerable influence.

Towards the end of Charlemagne’s reign, a controversy arose as to the procession of the Holy Spirit. In the Latin church it had always been held that the Third Person of the Godhead proceeds from the Second as well as from the First. The same doctrine which the Latins thus expressed—that the Godhead of the Holy Spirit is communicated not only from the Father but from the Son—had also been held by the Greeks in general; but, as the word proceed is in Scripture used only of his relation to the Father, they had not applied it to express his relation to the Son. Thus the second general council, in the words which it added to the Nicene creed in opposition to the Macedonian heresy, defined only that the Holy Ghost

proceedeth from the Father. Theodoret, indeed, had used language which seems irreconcilable with the western belief; but it is not to be understood as expressing more than the private opinion of a writer whose orthodoxy was not unimpeached on other points; and as yet no controversy either of fact or of expression had arisen as to this subject between the two great divisions of the church.

In the west, the procession of the Spirit from the Son was in time introduced into creeds. It is found in the Athanasian creed, a form which was undoubtedly of western composition, but of which the date is much disputed. The first appearance of the doctrine in the Nicene or Constantinopolitan creed was at the third council of Toledo, in 589; and it was often enforced by later Spanish councils, under the sanction of an anathema. It would seem to have been from Spain that the definition made its way into France, where the truth of the double procession was not controverted, but some questions were raised as to the expediency or lawfulness of adding to the Nicene creed.

The origin of the differences on this subject in the period now before us is not clear. There was some discussion of it at the council of Gentilly, where the ambassadors of Constantine Copronymus were present; but (as has been already stated) the details of that council are unknown. At the council of Friuli, in 796, Paulinus maintained the expediency of the definition, on account of those heretics who whisper that the Holy Spirit is of the Father alone, and proceedeth from the Father alone; he defended it against the charge of novelty, as being not an addition to the Nicene creed, but an explanation of it; and the council adopted a profession of faith in which the double procession was laid down.

The matter came in a more pressing form before a synod held at Aix in 809, when a complaint was made that one John, a monk of St. Saba's at Jerusalem, had attacked the Frankish monks and pilgrims there on account of this doctrine, and had attempted to drive them away by force. The council approved of the addition to the creed, and Charlemagne sent two bishops, and Adelhard, abbot of Corbie, to Rome, with a request that the pope would confirm the judgment. Leo, at a conference with the envoys, of which a curious account is preserved, expressed his agreement in the doctrine of the double procession, but decidedly opposed the insertion of it into the creed. It would, he said, be wrong to insert it, since a council guided by wisdom from above had omitted it; and, moreover, the point was one of those which are not necessary to salvation for the mass of ordinary Christians.

It is said that he put up in St. Peter's two silver shields engraved with the creed of Constantinople in Greek and in Latin, and that on both the words which express the procession of the Spirit from the Son were omitted. But, in order that there might be no doubt as to his opinion on the question of doctrine, he sent into the east a confession of faith in which the double procession was twice distinctly affirmed. We hear no more of the difference between the eastern and western churches on this subject until at a later time it was revived and led to important consequences.

It may be difficult to follow, and impossible to read with interest, the history of such controversies as those on monothelism and adoptionism; and the church has often been reproached with the agitation into which it was thrown by questions which never enter into the consideration of the great body of Christian believers. We ought, however, to remember that an error which is to agitate the church internally must not begin by setting at nought the decisions of former times; the spirit of speculation must fix on some point which is apparently within the limits already prescribed for orthodoxy. Hence, in the controversies which relate to the highest Christian doctrines, the ground is continually narrowed, as we proceed from Arianism to Nestorianism and Eutychianism, and from these to the errors which have lately come before us; while each question, as it arose, required to be discussed and decided by the lights of Scripture and of the judgments which had been before pronounced. It is not, therefore, the church that deserves to be blamed, if the opinions against which its solemn condemnations were directed became successively more and more subtle; and the reader must

be content to bear with the writer, if their path should sometimes lie through intricacies which both must feel to be uninviting and wearisome.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ORIENTAL SECTS.

It has been mentioned, in the sketch of the Mahometan conquests, that the Arabs took advantage of the enmity between the Catholics and the Jacobites (or monophysites) to enlist the depressed and persecuted sectaries on their side. For the services thus rendered, the Jacobites were repaid by a superior degree of favour from their new masters when Egypt and Syria had fallen under the rule of the caliphs. Many of those whom the measures of Heraclius had driven to profess Catholicism now returned to the open avowal of their old opinions; and the church further lost, not only by the progress of the sword and doctrines of Islam, but by the defection of many of its own members to the heretical Christianity.

The Jacobites continued to be strong in Egypt, and also in the more westerly countries of Asia, where they were now under the government of a patriarch resident at Amida. But the party had been extirpated in Persia, and it made no further progress towards the east.

The history of the Nestorians during this period was more remarkable. They, like the opposite sect, were at first courted and afterwards favoured by the Mussulmans on account of their hostility to the orthodox church. At their head was a bishop known by the title of catholic or; patriarch of Babylon; his residence was originally at Seleucia or Ctesiphon, but on the foundation of Bagdad by Almansur, in 762, the patriarch removed his seat to that city. In the eighth century, the Nestorians got a footing in Egypt; and in the east they laboured with great activity to propagate their form of Christianity, without, apparently, meeting with any rivalry on the part of the catholics. Following the course of trade, Nestorian missionaries made their way by sea from India to China, while others penetrated across the deserts to its northern frontier. A stone discovered at Singanfoo in 1625 bears a long inscription, partly Syriac and partly Chinese, recording the names of missionaries who had laboured in China, with the history of Christianity in that country from the year 636 to 781. Its fortunes had been varied by success and persecution; but in the eighth century it had usually, enjoyed great favour from the emperors, and many churches had been built. With these details the inscription contains a summary of Christian doctrine and practice, in which a tinge of Nestorianism is discernible. It would seem that this early Christianity of China fell with the dynasty which had encouraged it; for some missionaries who about the year 980 were sent by the catholic of Babylon into that country found the churches destroyed, and could hear of only one native who continued to profess their own religion.

The patriarch Timothy, who held his office from 777 to 820, reduced the Nestorian metropolitan of Persia to subjection, and was especially active in organizing missions. By the preachers whom he sent out a knowledge of Christianity was spread in Hyrcania, Tartary, Bactria, and other countries of central Asia, where it long retained a hold. Bishops and metropolitans, owing allegiance to the patriarch of Babylon, were established in those vast regions, and with a view to this a singular ritual provision was made by Timothy—that, if no more than two bishops could be procured for the consecration of a brother, the canonical number should be made up by allowing a book of the Gospels to supply the place of the third consecrator.

The tenets and character of the Paulicians have been the subject of controversy, which too often has been largely influenced by the party interests of those who have shared in it. Writers of the Roman church have professed to discover in the Paulicians the ancestors of the protestant reformers, and have transferred to these the charges of Manichaeism which are

brought against the ancient sect. On the other hand, some protestants have ventured to accept the pedigree, and, with a confidence which equally disdains facts and reason, have asserted that the Paulicians were guiltless of the heresies imputed to them—that they were the maintainers of what such writers suppose to be a purely scriptural Christianity. It would be useless to enter here into a discussion of these rival extravagances.

Although it is agreed that the word Paulician is a barbarous formation from the name Paul, there is a question as to the person from whom the designation was taken. Some trace it to one Paul of Samosata—not the notorious bishop of Antioch, in the third century, but a Manichæan of later, although uncertain, date; others to an Armenian who was eminent in the sect about the time of Justinian II. But the most probable supposition appears to be that it is derived from the name of the great apostle, whom the Paulicians affected especially to regard as their master.

Gnosticism, banished from other parts of the empire, had taken refuge in the countries bordering on the Euphrates, where in course of time the remnants of its various parties had come to be confounded under the general name of Manichæans. In this region, at the village of Mananalis, near Samosata, lived about the year 653 one Constantine, who is described as descended from a Manichæan family. A deacon, who was returning from captivity among the Saracens, became his guest, and in acknowledgment of his hospitality left with him a manuscript containing the Gospels and St. Paul's Epistles. Constantine read these, applying the principles of his old belief to the interpretation of them; and the result was, that he renounced some of the grosser absurdities in which he had been trained, burnt the heretical books which it was a capital crime to possess, and put forth a system which, by means of allegorical and other evasions, he professed to reconcile with the letter of the New Testament, while in reality it was mainly derived from the doctrines of his hereditary sect. Although he is usually styled a Manichæan, it would appear that the term is not to be strictly understood. His opinions were probably more akin to Marcionism, which is known to have been strong in the region of the Euphrates two hundred years earlier; and his followers freely anathematized Manes, among other heresiarchs.

Constantine styled himself Silvanus, and the leaders who succeeded him assumed the names of Titus, Epaphroditus, Timothy, and others of St. Paul's companions. In like manner they affected to transfer to the chief communities of their sect the names of churches in which the apostle and his associates had laboured. The Paulicians acknowledged St. Paul's epistles, with those of St. James, St. John, and St. Jude, and the Acts of the Apostles. They also originally admitted the four Gospels, although it would seem that they afterwards rested exclusively on those of St. Luke and St. John, if they did not absolutely reject the others. They rejected the Old Testament, and they especially denounced St. Peter, as a betrayer of his Lord and of the truth; nor was their enmity without reason, says Peter of Sicily, since that apostle had prophesied against their misuse of St. Paul.

The Paulicians held that matter was eternal; that there were two Gods—the one, generated of darkness and fire, the creator and lord of the present world, the God of the Old Testament and of the church; the other, the Supreme, the object of their own worship, the God of the spiritual world which is to come. They held that the soul of man was of heavenly origin, and imprisoned in a material body. They not only refused to the blessed Virgin the excessive honours which the Catholics had gradually bestowed on her, but are said to have altogether disparaged her; they denied her perpetual virginity, while they maintained that our Lord did not really take of her substance, but brought his body from heaven, and that his birth was only in appearance. They objected to the order of presbyters, because the Jewish presbyters or elders had opposed the Christ; their own teachers were not distinguished by any special character, dress, manner of life, or privileges. Of these teachers several grades are mentioned, but they did not form a permanent hierarchy; thus, when the “companions in travel”, who had been associated with the last great master of the sect, died out, the “notaries”, whose business

it was to copy the writings which were acknowledged as authoritative, became its chief instructors. The Paulicians revered Constantine and three others of their leaders as apostles or prophets. They rejected the sacraments : Christ, they said, did not give his disciples bread and wine, but by the names of these elements He signified his own sustaining words; and the true baptism is He Himself, who declared Himself to be the “living water”. They spat on the cross and attacked the Catholics on account of their reverence for images, while they themselves paid reverence to the book of the Gospels, as containing the words of Christ. They allowed themselves a great license of equivocation as to their opinions; and in the same spirit they did not scruple to attend the catholic worship or sacraments. They claimed for themselves exclusively the title of Christians, while they styled the Catholics Romans, as having merely a political religion. Their own places of worship were not styled temples or churches, but *houses of prayer*. By the modern patrons of the Paulicians, their opposition in some of these points to the current errors or superstitions of the time has been traced to an unbiassed study of holy Scripture; but it may be more truly explained by their connexion with older sects, which had become separate before the corruptions in question were introduced into the church itself.

Constantine fixed himself at Cibossa, in Armenia, where he presided over his sect for twenty-seven years, and made many converts, both from the church and from the Zoroastrian religion. At length the matter was reported to the emperor Constantine Pogonatus, who sent an officer named Symeon to Cibossa, with orders to put the heresiarch to death, and to distribute his followers among the clergy and in monasteries, with a view to their being reclaimed. Symeon carried off Constantine and a large body of the sectaries, whom he drew up in a line, and commanded to stone their chief. Instead of obeying, all but one let fall the stones with which they were armed; but Constantine was killed, like another Goliath (as we are told), by a stone from the hand of a youth—his own adopted son Justus. As the sectaries proved obstinate in their errors, Symeon entered into conference with some of them; the effect was, that, being ignorant as to the grounds of his old religion, he became their convert, and, after spending three years at Constantinople in great uneasiness of mind, he fled, leaving all his property behind him, and took up his abode at Cibossa, where, under the name of Titus, he became the successor of Constantine. After a time, Justus was struck by the seeming inconsistency of the Paulician doctrines with a text which refers the spiritual as well as the material world to the same one Creator. He proposed the difficulty to Symeon, expressing a fear that they might both have been in error, and might have misled their followers; and, on finding that Symeon would not satisfy him, he went to the bishop of a neighbouring town, Colonia (now About Calahissar), and exposed the tenets of the sect. The bishop reported the case to the emperor, Justinian II, and in consequence of this information, Symeon, Justus himself, and many of their followers, were burnt to death on one large pile.

Among those who escaped this fate was an Armenian named Paul, who took up his abode near Phanaroea, at a place which is said to have derived its name, Episparis, from the sowing of spiritual tares there by the elder Paul, the Samosatene. The sect revived under the Armenian Paul, but at his death the headship of it was contested his two sons. Gegnaesius, the elder, to whom his father had given the name of Timothy, rested his claims on hereditary succession, while the younger, Theodore, relied on an immediate commission from heaven and their dispute reached the ears of Leo the Isaurian, who ordered Germanus, patriarch Constantinople, to examine Gegnaesius. The Paulician was skillful enough to meet all questions with answers which appeared satisfactory. He anathematized all who denied the orthodox faith, for by that name he secretly intended his own heresy. He anathematized all who refused to worship the cross, for by the cross he meant our Lord Himself stretching out his arms in prayer or benediction. He anathematized all who refused worship to the Theotokos, into whom the Saviour entered—understanding under this description the heavenly Jerusalem, into which Christ has entered as the forerunner of his elect. By the

catholic church he meant his own sect; by baptism, Christ the living water by the body and blood of Christ, the Saviour's words of instruction : he therefore anathematized all who rejected any of these, and having thus satisfied Germanus, he was sent home with favourable letters from the emperor.

The abhorrence which the Paulicians professed for images might have been supposed likely to recommend the party to the iconoclastic emperors. But it would seem that these princes rather feared to connect themselves with the disrepute which its other opinions had brought on it; and thus we find that Leo and his son, instead of favouring the Paulicians, transported many of them from Armenia into Thrace. After various fortunes, the headship of the sectaries had fallen to one Baanes, who is styled "the filthy", and may therefore be probably supposed to have sanctioned some of the immoralities which are too often lightly imputed to all heresiarchs. But when the Paulicians had sunk thus low, a reformer appeared in the person of a young man named Sergius.

Sergius was converted to Paulicianism by a female theologian. The historians of the sect relate that this woman, having fixed on him as one whom it was desirable to gain, entered into conversation with him, and, after some compliments on his learning and character, asked him why he did not read the Scriptures. He answered that such studies were not lawful for Christians in general, but only for the clergy—an idea which Chrysostom had strongly opposed, but which since his time had become fixed in the popular belief, although without any formal authority from the Church. "It is not as you think", she rejoined; "for there is no acceptance of persons with God, since He will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth". And she went on to tell him that the clergy mutilated and corrupted the word of God, and that such of them as did miracles would be found among those to whom Christ will say in the judgment day, "I never knew you". Sergius began to read the Scriptures, and under the tuition of his instructress, he learnt to apply to the Catholics all that is there said against the fleshly Israel, and to regard the Paulicians as the true spiritual church of Christ. He assumed the name of Tychicus and became a new founder of the sect, which is said to have held his writings in equal veneration with the Scriptures themselves. His own morals would seem to have been unimpeachable, since Photius and Peter of Sicily can only charge him with hypocrisy; and he reformed the morality of the Paulicians, in opposition to the principles of Baanes. For thirty-four years—from the reign of Irene to that of Theophilus—Sergius laboured indefatigably in the cause of Paulicianism. He is said to have indulged in unseemly boasting of his success; to have preferred himself to the earlier teachers of the party; to have styled himself the resplendent lamp, the shining light, the life-giving star, and even the Paraclete.

The emperor Nicephorus was friendly to the sect, and granted it toleration in Phrygia and Lycaonia. Theophanes tells us that he engaged in magical practices with the Manicheans who are called Paulicians, in order to obtain victory for his arms. Under Michael Rhangabe severe laws were enacted against these heretics; such of them as should be obstinate in their errors were to be put to death. A party in the church, headed by Theodore the Studite, opposed the infliction of death as the punishment of heresy; but Theophanes argues that this view is absurd, since St. Peter inflicted death on Ananias and Sapphira, and St. Paul says that persons who are guilty of certain sins are worthy of death. To these scriptural authorities for persecution Peter of Sicily adds another—the command, "Those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me".

Leo the Armenian, iconoclast as he was, continued the persecution of the Paulicians. The sectaries, as usually happens, were exasperated by such treatment. The deaths of some of their chiefs were avenged by the slaughter of a prefect and a bishop who had been active against them. They lived in constant hostility to their neighbours, and, as opportunity favoured, they broke out from their bounds, devastated, plundered, and slaughtered. Their female captives, it is said, were given up to promiscuous lust; the children were either killed

or sold to the Saracens; and Sergius found himself unable to restrain the excesses of his followers. Sergius himself was slain with his own axe by a man who had found him cutting wood, in the year 835. His reforms had led to the separation of the sect into two hostile branches; and after his death, his followers, wishing to clear themselves from the obloquy attached to the Baanites, fell on these, and carried on a bloody contest with them, until a "companion in travel" of Sergius, named Theodotus, succeeded in recalling both parties to a remembrance of their common faith.

After the re-establishment of images, under the regency of Theodora, the empress was urged by the victorious party to undertake the suppression of Paulicianism, whether by conversion or by force; and, as the sectaries resisted all attempts which were made to gain them, the fury of persecution was let loose among them. It is said that not less than 100,000 were slain by the sword, beheaded, drowned, or impaled. Among the victims was the father of Carbeas, captain of the guard to the prefect of the east. Carbeas, on hearing of his parent's fate, renounced his allegiance to the empire, and, with 5000 companions, sought a refuge among the Saracens. The caliph gladly welcomed the fugitives, and granted them leave to settle within his territory, where, on the same principle by which they had justified their occasional conformity to the church, they adopted externally the rites of Islam. Carbeas built or enlarged and fortified several towns, of which Tephrica was the chief and became the headquarters of the sect. Paulicians from other quarters flocked to the new home which was opened for them; and the numbers of the party were swelled by refugees who sought an asylum from the imperial laws, and, according to its enemies, by others who found an attraction in the license of morals which it granted to its members. The Paulicians harassed their neighbours of the empire by continual aggressions. Under the command of Carbeas, their forces, in conjunction with the Saracens, gained a great victory over Michael, the son of Theodora, under the walls of Samosata; and in the reign of the emperor Basil, Chrysocheir, the son-in-law of Carbeas, advanced through Asia Minor with an army made up of Paulicians and saracens, pillaged Ancyra, Nicaea, Nicomedia, and other cities, gave up images and relics to his followers for profanation, and stabled his horses in the cathedral of Ephesus. Basil was reduced to sue for peace; but Chrysocheir refused it except on the intolerable condition that he should give up the east to "the servants of the Lord". The emperor had no choice but to carry on the war; he advanced into the Paulician country, and took some of the towns, but was obliged to relinquish the siege of Tephrica. Chrysocheir again invaded the imperial territory; but his troops were defeated by one of Basil's generals, and he himself, as he fled, was closely followed by one Pylades, who had formerly been his captive. It was in vain that he reminded his pursuer of the kindness with which he had treated him; a wound from the lance of Pylades compelled him to drop from his horse, and, as he lay stunned by the fall, some other Greeks despatched him. His head was carried to the emperor, who fulfilled a vow and gratified his enmity by piercing it with three arrows. After the death of Chrysocheir, the Paulicians ceased to be formidable. Tephrica was destroyed, yet a remnant of the sect continued to assert its independence for a century later.

In another quarter, the heresy had been kept up by the descendants of those who were transported into Thrace by Constantine Copronymus. It was in order to guard the newly-founded church of Bulgaria from the infection of its Thracian neighbours, that Peter of Sicily, about the year 870, addressed to the archbishop of the Bulgarians the tract which is a chief source of information as to the sect, drawing his materials in part from the observations and inquiries which he had made during a residence of nine months at Tephrica, on a mission for negotiating an exchange of prisoners.

CHAPTER IX.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

Influence of the Papacy.

The preceding chapters have set before us the changes which took place in the position of the patriarchs during the seventh and eighth centuries—the sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem reduced to subjection under the Mahometan rule; the bishops of Constantinople becoming more and more tools and slaves of the imperial court; while in the west the power of the Roman bishop is greatly and rapidly increased. This advance of the papacy was much aided by the circumstance that Rome, although often taken by barbarians, never remained long in their possession. It alone retained its ancient character, while in all other quarters the old national distinctions were obliterated by successive invasions. The popes alone kept their ground amid the revolutions of secular powers; and their authority was vastly extended as nation after nation of the barbarian conquerors was brought within the sphere of Christian influence. As in former times the bishop of Rome had been considered by the orientals to represent the whole western church, so he now appeared to the new nations of the north and of the west as the representative and source of Christianity on earth. St. Peter was regarded as holding the keys of heaven, and as personally connected with his successors. The popes strengthened their position at once by detaching themselves from the Byzantine empire, and by entering into an alliance with the princes of the west on terms such as the empire had never admitted.

They were connected by mutual interest with the Frankish kings, especially with those of the second dynasty, and Charlemagne's conquests gave them a supremacy over the church of northern Italy, which they had in vain desired in the time of the Lombard princes. By the donations of Pipin and of Charlemagne they acquired a new secular power; and it would seem to have been in the latter half of the eighth century, or early in the ninth, that the forged donation of Constantine appeared, to assert for them a more venerable claim to a wider jurisdiction, and to incite the Frankish sovereigns to imitate the bounty of the first Christian emperor. Constantine, it was said, was baptized by Pope Sylvester, and at his baptism received the miraculous cure of a leprosy with which he had been afflicted; whereupon, in consideration of the superiority of ecclesiastical to secular dignity, he relinquished Rome to the pope, conferred on him the right of wearing a golden crown with other ensigns of sovereignty, and endowed the apostolic see with the Lateran palace, and with all the provinces of Italy or the western regions. This forgery seemed to justify the Romans in withdrawing themselves from the empire; it seemed to legitimize the possession of all that the popes had gained, since this was but a part of what was said to have been bestowed on their see by the first Christian emperor; and the fable retained its credit, although not altogether unquestioned, throughout the middle ages.

The mission of Augustine introduced the papal influence into England, where a new church arose, strongly attached to Rome, and fruitful in missionaries who established the Roman ascendancy in Germany and in Gaul. The English church owed subjection to the pope, not so much on account of his supposed succession to St. Peter, as because it derived its origin from Rome, and thus was included in the Roman patriarchate by the same principle which subjected the Abyssinians to the see of Alexandria. But as the papal power increased elsewhere, the subjection of England to it became also greater. The council of Cloveshoo,

assembled by Ethelbald, king of Mercia, opened with the reading of two letters from Zacharias, “the pontiff and apostolic lord, to be venerated throughout the world”; and it is acknowledged that the recital of these documents, in which he exhorts the English of every degree to reformation, under the threat of an anathema, was in obedience to his “apostolical authority”. In 785, two Roman legates—the first (as they said) who had been sent into England since the time of Augustine—visited this country, and with a view to the reformation of the church, councils were held in their presence in Mercia and in Northumbria. Offa, king of Mercia, then the most powerful of the English kingdoms, attended the Mercian assembly at Chalchythe. In consequence of some offence which he had taken, on political or other grounds, at Janbert, archbishop of Canterbury, he wished that Lichfield should be erected into an archiepiscopal see. Janbert strongly opposed a scheme by which his metropolitan authority was to be limited to the kingdoms of Kent and Sussex; but it is supposed that the legates at Chalchythe favoured the change, and with the sanction of Pope Adrian, Higbert, who had been bishop since 779, received the title of archbishop. Some years later, however, Kenulph, the second successor of Offa, having annexed Kent to Mercia, and being desirous to conciliate the clergy of his new territory, joined with Athelard, archbishop of Canterbury, in a request that Leo would again reduce the see of Lichfield to its original condition. Athelard went to Rome in order to press the suit; the pope consented, and with his license the new archbishopric was abolished by a council held at Cloveshoo in 803.

Ina, king of Wessex, in 725 resigned his crown, and went on pilgrimage to Rome, where he ended his days as a monk; and his example was followed by other Anglo-Saxon sovereigns. It has been said that the tribute of a penny from every hearth in England, afterwards known as Romescot or Peterpence, was first granted by Ina, and was confirmed by Offa in 794. But it would seem that the donation of Ina is imaginary, and that in the case of Offa a payment of 365 marks towards the lighting of St Peter's and the relief of pilgrims—an eleemosynary grant from the crown—has been confounded with the Romescot of a later time, which was a tax levied on the subject, and was interpreted by the advocates of the papacy as an acknowledgment that this island was held in fee under the successors of St. Peter.

Relations of Church and State.

The right of confirming elections to the papacy had been exercised by the Byzantine emperors, either personally or through their representatives, the exarchs, from the reconquest of Italy under Justinian until the iconoclastic disputes led to the omission of the form in the case of Zacharias; and the Carolingian emperors assumed the same privilege as a part of their sovereignty. The story that, during Charlemagne's visit to Rome in 774, Adrian, with a synod of a hundred and fifty-three bishops, bestowed on him and his successors the right of nominating the popes, is now rejected, and, with other such inventions, is supposed to have originated in later times from the wish of the Roman party to represent the superintendence which the Frank princes undeniably exercised over ecclesiastical affairs as if it were derived from the gift of the popes.

In the East, where no political power was attached to the episcopal office, the emperors had not usually interfered in the appointment of bishops, except at Constantinople and other cities in which they themselves resided. The second council of Nicaea enacted that bishops should be chosen by their episcopal brethren, and that any nomination by princes should be invalid. But in the new states of the west, the position of the bishops as great landowners, and the political importance which they acquired, occasioned a remarkable mixture of secular and spiritual things. Although it was again and again laid down by Frankish councils that the elections of bishops should be free, without any other condition than the approbation of the sovereign, the usual practice throughout the period appears to have been that bishops were appointed by the crown, whether the nomination were or were not followed

by a formal election on the part of the clergy and people. In 614 a synod at Paris enacted that a bishop should be appointed without any payment, by the concurrence of the metropolitan and bishops of the province with the clergy and people of the city. But Clotaire II, in ratifying the canons, introduced considerable alterations in favour of the royal prerogative; among them, he required that a bishop should be consecrated under a mandate from the crown, and reserved to himself the power of naming a clerk from his household to a vacant see, although he promised in so doing to have regard to the learning and merit of the nominee. It has been supposed that Charlemagne, by a capitulary of 803, professed to restore the ancient usage of election by the clergy and people; but no such enactment was really issued until the reign of Lewis the Pious, while it is certain that in the appointment of bishops the great emperor practically followed the example of his predecessors, and that he was imitated by his descendants.

In Spain, the fourth council of Toledo, in 633, enacted that a bishop should be chosen by the clergy and people of his city, and that the election should be approved by the metropolitan and synod of the province. But at the twelfth council of the same place, in 681, the appointment of bishops by the royal authority alone is mentioned as a matter of settled custom. The process by which this change was effected is unknown.

In England, although Wihtried, king of Kent, in 696, disclaimed the right of appointing bishops the royal authority influenced their appointment, as they were chosen by the witenagemot of each state in the presence of the king. And here, as in other countries, the influence of the crown gradually became more absolute. From letters written by Alcuin, a century after Wihtried's time, on a vacancy in the archbishopric of York, it appears that the ancient freedom of election was then giving way; that kings assumed an increased control over the choice of bishops, or even disposed of sees by gift. In the ninth century, the nomination of bishops had passed into the hands of the sovereign, while a shadow of the earlier system was kept up in a formal election of the person so appointed, and in the publication of his name from the pulpit of the cathedral, to which announcement the people replied by acclamations and wishes of long life to their new pastor.

The Frankish sovereigns, in their continual movements, required a staff of clergy to attend on them for the performance of divine service. At the head of this body was placed the archchaplain, whose office became one of great importance. Sometimes it was filled by a presbyter, sometimes by a bishop, who in such a case required a special dispensation for absence from his diocese; but, whether bishop or presbyter, the arch-chaplain stood next in dignity to the family of the sovereign, and at synods he took precedence even of archbishops. Combining the functions of chancellor with those of chaplain, he acted as a minister of the crown for spiritual affairs; he received reports from the bishops as to the state of their churches, prepared the king's ecclesiastical capitularies and other documents, and conducted his correspondence on matters which concerned the church. Such being the archchaplain's position, it depended on individual character whether he should sway the prince in the interest of the hierarchy, or the prince should by means of him obtain a control over the administration of the church.

The mixture of clergy and laity in the Frankish councils has been already mentioned. The capitularies bear a marked impress of clerical influence; but it was often possible for sovereigns, by the help of their lay vassals, to overrule the proposals of the bishops as to ecclesiastical affairs, or to carry measures notwithstanding their opposition. Sometimes, however, the clergy were assembled by themselves, as at Verne or Verneuil, in 755, where abbots for the first time appear as members of a Frankish council.

In Spain, from the time when king Recared and his nobles appeared at Toledo, for the purpose of arranging the change from Arianism to the catholic faith (A.D. 589), mixed councils of clergy and laity, summoned by the sovereign, were frequently held. At the earlier sessions of these, from the seventeenth council of Toledo, in 694, the affairs of the church were first discussed by the bishops and abbots, without the presence of the laity; but on the

fourth day, the nobles, the judges, and others, were called in to take a part in their deliberations.

Among the Anglo-Saxons, the kings and other laymen attended ecclesiastical synods, while the bishops sat in the *witenagemots*, or national assemblies. The part which the laity took, however, in councils, did not extend to matters purely spiritual, although it was for the witenagemot to confirm, by the authority of law, the decisions of the clergy in such matters. Bishops took precedence of the lay nobility; and sometimes the archbishops signed the acts of synods before the king himself, as was the case at Chalchythe in 785.

The claims of the ecclesiastical and secular judicatures in France were variously settled by successive enactments. It may be said in general, that, while the clergy were not amenable to secular judgment in questions between members of their own order, or in the case of ecclesiastical offences, the trial of questions between clerks and laymen belonged to a mixed tribunal of lay and spiritual judges. Priests and deacons were in no case to be tried except with the bishop's knowledge or co-operation; and in important criminal charges, this privilege was extended to the lower clergy. The principle of mixed tribunals was approved by Charlemagne; and although he seems to have in some of his laws exempted the clergy from all secular judgment in questions which concerned their own persons, this exemption was far short of that for which the high hierarchical party contended at a later time. For in cases which related to the possessions of clergymen, the secular judges still had a share the right of judicature was not regarded as inherent in the episcopal office, but as granted, and therefore revocable, by the sovereign, so that in the ninth century bishops are threatened with the loss of it if they neglect to exercise it rightly; and from metropolitans, as from secular judges, the appeal lay to the emperor, beyond whom there was no appeal. Among the Franks, as formerly under the Roman empire, there were many canons to prohibit clerks from carrying their grievances to the sovereign without abiding the judgment of their immediate superiors, or obtaining the leave of these Clotaire II, in his edict of 614, ordered that no such recourse to the king should be allowed, except in order to sue for pardon; but the royal letter of pardon was a protection against all punishment, and the bishops were bound to obey it.

In Spain, canons are found which forbid ecclesiastics to judge in cases of blood, or to inflict mutilation of the members.

In England, the judgment of clerks was as yet on the same footing with that of the laity. But this was before a mixed tribunal—the bishop sitting in the county-court with the ealdorman or earl, as the priests of the old Saxon heathenism had done; and the papal legates at the council of Chalchythe objected to the custom, as tending to implicate the bishops too much in worldly affairs. Notwithstanding their remonstrance, however, the practical usefulness of the system secured its continuance, until the spiritual jurisdiction was separated from the secular by William the Conqueror, at the instance of his Norman ecclesiastical advisers.

The Hierarchy.—Administration of the Church.

The metropolitan organization had originally grown out of an analogy with the civil divisions of the Roman empire. In the Frankish kingdom, where no such division existed, the system fell into decay, and although Boniface, under the authority of Pope Zacharias and with the countenance of Pipin and Carloman, attempted to restore it, his success was very imperfect. Charlemagne, when at Rome in 774, was urged by Adrian to undertake the revival of the metropolitan jurisdiction and established it not only in his original dominions, but in those which he acquired. But the new metropolitans had not the same influence as those of earlier times. In the national assemblies the metropolitan met the suffragan bishops as his peers, and a suffragan might by character or ability become more important than his ecclesiastical superior; while the growing connexion between France and Rome, and the

increase of the papal power, drew the Frankish clergy to look beyond their metropolitans to the yet higher authority of the popes.

In the eighth and ninth centuries we find frequent mention of Chorepiscopi—a title which in this period has some variety of application. Of those who were subject to the diocesan bishops, some had episcopal consecration, while the greater number were merely presbyters, enjoying a delegated authority in rural places. But besides these, there are frequent denunciations of chorepiscopi who were in the habit of wandering about, without any local authority, and of interfering with the rights of the established bishops by conferring orders and performing other episcopal acts. The chorepiscopi of this class who disturbed the Frankish church were for the most part from Ireland, where the peculiar system of the church encouraged the multiplication of bishops without local jurisdiction; while others may have been consecrated by chorepiscopi who had themselves received consecration as assistants to the diocesan bishops. But even when the original appointment and consecration were regular, chorepiscopi were often disposed to presume beyond their proper function. Charlemagne, in a letter, states that the proceedings of these persons had caused great trouble and scandal; that priests, deacons, and sub-deacons, who had been ordained by bishops, denied the validity of orders conferred by chorepiscopi; and that Pope Leo had disallowed the acts of these intruders. They are (he continues) not really bishops, since they neither have been consecrated by three bishops, nor possess episcopal titles to sees. Ordination, confirmation, veiling of nuns, consecration of churches and of altars, belong only to diocesan bishops—not to chorepiscopi or presbyters, who correspond to the seventy disciples, and not to the apostles. The emperor says that chorepiscopi had been made by bishops in ignorance of ecclesiastical decrees, and from a wish to devolve their own labour on others; and he forbids that any should be made in future. But in the following century we again meet with notices of this class, most commonly in the way of censure, or of prohibition from exceeding the limits of their commission.

Towards the end of the eighth century, the office of archdeacon acquired a new character and importance. In earlier times, there had been only one archdeacon in each diocese; but, with a view to a better superintendence of the clergy, the dioceses of the Frankish empire were now divided into archdeaconries, in which the archdeacons, although themselves of a lower degree, had jurisdiction over presbyters, and exercised all the ordinary administration except such acts as especially belonged to the episcopal order. The office became so lucrative that laymen attempted to intrude into it—an abuse which was forbidden by a capitulary of 805, and by many canons of later date. As the archdeacons were not removable except for some grave offence, it was soon found that many of them endeavoured to render themselves independent of their bishops and from canons of the ninth century it would appear that their exactions and the insolence of their followers were severely felt by the clergy subject to their jurisdiction.

The archdeaconries of the new organization were divided into deaneries (decania), each under an archpriest or rural dean (archi-presbyter) The clergy of each deanery met on the first of every month for conference on spiritual and ecclesiastical affairs. The conference was followed by a dinner; but complaints soon arose that these entertainments led to excesses which more than counterbalanced the benefits of the meeting. Hincmar, archbishop of Reims, in his injunctions of 852, found it necessary to denounce the abuse, and to lay down rules for moderation, restricting the allowance of the clergy on such occasions to three cups for each.

The bishops were required to visit throughout their dioceses every year. The expense of entertaining them on their circuits was often complained of by the clergy; with a view to limiting it, the seventh council of Toledo ordered that the bishop should not on such occasions take more than five (or, according to another reading, fifty) horses in his train, and that his stay in each parish should not exceed one day. But even after this limitation, the expense continued to be heavy, as appears from the list of provisions required by a Lombard capitulary

of 855, which includes a hundred loaves, four large swine, a lamb, a pig, fifty pints of wine, and a sufficiency of honey, oil, and wax. Lewis the Pious, in 829, charges his commissioners to inquire whether the bishops in their visitations are burdensome to the clergy. A capitulary of Charles the Bald, in 844, denounces the misbehaviour which was common among the attendants of bishops when on visitation, and provides that the clergy of five neighbouring parishes shall combine to supply provisions for the usual hospitality to their diocesan. The priest at whose house the entertainment is held is to contribute in the same proportion as the others, with "perhaps" the addition of firewood and utensils. The third council of Valence, in 855, censures an abuse which some bishops had introduced by exacting visitation-dues of their clergy at times when they omitted to visit.

The parochial system was not yet completely organized in the Frankish church; the people in country places were often dependent for divine offices on the clergy of the cathedral city, or on the chaplain of some neighbouring castle. The division of England into parishes has (as we have already seen) been ascribed to the Greek archbishop, Theodore; but, whatever his share in promoting it may have been, the general establishment of the system appears to have been slowly and gradually effected.

With a view of enforcing ecclesiastical discipline, it was attempted by frequent enactments to bind the clergy by strict local ties. No stranger was to be admitted to officiate without producing letters of license and recommendation from his bishop. Fugitive clerks were to be examined and sent home; wandering clergy or monks, who disturbed the church by teaching error or by raising unnecessary questions, were to be apprehended, carried before the metropolitan, and put to suitable penance; all the clergy of a diocese were to be subject to the bishop's jurisdiction. Presbyters were obliged to remain in the diocese where they were ordained; some councils required a promise that they would do so, and Charlemagne even imposed an oath to that effect. No bishop was to receive a clerk from another diocese, or to promote him to a higher degree; but, while this was absolutely forbidden in a capitulary for France, the corresponding enactment for Lombardy allows it with the consent of the bishop to whose diocese the clerk had belonged. And it is evident, from facts which continually meet us in history and biography, that with such consent it was not unusual for clergymen to pass from one diocese, or even from one kingdom, to another.

During the earlier ages, ordination had not been conferred without a title (*i.e.* without assigning a particular sphere of labour), except in rare and extraordinary instances, such as that of St. Jerome. The same rule was now often re-enacted; but an exception was necessarily made in the case of missionaries, and was by degrees extended to other cases. Although the ancient canons as to the requisites for ordination were still in force, an important novelty was introduced, after the sixth century, by means of the tonsure. This was regarded as conferring the character of a clerk, without ordination to any particular grade of the ministry; and thus clerks were made in great numbers, without any regard to the canonical conditions or impediments of ordination. It may easily be conceived that much disorder was introduced by these "acephalous" (or headless) clerks, who enjoyed the immunities of the clerical state without being bound by its obligations.

The example of the royal household in France induced persons of rank to establish domestic chaplains. These were often disposed to set the bishops at defiance; and it appears from the testimony of many councils that the institution had an unfavourable effect on the religion of the people in general. It is represented that the absence of the lord from the parish-church encourages his dependants to absent themselves; that the clergy have no opportunity of enforcing the duties of the rich and powerful; and there are frequent complaints of attempts to withdraw the ecclesiastical dues from the bishops and parochial clergy, in order to provide for the chaplains by means of them. But in addition to these evils, the chaplains were usually persons of low and disreputable character; they were miserably paid, disrespectfully treated by their employers, and required to perform degrading services. The position and habits of

chaplains were found to bring discredit on the whole body of the clergy; and hence Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, in the reign of Lewis the Pious, took occasion to write a treatise in vindication of “the privilege and rights of the priesthood”. After showing from Scripture the estimation in which the clergy ought to be held, he proceeds by way of contrast to describe the abuses of his own time. Every person of any pretension to station, he says, then kept a priest of his own—“not to obey him, but continually to exact obedience from him, and that in unlawful as well as in lawful things”. The chaplains were employed to do the work of bailiffs, butlers, grooms, or dog-keepers, to wait at table, to lead ladies’ horses. As no respectable clergyman would accept such a position, the patrons, whose chief object was to obtain an excuse for deserting the public offices of religion and emancipating themselves from the control of the clergy, cared nothing how gross the ignorance of their chaplains might be, or how infamous their lives. They usually took one of the serfs on their estates, or procured a person of servile birth for the purpose, and were offended if the bishop hesitated to ordain him as a matter of course. Even if we might implicitly believe all that has lately been written against the English domestic chaplains of the seventeenth century, it would appear that the class had lost nothing in dignity between the age of Agobard and that of Eachard.

A new species of ecclesiastical officers arose in Gaul during the sixth and seventh centuries, under the title of advocates, *defensors*, or *vicedomini*. Except in name, these bore no resemblance to the *defensors* of the earlier ages; the new office grew out of the peculiar circumstances of the Frankish church. The bishops and clergy required the assistance of force to protect them against the outrages of their rough and lawless neighbours. Their landed possessions imposed on them duties which, if not altogether inconsistent with their spiritual office, might, at least, be more conveniently performed by laymen—such as the exercise of secular judicature, and the leading of the contingents which their estates were required to furnish to the national army. Moreover, as, by the Germanic laws, none but freemen, capable of bearing arms, were entitled to appear in law-suits, the clergy (like women, old or infirm persons, and children) required substitutes who might appear for them, and, if necessary, might go through the ordeal of battle in their behalf. For such purposes it was found expedient to call in the aid of some neighbouring layman, distinguished by influence or by personal prowess; and his services were usually recompensed by the use of lands belonging to the church, and adjacent to his own, in addition to a share of the fines inflicted in his court, and to other pecuniary dues. The appointment of an advocate was at first a voluntary act; but Charlemagne ordered that every church should be provided with such a champion. The qualifications for the office were very particularly defined, with a view of guarding against misconduct or encroachment; and the advocates were subject to the inspection of the imperial commissioners. The sovereign assigned advocates to churches which were themselves unable to find any. As such grants had the nature of a favour, the advocates thus appointed required higher terms than those whom churches chose for themselves; and from them the others gradually learnt to assume a superiority over the ecclesiastical bodies with which they were connected, to claim dues which absorbed a large portion of the revenues, and to become tyrants instead of protectors, both to the clergy and to their tenants. It was not, however, until after the period which we are now surveying that their relation to the church assumed this character.

Another encroachment on the church arose out of the system of lay patronage, which had become general throughout the west. In some cases, the right of presentation to a church expired with the founder, while in others it was continued to his representatives. But patrons were not always content with the power of nominating clerks. Sometimes the builder of a church reserved to himself a certain portion of its revenues; sometimes the church was built on speculation—the founder expecting to get more than a reimbursement from the oblations, while he made a composition to pay the incumbent a certain allowance. Against this practice canons were directed, which forbade bishops to consecrate churches erected on such

conditions; but the patron was considered to have a legal interest in the preservation and right disposal of the property belonging to his church. Charlemagne allows the sale of churches and Lewis the Pious enacted that, if the incumbent of a church should have a surplus of income, he should pay “due service” to his landlord. The division of inheritance was some times carried into the disposal of church-patronage, so that an “altar” might be divided into several portions, belonging to a like number of priests; such partitions were forbidden by a capitulary of Lewis the German, in 851.

A canon of the fourth council of Toledo provides that, if the founder or benefactor of a church, or his descendants, fall into poverty, an allowance shall be made to them out of its revenues.

The question of patronage was a fruitful source of disagreements between bishops and secular lords. Canons were passed for the purpose of guarding against abuses on both sides—enacting that no layman should present or eject a clerk without the consent of the bishop, while, on the other hand, the bishop was forbidden to reject a presentee except on good and valid grounds.

In the beginning of the period, we find many denunciations of simony in the writings of Gregory the Great. He complains of this “first of heresies”, this “buying and selling of doves in the temple”, as prevailing in all quarters—in Gaul, in Germany, in Africa, in Greece and Epirus, in the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; and he continually urges both princes and high ecclesiastics to join with him in labouring to suppress it. But in defiance of all denunciations and penalties, the evil continued, and from age to age there are frequent complaints both against patrons who, for the sake of gifts, nominated worthless persons to ecclesiastical office, and against bishops who corruptly conferred *ordinatio*.

The Frankish church continued to increase in wealth. Estates, sometimes of very great extent, were bestowed on it with the declared object of securing for the giver the remission of his sins and the salvation of his soul. And the inducements to make such donations were increased by the system of precarious contracts—so called because the giver, in endowing the church with his lands, prayed that the use of them might be allowed him for his lifetime, or perhaps that it might be continued to one or more persons in succession after him. Thus many who would have scrupled to deprive themselves of the income arising from an estate, were enabled to perform an act of bounty without expense to themselves, or even to make a profit by it; for the church, in consideration of the reversion assured to itself, in many cases allowed a donor to enjoy not only his own land, but other lands of perhaps much greater value than that of which his gainful piety was to deprive his heirs. With a view to the limitation of this abuse, it was enacted by the council of Epernay in 846, that a donor of land should not be allowed to receive more than twice the value of his gift by way of addition; that kings should not sanction precarious contracts except at the request of the church; and that, agreeably to ancient custom, the contract should require renewal every fifth year.

The lands of the church were either cultivated by its serfs for the benefit of the owners, or they were let to tenants, whether free or servile, who paid a fixed proportion of the produce by way of rent. In addition to these lands and to the oblations, the ecclesiastical revenues were now swelled by the general imposition of tithes. Under the old Roman system, a tenth of the produce of land was paid by the *coloni* to the state as rent; and when lands were granted on this condition to a corporation, a second tenth—a ninth of the remaining produce—was paid by the tenant to whom it was underlet. These two payments were known by the name of “tenths and ninths”. The church, as a large holder of lands under the state, exacted the ninths from its tenants; while sometimes, by special grant, it was excused from the payment of the fiscal tenth, and consequently was entitled to receive tenths as well as ninths for its own benefits.

The ecclesiastical or Levitical tithe was a third charge, distinct from these rent-payments. The earliest canon which required it, was passed by the council of Macon in 585.

But it would seem that this canon had little effect, and no attempt to reinforce it was made by the Frankish councils during the remainder of the Merovingian period. Pipin for the first time added the authority of the secular power to that of the church for the exaction of tithes; but little was done until the reign of Charlemagne, who by a capitulary of 779 enacted that they should be paid. The payment was enforced, not only by excommunication, but by heavy civil penalties, graduated according to the obstinacy of the delinquent and the obligation was extended to the newly-acquired territories beyond the Rhine, where (as we have already seen) it had the effect of exciting a strong prejudice against the Christian faith. The council of Frankfort (A.D. 794) represents the opposition to tithes as one of the offences by which a late scarcity had been provoked; devils, it is said, had been seen devouring the hoarded corn of those who refused the church its due, and voices had been heard in the air, uttering reproof of the general sin. The tithe had at first been exacted only for corn. It was then extended to other productions of the soil, such as flax and wine, and in some places to the increase of animals. The enactments of Charlemagne's time usually speak of it as payable on the "whole property"; but it was long before the clergy succeeded in establishing a general compliance with their claims in this respect.

The capitulary of 829 forbids the receiver of tithe to give the payers food, or any other consideration which might lead them to suppose that the payment depended on their own will.

In England it appears that tithes were not enforced until about the end of Bede's lifetime. The mention of them in the so-called "Excerptions of Egbert", archbishop of York, is not to be relied on; but Boniface, whose exertions contributed to the establishment of the impost among the Franks and their dependents, is a witness for the payment of it in his native country.

The abuse by which the Frankish princes granted the beneficial use of church-lands to laymen had defied the efforts of Boniface, and continued throughout the reign of Charlemagne. The holders of such benefices were now required by canons to pay tenths and ninths to the church, and also to repair, or contribute to repair, the churches which were situated on their lands. But it would appear that great difficulty was found in enforcing the canons against this powerful class; the council of Tours, in the last year of the reign, states that complaints had often been made to the *missi* of their neglect to pay tenths and ninths, but that such complaints met with no attention.

The disposal of the church's income was still in the hands of the bishops; but in the new kingdoms of the west the deacons did not, as such, take the same part in the administration of it by which their order had become so important in the earlier ages. The steward, by whom the bishop was assisted in this part of his administration, might be either a deacon or a priest; his dignity was next to that of the bishop, and he had the guardianship of the see when vacant. In some places the division of the funds was quadripartite—one portion being assigned to the bishop and his household, one to the rest of the clergy, one to the poor and strangers, and one to the fabric and expenses of the church; in other places, it was tripartite—a third to the bishop, one to the clergy, and one to the necessities of the church. The tripartite division was known as the Spanish custom; the quadripartite, as the Roman: and bishops are found announcing that, although entitled to the third part which was prescribed by the canon of Toledo, they will be content with a quarter, agreeably to the usage of Rome. The bishops were sometimes charged by the inferior clergy with taking more than their due proportion, and from the sixth century downwards canons were passed in order to restrain them from doing so. Even where the full amount of the clergy's share was fairly paid to them as a body, the allowance of each individual still depended on the will of the bishop, who thus had every clerk at his mercy. Where the tithe was paid in kind, it is probable that some composition was agreed on between the local clergy and the bishops, in order to avoid the inconveniences of removing it. The council of Worms, in 829, ordered that bishops who had a

sufficient income from other property should relinquish their canonical share of the tithes for the uses of the church and of the poor.

Capitularies were often passed to prevent the payers of tithes from taking the disposal of them into their own hands, instead of leaving it to the bishops; and from making the payment to some church which private reasons might lead them to prefer, rather than to that church which was rightfully entitled to it. In such cases, the *missi* were to take care that proper restitution should be made.

There is some inconsistency in the enactments of Spanish councils as to the dues which should be paid to the bishops. The second council of Braga, in 572, forbids them to take the third part of the oblations, and instead of it allows them only a yearly payment of two *solidi* from each parish. The fourth council of Toledo, held in 633, under a different government, in enacting that the bishop should not take more than a third, makes no reference to the canon of Braga. But another council at Toledo, in 646, re-enacts that canon; and one yet later, in 655, reverts to the system of allowing the bishop a third. The exaction of two *solidi* afterwards found its way into France; but there, in course of time, the bishops, instead of acknowledging it as a substitute for the third part, required it as an additional due, under the name of *cathedraticum*.

The burdens imposed on the clergy by the expenses of the bishop's visitation have already been mentioned. The new institution of archdeacons, who claimed dues in right of their office, also contributed to impoverish the parochial clergy.

The estates of the church in France, with the exception of the parish-priest's *mansus* or glebe, were subject to the payment of all the ordinary taxes, unless exempted by special privilege. The case was very different in England, where church-land was exempt from all but what was styled the "threefold necessity"—the obligation to contribute towards the national forces, the building of fortresses, and the expenses of bridges and highways.

As in earlier ages, canons continued to be passed forbidding the clergy to engage in secular employments.

In England, the mass-priests were required to learn some handicraft, to practise it, and to teach it to their clerks; not, however, with a view to their own gain, but in order that they might avoid the temptations of idleness, and might have the means of relieving the poor. And similar orders are found in France and elsewhere.

The high social position of ecclesiastics in the Germanic kingdoms appears from the rates at which their lives were valued. The payment known by the name of *wehr*, an institution common to the whole German race, (but by no means limited to it), was originally intended as a composition which should satisfy the relations of a slain person for his life, and re-establish peace between them and the slayer, so that the nation might not, on account of private enmities, be deprived of the service of its members. The principle by which the female relations of the slain man were excluded from any share of this payment—namely, that they were not capable of carrying on a feud—might naturally have been considered as extending to the clergy; but when these became a powerful order, the church claimed a *wehr* for their death. In France, the *wehr* of a presbyter was equal to that of a count; the *wehr* of a bishop, to that of a duke. In England an archbishop was rated in this respect as equal to an atheling, or prince of the blood; a bishop, to an ealdorman, or earl; a mass-priest, to a thane or lesser noble.

In days when the lay nobles were unable to read or write, the possession of learning marked out ecclesiastics as the only persons qualified for many important offices. The bishops, as men of counsel, got precedence of the counts, the men of the sword. It was the policy of Charlemagne to elevate the hierarchy by way of a counterpoise to the power of his rude vassals. He orders that all shall pay obedience to the bishops, and declares that those who refuse it shall have no home within the empire, "even if they were his own sons".

As the secular advantages of the clerical profession became greater, it was sought by members of the dominant race, who had before left it in the hands of the conquered. The occurrence of barbaric names among the clergy from the seventh century indicates the time when Franks began to enter into ecclesiastical orders; and very soon after, the effect of the change is seen in the necessity of laws to restrain the clergy from secular habits and occupations. Bishops led to the field the troops which their lands were required to furnish towards the national army, and not only gave their personal attendance (which was a matter of obligation, and might in some respects have been beneficial), but engaged in bodily service. They were unwilling to admit that their spiritual calling could deprive them of the birthright which belonged to every free Frank, to share in the wars of his people; they wished, too, by proving themselves men of action, to show that their property was not to be invaded with impunity by their lay neighbours, and possibly to preserve their estates from being applied by the sovereign to reward the military services of other men. Boniface endeavoured to suppress such practices: it was enacted that the clergy should not carry arms; that only so many of them should accompany the army as might be requisite for the duties of chaplains, and that these should confine themselves to their proper functions. But the reform seems not to have lasted long; Charlemagne renews the orders of his father's time, and exhorts the clergy, instead of bearing arms, to trust in God for protection. A suspected document represents him as explaining that the object of such enactments was not, as the bishops had supposed, to deprive them of their honours. But even during the remaining years of his reign fresh prohibitions were necessary; and when the strong hand of the great emperor was removed, the warlike inclinations of the Frank bishops were displayed in a greater degree than ever. In England also the clergy were disposed to bear arms, as a right belonging to their free condition, and canons were passed to check the practice.

While the Frankish laws restrained the pugnacity of the clergy, care was also taken to prevent the owners of property from evading the obligations attached to it under colour of ordination, or of the monastic profession.

Thus we find an order in 799 that no noble should receive the tonsure unless after an examination of his case before the bishop of the diocese, and that if such a clerk should afterwards wish to reside on his own land, he should perform the same military service as others.

With the carrying of arms other secular habits and amusements are forbidden to the clergy—as the keeping of hounds and hawks, games of chance, noisy entertainments, worldly songs and instrumental music, and the company of minstrels and buffoons.

The most remarkable regulations as to the marriage of the clergy during this period belong to the east—being those of the Trullan council (A.D. 691). This council is strongly opposed to second marriages. Presbyters who persist in such marriages are to be deposed; if the second wife be dead, or if the husband separate from he, he shall be allowed to hold his rank, but shall be excluded from priestly functions. If a priest, a deacon, or a subdeacon marry a widow, he shall separate from his wife, shall be suspended, and shall be incapable of higher promotion. The council forbids, under pain of deposition, the practice of African and Libyan bishops, who were reported to cohabit with their wives; the wife of a bishop is ordered to separate from him, and to go into a convent. It censures the practice of the Armenians, who required that the clergy should be of priestly family, and allowed those who were so born to officiate as singers and readers without receiving the tonsure; and it forbids the clergy to marry after their ordination as subdeacons. But in its 13th canon, after stating that the Roman church exacted of persons ordained as presbyters or deacons a promise to abstain from their wives, the council expressly sanctions the contrary practice, and grounds its sanction on the “apostolical canons”. No promise is to be required, no separation is to be enforced; deposition is threatened against any one who shall deprive priests, deacons, or subdeacons of their wives, and against all members of these orders who under pretence of religion shall forsake their

partners. And, while the 29th canon allows the clergy of “barbaric” churches to separate, if they think it their duty to do so, and if their wives consent, the permission is declared to be granted only in condescension to the narrow scrupulousness which may be expected in such churches.

A council which in this and other points directly and avowedly contradicted the principles and usages of Rome was not likely to find favour with the popes, and as we have seen, it was rejected by Sergius I. But the sanction which it gave to the marriage of the clergy has ever since continued to regulate the discipline of the Greek church.

In the west, the period presents us with many enactments against the marriage of the clergy. The Merovingian kings added their authority to confirm the ecclesiastical canons which forbade it. But it would seem that, notwithstanding the frequency of the prohibitions, many of the clergy continued to marry—more especially where the authority of the popes was not fully established, as in Lombardy, Spain, and some parts of Gaul and of Germany. The see of Chur, in the Grisons, was hereditary in a family of bishops who combined the powers of spiritual and civil government. The wife of one of these, about the middle of the seventh century, in signing documents, styled herself *episcopa*; and the marriage of the bishops implies that the clergy were also at liberty to marry.

A question put by Augustine to Gregory the Great seems to show that marriage had been usual among the British clergy. The law of the Anglo-Saxon church on this subject was the same with that of Rome; but here too there is frequent proof that the clergy continued to enter into the married state; nor was their marriage annulled or the issue of it declared illegitimate until the latter part of the twelfth century.

As in the earlier periods, the canons for the enforcement of celibacy are accompanied by many which indicate the disastrous effects of such measures. There are very frequent enactments as to the entertainment of women in the houses of the clergy. The fourth council of Toledo (A.D. 633) renews the orders of earlier Spanish councils that the concubines of clerks shall be sold; the ninth council of the same place (A.D. 655) adds that their children shall be serfs of the church. Some canons forbid the clergy to have as inmates of their houses even those nearest female relatives who had been allowed by the council of Nicaea,—alleging by way of reason that other persons had often been introduced under the pretence of relationship, and that even the laws of nature had been violated. The councils of Charlemagne’s reign in general, however, are content with renewing the Nicene rule.

An important attempt at reform was made about the year 760 by the institution of the canonical life. The title of canons (*canonici*), which had formerly been given to all the clergy, on account of their being enrolled in the canon or register of the church, and entitled to maintenance from its funds, was now applied in a new meaning, to designate clergy who lived under a canon or rule, resembling that of the monastic communities. The idea of such an institution was not new; for in earlier times Eusebius of Vercelli, Hilary of Arles, and the great Augustine had shown the example of living together with their clergy; and more recently a like practice had been usual in missionary bodies, where the bishop lived with his staff of clergy and monks. But it was now reduced to a regular system by Chrodegang, a nephew of Pipin, and archbishop of Metz.

Chrodegang’s scheme was in great measure an adaptation of the Benedictine rule to the different circumstances of the clergy. The bishop held a place corresponding to that of the Benedictine abbot, the archdeacon answered to the provost or prior, the seniors had the same oversight in both systems. Like Benedict, the father of the canonical institute prescribed a common dwelling, an uniform dress, a common table, a common dormitory, unless where the bishop should be pleased to allow an exception. The clergy were required to attend certain services daily. Every day they were to practise manual labour, and were to devote certain portions of their time to study. The younger members of the society were to show respect to the elders, as by rising and bowing when they passed, by asking their benediction, and by

standing in their presence, unless specially permitted to sit down. All were to confess to the bishop in Lent, and again in autumn; stripes or imprisonment were threatened as the penalties for going to any other confessor. All who were not prevented by sin were to communicate every Sunday and on other chief festivals. Articles of clothing were to be supplied at stated times; the elders were then to give up the clothes which they had worn, and these were to be transferred to the juniors. All were to take their turns in the services of the house; each was in his order to cook for a week, the archdeacon and the cellarer being the only exceptions. Laymen were not to be admitted, except for some special purpose, such as that of assisting in the kitchen and they were to leave the house as soon as their work was done.

The dietary of the canons was more liberal than that prescribed by the Benedictine rule. They were permitted to eat flesh, except during penitential seasons. They had an allowance of wine (or of beer, if they preferred it), graduated according to their rank—for priests and deacons, three cups at dinner and two at supper; for subdeacons, two at each meal; for the lower orders, two at dinner and one at supper. There were to be seven tables in the hall, appropriated respectively to the bishop, to the various orders of canons, to strangers, and to the clergy of the city, who on Sundays and other festivals dined in the college, and partook of the instruction which was given in the chapter-house. Edifying books were to be read at meals, and, in order that they might be heard, silence was to be kept, “because it is necessary that, when one taketh his bodily food, then also the soul should be refreshed with spiritual food”.

The most important difference from the Benedictine rule was, that the canons were allowed to enjoy individual property—whether that which they had possessed before entering into the society, or such fees and presents as they might receive for the performance of religious offices. They were, however, obliged at their death to leave all to the brethren

From Metz the rule of Chrodegang soon made its way to other cities. The number of its chapters was increased by additions from 34 to 86. Charlemagne even wished to reduce the whole of the clergy to this system; and, although the attempt failed, and the great majority of the clergy continued to live as seculars, many colleges of canons were formed under the government of abbots, in addition to the cathedral bodies for which the scheme had originally been intended. The rule was sanctioned for general use by a great council at Aix-la-Chapelle under Lewis the Pious, in 816; and by the middle of the ninth century it was established in almost all the cathedrals of France, Germany, and Italy, and had also been adopted in England. The clergy found their account in the apparent strictness of the new system, as a means of recovering much of that popular admiration which the monks had long enjoyed to the prejudice of the hierarchical orders; and in consequence of this strictness, donations were largely bestowed on the canonical societies. The cathedral chapters became wealthy and powerful, and soon began to assert a claim to act as the bishop's advisers, and to share in the administration of the diocese.

Monasticism

During these centuries the monks played an important part in western Christendom. The missions to the Germanic nations were chiefly their work; they planted colonies in lonely places, where towns soon grew up, as at Fulda, St. Gall, Eichstedt, and Fritzlar; and with the knowledge of religion they spread that of agriculture and civilization among the people. Through the employment of monks in missionary labour, ordination was more largely introduced into their ranks, as a necessary qualification for missionary duties. In some cases, sees were usually filled with monks from certain abbeys—an arrangement the more natural because learning was chiefly cultivated in the monastic societies. Thus Strasburg received its bishops from Munster in Alsace, Spires from Weissenburg, Constance from Reichenau or St. Gall.

The reputation of sanctity continued to wait on the monks. The term religion, which had been specially applied to the monastic profession by a council at Orleans as early as 549, became more and more restricted to it. Entrance on the monastic state was regarded as a second baptism. The Penitential ascribed to Theodore of Canterbury curiously follows out this idea by ordering that the novice shall for seven days have his head covered with the cowl, as the head of the newly-baptized was covered with the chrism or veil; and a like order, although with an abridgment of the time to three days, was made under Lewis the Pious in 817. Persons of high rank flocked into the cloisters; it was no unusual thing even for kings and queens to resign their royalty and to assume the monastic habit.

During the earlier part of the period there was a considerable variety of rules. That of St. Columban for a time appeared to rival the Benedictine code in popularity. It became not uncommon to combine the two; but by degrees the rule of St. Benedict triumphed, as being marked in a greater degree by practical sense, less rigorous, and more elastic than the others. With slight modifications in particular cases, it was commonly adopted in France, where a great excitement in its favour was produced about the middle of the eighth century by the alleged relics of the founder, which were said to have been translated to Fleury on the Loire about a hundred years before, when the parent monastery of Monte Cassino had been laid waste by the Lombards. In England, too, where the Benedictine rule was introduced by Wilfrid, it soon became general, although not without some mixture of the old national usages. But the Spanish monasteries continued until the ninth century to be governed by rules which had been compiled, partly from eastern sources, by Isidore of Seville, Fructuosus of Braga, and other native bishops.

The monasteries in general continued to be subject to the jurisdiction of their diocesan bishops; but exemptions, of which we have already seen traces in the sixth century, now became more common, and the authority of Gregory the Great had an important share in advancing the practice. It would appear, however, that the reason of such exemptions in this period is not to be sought in any ambition or assumption on the part of the monks, but in the oppressive conduct of bishops. These from the seventh century began to claim a share in the gifts bestowed on monasteries. They exacted unreasonable payments from the monks for the dedication of their churches, for the consecration of chrism, for ordaining their clergy and installing their abbots. A large part of the revenues was absorbed by the expense of visitations; and in addition to this, the bishops extorted heavy fees under the names of *cathedralicum* and the like. Where the choice of an abbot belonged to the monks, the bishops often endeavoured to wrest it from them, and exercised it without any regard to the welfare of the house, or to the pretensions of the more eminent members, who might have reasonably expected to succeed to the headship. The grossness of the tyranny practised by some prelates may be inferred from the fact that the monastic bodies often appealed against it to synods, and that these, although composed of bishops, felt themselves obliged to condemn it in strong terms, and to forbid its continuance. In some cases during the eighth century, it was provided that, if the diocesan bishop would not perform his functions with respect to a monastery on reasonable terms, the abbot might apply to another. On the whole, it may be said that the exemptions of this period were sought not so much for the sake of emancipation from the rightful authority of the bishops, as for relief from their rapacity. The bishop still retained his general supervision of religion and morals in the exempt monasteries; he was even entitled to inquire into the administration of the temporalities, while he was restrained from acts of plunder and oppression.

When some monasteries had obtained such privileges, it became usual with founders to insist that those which they established should stand on a level with others in this respect. There were, too, certain monasteries which were styled royal—either from having been founded by princes, or from having obtained their special protection; and these were exempt from all jurisdiction except that of the sovereign, which was exercised through the *missi* and

the bishops. Some monastic houses, of more than ordinary dignity, had bishops of their own, resident within their walls, as was the case at St. Denys. And in addition to these, it appears that the popes had already commenced a practice of granting exemption from all authority but their own. The first instance is commonly said to have been a grant from Zacharias to the abbey of Fulda; but the genuineness of the document is much questioned. If genuine, it was granted at the request of Boniface himself, and therefore not with an intention to injure the rights of the diocesan. But when the archbishopric and the abbacy which had been united in the apostle of Germany were separated, the privileges conferred on Fulda, and the renown which it acquired as the resting-place of his remains, excited the jealousy of Lull, his successor in the see of Mayence. The archbishop complained that the exemption wrongfully interfered with his jurisdiction. He is said to have persecuted the abbot, Sturmi, by unscrupulous means—even inducing Pipin, by a charge of treason, to banish him for two years; and the enmity between the two continued to the end of the abbot's life, so that, on his death-bed, in declaring his forgiveness of all men, he thought it necessary to mention Lull by name, as being the person who most especially needed it.

Exemptions existed also in the patriarchate of Constantinople, where some monasteries were discharged from the bishop's authority and subject to the metropolitan, while others were subject to the patriarch only. In token of these privileges, the metropolitan or patriarchal crosier was erected over the altar in the chapel of the monastery. The second council of Nicaea allowed abbots, if they were presbyters, to ordain the lower clergy of their monasteries. The rule was adopted in the west, and from this and other circumstances it came to pass that the inmates of a monastery, instead of being mostly laymen, as in earlier ages, now belonged, with very few exceptions, to some grade of the hierarchy.

The age of admission to the monastic community was variously fixed. The Trullan council lays down that it ought not to be under ten. Theodore of Canterbury names fifteen as the age for monks, and sixteen or seventeen for nuns. The capitularies of 789 re-enact the old African canons which forbade the reception of women before the age of twenty-five, unless for some special reason. But besides those who took the vows on themselves, children might be devoted by their parents to the monastic state; and in this case, as in the other, there was no release from its obligations. Charlemagne, however, endeavoured to put some limit to the practice, by ordering that, "saving the authority of the canons", girls should not be veiled until they were old enough to understand their engagement.

Many orders are found against the admission of serfs into monasteries without the consent of their masters, and of freemen without licence from the sovereign. It was not unusual to make a false profession of withdrawing from the world, for the sake of escaping from military service. In order to check this abuse, Charlemagne orders, in 805, that those who forsake the world shall be obliged to live strictly according to rule, either as canons or as monks.

Although the observance of the same rule was a bond of union between monastic societies, no more intimate connexion was as yet organized in the west. Some of the greater monasteries had cells or priories dependent on them; but, except on this very limited scale, there was no affiliation of one religious house to another, nor was there any subjection of many to a common head, as had been the case in the system of St. Pachomius. It was usual for an abbot, in sending forth one of his monks to found a new community, to release him from the vow of obedience so soon as he should be able to establish a footing. During the earlier part of the period, it was forbidden to an abbot to have more than one monastery, although Gregory the Great allowed it in some cases; but this rule was afterwards disregarded. Pluralities, both ecclesiastical and monastic, became frequent, and sometimes both kinds were held by the same person. Thus about the year 720, Hugh, a member of the Carolingian family, was at once bishop of Paris, Rouen, and Bayeux, and abbot of Fontenelle and Jumieges. In the instances where a see was usually filled from a particular monastery, the bishops often united

the abbacy with their higher dignity; and where bishops were able to usurp the power of nomination to an abbacy, they sometimes took the office for themselves. In this manner Sidonius, bishop of Constance, who had already got possession of the abbey of Reichenau, resolved in 759 to make himself master also of that of St. Gall; and, although we are told by the monastic historians that his rapacity was punished by a death like that of Arius, the next bishop, John, not only engrossed the same rich preferment, but towards the end of his life formed a scheme of providing for his three nephews by transferring the bishopric to one of them, and an abbacy to each of the others.

Many of the monastic societies were specially exempted by sovereigns from all public imposts and tolls. But such exemptions were as often tokens of poverty on the part of the house as of extraordinary royal favour. Thus in a list of the Frankish monasteries, drawn up at Aix-la-Chapelle in 817, where they are ranged in three classes, as owing to the prince both gifts and military service, as owing gifts only, or as free from all duty except prayer, the most distinguished foundations are for the most part included in the most heavily burdened class.

As monasteries grew rich, some evil consequences followed. The vow of poverty was considered to be satisfied by the renunciation of individual property. Where its obligation was felt as matter of conscience, the monks retained their original simplicity of dress and food, while their superfluous wealth was spent on other objects, such as the erection of costly buildings. But very commonly the possession of the means of luxury introduced the enjoyment of it. In the east, the confessor Maximus, in the middle of the seventh century, denounces the disorderly lives of monks, and says that their profession of piety was no better than hypocrisy. Charlemagne in 811 censures the abbots as caring only to swell the numbers of their monks, and to obtain good chanters and readers, without any solicitude as to their morals. He sarcastically asks how the monks and clergy understand the text against entangling themselves with the affairs of this life; whether they suppose the only difference between themselves and secular men to consist in their being unmarried and carrying no arms; whether those can be said to have forsaken the world who are incessantly striving to increase their possessions by all sorts of means—who use the hopes of heaven and the terrors of hell, the names of God and the saints, to extort gifts not only from the rich but from the poor and ignorant, and by diverting property from the lawful heirs drive many to theft and robbery. How, he continues, can they be said to have forsaken the world who suborn perjury in order to acquire what they covet? or those who retain their secular property, and are surrounded by bands of armed men?

Abbots, as well as bishops, were addicted to war, to hunting and hawking, to games of chance, to the company of minstrels and jesters. There are many ordinances against irregularities of this kind—some of them extending to abbesses also; and there are frequent complaints of gross immorality among recluses of both sexes, with attempts to restrain such practices.

The wealth of monasteries, like that of churches, suffered from the exactions of their advocates, and from alienation to laymen. A remarkable instance of such alienation is recorded as to the abbey of Stablo, in the diocese of Liege, where, in consequence of the conversion of the revenues into a lay “benefice”, there were two successions of abbots, the one line being generally made up of the bishops of Liege, while the other consisted of powerful laymen.

Towards the end of the period, a remarkable reformer of the monastic life appeared in France. Witiza, afterwards known as St. Benedict of Aniane, was of Gothic descent, and son of the count of Maguelone in Septimania. When a boy, he was placed in the court of Pipin, to whom he became cupbearer, and he continued in the service of Charlemagne. In 774 he accompanied his master to Rome; and on his way homeward he narrowly escaped from drowning in a vain attempt to save his brother, who had rashly plunged into a swollen ford. In gratitude for this preservation, he carried out a thought which he had already for some time

entertained, of embracing a monastic life, by entering the monastery of St. Seine, in Burgundy. Although he had assumed the name of Benedict, the rule of the Nursian monk appeared to him fit only for weak beginners and he rushed into the austerities of eastern monachism. He macerated his body by excessive fasting; his dress was of rags, swarming with vermin, and patched with a variety of colours; he took very little sleep, and that on the bare ground; he never bathed; he courted derision and insult as a madman, and often expressed his fear of hell in piteous outcries; and, although his abbot repeatedly urged him to relent from these severities, Benedict's resolution was inflexible

On the death of the abbot, Benedict was chosen as his successor; but he fled from St. Seine, and built himself a little hermitage on his father's estate, by the bank of the river Aniane. Some monks who attempted to live with him, found themselves unable to support the excessive severity of his system; but in course of time a considerable society was gathered around him, and a monastery was erected near his cell. Benedict himself took part in the building of it; he and his monks were obliged to carry the materials, as they were unable to provide oxen for the work. The walls were of wood; the roof was thatched with straw the vestments for divine service were coarse, whereas silk was usually employed for such purposes; the eucharistic vessels were of wood, afterwards of glass, and finally of pewter. The monks lived chiefly on bread and water, varied sometimes by milk, and on Sundays and holydays by a scanty allowance of wine. If the rigid simplicity of Benedict's first arrangements was partly dictated by fear lest richness of architecture and of ornament should prove injurious to monastic discipline, he must afterwards have changed his opinion on the subject; for in 782 the humble wooden buildings made way for a splendid monastery. The church was adorned with marble pillars; there were several costly chapels; and all that belonged to the furniture and to the services was of unusual magnificence. Charlemagne, who had contributed to the expense, exempted the monastery from all taxes, and from the jurisdiction both of bishops and of counts.

Benedict became a man of great note and influence. His name has already come before us, as one of the commissioners employed by Charlemagne to reclaim the adherents of Felix of Urgel; Lewis the Pious, while king of Aquitaine, employed him to reform the monasteries of that country; and the effect of his institutions was widely felt. He collected into two books the monastic rules of the east and of the west; in a third book he added the rules for nunneries; and from the whole he composed a "Harmony of the Rules", in which the precepts of the earlier St. Benedict on every subject are illustrated by those of other monastic legislators. In his reforms he was content to enforce the Benedictine system, which experience had shown him to be better suited for general use than the rigours of oriental monachism. In his own practice, he was obliged to abate somewhat of the violence with which he had begun; but his life continued to be strictly ascetic, and he shared with his monks in the labours of ploughing, digging, and reaping. Soon after the accession of Lewis to the empire, Benedict resigned the abbacy of Aniane, and removed to a new royal foundation on the bank of the Inda, near Aix-la-Chapelle; and, after having played an important part during the earlier years of his patron's reign, he died at the age of seventy, in 821.

In England, monachism fell into decay from the earlier part of the eighth century. The monasteries were often invaded and occupied by secular persons, and although a canon of Cloveshoo was directed against this evil, the terms which are used significantly prove that the council had little hope of being able to suppress it. Boniface in his letters to Archbishop Cuthbert, and to Ethelbert, king of Mercia, complains that the English monasteries are oppressed beyond any others in Christendom; that their privileges are violated, that they are heavily and unjustly taxed, that they are ruined by the expense of entertaining the king and his hunting train; that the monks are forced to labour at the royal buildings and other works.

But much blame is also laid on the communities themselves. The monks are often charged with riotous living and with drunkenness, which Boniface describes as a peculiarly

national vice; and the fondness for gay clothing, which was another characteristic of the English, defied all monastic rules. Aldhelm strongly reproveth the indulgence of this taste. Boniface complains of it to Cuthbert; the council of Cloveshoo censures it in clergy, in monks, and in nuns, denouncing especially in men the affectation of a laical headdress, and the fashion of adorning the legs with fillets of various colours; the council of Chalchythe desires monks and canons to use the same habit with those of the continent, and not dyed with Indian dye, or very costly. But some years later Alcuin is found continuing the complaint against such vanities; and the love of them was not to be overcome.

In addition to the causes which have been mentioned—the secular oppression to which the monks were subjected, and their own unwillingness, when the first period of fervour had passed away, to bear the restraints of the monastic rule—the introduction of the canonical life contributed to the decline of English monachism. The occupants of religious houses became canons instead of monks; and about the middle of the ninth century the Benedictine order was almost extinct in England.

The regulations of this period as to female recluses correspond in general character with those for monks. Abbesses are required to be subject to their bishops; they are censured for interfering with the sacerdotal function by presuming to veil virgins, and to give benedictions and imposition of hands to men—apparently by way of ordination to the lower grades of the ministry. There are frequent complaints of dissolute life in nunneries, and the abbesses themselves are sometimes charged with a share of the guilt. Other canons are directed against the practice of allowing widows to take the veil during the first agitation of their bereavement, as it had been found that such nuns often relapsed into worldly business or gaieties, and endeavoured to secure at once the privileges of the monastic and of the secular life.

The Benedictine rule was adapted to the use of female societies; and towards the end of the period the example of Chrodegang's rule led to the institution of canonesses, who lived together under a less rigid code than nuns, and without being obliged to give up their private property.

Rites and Usages.

Throughout the west, Latin had from the first been used as the language of divine service. As it was spoken in all the western provinces of the empire, there was no necessity for translating the liturgy into other tongues; and after the barbarian conquests Latin remained as the language of superior civilization, and especially as that of the clergy, whose ranks were for a long time generally filled from among the Romanized inhabitants. It was the medium by which nations carried on their official intercourse; it alone remained stable, while the dialects of the invaders were in a course of fluctuation and change; and where new languages were formed on its basis—a process in which the ecclesiastical use of the Latin contributed greatly to secure its predominance—the formation was gradual, so that it would have been impossible to fix on any time at which the ancient Roman tongue should have been disused as obsolete. The closer connexion established with Rome by Pipin and Charlemagne confirmed the use of Latin in the Frankish church. And thus an usage which originally arose out of circumstances, came at length to be regarded as necessary, and at a later time to be justified by theoretical argument, although confessedly as contrary to the practice of the early church as it appears to be to reason. Charlemagne, however, notwithstanding his attachment to the Roman ritual, combated the growing opinion on this point. “Let no one”, it is said in his capitulary at the council of Frankfort, “suppose that God may not be prayed to except in three languages; forasmuch as in every tongue God is worshipped, and man is heard if he ask the things which are right”.”

The chanting was now left to the choir, and the people joined only in the *Kyrie eleison*. But Charlemagne and others were careful that preaching—which by means of missions regained an importance which it had once appeared likely to lose—should be frequent, and in the vulgar tongue. His measures for the instruction of the people in the creed and in the Lord's prayer have been noticed in a former chapter.

In England, Latin was employed as the ritual language, not only by Augustine and his followers, but by the Scottish and Irish teachers, who had been accustomed to it in their native churches. The epistle and gospel, however, were read in the vernacular tongue, and in it sermons were delivered. The Scottish or Irish liturgy was suppressed by the council of Cloveshoo in those parts of southern England where it had before been used; but, notwithstanding the influence of Wilfrid, it kept possession of the church of York until the time of Alcuin, who is found recommending that it should be abandoned. It would, however, seem that, in the adaptation of the Roman ritual for England, some use was made of that license of selection from other formularies which had been granted by Gregory to Augustine.

In the east, Greek had been the usual language of the church, and continued to be so under the Mahometan rule, where Arabic was used for the ordinary business of life. The monophysites of Egypt, however, employed the Coptic in their service, and the Nestorians the Syriac.

The use of organs was now brought into the service of the Latin church. The earliest mention of such instruments (as distinguished from the ancient hydraulic organ, of which the invention is by some ascribed to Archimedes) is perhaps in a passage of St. Augustine. Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers about the year 600, compares the voices of boys and men in a choir to the smaller and the larger pipes of an organ respectively, but does not speak of the instrument itself as used in churches; so that his words are not inconsistent with the opinion which ascribes the introduction of organs into churches to Pope Vitalian (A.D. 657-672). It appears from the testimony of Aldhelm that they were known in England at the beginning of the eighth century; but it would seem that, after the age of Venantius, the organ had again become a novelty to the Franks when one was sent by Constantine Copronymus as a present to Pipin in 757. The St. Gall biographer of Charlemagne tells us that a similar instrument, “emulating at once the roar of thunder and the sweetness of the lyre”, which was brought by some Greek ambassadors to the great emperor, excited the imitative talent of the Franks. Under Lewis the Pious, a Venetian priest named George was employed by the emperor to build an organ at Aix-la-Chapelle, and is said to have performed his task “with marvellous skill”; but it would seem that the instrument was of the hydraulic kind. So skillful, however, did the Franks become in the manufacture of organs, that about a century after the date of Constantine's gift to Pipin, Pope John VIII is found requesting a bishop of Freising to send him one, with a person skilful in the use of it, because the organs of the north were superior to any that could be made in Italy. Some of the great organs of those days must have been very formidable instruments, if we may take literally the poetical description of one which was erected in Winchester cathedral by Bishop Alphege (afterwards archbishop of Canterbury), in the end of the tenth century; for it is said to have been blown by twenty-six pairs of bellows, which required the hard labour of seventy men to work them.

To this period also is ascribed the introduction of church bells. The belief which was long current, that they were invented by St. Paulinus of Nola in the end of the fourth century, is without historical support, and rests only on a mistaken etymology. According to some writers, they were first used in churches by Sabinian, the successor of Gregory the Great in the see of Rome; but in any case it is certain that in the course of the seventh and eighth centuries the use of them spread widely throughout France and other countries. Bells are familiarly mentioned by Bede, and in St. Boniface's letters. Under Charlemagne, we find the legendary St. Gall biographer relating that a monk of his own community, named Tancho, having received a commission from the emperor for a great bell, substituted tin for silver in the

composition of the metal, and was punished for his fraud by a miraculous death; and in the capitulary of 789 there is a prohibition of the baptism of bells—a superstition which was afterwards carried further, by conferring baptismal names on them, and furnishing them with sponsors.

The history of the eucharistic doctrine during this period has been disputed with as much zeal and partiality as if the question between modern Rome and its opponents depended on the opinions of the seventh and eighth centuries. The word *figure*, when it occurs, is hailed by one party, and such words as *body*, *blood*, or *changed*, by the other, as if they were sufficient to determine the matter. But the truth seems to lie between the extremes. Both in language and in opinion there was a progress towards the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the feeling of individuals may have closely bordered on it; but there was no acknowledgment, nor apparently even any assertion, of more than an effective grace, by which the consecrated elements, while retaining their original substance, convey to the faithful receiver the benefits of the Saviour's death. Some passages of Bede and of Alcuin, for example, which are produced by Romanists as favourable to their views, appear really to maintain nothing beyond the doctrine of the English Reformation. Thus, when Alcuin speaks of a bishop as consecrating bread and wine into the substance of our Lord's body and blood, it would seem that by "substance" he does not mean anything material; that he does not even use the word in the scholastic sense, as denoting that by which a thing is what it is, but that he intends only a virtual efficacy. And after this, the Caroline Books, in which Alcuin himself is supposed to have been largely concerned, express themselves in a manner entirely accordant with our own eucharistic doctrine.

John of Damascus appears to have gone further than any of the western teachers. He rejects the term "*figure*", as unauthorized by Scripture, and declares the consecrated elements to be "the very deified body of the Lord". Yet the sense of this startling expression may be reduced by a comparison with the language then current as to the union of our Lord's natures or wills—where it was said that the flesh or the human will was "deified" by its connexion with the Godhead. If the meaning were more than this parallel would warrant—if John intended to maintain that the material elements were changed, instead of being united with something higher—it is certain that the eastern church did not adopt his view. The Eucharist was mentioned in the controversy as to images by the hostile synods of Constantinople and Nicaea. The iconoclastic assembly declares that the only true image of the Saviour is the Eucharist—meaning that the union of the Divine grace with the earthly elements represents that union of Godhead and manhood in his person which images failed to convey, inasmuch as they could only set forth the humanity. The Nicene council, in answering this, finds fault with the term *image*, as being one which no father had applied to that which is His body and blood. Yet no objection is made to the substance of the comparison; nor do we find anywhere in this controversy the distinction which must have occurred if the modern Roman doctrine as to the sacrament had been then received—that the consecrated elements are unlike images, forasmuch as they are not a representation, but are really Christ Himself.

Instead of the common bread in which the Eucharist had originally been administered, wafers were now substituted in the west. They were of very fine flour unleavened, round in shape, and stamped with an instrument. The communion of infants appears to have been still in use, and many superstitions were practised with the consecrated bread—such as giving it to the dead and burying it with them. The cup continued until the twelfth century to be administered to all communicants

The height to which the idea of a sacrifice in the Eucharist was carried (an idea which appears in the earliest ages of the church, although with some indefiniteness of meaning), now led to some important consequences. The sacrifice was supposed to avail not only for those who were present but for the absent; for the dead as well as for the living. One result of this was, that the obligation of receiving the sacrament was less felt, so that there is much

complaint as to the rarity of communion, and that canons are passed for restoring the three receptions yearly which had been prescribed by the council of Agde. At length masses came to be celebrated privately, and by the priest alone. This practice was forbidden by Theodulf of Orleans; it is censured, although not in absolute terms, by the council of Mentz in 813, is more decidedly condemned by the sixth council of Paris, in 829, and in the following century is again forbidden by Atto, bishop of Vercelli.

From the time of Gregory the Great, the doctrine of Purgatory spread and was developed. In the English church, the offspring of Gregory's own exertions, it appears to have especially taken root. Bede relates stories of persons who had been transported in vision to the regions of the dead; they returned to consciousness with a sad and awestruck air, told their tale, and soon after died. Thus Fursey and Drithelm were permitted to see the punishments of hell and purgatory, and the bliss of the righteous who were awaiting their consummation in paradise. The vision of Drithelm was versified by Alcuin; other narratives of the same kind appeared; the idea of such visions became familiar to men's minds; and, six centuries later, the dreams of the obscure Irish or Northumbrian monks issued in the great poem of the middle ages.

With the belief in purgatory, that in the utility of the masses for the departed advanced. Fraternities were formed, especially among monks, with the obligation to say a certain number of masses for the soul of every brother at his death, and on the anniversary of it, or to provide for the purchase of them by a payment which in England was called *soulscot*. The performance of these masses became an important source of income to the clergy. It is recognized as such by Chrodegang's rule; and for this purpose additional altars were erected in churches which before had only one. Masses were also used in order to obtain temporal benefits, such as fair weather or seasonable rain.

A greater strictness in the observance of the Lord's-day had gradually been introduced into the church, and occupations which councils of the sixth century had vindicated against a judaizing tendency. were now forbidden as contrary to the sanctity of the day, which it became usual to ground on the fourth commandment. Many canons throughout this period, and shortly after, enact that it should be kept by a cessation from all trade, husbandry, or other manual labour. No law-courts or markets may be held, men are to refrain from hunting, women must not sew, embroider, weave, card wool, beat flax, shear sheep, or publicly wash clothes. No journeys were to be taken except such as were unavoidable; and these were to be so managed as not to interfere with the duty of attending the church-service. The Penitential ascribed to Theodore of Canterbury states that the Greeks and the Latins agree in doing no work on Sunday; that they do not sail, ride, drive except to church, hawk, or bathe; that the Greeks do not write in public, although at home they write according to their convenience. Penalties were enacted against such as should violate the sanctity of the day. Thus the council of Narbonne, in 589, condemns a freeman to pay six solidi, and a serf to receive a hundred lashes. Ina, king of Wessex (A.D. 688-725), directs that, if a serf work on the Lord's-day by his master's order, he shall be free; if at his own will, he shall pay a fine or shall "suffer in his hide". The council of Berghamstead (A.D. 696), enacts that a freeman breaking the rest of the day shall undergo the *healsfang* and imposes a heavy fine on any master who shall make his servant work between the sunset of Saturday and that of Sunday. The authority of pretended revelations was called in to enforce the observance of the Lord's-day. It appears that this was the object of a letter which was said to have fallen from heaven in 788, and of which Charlemagne, in his capitulary of the following year, orders the suppression; and the same pious fraud, or something of the same kind, was employed in England. Under Lewis the Pious, councils are found speaking of judgments by which persons had been punished for working on the Lord's-day—some had been struck by lightning, some lamed in their members, some reduced to ashes by visible fire. The clergy, the nobles, and the emperor himself, are desired to show a good example by a right observance of the day.

But notwithstanding the increased severity as to the Lord's-day, the idea of identifying it with the Jewish Sabbath was condemned. Gregory the Great speaks of this as a doctrine of Antichrist, who, he says, will require the observance of both days—of the Sabbath for the sake of Judaism; of the Lord's-day, because he will pretend to rival the Saviour's resurrection. Gregory goes on to notice the scruples of some who held that it was wrong to wash the body on the Lord's-day. It is allowed, he says, for necessity, although not for luxury, alike on this and on other days, and he adds a curious attempt at scriptural proof. The councils of Lestines and Verne censure an extreme rigour in the observance of the day, as "belonging rather to Jewish superstition than to Christian duty".

The Lord's-day was commonly considered to begin on Saturday evening, and to reach to the corresponding hour on Sunday. Such, as we have seen, was the length of the labourer's rest in England at the time of the council of Berghamstead (A.D. 696); but by the middle of the tenth century it was extended, and reached from nones (3 p.m.) on Saturday to the dawn of Monday

The festival of All Saints (which was intended to make up for the defects in the celebration of saints individually) has been generally connected with the beginning of this period, when Boniface IV obtained a grant of the Pantheon at Rome from Phocas, and consecrated it as the church of St. Mary ad Martyres in 609. It would, however, appear that a festival of martyrs, on May 13, which arose out of the consecration of the Pantheon, has been confounded with All Saints' day (Nov. 1), and that the latter was not observed at Rome until the eighth century. It was raised to the first class of festivals, and was recommended for general celebration, by Gregory IV in 835. In the east, the Sunday after Whitsunday had been connected with the memory of all saints as early as the time of St. Chrysostom.

The growing reverence for the blessed Virgin led to an increase of festivals dedicated to her. The "Presentation in the Temple" became the "Purification of St. Mary". Her Nativity (Sept. 8) was already celebrated both in the east and in the west, and her own "Presentation" (*i.e.* her supposed dedication to the service of the temple) was established as a festival in the Greek church (Nov. 21), although it was not adopted in the west until the fourteenth century. In Spain, the appearance vouchsafed to Ildefonso of Toledo led to the institution of the "Expectation of St. Mary" (Dec. 18). The Assumption (Aug. 15) was also now introduced. In the silence of Scripture as to the blessed Virgin's death, legends on the subject had arisen. At the time of the council of Ephesus (A.D. 431), she was supposed to have spent her last years with St. John in that city, and to have been interred in the church where the council met. But afterwards it came to be believed that she had been buried in the valley of Jehoshaphat, and thence had been caught up to heaven. From this tale, which originated in a conjecture of Epiphanius that she never died, and was afterwards supported by sermons falsely ascribed to Jerome and Augustine, the festival of the Assumption took its rise. In one of the capitularies it is mentioned as a subject for inquiry; but the observance of it is sanctioned by the council of Mayence, in 813. The other festivals named in the same canon are—Easter with the week following, Ascension-day, Whitsunday and the week after it, the Nativity of St. John Baptist, St. Peter and St. Paul, St. Michael, St. Remigius, St. Martin, St. Andrew, four days at Christmas, the Circumcision, the Epiphany, and the Purification with the dedication of each church, and the feasts of the martyrs and confessors whose relics are preserved in the diocese or parish. This last provision contained the germ of a great multiplication of festivals, which naturally ensued as saints of local fame became more generally celebrated, and as their relics became more widely dispersed.

The council of Mayence also sanctions the celebration of the Ember-weeks, which was now generally established

The superstitions connected with an excess of reverence for saints were continually on the increase. Stories of visions in which saints appeared, and of miracles performed by them, are found in immense profusion—so great, indeed, that even some contemporaries began to

murmur. Thus we are told by the biographer of St. Hildulf, abbot of Moyon-Moutier, in the Vosges, who died in 707, that the death of one of his monks named Spinulus was followed by a number of miracles. Three mineral springs burst forth in the abbey garden, and crowds of people were attracted to the place. Hildulf understood the advantages which his house was likely to derive from the offerings of pilgrims; but he feared that the monks might be drawn away from their proper work to attend to earthly business. He therefore knelt down at the tomb of Spinulus, and, after having thanked God for the assurance of his brother's beatification, charged the deceased monk, by the obedience which he had owed him while alive, to save the society from the threatened danger. Spinulus complied; the springs dried up, and the miracles ceased. Other stories might be produced, which show that some persons felt the general craving after miracles to be unwholesome in its effects, even where they did not venture to question the reality of the wonders which were reported.

The passion for relics was more and more developed. The second council of Nicaea orders that no church should be consecrated without some relics, and imputes a disregard of them to the opponents of images; but these, as we have seen, were eager to relieve themselves of the odium. Relics of our Lord and his virgin mother, the most precious class of all, were multiplied. The seamless coat and the napkin which had bound the Saviour's head in the sepulchre were each supposed to be preserved in more than one place. Among the treasures of the monastery of Centulles, under abbot Angilbert, who died in 801, were fragments of the manger in which our Lord was laid, of the candle lighted at his birth, of his vesture and sandals, of the rock on which he sat when he fed the five thousand, of the wood of the three tabernacles, of the bread which he gave to his disciples, of the cross, and of the sponge; with portions of the blessed Virgin's milk, of her hair, her dress, and her cloak. In honour of the cross were instituted festivals of its Invention and Exaltation.

Other relics were also diligently sought for, and were highly prized. Not only are saints said to have appeared, as in former ages, for the purpose of pointing out the resting-places of their remains, but it was believed that sometimes, in answer to earnest prayer, relics were sent down from heaven. A great impulse was given to this kind of superstition when, on the approach of the Lombards to Rome in 761, Pope Paul removed the bodies of saints from their tombs outside the city to churches within the walls. The Frankish records of the time abound in accounts of the translation of relics to various places in France, and of the solemnities with which they were received. The mere connexion with Rome was supposed to confer a sanctity and a miraculous power. Thus it is related that Odo, duke of Aquitaine, a contemporary of Charles Martel, having got possession of three sponges which had been used in wiping the pope's table, divided them into little morsels, which he caused his soldiers to swallow before a battle; that no one of those who had partaken was wounded, and that, while 375,000 Saracens were slain in one day, the duke's losses throughout the war amounted to only 1500 men

Charlemagne repeatedly condemns some ecclesiastical superstitions, as well as those of the heathens whom he subdued. He forbids the veneration of fictitious saints and doubtful martyrs the invocation or worship of any saints except such as the church had approved, or the erection of memorials to them by the wayside; the circulation of apocryphal or questionable narratives; the introduction of new names of angels, in addition to those for which there is scriptural authority—Michael, Gabriel, and Raphael. The council of Mayence forbids the translation of the bodies of saints, unless with permission from the sovereign and the bishops.

Legendary lives of saints were now produced in wonderful abundance, and were the most popular literature of the times. In addition to their falsehood (which, where consciously introduced, may have been held excusable by the writers for the sake of the expected good effects) and to their enforcement of all the errors which had grown upon the church, they were blameable as teaching men to look for visible prosperity and chastisement according to individual desert in the ordinary government of the world. Yet the evil of such legends was

not with-put a large compensation of good. They set forth the power of religion, not only in miracles but in self-denial and renunciation of earthly things. In contrast with the rudeness and selfishness which generally prevailed, they presented examples which taught a spirit of gentleness and self-sacrifice, of purity, of patience, of love to God and man, of disinterested toil, of forgiveness of enemies, of kindness to the poor and the oppressed. The concluding part of the legend exhibited the saint triumphant after his earthly troubles, yet still interested in his brethren who were engaged in the struggle of life, and manifesting his interest by interpositions in their behalf. And above all there was the continual inculcation of a Providence watching over all the affairs of men, and ready to protect the innocent, or to recompense and avenge their sufferings.

Even as early as the fourth century, some of the evils attendant on the general practice of pilgrimage had been noticed by Gregory of Nyssa and others; and strong complaints of a like kind continue to be found from time to time. Gregory the Great tells Rusticana, a lady of the imperial court, that, while she had been on a pilgrimage to Sinai, her affections had been at Constantinople, and expresses a suspicion that the holy objects which she had seen with her bodily eyes had made no impression on her heart. But the idle spirit in which pilgrimages were often undertaken was not the worst mischief connected with them. Boniface writes to archbishop Cuthbert that of the multitude of English women who flocked to Rome, only a few escaped the ruin of their virtue; that it was rare to find a town of Lombardy or France in which some dishonoured English nun or other female pilgrim had not taken up her abode, and by her misconduct brought disgrace on the church of her native land. Another unhappy effect of pilgrimages was, that for the sake of it bishops and abbots absented themselves for years from their proper spheres of labour, to the great injury of religion and discipline among those committed to their care.

From Britain pilgrimages were most commonly made to Rome, where the English had, in the neighbourhood of the Vatican basilica, a quarter of their own, which was known by the Saxon name of *Burg*,—the Borgo of later times. Some pilgrims from our island even found their way to the Holy Land. In France the chief place of pilgrimage was the shrine of St. Martin, at Tours; but the resort from that country to Rome became greater after the accession of the Carolingian dynasty. The lives of pilgrims were regarded as sacred, and many hospitals were built for their reception; among these was one founded at Jerusalem by Charlemagne for the benefit of Latin pilgrims. The emperor in 802 orders that no one, whether rich or poor, shall refuse to pilgrims a roof, fire, and water, and encourages those who can afford more to greater hospitality by a consideration of the recompense which Scripture promises. There are, however, canons against some of the abuses connected with pilgrimage. The council of Verne, in 755, orders that monks shall not be allowed to wander to Rome without their abbot's consents. The council of Chalons, in 813, forbids the clergy to go either to Rome or to Tours without leave from their bishop; and, while it acknowledges that pilgrimage is profitable for those who have confessed their sins and have obtained directions for penance, who amend their lives, give alms, and practise devotion, it denounces the error of such as consider pilgrimage a licence to sin, and begs the emperor to take measures against a common practice of nobles, who extorted from their dependents the means of paying the expense of their own pilgrimages.

In some cases, persons who had been guilty of grievous sin were condemned by way of penance to leave their country, and either to wander for a certain time, or to undertake a pilgrimage to some particular place. These penitents were furnished with letters from their bishops, which at once made known their guilt and bespoke the charity of Christians for them. Many of them were loaded with chains, or with rings which ate into the flesh and inflicted excessive torture. Ethelwulf, the father of Alfred the Great, at his visit to Rome in 855, obtained from Benedict III the privilege that no Englishman should ever be obliged to leave his own country for this sort of penance; but long before his time impostors had found their

account in going about naked and in irons under the pretence of having been sentenced to pilgrimage for some fearful crime. The capitulary of 789 forbids such vagabonds to roam about the country, and suggests that those who have really been guilty of some great and unusual offence may perform their penance better by remaining in one place

The discipline of the church in dealing with sin was now regulated by penitential books. These books were of eastern origin; the earliest of them was drawn up by John, patriarch of Constantinople, the antagonist of Gregory the Great; the first Penitential in the western church was that which is commonly ascribed to Theodore, the Greek archbishop of Canterbury. As the impossibility of fulfilling the requirements of the ancient canons had led to a general evasion or disregard of them, a scheme of commutation was introduced; for example, a certain amount of fasting might be redeemed by the recitation of a prescribed number of psalms. From this the transition was easy to a system of pecuniary commutations—a system recommended by the analogy of the *wehr*. That institution had been extended from its original character of a composition for life to the case of lesser bodily injuries, so that the loss of a limb, an eye, a finger, or a tooth was to be atoned for by a fixed pecuniary fine; and the principle was now introduced into the penitentials, where offences were rated in a scale both of exercises and of money nearly resembling that of the civil damages. As yet, however, these payments were not regarded as a source of profit to the church, but were to be given to the poor, according to the penitent's discretion. In England, the rich were able to relieve themselves in their penance by associating with themselves a number of poor persons for the performance of it. By such means it was possible to clear off seven years of penitence within a week; and, although the practice was condemned by the council of Cloveshoo, it was afterwards formally sanctioned.

The necessary effect of the new penitential system was not only to encourage the fatal error of regarding money as an equivalent for sin—an error against which some councils protested in vain, while the language of others seems to countenance it—but to introduce a spirit of petty traffic into the relations of sinners with their God. In opposition to this spirit Gregory III said that canons ought not to lay down exactly the length of time which should be assigned to penance for each offence, forasmuch as that which avails with God is not the measure of time but of sorrow. The council of Chalons denounces the penitential books, of which it says that “the errors are certain and the authors uncertain”; it charges them with “sewing pillows to all arm-holes”, and requires that penance should be restored to the footing of the ancient canons; and there are similar passages in other French councils of the ninth and tenth centuries.

Confession of secret sins was much insisted on; but the priest was regarded rather as an adviser than as a judge, and the form of his absolution was not judicial but precatory. Absolution was usually given immediately after confession, and the prescribed penance was left to be performed afterwards, so that, whereas in earlier ages the penitents had been excluded for a time from the full communion of the church, they now remained in it throughout.

The penalty of excommunication became in the Frankish church much more severe than it had formerly been. The council of Verne lays down that an excommunicate person “must not enter the church, nor partake of food or drink with any Christian; neither may any one receive his gifts, or kiss him, or join with him in prayer, or salute him”. It has been supposed that the new terrors of this sentence were borrowed from the practice of the druids, with a view to controlling the rude converts who would have disregarded a purely spiritual penalty. The power of wielding it must doubtless have added greatly to the influence of the clergy, although this effect did not yet appear so fully as at a later period.

The trial of guilt or innocence by means of a solemn appeal to heaven had been practised among many heathen nations, including those of the north. The Mosaic law had sanctioned it in certain cases; it fell in with the popular appetite for miracles, and the church

now for a time took the management of such trials into her own hands. The ordeal, or judgment of God, was not to be resorted to where the guilt of an accused person was clear, but in cases of suspicion, where evidence was wanting or insufficient. The appeal was conducted with great solemnity. The accuser swore to the truth of his charge; the accused (who for three days had been preparing himself by fasting and prayer) asserted his innocence in the same manner; and he was adjured in the most awful terms not to approach the Lord's table if he were conscious of any guilt in the matter which was to be submitted to the Divine judgment. Both parties then communicated; and after this, the clergy anointed the instruments with which the trial was to be made.

The ordeal was of various kinds. That by *judicial combat* or *wager of battle* was employed, not only for the discovery of crime but in civil matters, such as disputes relating to the boundaries of property. Otho the Great even resorted to it as a means of determining a legal principle—whether at a man's death the children of a deceased son should share in the inheritance with their surviving uncles. This manner of appeal to the Divine judgment was introduced into the Burgundian law by the Arian king Gundobald, the contemporary of Clovis, against the remonstrances of Avitus, bishop of Vienne. It was not uncommon among the Franks, but appears to have been unknown in England until after the Norman conquest. Persons who were disqualified for undergoing this ordeal by age, sex, bodily weakness, or by the monastic or clerical profession, were allowed to fight by champions, who were usually hired, and were regarded as a disreputable class. In like manner corporations or societies committed their interests to champions. In the trial by hot iron, the accused walked barefoot over heated ploughshares, or (which was the more usual form), he carried a piece of glowing iron in his hand nine times the length of his foot. The foot or the hand (as the case might be) was then bound up and sealed until the third day, when it was examined, and according to its appearance the guilt or innocence of the party was decided. The trial of hot water consisted in plunging the arm into a boiling caldron, and taking out a stone, a ring, or a piece of iron, which was hung at a greater or less depth in proportion to the gravity of the offence in question. That of cold water was performed by throwing the accused into a pond, with a cord attached to him, by which he might be drawn out. If he were laden with weights, sinking was a proof of guilt; if not, it was held to prove his innocence. In the ordeal of the “cross” (which, notwithstanding the name which it acquired, was probably of heathen origin), the accused or his proxy held up the right arm, or both arms y psalms were sung during the trial, and the sinking or trembling of the arms was evidence of guilt. Among other kinds of ordeal were—holding the hand in fire; walking in a thin garment between two burning piles; eating a cake, which in England was called the *corsned*; and receiving the holy Eucharist.

Some of these practices were condemned after a time. Lewis the Pious, after having in 816 prescribed the trial of the cross as a means of deciding between contradictory witnesses, abolished it in the following year, “lest that which hath been glorified by the passion of Christ should through any man's rashness be brought to contempt”. Under the same emperor, the ordeal of cold water was forbidden in 829, although in 824 it had been sanctioned by Eugenius II—the only pope who ever countenanced the system of ordeals. Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, a strenuous opponent of popular superstitions, addressed to Lewis two tracts against the judicial combat. He reflects on the heresy of the Burgundian king who had sanctioned it. He denounces such duels as unchristian, and as involving a breach of charity more important than any good which could be expected from them. He argues that, if truth might be thus ascertained, all judges are superfluous; that the system holds out a premium to brute strength and to perjury; that the idea of its efficacy is contrary to Scripture, since we are there taught to despise the success of this world—since God suffers his saints to be slain, and has allowed believing nations to be overcome by unbelievers and heretics; and he appeals to instances in which the vanity of such trials had been manifested. The ordeal, however,

continued to be supported by the popular feeling, and the cause which Agobard had opposed soon after found a powerful champion in Hincmar.

The privilege of asylum in the Germanic kingdoms differed considerably from that which had existed under the Roman empire. It arose out of the ancient national usages; the object of it was not to bestow impunity on the criminal, but to protect him against hasty and irregular vengeance, to secure for him a legal trial, to afford the clergy an opportunity of interceding for him, and, if possible, of mitigating his punishment. The operation of this institution was aided by the system of pecuniary composition for wrongs. The clergy were usually able to stipulate for the safety of the offender's life and limbs on condition that he should pay a suitable fine, or perhaps that he should submit to a course of penance. Charlemagne in 779 limited the right of sanctuary by enacting that murderers or other capital offenders should not be allowed to take refuge in churches, and that, if they gained admittance, no food should be given to them. According to the ancient Roman idea of asylum, the denial of food would have been an impiety sufficient to draw down some judgment from the patron saint of a church; but it was not inconsistent with the German view. The clergy, however, soon discovered a way of evading this law, by construing it as applicable to impenitent criminals only—*i.e.* to such as should refuse to confess to the priest and to undergo ecclesiastical penance—a refusal which was not likely to be frequent, where it involved the choice between death by hunger and the forfeiture of sanctuary. The prohibition of food does not appear in later enactments of the reign.

The church could not fail to derive popularity from the power of offering shelter within its precincts against the lawlessness of which the world was then so full. With a view of investing it with such popularity among his new subjects, Charlemagne ordered, in his capitulary for Saxony (A.D. 785), that any person who should take sanctuary should, for the honour of God and His church, be safe in life and limb, and should be unmolested until the next court-day, when he was to be sentenced to make suitable amends for his offence. In legislating for the country after it had been reduced to a more settled state, this privilege was withdrawn, and the church was required to surrender up persons convicted of capital crimes

Among the Anglo-Saxons, the earliest law on the subject of asylum was that of Ina, in 696, which ordered that fugitives guilty of capital crimes should have their life protected by the church, but should be bound to make legal satisfaction; and that delinquents who had "put their hide in peril"—*i.e.* who had incurred the penalty of whipping—should be forgiven. But the shelter of the church was only to be granted for a certain time. The laws of Alfred (A.D. 877) limit it in some monasteries to three days; but it was afterwards extended, and even in the same laws a longer term is allowed to other places. Persons guilty of murder, treason, or crimes against religion, might ordinarily be dragged even from the altar; but some churches of especial sanctity, among which that of Croyland enjoyed the most extensive immunities, had the right of protecting all fugitives whatever. The effect of such a privilege was probably felt as a serious hindrance to the execution of justice; for when Croyland, after having been laid waste by the Danes, was restored in the reign of Edred by his chancellor Turketul, the aged statesman declined to accept a renewal of its ancient rights of sanctuary.

Slavery.

Instead of absolutely condemning slavery as an unlawful institution—a course which would probably have introduced anarchy into society, and would have raised a serious hindrance to the progress of the Gospel—the New Testament had been content to prepare the way for its gradual abolition by exhorting both master and slave to the performance of their mutual duties on the ground of their common brotherhood in Christ. And as yet the church aimed only at a mitigation, not at an extinction, of slavery.

Servitude was of two kinds—that of slaves properly so called, and that of the *coloni*. The slaves were individually liable to removal and sale; they were incapable, under the Roman empire, of contracting a legitimate marriage, and their property belonged to their master. The *coloni* were regarded as freeborn, so that, unlike slaves, they might become soldiers; they were attached to the land, so that they could not be separated from it, nor could it be sold without them. They were capable of marriage and of possessing property; for the land which they cultivated they paid a fixed rent, generally in kind, and they were subject to the land-tax and to a poll-tax. It would, however, seem difficult to distinguish thoroughly between these classes in the canons which relate to the subject.

The Penitential ascribed to Theodore of Canterbury notes it as a point of difference between the eastern and the western monks, that, while the Latins have slaves, the Greeks have none. The oriental monks themselves performed the labour which was elsewhere devolved on slaves; it was usual for persons entering on the monastic life to emancipate their slaves; and some teachers, as Isidore of Pelusium in the fifth century, and Theodore the Studite in the ninth, altogether questioned, or even denied, the lawfulness of having such property. In the west there are occasional appearances of a like kind. Thus Wilfrid, on getting possession of the isle of Selsey, emancipated all the serfs who were attached to the soil, and Benedict of Aniane, whose ideas were chiefly drawn from the eastern monastic rules, on receiving gifts of land for his monasteries, refused to accept the serfs with it. Somewhat in the same spirit was the enactment of the council of Chalchythe, in 816, that a bishop at his death should liberate such of his English slaves as had been reduced to bondage in his own time. But the usual practice of the west was different. In donations of land to the church, the serfs passed with the soil, as in other transfers. Bishops were restrained by a regard, for the property of their churches from emancipating the serfs who belonged to these; the fourth council of Toledo (A.D. 633) declared such emancipation to be a robbery of the church; it enacted that the next bishop should assert his right over any persons whom his predecessor had thus wrongfully liberated, and that any bishop wishing to emancipate a slave should indemnify the church by providing another in his stead. An earlier council—that of Agde, in 506—had restrained the power of bishops to alienate slaves; and, in a spirit curiously opposed to the oriental principles, it forbade monks to manumit their slaves, “lest they should keep holiday while the monks work”. It was even found that some persons—whether from a reckless spirit of mistaken devotion, or from a calculation of the advantages and disadvantages of the two conditions—voluntarily made over themselves and their descendants in servitude to some church; and for such an act special forms were provided.

Yet with all this the church did very much to abate the evils of slavery. It insisted on the natural equality of men and on the brotherhood of Christians, as motives to kindness towards slaves; and in the treatment of its own dependants it held out an example to lay masters. It threw open its sanctuaries to those who fled from cruelty; it secured their pardon before surrendering them to their owners; it denounced excommunication against any master who should break a promise made to a fugitive slave.

It placed the killing of a slave without judicial authority on the same footing of guilt as the killing of a freeman. It endeavoured to restrain the sale of slaves, by limiting the power which parents among the heathen nations exercised over their own offspring, and by prohibiting that any should be sold to Jews or heathens. It encouraged the redemption of captives, and declared the enfranchisement of slaves to be a work conducive to salvation; and it was through the influence of the church that innumerable masters directed by their wills that their slaves should be set free “for the deliverance of their own souls”. The liberation was often, as under the Roman law, visibly associated with religion by being performed at the altar, where the master resigned his slave to the church, with which the freedman was thenceforth connected by a peculiar tie—he and his descendants paying some slight acknowledgment to it, while, in the failure of posterity, the church was heir to his property.

There was also another way by which the church signally contributed to raise the estimation of the servile classes. As the freemen of the conquering nations were prevented from becoming clergy or monks without the sovereign's leave, in order that he might not lose their military service, the bishops were obliged to recruit the ranks of their clergy chiefly from the classes which were below the obligation to such service. The fourth council of Toledo requires that serfs ordained to be clergymen should be emancipated; but it was not until the year 817, in the reign of Lewis the Pious, that a similar law was established in France, although before that time the clergy of servile race had been exempted from servile duties. The serf, when ordained, became capable of rising to honour and power; when promoted beyond the minor orders, he was assessed at a *wehr* corresponding to that of high secular rank; and this rose with each step to which he was advanced in the hierarchy. The clergy who had thus been raised from a servile condition to dignity and influence felt themselves bound (apart from all religious motives) to labour for the benefit of the class to which they had originally belonged, and a general elevation of that class was the result.

The advancement of persons servilely born to high ecclesiastical station was not, however, unattended by a mixture of bad effects. Thegan, the biographer of Lewis the Pious, gives a very unfavourable representation of such clergy. He tells us that, when they have attained to offices of dignity, the gentleness of their former manners is exchanged for insolence, quarrelsomeness, domineering, and assumption; that they emancipate their relations, and either provide for them by church-preferment or marry them into noble families; and that these upstarts are insufferably insolent to the old nobility. The picture is no doubt coloured both by Thegan's prejudices as a man of high birth, and by his indignation at the behaviour of some ecclesiastics towards his unfortunate sovereign; but the parallels both of history and of our own experience may assure us of its substantial truth.

BOOK V.

FROM THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE TO THE DEPOSITION OF POPE
GREGORY VI,
A.D. 814-1046.

CHAPTER I.

LOUIS THE PIOUS (A.D. 814-840).—END OF THE CONTROVERSY OF THE
IMAGES (A.D. 813-842).THE FALSE DECRETALS

THE great defect of Charlemagne's system was, that it required a succession of such men as himself to carry it on. His actual successors were sadly unequal to sustain the mighty burden of the empire.

Feeling the approach of his end, Charlemagne, after having obtained the concurrence of the national diet, summoned his only surviving legitimate son, Louis, from Aquitaine to Aix-la-Chapelle, where, in the presence of a vast assemblage, he declared him his colleague and successor. He exhorted the prince as to the duties of sovereignty, and received from him a promise of obedience to his precepts. He then desired Lewis to advance to the high altar, on which an imperial crown was placed, to take the crown, and with his own hands to set it on his head—an act by which the emperor intended to assert that he and his posterity derived their title neither from coronation by the pope nor from the acclamations with which the ceremony in St. Peter's had been hailed by the Romans, but immediately from God. After this inauguration, Lewis returned to the government of Aquitaine, but was soon again summoned to Aix-la-Chapelle, in consequence of his father's death, which took place in January 814.

Lewis, at the time of his accession to the empire, was thirty-six years of age. In his infancy, he had been crowned by Pope Adrian as king of his native province, Aquitaine. He had for many years governed that country, and had earned a high character for the justice and the ability of his administration. He was brave, learned, and accomplished; kind-hearted, gentle, and deeply religious. But when from a subordinate royalty he was raised to the head of the empire, defects before unobserved began to appear in his character. His piety was largely tingured with superstition; he had already thought it his duty to abjure the study of classic literature for such as was purely religious, and, but for his father's prohibition, he would have become a monk like his great-uncle Carloman. He was without resolution or energy, wanting in knowledge of men, and ready to become the victim of intrigues.

In Aquitaine Lewis had been surrounded by a court of his own, and his old advisers continued to retain their authority with him. The chief of these was Benedict of Aniane, whose rigid virtue could not fail to be scandalized by the licentiousness which, after Charlemagne's example, had increased in the imperial household during the last years of the late reign. This Lewis at once proceeded to reform by banishing from the court his sisters and their paramours, with other persons of notoriously light reputation. Nor were the statesmen who had been associated with Charlemagne spared. Among these the most important were three

brothers, related to the royal family—Adelhard, Wala, and Bernard. Adelhard had in his youth left the court of Charlemagne in disgust at the divorce of the Lombard queen, and had entered the monastery of Corbie, of which he became abbot. In later years he had acquired a powerful influence over the great emperor; he had been the principal counsellor of his son Pipin in the government of Italy, and in conjunction with Wala he had advised Charlemagne to name Pipin's son Bernard as heir of the empire, in preference to Lewis. Adelhard and the youngest brother were banished; Count Wala was compelled to become a monk in the abbey from which Adelhard was removed; and thus was laid the foundation of a lasting enmity between the men of the old and those of the new reign.

Leo III, dissatisfied (as it would seem) at the manner in which Lewis had received the crown, omitted to congratulate him on his accession, and did not exact from the Romans the usual oath of fidelity to the emperor. The feuds which had once before endangered this pope's life broke out afresh shortly after the death of his protector. There were serious disorders and much bloodshed at Rome; and Leo took it on himself to punish some of his enemies with death—an act which Lewis regarded as an invasion of his own sovereignty. He therefore sent his nephew Bernard, king of Italy, to inquire into the matter on the spot; but the pope disarmed his indignation by submitting to give an explanation of his conduct. Leo died in 816. The wealth which he had at his disposal appears to have been enormous, and the papal librarian Anastasius fills many pages with an enumeration of the splendid gifts which it enabled him to bestow on his church.

The Romans hastily chose as his successor Stephen IV, who was consecrated without any application for the emperor's consent. Stephen felt the necessity of apologizing for this irregularity, which he ascribed to the emergency of the time, when popular tumults were to be apprehended. He published a decree by which it was enacted that the consecration of future popes should be performed in the presence of imperial commissioners; and, after having made the citizens of Rome swear allegiance to Lewis, he himself went into France for the purpose of explanation and excuse—perhaps also to secure himself from the violence of the Roman factions. But the devout emperor did not wait for his submission. He met him at the distance of a mile from Reims; each dismounted from his horse, and Lewis thrice prostrated himself at the pope's feet before venturing to embrace him. On the following Sunday, the pontiff placed on the head of Lewis a splendid crown which he had brought with him, and anointed both him and his empress Ermengarde. Anastasius tells us that the honor paid to the pope almost exceeded the power of language to describe: that he obtained from the emperor whatever he desired; that, after our Lord's example of forgiveness, he pardoned all who in the time of Leo had been obliged to seek a refuge in France on account of offences against the church, and that they accompanied him on his return to Rome. On the death of Stephen in the beginning of the following year (817), Paschal was immediately chosen and consecrated as his successor. The new pope sent a legation to assure the emperor that he "had been forced rather than had leapt into" his see; and his apology was accepted.

Lewis was bent on effecting a reformation both in the church and in the state. By means of his *missi* he redressed many grievances which had grown up under his father's government; and in councils held at Aix in 816 and 817, he passed a great number of regulations for the reform of the clergy and of the religious societies. The secular business in which bishops had been much employed by Charlemagne had not been without an effect on their character and on that of the inferior clergy, so that the condition of the church towards the end of the late reign had retrograded. The canons now passed testify to the existence of many abuses. Their general tone is strict; they aim at securing influence and respect for the clergy by cutting off their worldly pomp, and by enforcing attention to their spiritual duties. The canonical life is regulated by a code enlarged from that of Chrodegang. The acquisition of wealth by improper means is checked by an order that no bequest shall be accepted by churches or monasteries to the disinheriting of the testator's kindred, and that no one shall be

tonsured either as a monk or as a clergyman for the sake of obtaining his property. We find, however, complaints of the evils against which this canon was directed as well after its enactment as before. Another important canon ordered that every parish priest should have a *mansus*, or glebe; that both the glebe and his other property should be discharged from all but ecclesiastical service; and that when this provision should have been fulfilled, every parish, where there was a sufficient maintenance, should have a priest of its own. Benedict of Aniane was president of the assembly which was charged with the monastic reform. He recovered to their proper use many monasteries which had been alienated either to laymen or to secular clergy; and he obtained relief for many from the burdens of gifts to the crown and of military service,—burdens which had pressed so heavily on some of them that the remaining income had been insufficient even for food and clothing. The rule of St. Benedict was taken as the basis of the new reforms; but the canons are marked by a punctilious minuteness very unlike its original spirit.

These reforms were the work of the independent Frankish church, and were sanctioned by the supreme authority of the emperor, who exercised the same prerogative as his father in matters concerning religion.

In the holy week of 817, as Lewis and his household were passing along a gallery which led from the palace to the church of Aix, the wooden pillars on which it rested gave way. The emperor suffered little hurt; but the accident suggested to his counselors the possibility of his death, and the expediency of providing for that event. By their advice he proposed the subject to the national assembly, and obtained its consent to the association of his eldest son, Lothair, as his colleague in the empire; but this measure, which was intended for the preservation of peace, became the source of fatal divisions. The younger brothers, Pipin and Lewis, who held respectively a delegated sovereignty over Aquitaine and Germany, were discontented at finding themselves placed in a new relation of inferiority towards their senior, to whom they were bound to pay gifts, and without whose consent they were not at liberty to make war or peace, to receive ambassadors or to marry. But the elevation of Lothair was still more offensive to Bernard, son of the emperor's elder brother Pipin by a concubine. Bernard had been appointed by Charlemagne to succeed his father in the kingdom of Italy. The defect of his birth was not regarded by the Franks as a bar to inheritance; as it had not prevented his receiving an inferior royalty, it did not disqualify him for succeeding his grandfather in the empire; and, as it was chiefly on the ground of maturer age that Lewis, the younger son of Charlemagne, had been preferred to the representative of the elder son, Bernard might have now expected on the same ground to be preferred to the children of Lewis. The king of Italy had hitherto endeavored, by a ready submission and compliance with his uncle's wishes in all things, to disarm the jealousy which the empress Ermengarde continually strove to instill into her husband's mind. But he now yielded to the influence of the discontented party, of which Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, a Goth or Lombard by birth, and the bishops of Milan and Cremona, were the most active members, while Wala from his monastery zealously aided them by his counsels. The pope himself, Paschal, is said to have been implicated in their schemes. But the emperor and his partisans made demonstrations which showed that any attempt to subvert the government would be hopeless. Bernard repaired to Châlons on the Saone—decoyed, according to some writers, by the empress, under a promise of forgiveness and safety. He confessed to his uncle his guilty designs, and after a trial was sentenced to death. The sentence was compassionately changed by Lewis to the loss of eyesight; but, whether from the cruelty with which the operation was performed, or from grief and despair, the unhappy Bernard died within three days. Theodulf was deprived of his see, without any regard to his plea that, as having received the pall, he was subject to no jurisdiction except the pope's. Lewis, now rendered suspicious of all his kindred, compelled three of his illegitimate brothers—of whom Drogo was afterwards creditably known as bishop of Metz—to be tonsured.

The empress Ermengarde, whose zeal for the interest of her sons had been a principal cause of the late troubles, died shortly after. Lewis in his sorrow was disposed to resign his crown and become a monk. But the ecclesiastics whom he consulted dissuaded him; the daughters of his nobles were assembled for his inspection, and he chose Judith, daughter of Welf I, count of Bavaria, to be the partner of his throne. The new empress is described as not only beautiful, but possessed of learning and accomplishments unusual in the ladies of that age; and her power over her husband was absolute.

In 821, on the marriage of Lothair, Theodulf, Wala, Adelhard, and the other accomplices of Bernard were forgiven—an act of grace which has been traced to the removal of Benedict by death from the emperor's councils. But Lewis was still disturbed by the remembrance of the severities which had been exercised in his name; the alarms of his conscience were increased by some reverses, by earthquakes, and other portents; and at the diet of Attigny, in the following year, he appeared in the dress of a penitent. He lamented his own sins and the sins of his father. He expressed remorse for the death of Bernard—an act in which his only share had been that mitigation of the sentence which had been so unhappily frustrated in the execution. He entreated the forgiveness of Wala and Adelhard, who were present. He professed sorrow for his behaviour to Drogo and his brothers, and bestowed high ecclesiastical dignities on them by way of compensation. He gave large alms to monks, and entreated their prayers; and he issued a capitulary acknowledging his neglect of duty towards the church, and promising amendment of abuses. Wala was sent into Italy, to act as adviser to Lothair, who had obtained that kingdom on the death of Bernard.

On Easter-day 823, Lothair, who had gone to Rome on the invitation of Paschal, was there crowned by the pope as emperor. He had already been crowned by his father, at the time of his elevation to a share in the empire; but Paschal, by persuading him to accept this second coronation, as an ecclesiastical sanction of his authority, carried on a chain of policy which resulted in persuading the world that sovereignty was derived from the gift of St. Peter's successors.

Soon after Lothair's departure from the city, two high officers of the church, who were among the chief of the emperor's Roman partisans, were decoyed into the Lateran palace, where—in punishment, as was believed, of their attachment to the Frank interest—they were blinded and afterwards beheaded. Lewis, on hearing of this affair, sent a count and an abbot to investigate it. The pope appeared before the commissioners, and, with thirty-four bishops and five other clergymen, swore that he had no share in the death of the victims. But he maintained that they had deserved it as traitors; and he refused to give up the murderers, on the ground that they had sought the protection of St. Peter and belonged to the apostle's family. The commissioners, having no authority to use force, reported the circumstances to their master, and Paschal at the same time sent some envoys to offer explanations. The emperor did not pursue the matter further; but he resolved to place his relations with Rome on a more satisfactory footing.

An opportunity was soon furnished in consequence of Paschal's death, which took place in May, 824. A severe contest arose for the papacy. Lothair again went to Rome, and asserted the Frankish sovereignty by acknowledging Eugenius II, the candidate who was supported by Wala's influence, as the rightful successor of St. Peter. The young emperor complained of the late murder of his adherents. He inquired why the popes and the Roman judges were continually spoken against. He discovered that many pieces of land had been wrongfully seized by the popes (perhaps under the pretence that they were legacies to the church), and caused great joy by restoring them to the rightful owners. He settled that, according to ancient custom, imperial commissioners should visit Rome at certain times for the general administration of justice. He exacted of the Romans individually an oath of fealty to the empire, saving their faith to the pope. He enacted that no person should interfere with their right of electing a bishop; but he bound them by an engagement that they would not

allow any one to be consecrated as pope until he should have sworn allegiance to the emperor in the presence of an imperial commissioner. Although this engagement was in the sequel sometimes neglected or evaded, the report of Lothair's proceedings is evidence of the ideas which were then entertained as to the relations of the papacy and the empire. It was considered that the emperor was entitled to investigate elections to the Roman see, and to decide between the pretensions of candidates; and, while the pope was the immediate lord of Rome, his power was held under the emperor, to whom the supreme control of the administration belonged.

After four years of childless marriage, Judith in 823 gave birth to a son, Charles, afterwards known as the Bald. The jealousy of the emperor's sons by Ermengarde was excited; they declared Charles to be the offspring of adultery, and charged Judith with bewitching their father. The empress, on her part, was bent on securing for her son an inheritance like that of his elder brothers, and in 829 he was created duke of Germany—probably in the vain hope that such a title would give less offence than the title of king. Lewis, under the influence of his wife, laboured to buy partisans for Charles by profuse gifts from the hereditary domains of his family and from the property of the church. On this account he had been bitterly attacked by Wala at a diet held in 828; and when his elder sons now broke out into rebellion, they were aided by a powerful party of the hierarchy, headed by Wala (who in 826 had succeeded Adelhard in the abbacy of Corbie), with the archchaplain Hilduin, abbot of St. Denys, Jesse, bishop of Amiens, and Elissachar, abbot of Centulles. Of the motives of these ecclesiastics it is difficult to judge. They may have honestly felt the dangers which threatened the empire from the system of partition which had been introduced; they may have been galled by the imperial control of ecclesiastical affairs, as well as by the invasions of church property. But the pretensions to superiority over the crown which now began to be asserted in their councils are startling, and the conduct by which they followed up their theories was utterly indefensible.

Judith was caught by the insurgents at Laon, and was pursued by the curses of the people into a convent at Poitiers, where she was compelled to take the veil. She was also forced to engage that she would use her influence over her husband to persuade him to enter a monastery. But the inclination which Lewis had formerly felt towards the monastic life was now mastered by his love for Judith and her son. He asked time for consideration; in spite of all opposition he contrived that the next national assembly should not be held in Gaul, where the population were generally disaffected to the Frankish rulers, but at Nimeguen, where he might hope to be supported by the kindred and friendly Germans; and the event answered his expectation. At Nimeguen the emperor found himself restored to power. Hilduin, who had ventured to transgress an order that the members of the diet and their followers should appear unarmed, was banished; and a like sentence was passed on Wala, with others of his party. Lothair (who had rebelled after having sworn to maintain the young Charles in his dukedom), with characteristic meanness, made his submission, abandoned his accomplices, and joined in giving judgment against them. Judith was brought forth from her convent, the pope having declared that her forced profession was null. She undertook to prove by ordeal her innocence of the witchcraft and adultery imputed to her, but, as no accuser appeared, she was allowed to purge herself by oath; and Bernard, count of Septimania, her supposed paramour, on offering to clear himself by the wager of battle, found no one to accept his challenge. Some of those who had been most hostile to Lewis in his distress were condemned to death; but, with his usual gentleness, he allowed them to escape with slighter punishments.

Again and again Judith's eagerness for the interest of her own son, and the jealousy of the elder brothers, brought trouble on the unhappy Lewis, who seems to have fallen into a premature decay. A fresh insurrection took place in 832, in consequence of Charles' advancement to the kingdom of Aquitaine. The pope, Gregory IV, who partly owed his dignity to the influence of Wala and Hilduin, crossed the Alps, and appeared in the camp of

the rebels, where Wala and the other ecclesiastical chiefs of the party waited on him. Lewis was supported by many bishops, who, on a report that the pope meant to excommunicate them and the emperor, declared that, if he had come with such intentions, he himself should be deposed and excommunicated. An answer which Gregory issued, and which was probably written by Paschasius, one of Wala's monks, had no effect; and he began to show uneasiness and discontent with the part which he had undertaken, when Wala and Paschasius reassured him by producing a collection of canons and decretals, which were intended to prove that the pope had the right to judge all causes, and could himself be judged by no man. It seems to have been at this time that Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, sent forth two tracts—the one, a comparison between hierarchical and secular authority; the other, a defence of the rebel princes. In the first of these, he insists on the superiority of the ecclesiastical power; he utters many reproaches against the emperor, and exhorts him to submit to the pope. "If, indeed, pope Gregory had come without reason, and for the purpose of fighting, he would deserve to be opposed and driven back; but if he came for peace, he ought to be obeyed". In the other pamphlet, Agobard charges Judith with gross and notorious profligacy; he justifies the proceedings of the emperor's sons; and, as a precedent for the part taken by himself and his brethren, he alleges the opposition which the priests and prophets of Israel offered to Jezebel and Athaliah. He tells the emperor that Samson, for his love to an unchaste and unbelieving woman, lost his eyes and his judgeship; he exhorts him, since he has thus far been like Samson in the loss of his power, to study that, like him, he may escape the forfeit of his eternal portion by humbly and patiently submitting to his lot.

On St. John Baptist's day (833), the two armies encamped opposite to each other near Colmar. Gregory paid a visit to the emperor, who received him without the usual marks of respect but they afterwards exchanged presents, and the pope continued to pass from the one camp to the other. Arguments, threats, money, and other inducements were employed to influence the adherents of Lewis; and, on the morning of St. Peter and St. Paul's day, he found that all but a handful of his men had deserted him during the night. On discovering his forlorn condition, he professed himself unwilling to be the cause of bloodshed; he advised those of his followers who could expect no mercy from the rebels to save themselves by flight, desired the others to follow the example of the majority, and gave himself up as a prisoner to his sons. The pope is said to have returned to Italy in deep grief and shame on account of his share in these transactions, while the popular feeling with respect to them was shown by the name given to the scene where they took place—*Lugenfeld*, "the Field of Lies".

Judith, for whose safety in life and limb the successful rebels had pledged themselves by oath, was sent across the Alps to Tortona, while Charles was shut up in the abbey of Prüm, and Lewis was led about as a captive by his eldest son. But Lothair and his advisers soon became aware that a general feeling of pity was rising in favour of the unfortunate emperor; and they resolved to defeat it by an act which was intended to disqualify him for reigning. At a diet held at Compiègne, a bishop (probably Agobard) begged Lothair's permission that a representation should be made to Lewis of the misdeeds by which he had lowered the empire of the great Charles. There was little show of opposition to the proposal; Lewis in his captivity was importuned to become a monk by a number of bishops, among whom Thegan tells us that the most active were some of servile or barbaric birth,—above all, shameless and most cruel, Ebbo of Reims, who had turned against the emperor at the Field of Lies; and, as their solicitations were in vain, they resolved to proceed by other means. In an indictment of eight heads, drawn up with much iteration, and partly relating to offences for which he had already done penance at Attigny, he was charged with acts of violence towards his kinsmen—the death of Bernard, the tonsuring of Drogo and his brothers; with frequent breach of oaths, especially as to the partition of the empire; with having violated the rest of holy seasons by military expeditions and by holding courts or diets; with outrages and injustice against many of his subjects; with having caused waste of life and an infinite amount of misery through the

calamities of war. The bishops assumed the right of judging the emperor. They condemned him in his absence, declared him to be deprived of earthly power, and, in order to prevent the loss of his soul, they sentenced him to do penance before the relics of St. Medard and St. Sabinian at Soissons. He was strictly guarded in a cell until the day appointed for the ceremony, when he was led forth, not as a sovereign, but as a sinful Christian desirous of showing penitence for his offences. Lothair was present, with a large body of bishops and clergy, and the cathedral was filled by a crowd of spectators. The emperor, clothed in sackcloth, prostrated himself before the altar; he acknowledged that he had been guilty of misgovernment, offensive to God, scandalous to the church, and disastrous to his people; and he professed a wish to do penance, that he might obtain absolution for his misdeeds. The bishops told him that a sincere confession would be followed by forgiveness, and exhorted him that he should not, as on the former occasion, attempt to hide any part of his sin. The list of charges against him was put into his hands; with a profusion of tears he owned himself guilty of all; and he gave up the document, to be placed on the altar as a record of his repentance. He then laid down his sword and his military belt; he was stripped of the secular dress which he had worn under his sackcloth; and after these acts it was pretended that, according to the ancient canons, he was incapable of returning to the exercise of arms or of sovereign power. 6 Every bishop who had been concerned in the affair drew up a memoir of it, which he gave into the hands of Lothair.

But the projectors of this humiliation were mistaken in their hopes. Compassion for the emperor and indignation against those who had outraged him under the pretence of religion were almost universal. His younger sons, Pipin and Lewis, took his part, and Lothair, alarmed by the tokens of the general feeling, hastily withdrew from St. Denys, leaving his father at liberty. Friends speedily gathered around Lewis; he was advised to resume his military ornaments, but refused to do so unless with the formal sanction of the church. He was therefore solemnly reconciled in the abbey of St. Denys; his belt and sword were restored to him by some of the same bishops who had been concerned in his degradation; it was declared that a penitent who had laid down his belt might resume it on the expiration of his penance; and the popular joy at the emperor's restoration drew encouragement from a sudden change of the weather, which had long been boisterous and ungenial.

In February 835 a council was held at Thionville, where eight archbishops and thirty-three bishops condemned their brethren who had shared in the proceedings at Compiègne and Soissons. Among these delinquents the most noted was Ebbo, a man of servile birth, who had been foster-brother of Lewis, and like other low-born clerks, had been promoted by him with a view of counterbalancing the aristocratic prelates who aimed at independence of the crown. Ebbo was a man of learning, and had labored as a missionary among the northern tribes; but his behavior towards his benefactor had been conspicuously ungrateful. His treason had been rewarded by Lothair with a rich abbey, and, when the cause of Lewis again became triumphant, he had fled, with all the wealth that he could collect, in the hope of finding a refuge among the Northmen. He was, however, overtaken, and, after having for some time been detained in the monastery of Fulda, he was compelled to ascend the pulpit of a church at Metz, where, in the presence of Lewis, and of the assembled bishops, clergy, and laity, he acknowledged that all the late proceedings against the emperor were unjust and sinful. At Thionville he wrote and subscribed a profession of his own unworthiness; he was deposed from his see, and remained in monastic custody or in exile until the death of Lewis. Other bishops who had taken part against the emperor were gently treated on confessing their guilt, while Agobard, who did not appear, was condemned for his contumacy.

Lothair was deprived of the imperial title, and was confined to the kingdom of Italy. But Judith afterwards found it expedient to make overtures to him, and a partition—the last of the partitions which attest the difficulties and the weakness of Lewis—was made in 839, by which Pipin, the emperor's grandson, was to be excluded from inheriting his father's kingdom

of Aquitaine; and, with the exception of Bavaria, which was left to the younger Lewis, the whole empire was to be shared between Lothair and Charles. To the last the reign of Lewis was distracted by the enmities of his sons, who had alike cast away all filial and all brotherly regards. He died on the 20th of June 840, in an island of the Rhine opposite Ingelheim, when engaged in an expedition against his son Lewis of Germany. On his death-bed he received the consolations of religion from his illegitimate brother Drogo, bishop of Metz. His last words, "Out! Out!" were interpreted as an adjuration commanding the evil spirit to depart.

During the earlier years of this reign, the fame of Charlemagne continued to invest the empire with dignity in the eyes of foreign nations, and Lewis himself carried on successful war in various directions. But the dissensions of the Franks afterwards exposed them to enemies from without. The Northmen, whose first appearances on the coast had filled the mind of Charlemagne with gloomy forebodings, advanced up the Scheld in 820. In 835, they burnt the great trading city of Dorstadt, with its fifty-four churches; and their ravages were felt on the banks of the Loire and elsewhere. To the south, the Saracens were a no less formidable foe; in 838 they plundered Marseilles, and carried off its monks and clergy as prisoners. And on the east, the Slavonic nations had taken advantage of the Frankish contests to make inroads on the imperial territory. The dangers which thus threatened the empire on various sides became yet more serious under the successors of Lewis.

Although the decision of the second Nicene council had been established as law in the eastern empire, the conformity to it which was enforced was in many cases insincere. A considerable party among the bishops and clergy was opposed to the worship of images; and in the army, the enthusiasm with which the memory of the martial iconoclastic emperors was cherished was usually accompanied by an attachment to their opinions.

Leo V, the Armenian, who in 813 became emperor by the deposition of Michael Rhangabe, was, by the influence both of his early training and of his military associations, opposed to the worship of images. His enemies speak of him by the name of *Chameleon*, on account of the insincere and changeable character which they impute to him; but even they allow that he was a man of unusual energy, and of abilities which fitted him to sustain the declining empire. The patriarch Nicephorus—not (it would seem) from suspicion, but merely in compliance with custom—required him on his elevation to subscribe a profession of faith; but Leo desired that the matter should be deferred until after his coronation, and, when the application was then renewed, he refused.

Like other adventurers who rose to the possession of empire (and probably like a far greater number in whom the promise was not fulfilled), Leo had in early life been told that he was destined to become emperor. Hence he derived an inclination to believe in prophecies; and a monk who by a rare exception to the feeling of his class, was adverse to the cause of images, now assured him of a long and glorious reign if he would suppress the worship of them, while he threatened him with calamity in case of his acting otherwise. The words produced their effect on Leo; and he was further influenced by a comparison between the prosperous reigns of the iconoclastic emperors and the misfortunes of those who had followed an opposite policy. He resolved to take the Isaurian Leo and his son for his examples; but, before proceeding to action, he wished to assure himself as to the grounds of his cause. He therefore desired Antony, bishop of Sylaeum in Pamphylia, John the Grammarian, and other ecclesiastics, to abridge for his information the acts of Constantine's iconoclastic synod, and to collect authorities from the fathers against the adoration of images. He then opened the matter to Nicephorus, urging that the disasters of the empire were popularly ascribed to the worship of images—an assertion which ought perhaps to be taken as representing the feeling of the soldiery alone; and he proposed that such as were placed low and within reach should be removed. The patriarch refused his consent; on which the emperor asked him to produce any scriptural warrant in favour of images. Nicephorus replied that the worship of these, like many other unwritten things, was matter of apostolical tradition, and had been taught to the

church by the Holy Ghost; that it would be as reasonable to ask for scriptural proof in favour of reverencing the cross or the gospels. And on being desired to argue the question with Antony and John, or to refute the authorities which they had produced against his views, he declined, on the ground that he must have nothing to do with heretics.

Nicephorus and his partisans—clergy, monks, and laity—now held nightly meetings in the cathedral, where they engaged in prayer for the frustration of the emperor's designs, and bound themselves to stand by the cause of images even to the death. On hearing of these assemblies, Leo in the dead of night sent for the patriarch, and the question was discussed at great length. Nicephorus repeated his declaration as to the unlawfulness of holding conference with heretics, and after a time asked leave to introduce his friends, who had accompanied him to the palace, and during his conference with the emperor had been waiting without the gates. Of these the most prominent was Theodore, a priest, and abbot of a monastery in the capital, which had been founded by Studius, a noble Roman, and was better known by a name derived from his than by that of its patron, St. John the Baptist. Theodore was a nephew of the abbot Plato, who had excommunicated Constantine VI, on account of his second marriage, and had vehemently opposed Tarasius for his compliance with the emperor's will in that affair. Theodore himself had taken part with his uncle; he had endured exile and other severities in punishment of his contumacy, and had incurred fresh penalties under the reign of Nicephorus, when some questions connected with Constantine's marriage were revived. Under his care, the Studite community had increased the number of its members from about twelve to nearly a thousand; the strictness of its discipline had acquired for it an eminence above all other Greek monasteries; and the abbot's character and sufferings had won for him an influence which made him important even in the eyes of the sovereign. Theodore took up the cause of images with all his characteristic zeal. There were, indeed, among its partisans some extravagances so violent that he felt himself obliged to reject and censure them; but he himself went so far as to eulogize a high official for employing an image as sponsor for a child. He held that images were not for the unlearned only, but were necessary for the most advanced Christian; that a reverence for them was necessary in order to a right faith in the Incarnation. If images were suppressed, he said, "our preaching is vain, and your faith is also vain".

On being admitted into the emperor's presence, Theodore entered on the subject of images with great vehemence. He reproached Leo for innovating in matters of religion, and reminded him of the fate which had befallen emperors who had been enemies of the faith. The Old Testament prohibitions of images, he said, are abolished by the incarnation: if the law of Moses were to be regarded, how is it that we worship the cross, which the law speaks of as accursed?—and he urged the other usual topics of his party. The emperor told him that his insolence was notorious, but that, if he wished for the glory of martyrdom, he would be disappointed. Theodore rejoined that the imperial power was limited to external matters; that, according to St. Paul, God had "set in the church first apostles, then prophets, and afterwards teachers", but that nothing was said of emperors; that the emperor was bound to obey in matters of religion, and not to usurp the office of others. "Do you exclude me from the church?" asked Leo. "It is not I", the monk replied, "but the apostle; nay rather, it is you who by your deeds have excluded yourself". The emperor desired that Antony of Sylaeum might be released from the excommunication which Nicephorus had pronounced against him; but this was refused, and at length Leo in anger dismissed the patriarch and his party. On leaving the palace Theodore was enthusiastically kissed by his companions, and was greeted with demonstrations of the warmest admiration on account of the stand which he had made.

Leo now desired the friends of images to give up their meetings, to remain quietly at home, and to refrain from discussing the subjects which were in question; and he required them to bind themselves by a written promise of obedience. Some complied; but before Nicephorus had signified his intentions, Theodore sent forth a violent circular addressed to all the monks of the empire, censuring the patriarch for his neglect to take more decided

measures against the emperor; and threatening with eternal punishment all who should desert the cause of images. He kept up a lively agitation by means of letters, visits, and conversations, and vehemently asserted the cause of images, in verse as well as in prose. The chief of his productions are three tracts which bear the title of *Antirrhetics*—the first two in the form of dialogue between an orthodox man and a heretic; the third, consisting of the iconoclastic objections with a triumphant answer to each of them.

The emperor's opposition to images was not extreme. He did not wish to destroy them, or even to remove such as might be retained without superstition; nor did he desire to disturb the convictions of those who were attached to them, if they would consent to extend a like toleration to others. But the vehemence of Theodore and his party, who regarded the worship of images as an inseparable consequence of a right faith in the incarnation, provoked Leo to measures of great severity. The soldiery, without waiting for a legal warrant (yet perhaps incited by the emperor, as his enemies asserted), broke out into tumult, and rushed to the brazen gate, where the image of "the Surety", so famous in an earlier stage of the controversy, had been reinstated by Irene. They uttered much abusive language, and pelted the figure with dirt and stones; whereupon the emperor removed it, under the pretence of rescuing it from such indignities, and issued a commission for taking down images in general, wherever it could be done with safety. Images were broken, burnt, or bedaubed with clay and filth. Many refractory bishops, abbots, and others, were ejected and banished; among the sufferers was the chronicler Theophanes, who died in the island of Samothrace.

At Christmas 814, the emperor went in state to St. Sophia's, having previously satisfied Nicephorus that no disorder was to be apprehended by drawing a picture from his bosom and kissing it. He advanced to the altar, and kissed the altar-cloth, which was embroidered with a representation of the Saviour's nativity. But when, in the course of the service, a denunciation of idolatry was read from Isaiah, one of the clergy stepped forth, and, addressing the emperor, told him that God, by the prophet's words, commanded him to proceed firmly in his measures for the suppression of image-worship.

Nicephorus fell seriously ill, and it was hoped that his death would spare the emperor the necessity of proceeding against him. But he recovered, and, as all attempts to treat with him were fruitless, he was deprived, and was shut up in a monastery, where he lived fourteen years longer. John the Grammarian was proposed as his successor, but was rejected as wanting in birth and in age; and the Patriarchate was bestowed on Theodotus Cassiteras, a layman connected with the family of the Isaurian emperors, and the supposed prompter of the monk by whose prophecies Leo had been induced to attempt the suppression of image-worship. Theodotus, who is described by his opponents as "a man without reason, more dumb than the fishes, and ignorant of everything but impiety", gave great offence to the monastic party by his free and secular habits of life. He assembled a synod, which confirmed the judgments of the iconoclastic council of 754, and annulled those of the second Nicene council. The most eminent abbots had been summoned to take part in the assembly; but Theodore in their name sent a refusal in his usual vehement strain, condemning all who should attend, and declaring that he would not share in or regard any measures which might be taken without the consent of the lawful patriarch Nicephorus. In defiance of the imperial order against the public exhibition of images, he caused his monks on Palm Sunday to carry in solemn procession all those which belonged to the monastery, and to chant a hymn which began with the words, "We adore thine undefiled image".

The emperor, greatly provoked by this daring contumacy, sent Theodore into banishment, where he remained for seven years. He was removed from one place to another; he was often cruelly scourged, even to the danger of his life; his wounds were undressed, nor, when he fell seriously ill, could he obtain any attendance or relief; he suffered from want of food; he was imprisoned for three years in a loathsome subterranean dungeon, and was often threatened with death. But his resolution rose with the severity of his treatment. He declared

that he would bear whatever might be inflicted on him, but that nothing should reduce him to silence. He found means of writing and of circulating letters which sustained the determination of his party; he denounced the emperor as a Pharaoh and a Nebuchadnezzar, an enemy of the Saviour and of His virgin mother; and the increased punishment which he drew on himself by each offence served only to stimulate him to greater violence. He wrote to the bishop of Rome, to the three eastern patriarchs, and to the heads of some important monasteries, representing the oppressions of the church in the most moving terms, and earnestly praying for sympathy.

Paschal, who had just been raised to the papacy, refused to admit the imperial envoys into Rome, sent legates to intercede with Leo for the friends of images, and, in token of the interest which he took in them, built a monastery for Greek refugees, to whom he assigned the new church of St. Praxedis for the performance of service in their own language. The clergy of the party sought ordination in Italy; the laity, instigated by Theodore's teaching, refused religious offices at the hands of the iconoclastic clergy. Leo was more and more exasperated. The worshippers of images were scourged, banished, mutilated, blinded, or put to death; it was ordered that all pictures should be whitewashed, or taken down and burnt; spies were employed to discover all who possessed images or books in defence of them, all who should venture to shelter a fugitive or to relieve a prisoner of the party. All hymns in honor of images were expunged from the liturgy, and care was taken to instill an abhorrence of images into children by means of their school-books

Michael the Stammerer, a general to whom Leo had been indebted for his throne, at length became discontented, and was convicted, by his own confession, of treasonable designs, on the eve of Christmas 820. He was condemned to death, and Leo would have ordered the execution of the sentence to take place immediately, but for the intercession of his empress, who entreated him to defer it until after the festival. The emperor agreed, but, with a melancholy foreboding, told her that her pious scruples would cost her and her children dear. Michael was confined in the palace, and Leo, anxious to assure himself, went in the middle of the night to look whether the prisoner were safe. He found both him and the officer who guarded him asleep; but the keeper had resigned his bed to the criminal, and was lying on the floor. A slave, who was in the room unobserved, had recognized the emperor by his purple buskins, and on his withdrawal aroused the sleepers. The officer, knowing that the indulgence which he had shown to the prisoner must render himself suspected as an accomplice, concerted with Michael a plan for instant action. Under pretence that a confessor was required, he introduced into the palace one of Michael's partisans, who, on going out, communicated with others. It was the custom to celebrate the earliest service of Christmas-day at three o'clock in the morning; the ivory gate of the palace was open to admit the clergy and singers, and among them a band of disguised conspirators entered. These attacked the chief chaplain, supposing him to be the emperor, who usually led the psalmody on such occasions; but the priest escaped by uncovering his tonsured head. They then fell on Leo, who for a time defended himself by swinging the chain of a censer, and afterwards, seizing a large cross from the altar, dealt heavy blows around him, until a conspirator of gigantic size disabled him by a stroke which cut off his right hand. On this, the emperor was immediately dispatched; his head was cut off, and his body was dragged into the circus. Michael, before a smith could be found to release him from his chains, was hastily enthroned, and on the same day he was crowned in the church of St. Sophia.

The friends of images now flattered themselves that Leo's policy would be reversed. The deposed patriarch Nicephorus wrote to request that the emperor would restore the images; while Theodore the Studite warmly congratulated Michael on his accession, and celebrated the murder of Leo with ferocious exultation. "It was right", he said, "that the apostate should thus end his life. It was fitting that in the night death should overtake the son of darkness. It was fitting that he who had desolated the temples of God should see swords bared against

himself in God's temple. It was fitting that he should find no shelter from the altar who had destroyed the altar itself, and that that hand should be cut off which had been stretched forth against the holy things. It was fitting that a sword should pierce through the throat which had vomited forth blasphemies". After exercising his rhetoric in this style through other points of congruity, Theodore adds, in words which it is possible that he may have himself believed—"I do not mock at the manner of his death, as rejoicing in the fate of the impious man, but I speak in sorrow and with tears. It is because, as He hath said who cannot lie, that wicked man hath been miserably destroyed"; and he goes on to express his hope "that a new Josiah or Jovian may arise for the restoration of images and of religion".

Michael recalled those who had been banished for their attachment to images, and the return of Theodore was celebrated by a sort of public triumph. But the hopes which had been rashly entertained were soon disappointed. The emperor, a Phrygian by birth, was a rude soldier; it is said that he could hardly read. His enemies assert that his highest accomplishments consisted in a knowledge of horses, asses, and pigs; and to this it is added, that in early life he had been connected with a strange sect which mixed up Jewish tenets with those of the Athingani and Paulicians—that he still retained its errors, that he denied our Lord's resurrection and the existence of the devil. The joy of the monastic party was effectually checked when the noted iconomachist Antony of Sylaeum was raised in 821 to the patriarchate of Constantinople. Michael declared that he himself had never worshipped any imaged he forbade all changes in religion, and all preaching on either side of the question. Both the friends and the opponents of images were to enjoy full liberty of opinion; but no public worship of images was to be allowed in the capital. Thus Theodore and his friends found that, instead of the ascendancy which they had expected, they were only to enjoy toleration—and that of a kind which was equal only in name, inasmuch as, while the opposite party lost nothing, the devotees of images were restrained from the open exercise of the worship which they regarded as essential. They once more refused to confer with their opponents, on the ground that it was unlawful to do so. Theodore repeated to Michael the declaration which he had made to Leo, that earthly princes have no right to intermeddle with matters of religion. He desired the emperor to restore Nicephorus to the patriarchal throne, or, if he felt any doubt or distrust, to follow the tradition of the fathers by referring the matter to the bishop of Rome, as the inheritor of the Saviour's promise to St. Peter. He met Michael's endeavors at a reconciliation between the parties by laboring to separate the church from the state. He wrote to Marina, the divorced wife of Constantine VI, whose daughter Michael had taken from a convent to become his second wife, charging her to leave the palace and her daughter's company, because the sword spoken of in the Gospel was now come to set the nearest kindred at variance among themselves. Michael was provoked by the intractable behavior of Theodore and his followers to abandon his principle of toleration, and to employ harsh measures against them. The Studite was once more banished, and died in exile at the age of sixty-nine.

As the adherents of images relied much on the support of Rome, the emperor in 824 sent a legation to pope Paschal, with a view of endeavoring to dissuade him from harboring refugees of the party. At the same time, he sent ambassadors to Lewis the Pious, with a letter in which he announced his accession, and his late victory over a rival named Thomas, who had pretended to be the deposed Constantine, and for three years had contested the possession of the empire. In this letter Michael clears his faith and his conduct in ecclesiastical matters from misrepresentations which had reached the west; he entreats the Frank emperor to aid him by the influence which, as lord of Rome, he could exercise over the pope, and in justification of his proceedings he gives some curious statements of the excess to which the superstition as to images was carried. The cross was turned out of churches, and images were substituted for it; lights and incense were offered to them, hymns and prayers were addressed to them. They were employed as sponsors for children; and novices entering into the monastic state, instead

of asking religious persons to receive their hair when cut off, allowed it to fall into the lap of images. Some of the clergy, in contempt of the public churches, celebrated the Eucharist in houses, using pictures for altars. Some scraped off the colors of images, mixed them with the sacramental elements, and administered the mixture to communicants ; while others placed the consecrated bread in the hands of images, and from these the communicants received it. The effect of this embassy fell short of Michael's expectation; but we shall see that it was not unimportant in the history of the western church.

Michael was succeeded in 829 by his son Theophilus. The young emperor had been carefully educated under John the Grammarian. He was a friend of literature, arts, and science; he composed hymns and church-music, and himself led the choir in divine service. He prided himself on a strict administration of justice, which sometimes became an absurd or cruel pedantry; and his attempts in war against the Saracens resulted in fruitless displays of courage and waste of blood, which gained for him the epithet of "the Unlucky". From the lessons of John he had derived a strong abhorrence of images, and he carried out his views with relentless determination.

The first measure of Theophilus against images was an order, issued on the occasion of a general taxation, that the opinions of every person on the question should be ascertained. He then, in 832, commanded that images should not be revered in any way, and that they should not be styled holy, forasmuch as God alone is holy. In the same year, on the death of Antony, he bestowed the patriarchate on his tutor, John, who soon after held a synod at which the decrees of the second Nicene council were condemned. The emperor then ordered that pictures of animals and other common subjects should be substituted in churches for those of a religious kind; and he proceeded with great severity to enforce obedience. A general burning of religious pictures and statues took place. Many of the party devoted to images were imprisoned or banished. Monasteries were to be applied to secular uses; monks were forbidden to wear their habit; such of them as had lived in rural convents were not to be admitted into towns; and those who painted images were especially forbidden to exercise their art. The zealous party among the monks, on their side, were as resolute as the emperor. Many of them went to him, and told him to his face that he was accursed for interfering with a worship which was derived from St. Luke, from the apostles, and from the Saviour himself. A monastic artist named Lazarus persisted in painting, notwithstanding repeated admonitions. He was cruelly beaten; but as soon as he had recovered in some degree, he boldly resumed his occupation. For this defiance of the law, he was again arrested; by way of disabling him, his hands were seared with hot plates of iron; and it was with difficulty that his life was saved through the intercession of the empress Theodora. Yet no suffering or danger could subdue the zealous painter, who, on being set at liberty, took refuge in a church of St. John the Baptist, and there produced a picture which speedily acquired the reputation of miraculous power. Two other monks, the poet Theophanes and his brother Theodore, were summoned to the emperor's presence. Theophilus, who was fond of displaying his learning and ability in disputation, was provoked at finding that the monks did not yield with the same facility to which he had been accustomed in his courtiers. He ordered that each of them should receive two hundred lashes, and should afterwards be branded on the forehead with twelve iambic verses of the emperor's own composition : "If the lines are bad", he said, "they deserve no better". Yet, notwithstanding these and many other severities, it does not appear that any persons suffered death in this reign on account of an attachment to images.

But within the emperor's immediate circle the worship of images was secretly practiced. In the beginning of his reign, his stepmother, Euphrosyne, the daughter of Constantine VI by his Armenian empress, had caused the noblest maidens of the empire to be assembled in order that Theophilus might select a consort from among them. Struck with the beauty of Icasia, he was about to bestow on her the golden apple, which was the symbol of his choice, when he paused for a moment, and said, as if unconsciously uttering his thought—"Of

how much evil have women been the cause!”. Icasia at once answered the reference to Eve with an allusion to the Redemption—“Yes; and of how much greater good!”. But the emperor took alarm at this excessive readiness of repartee; he gave the apple to Theodora, a candidate of less brilliant and more domestic character; and Icasia sought consolation in founding a monastery, where she lived for the cultivation of learning. Theodora had been brought up in the worship of images. Her mother, who was devoted to them, secretly kept a number of them, and, when the emperor’s children visited her, she used to bring forth the images, and offer them to be kissed. Theophilus, by questioning the children, discovered that their grandmother was in the habit of amusing them with figures which they regarded as dolls. He strictly forbade them to visit her again, and she had difficulty in escaping punishment, although she continued to reprove the emperor very freely for his measures. Theodora herself was detected in paying reverence to images by a dwarf, who was kept about the court as a jester. On hearing his tale, Theophilus rushed in a fury to the empress’s apartment; but the images were not to be found, and the dwarf was silenced for the future by a whipping.

Theophilus died in January 842. Fearing, in his last sickness, for the empire which he was about to leave to women and young children, he endeavored to secure it by the death of his brother-in-law Theophobus, a descendant of the Persian kings, who had distinguished himself by military services. The head of Theophobus was cut off in prison, and was carried to the emperor; and with his hand on it he expired.

It is said that Theophilus, with a view to the continuance of his own ecclesiastical policy, had bound Theodora and the senate by oath to make no change as to religion. The guardians of his son Michael, however, were either favorable to images or capable of being gained to the cause. The only seeming exception was Manuel, uncle of the empress. But in a dangerous sickness he was visited by some Studite monks, who promised him life if he would swear to undertake the restoration of images : and Manuel, on his recovery, joined with the other ministers in laying the subject before Theodora, who replied that her own wishes had long been in the same direction, but that she had felt herself restrained by her engagements to Theophilus. The revolution was speedily begun. The patriarch John was ejected, not without personal violence, and Methodius, who had been a confessor under the last reign, was put into his place. A synod, to which those who were known as resolute iconomachists were not invited, pronounced in favour of images; but the empress still hesitated, and entreated the assembled clergy to intercede for the forgiveness of her husband’s sins. Methodius replied that they could only intercede for those who were yet on earth; that, if Theophilus had died in his error, his case was beyond the power of the church. Thus urged, Theodora ventured on the fiction (which she is said to have even confirmed with an oath) that the emperor, before his death, had expressed repentance for his measures; that he had asked for some images, and had kissed them with ardent devotion; whereupon the patriarch assured her that, if it were so, he would answer for her husband’s salvation. There was now no further hindrance to the restoration of images. Those of the capital were reestablished with great solemnity on the first Sunday in Lent—a day which was styled the Feast of Orthodoxy, and has ever since been celebrated by the Greeks under that name, although with a wider application of the term. The bodies of Nicephorus, Theodore the Studite, and other friends of images who had died in exile, were translated to the capital. The sees were filled with members of the triumphant party, and among them was the branded monk Theophanes, who obtained the bishopric of Nicaea. The empress, at a banquet, expressed to him her regret for the cruelty with which her husband had treated him. “Yes”, said Theophanes, “for this I will call him to account at the righteous judgment-seat of God!”. Theodora was struck with horror; but the patriarch Methodius reassured her by blaming the vehemence of his brother, and by repeating his declaration that Theophilus was safe.

The worship of images—although only in the form of painting, not of sculpture—has ever since been retained by the Greeks. The opposition to it had not proceeded from the

people, but from the will of the emperors; and when the imperial authority was steadily exerted in favour of images, the iconomachist party became, not indeed immediately, but within no long time, extinct.

The opinion of the Frankish church as to images had continued in accordance with the council of Frankfort, when the embassy from the Greek emperor Michael, in 824, led to a fresh examination of the question. Lewis had such confidence in the correctness of the Frankish view as to hope that, if care were taken to avoid all cause of irritation, even the pope himself might be brought to agree in it. He therefore, after having received the Greek ambassadors, sent some envoys of his own to Rome in their company, with a request that Eugenius, who had just succeeded Paschal, would allow the clergy of Gaul to collect the opinions of the fathers on the subject. Having, by this show of deference to the pope, guarded against offence in the outset, Lewis summoned an assembly which met at Paris in 825. The bishops drew up a collection of authorities, which they forwarded to the emperor, with a letter in which they censure both the extreme parties among the Greeks. They distinguish, as the Caroline Books had done, between paying reverence to the cross and to images, and declare the opinion of the fathers to be, that images are not to be worshipped or adored, but are to be used for loving remembrance of the originals. They strongly censure Pope Adrian's manner of answering the Caroline Books; but they charitably suggest that his reference to his predecessor Gregory the Great, in behalf of opinions widely different from those which that father really held, proves his error to have been not willful, but committed in ignorance. They congratulate Lewis on the prospect which the Greek application affords him of being able to mediate between the opposite parties, to convince the pope himself, and to bring both to an agreement in the truth. They send him a sketch of a letter to the pope, drawn up with an extreme anxiety to avoid all risk of a collision. In this document the emperor is made to extol the position and authority of the supreme pontiff, the universal pope, as having the means of reconciling the intolerant factions of the Greeks; he will not presume to dictate, but only ventures on suggestions; he speaks of the assembly of Paris as not a synod, but merely a conference of his friends, the children of the apostolic father. The bishops even go so far as to annex a letter which they suggest that the pope himself might subscribe and send to Constantinople—forbidding all superstitions as to images on the one hand, and all acts of contempt or outrage against them on the other.

Two bishops, Jeremy of Sens and Jonas of Orleans, were sent by Lewis to Rome, with a letter entirely different from the draft which the council had supplied. The emperor requests Eugenius to mediate between the friends and the enemies of images, and offers that his own envoys may accompany those whom the pope should send to Constantinople. The instructions given to Jeremy and Jonas direct them to deal very carefully with the pope. They are not to show him any parts of the documents drawn up at Paris which might be distasteful to him; they are to avoid everything which might possibly jar on the characteristic obstinacy of the Romans, and thus might provoke him to some irrevocable act; they are to present the matter to him in such a way that, instead of supposing the truth to be forced on him, and thence conceiving a prejudice against it, he may imagine it to be his own discovery.

The result of this mission is but imperfectly known. It did not induce the Romans to abandon their former views; yet Eugenius made no such demonstration against Lewis as his predecessors had made against the eastern emperors; nor did he even attempt to answer him, as Adrian had answered Charlemagne. The envoys whom Lewis sent to the east were well received there, and, as Michael was himself no violent iconoclast, it seems probable that the two imperial courts agreed as to the question of images. But the Franks were soon after engrossed by domestic troubles, which may sufficiently account for the absence of any later communication with the Greeks on the subject of this controversy.

There were, however, some members of the Frankish church who carried their opposition to images beyond the views which had been sanctioned by the councils of

Frankfort and Paris. Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, whose share in the political movements of his time has been noticed in the earlier part of this chapter, distinguished himself more creditably by his opposition to prevailing, superstitions—as to ordeals, to the expectation of miraculous cures, to the excess of reverence lavished on the tombs of saints, to the belief that storms, diseases of cattle, and other rural troubles were caused by magical art. Among his tracts is one *Of the Images of Saints*, in which —provoked, as it would seem, by the eastern emperor's report as to the extravagant superstition of the Greeks—he appears altogether to disallow the use of such representations. He quotes largely from older writers, especially from St. Augustine, and shows that the early church had employed images for remembrance only, and not for any religious purpose. In answer to a plea frequently advanced by the advocates of images, he maintains that visible things, even although good in themselves, instead of aiding towards the contemplation of things unseen and spiritual, often act as a hindrance to it. An image, he says, represents the body only; if men were to be worshipped at all, such honor ought rather to be paid to them while alive, and complete in the union of body and soul. He who adores a picture or an image pays his worship not to God, to angels, or to saints, but to the image itself; to think otherwise is to yield to a delusion of the devil, who aims at the restoration of idolatry. Nor is it less absurd to expect good from religious pictures than it would be to think of recruiting an army with painted soldiers, or to look for the fruits of the earth from a picture of the harvest or of the vintage.

It does not appear that Agobard incurred any censure on account of his opinions as to images; but one of his contemporaries, Claudius of Turin (who, indeed, took up the subject somewhat earlier), by a more thorough and more active opposition to the prevailing religion, occasioned much agitation in the Frankish church. Claudius was by birth a Spaniard, and is said to have been a pupil of Felix of Urgel, although he does not appear to have been a follower of the adoptionist doctrines. He was a diligent student of St. Augustine, but spoke contemptuously of the other fathers in general; and it would seem that from the doctrines of the great African teacher as to the nothingness of human merit he derived a strong dislike of the current opinions as to the means of attaining sanctity. He had gained reputation by commentaries on Scripture, of which some are still extant. He had been attached to the court of Lewis in Aquitaine and in the first year of his patron's reign as emperor was appointed by him to the see of Turin, in the hope that he might be able to effect a reform among his clergy and in the neighbouring district. The emperor, however, could hardly have been prepared for reforms so extensive as those which Claudius attempted. Finding that the churches of his diocese were full of images and votive offerings, he at once unceremoniously ejected all such ornaments. No distinction was made in favor of historical pictures; and relics and crosses—objects which the eastern iconoclasts had spared—shared the same fate. To worship the images of saints, he said, is merely a renewal of the worship of demons under other names; to worship the cross is to join with the heathen in dwelling on the shame of the Saviour's history, to the exclusion of his glorious resurrection; and he followed out this by arguing, in a somewhat ribald style, that, if the cross were to be revered on account of its connection with the Saviour, the same reason would enforce the veneration of all other objects which are mentioned as having been connected with Him. He opposed the worship of saints, supplications for their intercession, and the practice of dedicating churches to their honour. He also objected to the practice of pilgrimage; it was, he said, a mistake to expect benefit from visiting the shrine of St. Peter, inasmuch as the power of forgiving sins, which was bestowed on the apostles, belonged to them only during their lifetime, and on their death passed from them to others. On being pressed, however, he said that he did not absolutely either condemn or approve pilgrimages, because their effects were various in different persons. The proceedings of Claudius occasioned much excitement. Pope Paschal, on hearing of them, expressed his displeasure, although he did not venture to take any active steps against a bishop who had been so lately promoted by the emperor's personal favour; but Claudius made light

of the papal censure—declaring that the title of apostolical belongs not to him who occupies an apostle's seat, but to one who does an apostle's work.

Theodemir, an abbot, who had been a friend and admirer of Claudius, on receiving one of his works which was inscribed to himself, took alarm and wrote against him. Claudius defended himself in a scornful and contemptuous tone. He met the charge of impiety by taxing his opponents with superstition and idolatry; and, in answer to Theodemir's statement that he had founded a sect which had spread into Gaul and Spain, he declared that he had nothing to do with sects, but was devoted to the cause of unity. The controversy was carried further. The Frankish clergy in general, who had at first been disposed to countenance Claudius, now took offence. Some of them requested Lewis to examine into the bishop's opinions, and the emperor, with the advice of his counsellors, pronounced against him. A synod of bishops was then held; but Claudius, who had been cited, refused to appear before it, and is said to have spoken of it as an assembly of asses.

Dungal, a deacon of Scottish or Irish birth, who had been established by Charlemagne as a teacher at Pavia, wrote against Claudius in 827, with a great display of learning, but without much critical judgment; he speaks, for example, of images as having been used in the church from the very beginning—about eight hundred and twenty years or more —although he produces no instance earlier than Paulinus of Nola, who flourished about the year 400. Jonas, bishop of Orleans, one of the commissioners who had been sent to Rome after the synod of Paris, also undertook a refutation of Claudius at the request of Lewis, but before it was finished, both Claudius and the emperor died. Jonas had abandoned the work, when, in consequence of finding that the errors of Claudius continued to be spread by means of his writings and of his pupils, he was induced to complete it in three books, which are dedicated to Charles the Bald, and are severally devoted to the defence of images, of the cross, and of pilgrimages. But, although Jonas is vehement in his opposition to Claudius (whom he charges with having left behind him writings of an Arian tendency), he preserves on the subject of images the medium characteristic of the Frankish church, whereas Dungal had approximated to the Nicene view; and he denounces in strong terms the superstitious doctrines and practices of the Greeks. As a lesser matter, it may be mentioned that he frequently remarks on the ignorance of Latin style, and even of grammar, which the bishop of Turin had displayed.

Claudius died in possession of his see. It has been erroneously said that he went to the length of separating his church from the communion of Rome, and the hostility to Roman peculiarities which was afterwards cherished in the Alpine valleys has been traced to him, either as its originator, or as a link in a chain begun by Vigilantius, or earlier; but, although it may be reasonably supposed that his writings, like those of others who more or less strongly opposed the prevailing system of religion, had some effect in maintaining the spirit of such opposition, the idea of a succession of connected "witnesses" against the Roman church appears to be altogether groundless. In Claudius, as in many other reformers, the intemperance of his zeal marred the goodness of his designs.

Notwithstanding the difference on a subject which had elsewhere occasioned so many anathemas, the Frankish church remained in uninterrupted communion with Rome. It continued until nearly the end of the century to adhere to its distinctive view; but about that time a change becomes visible, which gradually assimilated its doctrines on the question of images to those which were sanctioned by the papal authority.

About the time which we have now reached, the law of the church received an extraordinary addition, which in the sequel produced effects of vast importance. The collection of canons and decretals made by Dionysius Exiguus had been generally used throughout the west. But from the beginning of the seventh century another collection, which (whether rightly or otherwise) bore the name of Isidore of Seville, had been current in Spain; and, as it contained some pieces which were not in the compilation of Dionysius, it also found

its way into France. The same venerated name was now employed to introduce another set of documents, distinguished by some new and very remarkable features.

In the older collections, the decretal epistles had begun with that addressed by pope Siricius to Himerius, in 385. But the writer who styled himself Isidore produced nearly a hundred letters written in the names of earlier bishops of Rome, from Clement and Anacletus, the contemporaries of the apostles, with some letters from supposed correspondents of the popes, and the acts of some hitherto unknown councils. The spuriousness of these pieces is established by gross anachronisms, and by other instances of ignorance and clumsiness; as, that persons who lived centuries apart are represented as corresponding with each other; that the early bishops of Rome are made to quote the Scriptures according to St. Jerome's version; and that some of them, who lived while Rome was yet heathen, complain of the invasion of church-property by laymen in terms which evidently betray a writer of the Carolingian period. Some of the forgeries included in the work—among them, the Donation of Constantine—were of earlier manufacture : a great part of the other materials has been traced to various sources—to Scripture, to the Latin ecclesiastical writers, to the service books of the church, to genuine canons and decretals, to the Theodosian code, and to the Pontifical Books (a set of legendary lives of Roman bishops, which was continued by Anastasius the Librarian, and is usually cited under his name). The work of the forger consisted chiefly in gathering these materials (in great part from secondary sources), in connecting them together, and in giving them the appearance of a binding authority.

The date of the composition must be placed between the sixth council of Paris, in 829, from which the forger has borrowed, and that of Quiercy, in 857, where the decretals were cited as authoritative by Charles the Bald. That they were of Frankish origin is proved by certain peculiarities of language; and Mayence is now commonly supposed to have been the place of the fabrication. Hincmar says that the collection was brought from Spain by Riculf, who held that see from 787 to 814—a statement which is probably founded on Riculf's having obtained from Spain a copy of the older Isidorian collection, of which the forger availed himself. And Benedict, a "Levite" (or deacon) of Mayence, who between 840 and 847 added to the capitularies of Charlemagne and Lewis three books of spurious collections, which have much in common with the decretals, states that he chiefly derived his materials from the archives of his cathedral, where they had been deposited by Riculf and had been discovered by the existing archbishop, Autcar, or Otgar. This Benedict has been regarded by many writers in late times as the forger of the decretals also, although it seems to be questionable whether the evidence will suffice to bring the work home to him.

In these decretals, the privileges of the clergy in general, and especially of the bishops, are set very high; and the power of the pope is extended beyond anything that had as yet been known. He appears as the supreme head, lawgiver, and judge of the church, the one bishop of the whole. All causes may be carried to him by appeal; he alone is entitled to decide all weighty or difficult causes; without his leave, not even provincial councils may be called, nor have their judgments any validity. A very large proportion of the decretals relates to accusations against bishops; indeed almost every one of the popes who are personated has something to say on this subject. Bishops are declared to be exempt from all secular judgment; evil bishops are to be borne as an infliction of Providence, which will redound to the eternal benefit of those who submit to it; the judgment of them is to be left to God. If, however, charges should be brought against a bishop, care is taken, by the rigour of the conditions which are laid down as necessary, to render the prosecution of such charges almost impossible. No layman may accuse a bishop, or even a clerk; for the disciple is not above his master, nor must the sheep accuse their shepherd. A clerk who would accuse his bishop is infamous, as a son taking arms against his father; and therefore he is not to be heard. In order to prove a bishop guilty, seventy-two witnesses are required; and the qualifications of

witnesses are defined with a strictness which seems intended rather to shut out evidence than to secure its trustworthiness.

There was, however, one grade in the hierarchy on which the decretals bore hardly—the metropolitans. In the Frankish system, the trial of a bishop had belonged to his metropolitan, from whom the last appeal lay to the sovereign; but by the decretals the metropolitan was powerless without the concurrence of his suffragans; he could not even assemble these except by the pope's permission, and all decisive judgment in such matters belonged to the pope alone. And now a broad distinction was drawn between ordinary metropolitans and the higher grade of primates, who were distinguished by the commission of vicars under the pope.

It is matter of conjecture in what interest this forgery was originally made—whether in that of the pope, to whom it assigned a supremacy so awful in its alleged origin and unlimited in its extent; or of the bishops, whom it emancipated not only from all secular control, but also from that of metropolitans and provincial synods, while it referred their causes to the more distant tribunal of the pope, as the only judge competent to decide them; or whether, without any definite purpose as to the mutual relations of different classes in the hierarchy, it was merely intended to assert the privileges of the clergy against the oppressions which they suffered in the troubled reigns of Charlemagne's successors, and to claim for them a position independent of the temporal power. The opinion of the most judicious inquirers appears to point to a combination of the second and third of these motives—that the decretals were fabricated for the benefit of the clergy, and more especially of the bishops; that they were designed to protect the property of the church against invasion, and to fix the privileges of the hierarchy on a basis independent of secular authority; that the metropolitans were especially assailed because they had been the chief instruments by which the Carolingian princes had been able to govern the bishops, to depose such of these as were obnoxious, and to sway the decisions of synods. The popes were eventually the principal gainers by the forgery; but this appears to have been a result beyond the contemplation of those who planned or who executed it.

That the author's design was, as he himself professes, to supply a digest of the existing ecclesiastical laws—to promote the advancement of religion and morality—will hardly be believed on his own authority, although in our own time the assertion has found champions whose ability is more conspicuous than their sincerity. Yet we may do well not to judge him too severely for his imposture, but are bound to remember the vicious principles which his age had inherited from several centuries which preceded it as to the lawfulness of using falsehood for purposes which were supposed to be good: nor, although he differed from other forgers in the greatness of the scale on which he wrought, and although his forgery has exceeded all others in the importance of the results, would it be easy to show any essential moral difference between his act and the acts of others who had fabricated documents; of less extent, or of the innumerable legendary writers who imposed on the world fictions as to the lives and miracles of saints.

It has been argued in the Roman interest, that the false decretals made no change in the actual system of the church. The only considerable new claim, it is said, which they advanced in behalf of the pope, was that which regarded provincial councils; and this, it is added, never actually took effect. To such arguments it has been answered that the system of the decretals was a direct reversal of that which immediately preceded them in the government of the Frankish church; but the answer, although true, is even narrower than the proposition which it is intended to meet. To rest such a proposition on an analysis of the decretals is, however, obviously a fallacy. Although it may be shown in detail that this or that portion of them was older—that things which were now laid down universally had before been said with a more limited application—that claims had been made, that jurisdiction had been exercised; although, in truth, the main outline of the papacy had been marked out four centuries earlier

by Leo the Great;—the consolidation of the scattered fragments into one body, the representation of the later papal claims as having come down by unbroken tradition from the apostolic times in the character of acknowledged rights, could not but produce a vast effect; and the difference between the earlier and the following history abundantly proves their influence.

The story of the introduction of these documents in France and at Rome will be given in the next chapter. Published in an uncritical age, they bespoke a favorable reception by holding out to various classes redress of their grievances and increase of their privileges; even those who were galled by them in one respect were glad, like Hincmar of Reims, to make use of them where it was convenient to do so. They were therefore admitted without any expressed doubt of their genuineness, although some questions were raised as to their application or obligatory power. In the next century, they were cited in a collection of canons by Regino, abbot of Prum; and they continued to be used by the compilers of similar works, until in the twelfth century Gratian made them the foundation of his *Decretum*, the great law-book of the church during the middle ages, and accommodated to their principles all the more genuine matter which he admitted. Although sometimes called in question during the long interval before the Reformation, they yet maintained their public credit; and, while the foundation has long been given up, even by the extremest writers of the Roman church, the superstructure yet remains.

CHAPTER II.

THE FRANKISH CHURCH AND THE PAPACY. FROM THE DEATH OF LEWIS THE PIOUS TO THE DEPOSITION OF CHARLES THE FAT. A.D. 840-887.

The history of the Carolingians after the death of Lewis the Pious is marked by a continuance of those scandalous enmities between the nearest kinsmen which had given so unhappy a character to his reign. Sometimes these enmities were carried out into actual war; but after the battle of Fontenailles, in 841, where the loss is said to have amounted to 40,000 on one side, and on the other to 25,000 or 30,000, they more commonly took the form of intrigues, of insincere alliances, and selfish breaches of treaties.

Charlemagne had found great difficulty in keeping together the various elements of which his vast empire consisted. As often as he led his troops into any quarter, for the purpose of conquest or of suppressing rebellion, an insurrection usually broke out behind him. In order to conciliate the nationalities which were united under his scepter, he appointed kings to govern them, as in Aquitaine and in Italy. By his system, which was continued under Lewis, these kings were to be subordinate to the senior or head of the family; the whole empire was to be regarded as one, subject to the chief. But in the beginning of the period now before us, this system is broken up; the delegated government by kings is found to have been the means of organizing the different nations for resistance to the idea of unity, and for asserting their independence of each other. Language played an important part in the dissolution of the empire. From the time of the Frank conquest of Gaul, Latin had been the language of the church and of the state, while German had been that of the army. The king and the chiefs were familiar with both; but in the south the Latin—(or rather the rustic Roman, which differed from the more correct official Latin)—was native, and the German was acquired by learning, while the reverse was the case in the northern and eastern territories. The populations which used these different languages as their mother-tongues now became separate. At the treaty of Strasburg, in 842, Lewis of Bavaria took an oath in German, while Charles of Neustria swore in the Romance dialect, and they addressed their subjects in the same tongues respectively. The Romance oath is the oldest monument of French; the other is the oldest specimen of German after the baptismal renunciation of St. Boniface's time. A like scene was enacted at Coblenz in 860, when, in pledging themselves to the observance of certain articles, Lewis and the younger Lothair employed the German language, and Charles the Romance.

The treaty of Verdun, by which the empire was divided in 843 between the three sons of Lewis, established each of them in entire independence. The portion of the second brother, Lewis, may be broadly spoken of as Germany; Charles the Bald's share may with a like latitude be styled France; while Lothair, the emperor, had a territory lying between the two—long and for the most part narrow, reaching from the mouths of the Weser and the Scheldt to the frontier of the duchy of Benevento, and including the two imperial cities—Rome, the ancient capital of the world, and Aix, the chief seat of Charlemagne's sovereignty. The Rhine served throughout a large portion of its course as the eastern boundary of this territory : but a deviation was made from it, in order that Lewis might include within his dominions Mayence, the see of Boniface and ecclesiastical metropolis of Germany, with the suffragan dioceses of Worms and Spire; while this cession was compensated to Lothair by a tract to the east of the river in the region of Berg and Cleves. Lothair's kingdom, not being marked out by any older boundaries of population or language, was called from him Lotharingia. By a later partition, the portion of it north of the Alps was divided between Lewis and Charles the Bald, when

Lewis added to his dominions the countries of the German and Belgic tongues, and Charles acquired those in which the Romance prevailed

The feeling of nationality also showed itself in the rebellion of the Bretons under Nomenoe, who compelled Charles to acknowledge him as king, and established a new hierarchy under the archbishop of Dol, independent of the Roman connection; in the revolts of the Saxons, who killed or drove out their governors, and resumed the profession of paganism and in the subdivision of France towards the end of the century into a great number of petty principalities, although other causes also contributed to this result.

Charlemagne had endeavored to provide a defence against the northern pirates by fortifying the mouths of rivers; but this policy was now neglected. No longer content with ravaging the coasts, the fierce barbarians of the north made their way in their *serpent* barks up every river whose opening invited them, from the Elbe to the Adour. They repeatedly plundered the more exposed cities, such as Hamburg, Dorstadt, and Bordeaux; they ascended the Rhine to Mayence, and even to Worms; the Moselle to Treves; the Somme to Amiens; the Seine to Rouen and to Paris, once the Merovingian capital, and still the chief city of Neustria, rich in churches and in treasures, and having the royal monastery of St. Denys in its immediate neighborhood. From Paris they made their way up the Marne to Meaux and Châlons, up the Yonne to Sens and Auxerre. The Loire gave them a passage to Tours, the city of St. Martin, and to Orleans; the Vienne, to Limoges; the Charente, to Saintes and Angouleme; the Garonne, to Toulouse. They sailed on to the Spanish peninsula, plundered Lisbon, passed the strait of Gibraltar, and successfully encountered the Arabs of Andalusia; even the coast of Italy felt their fury. Everywhere they pillaged, burnt, slew, outraged women, and carried off captives. After a time, growing bolder through impunity, they would leave their vessels on the great rivers, and strike across the unresisting country to pillage inland places of noted wealth—such as Ghent, Beauvais, Chartres, Bourges, Reims, Laon, and Charlemagne's own city of Aix, where they stabled their horses in the imperial palace. They established permanent camps, often on islands in the great rivers, and ravaged in a wide circle around them. Many of these pirates were exiles or adventurers who had fled from other countries to the regions of the north; many were men who had suffered from the forcible means employed by Charlemagne for the conversion of the pagans, or were the offspring of such men. Their enmity against Christianity was therefore fierce and unsparing; there was religious hatred, as well as the lust of spoil, in the rage which selected churches and monasteries as its especial objects. Wherever the approach of the Northmen was reported, the monks deserted their abodes, and fled, if possible, leaving their wealth to the invaders, and anxious only to rescue the relics of their patron saints. The misery caused by these ravages was extreme. From dread of them, husbandry was neglected, and frequent famines ensued; even wolves were allowed to prey and to multiply without any check. The condition to which Aquitaine was reduced may be inferred from the fact that a bishop was translated from Bordeaux to Bourges on the ground that his former diocese had been rendered utterly desert by the pagans. Many monks who had been driven from their cells threw off the religious habit, and betook themselves to a vagabond life. And a striking proof of the terror inspired by the invaders is found in the insertion of a petition in the Gallican liturgies for deliverance "From the fury of the Northmen"

However divided by dissensions among themselves, the Northmen always acted in concert as to the course which their expeditions should take. They kept a watch on the movements of the Carolingian princes, and were ready to take advantage in every quarter of their discords and of their weakness. Sometimes, it would seem, they were not only attracted by the hope of booty, but were bribed by one of Charlemagne's descendants to attack the territories of another.

The martial spirit of the Franks had been exhausted by the slaughter of Fontenailles. Many of the free landholders—the body on which the whole Frankish system mainly relied

for national defence—sought a refuge from the miseries of the time by becoming serfs to abbots or nobles who were strong enough to protect them; and thus their military service was lost. The Franks were distracted by faction, and, instead of combining to resist the common enemy, each party and each class was intent on securing its own selfish interests. The nobles in general stood aloof, and looked on without dissatisfaction while the Northmen pillaged towns or estates which belonged to the crown or to the church. In a few cases the invaders met with a vigorous resistance—as from Robert the Strong, the ancestor of the Capetian line, and from his son Odo or Eudes, who, with the bishop, Gauzelin, valiantly defended Paris in 885. But a more usual course was that of paying them a large sum as an inducement to depart for a time—an expedient which pressed heavily on the people, who were taxed for the payment, while it insured the return of the enemy after a short respite. A better, although not uniform, success attended the attempt to appease the northern chiefs with grants of land. They settled on these estates; they and their followers were baptized and took wives of the country, by means of whom the northern language was soon extinguished among their offspring; they became accustomed to their new homes, and gradually laid aside their barbarian ferocity.

To the East, the Slave populations pressed on the German portions of the empire, and engaged its sovereigns in frequent wars; and in the south of France, as well as in Italy, the Saracens were a foe not less terrible than the Northmen on the other coasts of the empire. An expedition from Spain had made them masters of Crete in 823. Four years later they landed in Sicily, and by degrees they got possession of the whole island, although it was not until after half a century (A.D. 876) that Syracuse fell into their hands. They seized on Cyprus and Corsica, devastated the Mediterranean coast of France, sailed up the Tiber, carried off the altar which covered the remains of St. Peter, and committed atrocious acts of rapine, lust, and cruelty. The terror inspired by these adventurers—the offscourings of their race, which in Spain and in the east had become more civilized, and had begun to cultivate science and literature—drove the inhabitants of the defenseless towns to seek refuge in forests and among mountains. Some of the popes showed much energy in providing the means of protection against them. Gregory IV rebuilt and fortified Ostia, to which he gave the name of Gregoriopolis. Leo IV, who was hastily raised to the papal chair on an emergency when the Saracens threatened Rome, took very vigorous measures. He fortified Portus, in which he planted a colony of Corsican refugees; drew a chain across the mouth of the Tiber, and repaired the walls of Rome. With the approbation of the emperor Lothair, who contributed largely to the expense, he enclosed within a wall the Transtiberine district which contained the church of St. Peter and the English Burg; and to this new quarter he gave the name of the Leonine City. Nicolas I also contributed to the defence of Rome by strengthening the fortifications and the garrison of Ostia. But in the south of Italy the Saracens were triumphant. They established a sultan at Bari although after a time that city was recovered from them by the united forces of the western and eastern emperors, Lewis II and Basil the Macedonian. In Naples, Amalfi, Salerno, and other cities, finding resistance impossible, entered into alliance with them, and joined them in plundering. But for dissensions among themselves, the Moslems would probably have become masters of the whole Italian peninsula.

The royal power in France was greatly impaired by the changes of this period. Among the earlier Franks there had been no class of nobility, properly so called, but consideration had depended on wealth and power alone; nor had the counts originally been landholders, but officers of the sovereign, invested with a dignity which was only personal and temporary. But from the time of the civil wars between Lewis the Pious and his sons, the Frankish princes found themselves obliged to pay those on whom they depended for support by a diminution of their own prerogatives and property. The system was continued; at the diet of Quiercy, in 877, Charles the Bald, with a view of securing the consent of his chiefs to his projected expedition into Italy, granted that their lands should descend by inheritance, and only reserved to the sovereign the choice of a successor in cases where the tenant should die without male issue;

nay, as we shall see hereafter, in his eagerness to gain aid towards the extension of his dominions, he even consented that his crown should be regarded as elective. The nobles, thus erected into a hereditary order, became more independent; they took advantage of the weakness of the sovereign; and, by the end of the century, the dismemberment of the empire had been so much imitated on a smaller scale that France was broken up into no fewer than twenty-nine independent states.

The Frankish clergy suffered severely in their property during the troubles of the time. Not only did Lewis and his sons habitually employ the old resource of rewarding partisans with gifts of ecclesiastical benefices, but they even carried it further than before, by extending it to religious houses which had hitherto been regarded as exempt from this kind of danger. The abbey of St. Martin's itself—the most revered, as well as the richest, of all the sanctuaries of Gaul—was granted by Charles in benefice to Robert the Strong. Almost every council has its piteous complaint that the property of the church is invaded in a manner more fitting for pagan enemies than for her own sons; that the poor, the strangers, the pilgrims, the captives are deprived of the endowments founded for their relief; that hospitals, especially those of the Scots, are diverted from their object, so that not only are guests not entertained, but those who had dwelt in them from infancy are turned out to beg from door to door; that some lands are alienated in such a way as to cut off all hope of recovery; that the sovereigns grossly abuse their patronage by bestowing spiritual offices on laymen. The only weapon which the church could wield against the rapacious laity was excommunication; but neither spiritual terrors nor tales of judicial miracles were sufficient to check the evil. Another frequent complaint relates to the decay of letters among the Franks. Charles the Bald was a patron of learned men, and took pleasure in their society; but, while literature enjoyed this courtly and superficial encouragement, the institutions by which Charlemagne had endeavored to provide for the general instruction of his subjects were allowed to fall into neglect.

But in other respects the clergy gained greatly. The sixth council of Paris, in 829, had asserted for them a right to judge kings. This power had been exercised against Lewis by the rebellious bishops at Compiègne, and his restoration had not been accomplished without a formal act of the church. Charles the Bald admitted it, as against himself, at the council of Savonnières, in 859; and in all the disagreements of the Carolingians each prince carried his grievances to the pope—thus constituting the Roman see a general court of appeal, and weakening the rights of all sovereigns by such submission. Ecclesiastical judgments were popularly regarded as the judgments of God. Bishops asserted for themselves an exclusive jurisdiction in all matters relating to the clergy, and, by the superintendence which they exercised over morals, they were able to turn every scandal of the royal house to the advantage of the church. They became more and more active in politics; they claimed the power of bestowing the crown, and Charles appears to have acknowledged the claim. Yet, although they endeavored to gain for themselves an exemption from all secular control, that prince still kept a hold on them by means of his *missi*.

The most prominent among the French ecclesiastics of this time was Hincmar, a man of strong, lofty, and resolute character, of a mind at once subtle and eminently practical, of learning which, although uncritical and indifferently digested, raised him above almost all his contemporaries, and of great political talent. Hincmar was born in 806, of a noble family in Neustria, and at an early age entered the monastery of St. Denys, where he became a monk under Hilduin. He took an active part in restoring the discipline of the house, and to the end of his days he observed the monastic severity of life. His attachment to his abbot was shown by becoming the companion of Hilduin's exile in 830; but notwithstanding this, and although his own feelings were no doubt in favour of the unity of the empire, he withstood all Hilduin's attempts to draw him into rebellion, and to the last preserved the favour of Lewis, by means of which he was able to effect his superior's recall. In 845 he was promoted to the archbishopric of Reims, which had not been regularly filled since the deposition of Ebbo, ten years before.

He accepted the see on condition that the property which had been alienated from it to laymen during the vacancy should be restored; and he held it for thirty-nine years. His province, and even his diocese, were partly in Neustria and partly in Lotharingia—a circumstance which brought him into connection with the sovereigns of both countries. To him, as the successor of St. Remigius, it belonged to crown kings, and to take the chief part in state solemnities; and he gave full effect to his position. His political influence was immense; he steadily upheld the cause of the church against both the crown and the nobles, and in its behalf he often opposed the princes to whose interests in other respects he was zealously devoted. But most especially he was the champion of the national church and of the rights of his sovereign against the growing claims of the papacy.

The popes endeavored to take advantage of the weakness of Charlemagne's descendants in order to shake off the golden chains with which the great emperor had bound them, and in this endeavor they were greatly aided by the effect of the partition of the empire; inasmuch as they were thenceforth in no way subject to any prince except the one who held the imperial title and the kingdom of Italy, while they were yet brought into relation with all the Carolingian sovereigns, and became general arbiters between them.

On the death of Gregory IV, in 844, Sergius II, after some tumultuary opposition from a rival named John, was consecrated without waiting for the imperial confirmation. Lothair, indignant at the slight thus shown to his authority, sent his son Lewis to call the new pope to account. The prince was accompanied by Drogo, bishop of Metz, with a numerous train of prelates and counts, and was at the head of a large army, which is said, in its advance towards Rome, to have committed much wanton slaughter and devastation, and to have lost many of its soldiers, who, in punishment of their misdeeds, as was believed, were slain by lightning. Sergius received Lewis with the usual honors, but would not permit his troops to enter the city; nor would he allow the doors of St. Peter's to be opened to him, until, in answer to a solemn adjuration, the prince had professed that he came without any evil intention, for the good of Rome and of the church. The pope crowned him as king of the Lombards, but resisted a proposal that the Romans should be required to swear allegiance to him, on the ground that such oaths were due to the emperor alone. He consented, however, that a fresh oath should be taken to the emperor. Drogo returned to France with a commission appointing him primate and papal vicar, and conferring on him in that character large privileges and jurisdiction; but on finding that some question was raised as to the reception of this instrument by a synod to which he exhibited it, he refrained from urging his pretensions.

Sergius died after a pontificate of three years, and Leo IV was chosen by general acclamation. The Romans were in great perplexity; the imminent danger with which they were threatened by the Saracens required them to proceed to an immediate consecration, while they were afraid to repeat their late offence against the Frank empire. They therefore fell on the expedient of consecrating Leo with an express reservation of the imperial rights, and it would seem that this course was allowed to pass without objection. Towards the end of Leo's pontificate, Lothair, having been informed that a high Roman officer had expressed himself against the Frankish connection, and had proposed a revolt to the Greek empire, went to Rome, and held an inquiry into the case. The librarian Anastasius tells us that the charge was proved to be imaginary, and that the accuser was given up to the accused, from whom the emperor begged him. But the pope was required, probably in consequence of this affair, to promise obedience to the emperor and his commissioners. A remarkable innovation was introduced by Leo in his correspondence with sovereigns, by setting his own name before that of the prince to whom he wrote, and omitting the word *Domino* in the address—a change which intimated that St. Peter's successors no longer owned any earthly master.

Benedict III was elected as the successor of Leo; but he met with a very serious opposition from Anastasius,—probably the same with a cardinal of that name who under the last pontificate had been deposed, chiefly for his attachment to the Frankish interest.

Anastasius got possession of St. Peter's and of St. John Lateran, and (perhaps in the hope of recommending himself to the Franks, whom he may have possibly supposed to be iconoclasts) he is said to have broken and burnt the images which adorned the churches. He was aided by Frankish soldiers, and gained over the envoys who were sent to ask the imperial confirmation of his rival's election; he stripped Benedict of his robes, insulted him, and beat him. But the clergy and people of Rome adhered to Benedict, and their demonstrations prevailed on the emperor's commissioners to sanction his consecration.

Benedict was succeeded by Nicolas I, who, according to a contemporary annalist, owed his elevation rather to the presence and favour of Lewis II, Lothair's successor in the empire, than to the choice of the Roman clergy. At his consecration it has been commonly said that the new ceremony of coronation was introduced—a ceremony which may have had its origin in the fable that a golden crown had been bestowed on Sylvester by Constantine, and which was intended to assert for the pope the majesty of an earthly sovereign, in addition to that higher and more venerable dignity which claimed not only precedence but control over all earthly power. And when, soon after, Nicolas visited the camp of Lewis, the emperor, after the pretended example of the first Christian emperor, did him reverence by holding his bridle, and by walking at his side as he rode. Nicolas was one of those popes who stand forth in history as having most signally contributed to the advancement of their see. The idea entertained of him shortly after his death is remarkably expressed by Regino of Prum, who speaks of him as surpassing all his predecessors since the great Gregory; as giving commands to kings and tyrants, and ruling over them as if lord of the whole world; as full of meekness and gentleness in his dealings with bishops and clergy who were worthy of their calling, but terrible and austere towards the careless and the refractory; as another Elias in spirit and in power. He was learned, skillful in the management of affairs, sincerely zealous for the enforcement of discipline in the church, filled with a sense of the importance of his position, ambitious, active, and resolute in maintaining and advancing it. He took advantage of the faults or vices of the Frank princes—their ambition, their lust, or their hatred—to interpose in their affairs, and with great ability he played them against each other. His interposition was usually in the interest of justice, or in the defence of weakness; it was backed by the approbation of the great body of the people, who learnt to see in him the representative of heaven, ready everywhere to assert the right, and able to restrain the wicked who were above the reach of earthly law; and doubtless he was able to conceal from himself all but what was good in his motives. But those of his acts which in themselves were praiseworthy, were yet parts of a system which in other cases appeared without any such creditable veil—a scheme of vast ambition for rendering all secular power subject to the church, and all national churches subject to Rome.

Of the controversies or disputes of this time—which must be treated severally, since it is a less evil to sacrifice the display of their simultaneous progress than for its sake to throw the narrative into hopeless confusion—two related to important points of doctrine—the Eucharistic Presence, and Predestination.

We have already seen that, with respect to the Eucharist, there had been a gradual increase of mystical language; and that expressions were at first used rhetorically and in a figurative sense, which, if literally construed, would have given an incorrect idea of the current doctrine. In the west the authority of St. Augustine had generally acted as a safeguard against materializing views of the Eucharistic presence; but an important step toward the establishment of such views was now made by Paschasius Radbert, abbot of Corbie. Paschasius had been brought up in that monastery under Adelhard and Wala, whose biographer he afterwards became. He had been master of the monastic school, and had laboured as a commentator on the Scriptures. In 844 he was elected abbot; but the disquietudes which were brought on him by that dignity induced him to resign it in 851, and he lived as a private monk until his death in 865.

In 831, Paschasius, at the request of his old pupil Warin, who had become abbot of the daughter monastery of New Corbey, on the Weser, drew up a treatise on the Eucharist for the instruction of the younger monks of that society. Soon after his appointment to the abbacy of his own house, in 844, he presented an improved edition of the work to Charles the Bald, who had requested a copy of it. In this treatise the rhetoric of earlier writers is turned into unequivocally material definitions. Paschasius lays it down that although after the consecration the appearance of bread and wine remain, yet we must not believe anything else to be really present than the body and blood of the Saviour—the same flesh which was born of the blessed Virgin—the same in which He suffered on the cross and rose from the grave. This doctrine is rested on the almighty power of God; the miracles of Scripture are said to have been wrought in order to prepare the way for it and to confirm it; that the elements remain unchanged in appearance and in taste, is intended, according to Paschasius, as an exercise of our faith. The miraculous production of the Saviour's body is paralleled with his conception as man. Tales are adduced of miracles by which the reality hidden under the appearance of the elements was visibly revealed. The doctrine afterwards known as Transubstantiation appears to be broadly expressed; but, contrary to the later practice of Rome, Paschasius insists on the necessity of receiving the cup as well as the eucharistic bread.

Paschasius had professed to lay down his doctrine as being that which was established in the church; but protests were immediately raised against it. Raban Maur, Walafrid Strabo, Florus, and Christian Druthmar all of them among the most learned men of the age, objected to the idea of any other than a spiritual change in the Eucharist, and denounced it as a novelty. Even among his own community, the views of Paschasius excited alarm and opposition. One of his monks named Frudegard expressed uneasiness on account of the abbot's apparent contradiction to St. Augustine, so that Paschasius found it necessary to defend himself by the authority of earlier writers, among whom he especially relied on St. Ambrose. And the chief opponent of the doctrine was another monk of Corbie, Ratramn, who examined the abbot's book at the request of Charles the Bald, and answered it, although, in consideration of his relation to Paschasius, he did not name the author. Ratramn divides the question into two heads : (1) Whether the body and blood of Christ be present in figure or in truth; (2) Whether it be the same body which was born of the Virgin, suffered, rose again, and ascended. He defines figure to mean that the reality is veiled under something else, as where our Lord styles himself a vine; and truth to mean, that the reality is openly displayed. Although, he says, the elements remain outwardly the same as before consecration, the body and blood of Christ are presented, in them, not to the bodily senses, but to the faithful soul. And this must be in a figurative way; for otherwise there would be nothing for faith, "the evidence of things not seen", to work on; the sacrament would not be a mystery, since in order to a mystery there must be something beyond what is seen. The change is not material, but spiritual; the elements, while in one respect they continue bread and wine, are in another respect, by spirit and potency, the body and blood of Christ, even as the element of water is endued with a spiritual power in order to the sacrament of baptism. That which is visible and corruptible in them feeds the body; that which is matter of belief is itself immortal, sanctifies the soul, and feeds it unto everlasting life. The body of Christ must be incorruptible; therefore that which is corruptible in the sacrament is but the figure of the reality. Ratramn clears the interpretation of the passages which had been quoted from St. Ambrose in favour of the opposite view. He cites St. Augustine and St. Isidore of Seville as agreeing in his own doctrine; and argues from the liturgy that the Saviour's presence must be spiritual and figurative, since the sacrament is there spoken of as a pledge, an image, and a likeness.

John Scotus, who will be more particularly mentioned hereafter, is said to have also written on the question, at the desire of Charles the Bald; but if so, his book is lost. His other works contain grounds for thinking that he viewed the Eucharist as a merely commemorative rite, and that on this, as on other points, he was regarded as heterodox. While the most learned

divines of the age in general opposed Paschasius, his doctrine appears to have been supported by the important authority of Hincmar, although it is doubtful whether the archbishop really meant to assert it in its full extent, or is to be understood as speaking rhetorically; and Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt, a commentator of great reputation, lays it down as strongly as the abbot of Corbie himself. The controversy lasted for some time; but the doctrine of Paschasius, which was recommended by its appearance of piety, and by its agreement with the prevailing love of the miraculous, gained the ascendancy within the following century.

Throughout the west St. Augustine was revered as the greatest of all the ancient fathers, and the chiefteacher of orthodoxy; yet his system was not in general thoroughly held. The councils which had been assembled on account of the Pelagian doctrines had occupied themselves with the subject of Grace, and had not given any judgment as to Predestination; and the followers of Augustine had endeavored to mitigate the asperities of his tenets on this question. The prevailing doctrine was of a milder tone; in many cases it was not far from Semipelagianism, and even where it could not be so described, it fell so far short of the rigid Augustinianism that a theologian who strictly adhered to this might have fairly charged his brethren with unfaithfulness to the teaching of the great African doctor.

Gottschalk, the son of a Saxon count, was in boyhood placed by his father in the monastery of Fulda. On attaining to man's estate, however, he felt a strong distaste for the life of a monk, and in 829 he applied for a release from his vows to a synod held at Mayence under Archbishop Otgar. His petition was granted, on the ground that he had been devoted to the monastic profession before he could exercise any will of his own. But the abbot of Fulda, Raban Maur, the pupil of Alcuin, and himself the greatest teacher of his time, appealed to Lewis the Pious, arguing that persons offered by their parents, although without their own choice, were bound by the monastic obligations; and the emperor overruled the synod's decision.

Although compelled to remain a monk, Gottschalk was allowed to remove from Fulda, where his relation to Raban would have been inconvenient, to Orbais, in the diocese of Soissons. Here he gave himself up to the study of Augustine and his followers; he embraced their peculiarities with enthusiasm, and such was his especial love for the works of Fulgentius that his friends usually called him by the name of that writer. It is a characteristic circumstance that one of the most eminent among these friends, Servatus Lupus, abbot of Ferrières, in a letter of this period, charges him with an immoderate fondness for speculation, and exhorts him to turn from it to matters of a more practical kind. Hincmar, on the report of the abbot of Orbais, describes Gottschalk while there as restless, changeable, bent on perversities, addicted to argument, and apt to misrepresent what was said by others in conversation with him; as scorning to be a disciple of the truth, and preferring to be a master of error; as eager to gain an influence, by correspondence and otherwise, over persons who were inclined to novelty and who desired notoriety at any price. With a view, no doubt, to qualify himself for preaching his doctrines, Gottschalk procured ordination as a priest from a chorepiscopus of Reims, during the vacancy of that see after the deposition of Ebbo. This act appears to have been a token of disaffection to the episcopal body, with which the chorepiscopi were then on very unfriendly terms; it was censured as irregular, inasmuch as Gottschalk belonged to the diocese of Soissons, and as the chorepiscopus had no authority from any superior to confer the priestly ordination at all.

The doctrine on which Gottschalk especially took his stand was that of Predestination. The usual language in the church had been, that the righteous are predestinate, and that the wicked are foreknown, while the rigid Augustinianism spoke of the wicked as reprobate; but Gottschalk applied the term *predestinate* to both classes. There is, he said, a twofold predestination—a term for which he cited the authority of Isidore of Seville. In both cases predestination is to good; but good is twofold, including not only the benefits of grace but the judgments of justice. As life is predestined to the good, and they to it, so is evil predestined to

the wicked, and they to it. His opponents usually charged him with maintaining that the wicked were irresistibly and irrevocably doomed to sin, as well as to its consequences. But it would seem, even by Hincmar's own avowal, that Gottschalk did not admit this representation of his opinions; he maintained only that, as the perseverance in evil of the devil, his angels, and wicked men was foreknown, they were predestinated to righteous punishment. He denied that Christ died for any but the elect, and explained the texts which speak of God's willing all men to be saved as applicable to those only who actually are saved. And, unlike Augustine, he held that even the first human pair were subject to a predestination. The view which his adversaries took of his opinion may be in some degree excused by the violence with which he insisted on his difference from them, and by his zeal in condemning them—circumstances which could not but lead them to suppose the difference far greater than it appears to have really been.

Gottschalk was returning from a visit to Rome, in 847, when at the house of Eberhard, count of Friuli, a son-in-law of Lewis the Pious, he met Notting, who had been lately nominated to the see of Verona. He propounded his doctrine of twofold predestination, at which Notting was greatly startled. The bishop soon after mentioned it to Raban Maur, whom he found at the court of Lewis of Germany; and Raban, who had now become archbishop of Mayence, wrote both to Notting and to Eberhard, in strong condemnation of Gottschalk's opinion, which he declared to be no doctrine of St. Augustine. Predestination, he said, could only be a preparation for grace; God foreknows evil, but does not predestinate to it; all who yield their corrupt will to the guidance of Divine grace may be saved. Count Eberhard, on receiving the archbishop's letter, dismissed his dangerous visitor, who then travelled slowly homeward through Southern Germany; and it would seem to have been on account of his proceedings in these already Christian lands that Hincmar speaks of him as having visited barbarous and pagan nations for the purpose of infecting them with his errors. In 848 Gottschalk appeared before a synod held by Raban at Mayence in the presence of King Lewis. His attendance was probably voluntary, and, as if prepared for a disputation, he carried with him an answer to Raban's objections, in which he charged the archbishop with following the heresy of Gennadius and Cassian, and reasserted the doctrine of a double predestination. His opinions, as might have been expected, were condemned by the synod; he was obliged to swear that he would never again enter the dominions of Lewis; and he was sent to his own metropolitan, Hincmar, with a letter in which Raban styled him a vagabond,⁰ and recommended that, as being incorrigible, he should be confined.

In the following year, Gottschalk was brought by Hincmar before a synod at Quiercy on the Oise, where, according to the archbishop, he behaved like a possessed person, and, instead of answering the questions which were put to him, broke out into violent personal attacks. He was flogged severely, in the presence of King Charles,—a punishment for which the rule of St. Benedict and the canons of Agde were quoted as a warrant, although not without some straining of their application. When exhausted with this cruel usage, he was required to throw his book into the fire, and had hardly strength enough to do so. Hincmar long after told Pope Nicolas that he had been obliged to take the matter into his own hands, because the bishop of Soissons, Rothad, was himself infected with novelties; and for the same reason Gottschalk, who was condemned by the synod to perpetual silence, was removed to the monastery of Hautvilliers, within the diocese of Reims. His zeal was rather quickened than daunted by his imprisonment. He refused to subscribe a declaration sent to him by Hincmar, which would have had the effect of releasing him on condition of his admitting that there might be divine foresight without predestination. He denounced the opposite party under the name of Rabanists; and, in one of two confessions which he sent forth, he speaks of them as heretics whom it was his bounden duty to avoid. In these confessions he lays down his doctrine of a twofold predestination—predestination of good angels and men, freely, to bliss; of the evil to punishment, justly, on foreknowledge of their guilt. In the longer confession,

which (probably in imitation of St. Augustine) is composed in the form of an address to God, he breaks out into a prayer that an opportunity might be granted him of testifying the truth of his opinions, in the presence of the king, of bishops, clergy, monks, and laity, by plunging successively into four casks of boiling water, oil, fat, and pitch; and lastly by walking through a blazing pile. This wish has been variously traced to humility and to hypocrisy—qualities which seem to have been alike foreign to Gottschalk's character. It would accord better with the rest of his history, if we were to seek the motive in a proud and self-important, but sincere, fanaticism.

The doctrines for which Gottschalk was suffering now found champions of name and influence, although these varied somewhat among themselves, while all (like Gottschalk himself) disavowed the opinion of an irresistible predestination to sin. Among them were—Prudentius, a Spaniard by birth, bishop of Troyes; Servatus Lupus, abbot of Ferrières, an old pupil of Raban, who had great weight in the French church, and was highly esteemed by Charles the Bald; and Ratramn, who in this controversy, as in that on the Eucharistic presence, wrote at the king's request and for his information. Hincmar found it necessary to seek for assistance against these writers. Raban, to whom he applied, excused himself, chiefly on the plea of age and infirmity, and added that in many points he agreed with Gottschalk, although he thought him mistaken as to the predestination of the wicked. But Hincmar found allies in Amalarius, an ecclesiastic of Metz, who was distinguished as a ritualist, and in Amulo, archbishop of Lyons, the pupil and successor of Agobard.

The most remarkable work in opposition to Gottschalk's views, however, was that of John Scotus, whose name has already been mentioned in connection with the Eucharistic question. The circumstances of this celebrated man's life are enveloped in great obscurity. The name Scotus, like that of Erigena, which was given to him at a later time, indicates that he was a native of Ireland, a country which furnished many others of the learned men who enjoyed the patronage of Charles the Bald. From his knowledge of Greek (in which language he even wrote verses, although with an utter disdain of prosody) it has been supposed that he had travelled in the east; but the supposition is needless, as Greek was then an ordinary branch of education in his native country and in Britain. That he was acquainted with Hebrew has often been said, but without sufficient proof. Like the scholars of his time in general, John appears to have belonged to some order of the clergy, although this cannot be considered as certain. He had for some years found a home in the court of Charles, and had restored the reputation of the palatine school, which had sunk during the distractions of the preceding reign; while, among other literary labors, he had executed a translation of the works ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, which had been sent as a present by the Greek emperor Michael to Lewis the Pious. Scotus was better versed in Greek than in Latin theology, so that even as to the question of the Holy Spirit's procession he inclined to the oriental side. But in truth he had a far greater affinity with the ancient philosophers—especially the Neoplatonists—than with the theologians of his own age. His bold and rationalizing mind plunged into questionable, or evidently heretical, speculations; he startled his contemporaries by denying the literal sense of some parts of the scriptural narrative, and there are passages in his works which indicate an almost undisguised pantheism. Of his latter years nothing is known, except that Pope Nicolas, on the ground that his orthodoxy was suspected, requested Charles to send him to Rome, or at least to prevent his longer residence at Paris, where his teaching might do mischief. It would seem that, notwithstanding this denunciation, Charles continued to protect Scotus, and that the philosopher ended his days in France; although many writers have supposed that, after the death of his patron, he removed into England, and aided the great Alfred in his labours for the education of his people.

The controversy thus far had differed from those of the earlier ages in appealing exclusively to authority. Augustine and the other fathers had exercised their original thought in the definition of doctrine; but hitherto the question as to predestination did not relate to the

truth of Christian doctrine, but to the manner in which that doctrine had been determined by St. Augustine. Scotus, however, took a different course from the theologians who had preceded him on either side. Like them, indeed, he professed to appeal to Scripture and the fathers—especially to the great teacher on whom the opposite party chiefly relied; but both Scripture and fathers (he said) had condescended to the weakness of their readers, and much of their language was to be figuratively understood. Thus a principle was laid down by which their most positive expressions might be set aside, and anything which seemed to disagree with the philosopher's own speculations might be explained away.

Scotus wrote at the request of Hincmar, and inscribed his book to him and to his associate in the cause, Pardulus, bishop of Laon. He sets out with a somewhat ostentatious parade of philosophical method, and declares that true philosophy and true theology are identical. He treats Gottschalk as a heretic—a tool of the “old enemy”—and traces his errors to a want of liberal culture, especially to ignorance of the Greek language and theology. It is, he says, an impropriety to speak of “predestination” or “foreknowledge” in God, since to Him all time is present; but, admitting the use of such words, he holds that predestination is eternal, and is as much a part of God Himself as any other of his attributes. It can, therefore, only be one; we can no more suppose two predestinations in God than two wisdoms or two knowledges. He disallows Gottschalk's distinction of one “twofold predestination”; the Divine predestination must be truly one, and must be to good only; and such (he maintains) is the use of the term, not only in Scripture, but in Augustine's own writings, if rightly understood. Yet the number both of those who shall be delivered by Christ and of those who are to be left to their wickedness is known, and may be said to be predestined; God has circumscribed the wicked by his law, which brings out their wickedness, while it acts in an opposite manner on the good. Scotus strongly asserts the freedom of the will to choose not only evil (to which Lupus had limited it), but good; free-will (he says) is a gift with which our nature is endowed by God—a good gift, although it may be employed for evil; whereas Gottschalk, by referring all virtue and vice to predestination, denies both the freedom of the will and the assistance of grace, and thus falls at once into the errors of the Pelagians and of their extreme opponents. Predestination and foreknowledge in God are one, and relate only to good; for God can foresee only that which has a being, whereas sin and punishment are not. Sin is, as Augustine had taught, only the defect of righteousness; punishment is but the defect of bliss. If the soul has the capacity of blessedness, the longing for bliss without the power of attaining it is the keenest possible torment; thus the true punishment is that which sin inflicts on itself, secretly in the present life, and openly in that which is to come, when those things which now appear to be the pleasures of sin will become the instruments of torment. That which is punished is not our nature (which is God's work), but the corruption of our nature; nor is God properly the author of punishments; He is only so spoken of inasmuch as He is the creator of the universe in which they are; the wicked will be tormented by their own envy; the righteous will be crowned by their own love. The fire (whether it be corporeal, as Augustine thinks, or incorporeal, according to Gregory) is not needed for the punishment of the wicked—even of the evil, whose pride would suffice for its own chastisement; it is one of the four elements which form the balance and completeness of the universe. It is in itself good; the blessed will dwell in it as well as the wicked, and it will affect each kind according to their capacities even as light produces different effects on sound and on ailing eyes. “Forasmuch as there is no bliss but eternal life, and life eternal is the knowledge of the truth, therefore there is no other bliss than the knowledge of the truth. So, if there is no misery but eternal death, and eternal death is the ignorance of the truth, there is consequently no misery except ignorance of the truth”.

If Hincmar, in inviting Scotus to take part in the controversy, aimed at counteracting the influence of Lupus and Ratramn over Charles the Bald, he was in so far successful; for from that time the king was steadily on his side. But in other respects he found the

philosopher a very dangerous and embarrassing ally, so that he even felt himself obliged to disavow him.

The excitement raised by the novelties of Scotus was very great. Wenilo, archbishop of Sens, whom Hincmar had studiously, and hitherto successfully, endeavoured to conciliate now sent a number of propositions, extracted from the book, to Prudentius, with a request that he would examine, and, if necessary, refute them. The bishop of Troyes thereupon wrote against Scotus with great asperity, and he was followed by Florus, a deacon and master of the cathedral school at Lyons. These writers charge Scotus with Pelagianism, to which Prudentius adds accusations of Origenism and Collyridianism. They complain of him for imputing imaginary errors to his opponents; they censure him for substituting philosophy for theology, and sophistical subtleties for arguments from Scripture and ancient authorities. Hincmar and Pardulus entreated Amulo of Lyons again to assist them; but he died in 852, and his successor, Remigius, answered the application by writing, in the name of his church, a book on the opposite side—taking up the case of Gottschalk more expressly than those who had preceded him, censuring the cruelty with which he had been treated, and defending the impugned opinions, with the exception of that which limited the exercise of free-will since the Fall to the choice of evil.

Finding that the literary contest was turning against him, Hincmar resolved to fortify himself with the authority of a council, and at Quiercy, in 853, four decrees on the subject of the controversy were passed. It is laid down that man fell by the abuse of his free-will; that God, by his foreknowledge, chose some whom by his grace He predestinated to life, and life to them : but as for those whom He, by righteous judgment, left in their lost estate, He did not predestine them to perish, but predestined punishment to their sin. “And hereby”, it is said, “we speak of only one predestination of God, which relates either to the gift of grace or to the retribution of justice”. It is defined that our free-will was lost by the Fall, but was recovered through Christ; that we have a free-will to good, prevented and aided by grace, as well as a free-will to evil, deserted by grace; that God would have all men to be saved, and that Christ suffered for all; that the ruin of those who perish is to be ascribed to their own desert.

Prudentius, who was present when these decrees were passed, subscribed them, but afterwards put forth four propositions against them; and Remigius, who, as a subject of Lothair, felt himself independent of the influence of Charles the Bald, wrote, in the name of his church, a book against the articles of Quiercy. Of Scotus the archbishop says that he is ignorant of the very words of Scripture, and that, instead of being consulted on points of faith, he ought either to be pitied as a man out of his right mind, or to be anathematized as a heretic. Remigius, however, maintains the necessity of free-will in order to responsibility. Against the authority of the council of Quiercy was set that of one which met under the presidency of Remigius in 855 at Valence, in Lotharingia. This assembly condemned nineteen propositions extracted from Scotus, which, by a phrase borrowed from St. Jerome’s attack on Coelestius, it characterized as “porridge of the Scots”. It laid down moderate definitions as to free-will and as to the extent of the benefit of the Redeemer’s death. But it censured the four articles of Quiercy as useless, or even noxious and erroneous; and it forbade, in the name of the Holy Spirit, any teaching contrary to its own. The decrees of Valence were confirmed by a council held near Langres in 859, although, at the instance of Remigius, the offensive expressions against the articles of Quiercy were omitted. The subject was again considered by a greater council, to which that of Langres was preliminary, and which met a fortnight later at Savonnikres, a suburb of Toul. At this meeting Remigius acted in a spirit of conciliation, and the decision was adjourned to a future synod.

In the meantime Gottschalk was not inactive in his seclusion. Hincmar had altered an ancient hymn of unknown authorship, in which the application of the word trine to the Godhead seemed to suggest a threefold difference in the nature of the Divine Persons. But Ratramn defended the term, and Gottschalk—eager, it would seem, to provoke his powerful

enemy in all ways—put forth in its behalf a tract in which he charged Hincmar with Sabellianism. The archbishop replied in a work of which the substance was shown to Gottschalk, in the hope of converting him, although it was not completed until after his death. He meets the charge of Sabellianism with one of Arianism; he exhorts monks to keep clear of novelties in a style which seems to intimate that his opponent had many adherents among that class; and he gives very significant hints of the bodily and spiritual punishments to which an imitation of Gottschalk would render them liable. Hincmar was not further molested about this affair; but the word to which he had objected, although his objection was supported by the authority of Raban, kept its place in the Gallican service.

In 859, a monk of Hautvilliers named Guntbert, whom Gottschalk had gained, privately left the monastery, and carried an appeal from the prisoner to Rome. It appeared as if the new pope, Nicolas, were disposed to take up the matter. Hincmar wrote to him, professing his willingness to act as the pope should direct—to release Gottschalk, to transfer him to other custody, or even to send him to Rome (although he spoke of the two synods which had condemned the prisoner as a bar to this course); but he refused to appear with him before the pope's legates at Metz in 863, on an occasion which will be related hereafter. From a letter written by Hincmar to Egilo, archbishop of Sens, who was about to set out for Rome, we learn some details as to Gottschalk's condition. It is said that in respect of food, drink, and fuel, he was as well treated as any of the monks among whom he lived : that clothes were supplied, if he would receive them; but that, ever since he was placed at Hautvilliers, he had refused to wash not only his body, but even his face and hands. From another writing of Hincmar it appears that the unfortunate man had become subject to strange delusions, and had visions in which the imagery of the Apocalypse was applied to foreshow the ruin of his chief enemy. His long confinement and sufferings, acting on his vain, obstinate, and enthusiastic temper, had partially overthrown his reason.

The synodal discussion of the predestinarian controversy, to which the council of Savonnières had looked forward, was never held. But a council at Toucy, near Toul, in October 860, which was attended by Charles the Bald, Lothair II, and Charles of Provence, by twelve metropolitans, and by bishops from fourteen provinces, adopted a letter drawn up by Hincmar, which is in part a general statement of doctrine, and in part is directed against the invasion of ecclesiastical property. In this letter the freedom of man's will, the will of God that all men should be saved, the necessity of grace in order to salvation, the Divine mercy in choosing and calling men from out of the "mass of perdition", and the death of Christ "for all who were debtors unto death", are distinctly stated, but in such a manner as rather to conciliate than to repel those who in some respects had been the archbishop's opponents. Hincmar, at the desire of Charles the Bald, employed himself at intervals, from 859 to 863, in composing a work of great length on predestination and the kindred subjects, chiefly in defence of the articles of Quiercy, which he had before maintained in a book of which the preface only is extant. He labours to bring the theology of Augustine, Fulgentius, and others into accordance with his own opinions, which are rather those of the time before the Pelagian controversy arose. He quotes very profusely; but most of the passages which he relies on as St. Augustine's are from a work falsely ascribed to that father, which had already been employed by Scotus, and declared by Remigius to be spurious. He admits the expression of one twofold predestination, but differs from Gottschalk in saying that, while the righteous are predestined to life, and it to them, punishment is predestined to the reprobate, but they are not predestined to it; that God did not predestinate them, but forsook them. With this work the controversy ceased.

Gottschalk remained in captivity twenty years. In 869, the monks of Hautvilliers perceived that his end was approaching, and sent Hincmar notice of the fact, with an inquiry whether they should allow him to receive the last sacraments. It was replied that they might do so, if he would sign a confession embodying the archbishop's views as to predestination and

the Trinity. But Gottschalk was still unbending, and refused with much vehemence of behavior and language. In consequence of this refusal, he died without the sacraments and under the ban of the church; he was buried in unhallowed earth, and was excluded from prayers for the repose of his soul.

On the question of Gottschalk's orthodoxy or heterodoxy, very opposite opinions have been pronounced—a result rather of the opposite positions of those who have judged him than of any differences between them as to the facts of the case. Yet as to these facts there is room for an important question—whether his two confessions embody the whole of his doctrine on the subject of predestination, or whether he also held that opinion of an irresistible doom to sin, as well as to punishment, which his adversaries usually imputed to him. A moral judgment of the case is easier. Gottschalk's sincerity and resolute boldness were marred by his thoroughly sectarian spirit; but the harshness with which he was treated has left on the memory of Hincmar a stain which is not to be effaced by any allowances for the character of the age, since even among his own contemporaries it drew forth warm and indignant remonstrances.

From controversies of doctrine we proceed to some remarkable cases in which questions of other kinds brought the popes into correspondence with the Frankish church.

In 855 the emperor Lothair resigned his crown, and entered the monastery of Prum, where he died six days after his arrival. While his eldest son, Louis II, succeeded him in the imperial title and in the kingdom of Italy, the small kingdom of Arles or Provence fell to his youngest son, Charles, and the other territory north of the Alps, to which the name of Lotharingia was now limited, became the portion of his second son, Lothair II.

Lothair II in 856 married Theutberga, daughter of the duke or viceroy of Burgundy, and sister of Humbert or Hucbert, abbot of St. Maurice. He separated from his wife in the following year, but Humbert, who was more a soldier than a monk, compelled him by a threat of war to take her back. In 859 Theutberga was summoned before a secular tribunal, on a charge of worse than incestuous connection with her brother before her marriage; and the abbot's profession was not enough to disprove this charge, as the laxity of his morals was notorious.

It now appeared that, in desiring to get rid of his wife, Lothair was influenced by love for a lady named Waldrada, with whom he had formerly been intimate. Two archbishops—Gunther of Cologne, archchaplain of the court, and Theutgaud of Treves, a man who is described as too simple and too ignorant to understand the case—had been gained to the king's side, and insisted that Theutberga should purge herself by the ordeal of boiling water: but, when she had successfully undergone this trial by proxy, Lothair declared it to be worthless. In the following year the subject came before two synods at Aix-la-Chapelle, in which Wenilo, archbishop of Sens, and another Neustrian prelate were associated with the Lotharingian bishops. Theutberga—no doubt influenced by ill-usage, although she professed that she acted without compulsion—acknowledged the truth of the charges against her, while she declared that she had not consented to the sin; whereupon the bishops gave judgment for a divorce, and, in compliance with the unhappy queen's own petition, sentenced her to lifelong penance in a nunnery. A third synod, held at Aix in April 862, after hearing Lothair's representation of his case—that he had been contracted to Waldrada, that his father had compelled him to marry Theutberga, and that his youth and the strength of his passions rendered a single life insupportable to him—gave its sanction to his marrying again; and on the strength of this permission his nuptials with Waldrada were celebrated, and were followed by her coronation. Gunther's services were rewarded by the nomination of his brother Hilduin to the see of Cambray; but Hincmar refused to consecrate the new bishop, and Pope Nicolas eventually declared the appointment to be null and void.

The partisans of Lothair had represented Hincmar as favorable to the divorce; but in reality he had steadfastly resisted all their solicitations. A body of clergy and laity now

proposed to him a number of questions on the subject, and in answer he gave his judgment very fully. There were, he said, only two valid grounds for the dissolution of a marriage—where either both parties desire to embrace a monastic life, or one of them can be proved guilty of adultery; but in the second case, the innocent party may not enter into another marriage during the lifetime of the culprit. Among other matters, he discusses the efficacy of the ordeal, which some of Theutberga's enemies had ridiculed as worthless, while others explained the fact that her proxy had escaped unhurt by supposing either that she had made a secret confession, or that, in declaring herself clear of any guilt with her brother, she had mentally intended another brother instead of the abbot of St. Maurice. Hincmar defends the system of such trials, and says that the artifice imputed to her, far from aiding her to escape, would have increased her guilt, and so would have ensured her ruin. With respect to a popular opinion that Lothair was bewitched by Waldrada, the archbishop avows his belief in the power of charms to produce the extremes of love or hatred between man and wife, and otherwise to interfere with their relations to each other; and he gives instances of magical practices as having occurred within his own knowledge. He strongly denies the doctrine which some had propounded, that Lothair, as a king, was exempt from all human judgment; for, he said, the ecclesiastical power is higher than the secular, and when a king fails to rule himself and his dominions according to the law of God, he forfeits his immunity from earthly law. He says that the question of the marriage, as it is one of universal concern, cannot be settled within Lothair's dominions; and, as it was objected that no one but the pope was of higher authority than those who had already given judgment on it, he proposes a general synod, to be assembled from all the Frankish kingdoms, as the fittest tribunal for deciding it.

Theutberga had escaped from the place of her confinement, and had found a refuge with Charles the Bald, who, in espousing her cause, would seem to have been guided less by any regard for its justice than by the hope of turning his nephew's misconduct to his own advantage. She now appealed to the pope, whose intervention was also solicited by others, and at last by Lothair himself, in his annoyance at the opposition of Hincmar and the Neustrian bishops. In answer to these applications, Nicolas declared that, even if the stories against Theutberga were true, her immoralities would not warrant the second marriage of her husband; he ordered that a synod should be assembled, not only from such parts of the Frankish dominions as Lothair might hope to influence, but from all; and he sent two legates to assist at it, with a charge to excommunicate the king if he should refuse to appear or to obey them.

The synod was held at Metz in 863, but no bishops except those of Lotharingia attended. The legates had been bribed by Lothair; one of them, Rodoald, bishop of Portus, had already displayed his corruptness in negotiations with the Byzantine church. Without any citation of Theutberga, or any fresh investigation of the case, the acts of the synod of Aix were confirmed. Nicolas represents the tone of the bishops as very violent against himself, and says that when one bishop, in signing the acts, had made a reservation of the papal judgment, Gunther and Theutgaud erased all but his name. These two prelates set off to report the decision to the pope—believing probably, from what they had seen of Rodoald that at Rome money would effect all that they or their sovereign might desire. But in this they found themselves greatly mistaken. Nicolas, in a synod which appears to have been held in the ordinary course, annulled the decision of Metz, classing the council with the notorious Latrocinium of Ephesus, and ordering that, on account of the favour which it had shown to adulterers, it should not be called a synod but a brothel. He deposed Gunther and Theutgaud, and declared that, if they should attempt to perform any episcopal act, they must not hope for restoration. He threatened the other Lotharingian bishops with a like sentence in case of their making any resistance; and he announced his judgment to the Frankish sovereigns and archbishops in letters which strongly denounced the conduct of King Lothair—if (it was said) he may be properly styled a king who gives himself up to the government of his passions.

Rodoald was about to be brought to trial for his corruption, when he escaped from Rome by night. It was evident from the manner of the pope's proceedings that the indignation which he sincerely felt on account of Theutberga's wrongs was not the only motive which animated him; that he was bent on taking advantage of the case to establish his power over kings and foreign churches.

Gunther and Theutgaud, in extreme surprise and anger, repaired to the emperor Lewis II, who was then at Beneventum, and represented to him that the treatment which they had received was an insult not only to their master, but to the whole Frankish church, and to all princes—especially to the emperor himself, under whose safe-conduct they had come to Rome. On this Lewis immediately advanced against Rome, and, without attempting any previous negotiation with the pope, entered the city. Nicolas set on foot solemn prayers, with fasting, for the change of the emperor's heart. Penitents moved about the streets in long processions, and offered up their supplications in the churches; but as one of these penitential trains was about to ascend the steps of St. Peter's, it was violently assaulted by some of the imperial soldiers. Crosses and banners were broken in the fray; one large cross of especial sanctity, which was believed to be the gift of the empress Helena to St. Peter's see, and to contain a piece of the wood on which the Redeemer suffered, was thrown down and trodden in the mire, from which the fragments were picked up by some English pilgrims. Nicolas, in fear lest he should be seized, left the Lateran palace, crossed the river in a boat, and took refuge in St. Peter's, where for two days and nights he remained without food. But in the meanwhile signs which seemed to declare the wrath of heaven began to appear. The soldier who had broken the precious cross died. Lewis himself was seized with a fever, and in alarm sent his empress to mediate with the pope. A reconciliation was thus effected, and, after having committed many acts of violence, the troops withdrew from Rome. The emperor ordered Gunther and Theutgaud to leave his camp and to return home, and it would seem that Nicolas had stipulated for freedom of action in his proceedings as to the case of Lothair.

Gunther had drawn up, in his own name and in that of his brother archbishop, a protest against their deposition, conceived in terms which Hincmar described as diabolical and altogether unprecedented. In this document Nicolas is charged with madness and tyrannical fury, with extravagant pride and assumption, with fraud and cunning, with outrageous violation of all the forms of justice and ecclesiastical law; the archbishops declare that they spurn and defy his accursed sentence—that they are resolved not to admit him into their communion, "being content with the communion and brotherly society of the whole church"; and they conclude by asserting that Waldrada was not a concubine but a wife, inasmuch as she had been contracted to Lothair before his union with Theutberga. With this paper Gunther now sent his brother Hilduin to the pope, charging him, if it were refused, to lay it on the high altar of St. Peter's; and Hilduin executed the commission, forcing his way into St. Peter's with a party of Gunther's adherents, who beat the guardians of the church and killed one of them who resisted. Gunther also circulated the protest among the German bishops, and sent a copy of it to Photius, of Constantinople, with whom Nicolas was by this time seriously embroiled. The other Lotharingian bishops, however, were terrified by the pope's threats, or were gained by his promises, and made submission to him in very abject terms.

Gunther had hurried from Rome to Cologne; in defiance of the pope's sentence he had performed episcopal functions; and he had made a compact with his canons, by which, at a great sacrifice both of power and of revenue, he drew them into concurrence in his proceedings. The pusillanimous Lothair—partly influenced by the demonstrations of his uncles against him—now abandoned the cause of the deposed metropolitans. He gave up Gunther altogether, and expressed horror at his acts, while he entreated that Theutgaud, in consideration of his simple character, and of his obedience to the pope's judgment, might be more leniently dealt with. As for himself, he professed himself willing to go to Rome, and to obey the pope like one of the meanest of men. Gunther, indignant at finding himself thus

sacrificed, declared an intention of exposing all the king's proceedings, and set out for Rome, carrying with him as much of the treasures of his see as he could lay hands on, in the hope that by such means he might be able to propitiate the pope. But he was again disappointed; Nicolas in a synod renewed the condemnation which had been passed both on him and on Theutgaud. In the meantime Lothair bestowed the archbishopric of Cologne on Hugh, abbot of St. Bertin's, whom Hincmar describes as a subdeacon, but of habits which would have been discreditable to a layman. The preferment was probably a reward for the exertion of the abbot's influence with Charles the Bald, to whom he was maternally related.

The meanness of Lothair's behavior served only to increase the contempt and disgust with which Nicolas had before regarded him. The pope wrote to the other Frankish princes, desiring them not to interfere in the matter, as it was for his own judgment alone; and it is remarked by Hincmar that in these letters he made no use of such terms of courtesy as had been usual in the letters of Roman bishops to sovereigns. He sent Arsenius, bishop of Orba, as his legate, with orders to visit Lewis of Germany and Charles; but it was declared that, unless Lothair would give up Waldrada, the legate must hold no communication with him, nor would the king be admitted to an audience if he should repair to Rome. Arsenius received Theutberga from the hands of Charles, and delivered her to Lothair, who, in terror at the pope's threats of excommunication, swore on the Gospels and on a fragment of the true cross that he would always treat her with the honor due to a queen, imprecating on himself the most fearful judgments, both in this world and in the next, if he should fail. Twelve of his nobles joined in the oath, and the reunion of the royal pair was sealed by a new coronation. Waldrada was committed to the care of the legate; but in the course of his return to Rome both she and another royal lady of light character, Ingeltrude, wife of Count Boso, contrived to make their escape from him, and Waldrada rejoined Lothair, by whom her escape had been planned. The king had cast aside all regard for his oath almost immediately after having sworn it. His submissiveness towards the pope was forgotten. He ejected Hugh from Cologne, confirmed Gunther's arrangement with the canons, and put Hilduin into the see as nominal arch, bishop, while both the power and the revenues were really in the hands of Gunther.

Theutberga now again escaped from her husband, and, worn out by the miseries to which she had been subjected, petitioned the pope for a dissolution of the marriage. She went so far as even to own Waldrada to be the rightful wife of Lothair, and she requested leave to repair to Rome and tell all her story. But Nicolas was firm in asserting the rights which the unhappy queen had been wrought on to abandon. He solemnly excommunicated Waldrada, and charged the Frankish bishops to hold Lothair separate from the church until he should repent of his misdeeds. He told Theutberga that he could not comply with a request which was evidently made under constraint; that, if Lothair's marriage were to be dissolved, the precedent would enable any man to get rid of his wife by ill-usage; that she must consider herself as under the protection of the apostolic see; that, instead of travelling to Rome, she should persuade Lothair to send Waldrada thither for trial: and in all his letters he insisted on celibacy on Lothair's part as a necessary condition of any separation. Lothair again attempted to pacify the pope by flattery; he assured him that he had not cohabited with Waldrada, or even seen her, since her return from Italy; but Nicolas was unmoved, and appeared to be on the point of pronouncing a sentence of excommunication against the king, when he was arrested by death in May 867.

The increase of the papal power under this pontiff was immense. He had gained such a control over princes as was before unknown. He had taken the unexampled steps of deposing foreign metropolitans, and of annulling the decisions of a Frankish national council by the vote of a Roman synod. He had neglected all the old canonical formalities which stood in the way of his exercising an immediate jurisdiction throughout the western church. And in all this he had been supported by the public feeling of indignation against Lothair and his subservient clergy, which caused men to overlook the novelty and the usurping character of the pope's

measures. The other Frank princes had encouraged him in his proceedings against Lothair. The great prelates of Lotharingia, strong in position and in family interest, had rendered themselves powerless before the bishop of Rome by espousing a discreditable and unpopular cause. The pope appeared, not as an invader of the rights of sovereigns and of churches, but as the champion of justice and innocence against the oppressors of the earth.

Adrian II, the successor of Nicolas, had already twice declined the papacy, and was seventy-five years of age at the time of his election. The partisans of the late pope apprehended a change of policy, by which the recent acquisitions might be lost. But in this they were mistaken. Adrian appears to have been urged on by a feeling that he was expected to show want of energy, and by a wish to falsify the expectation. He soon cast aside the air of humility and of deference towards the emperor which he had at first displayed. The losses which the papacy suffered under him arose, not from a reversal of his predecessor's policy, but from the attempt to carry it on in an exaggerated form, without the skill of Nicolas, without understanding the change of circumstances, or the manner of adapting his measures to them.

The beginning of Adrian's pontificate was marked by a tragedy among his own nearest connections. The pope, himself the son of a bishop, had been married—a circumstance which contributed to the alarm felt at his election, as Nicolas, like other chief agents in the exaltation of the papacy, had been strenuous for the celibacy of the clergy. Adrian's wife, and a daughter, the offspring of their marriage, were still alive; but, within a few days after his election, the daughter, who had been betrothed to a nobleman, was carried off, together with her mother, by Eleutherius, a son of Arsenius of Orba. Eleutherius, on being pursued, killed both the women, but was himself taken prisoner. Arsenius, with whose intrigues this affair was connected, did not long survive. It is said that on his deathbed he was heard to discourse with friends, and that he departed without receiving the Eucharist. At the instance of Adrian, the emperor appointed commissioners for the trial of Eleutherius, who was put to death by their sentence.

Lothair conceived fresh hopes from the change of popes, and wrote to Adrian in terms expressive of high regard for his predecessor, while he complained that Nicolas had wronged him by listening to idle rumours. At his request, Adrian released Waldrada from her excommunication, and the king himself was invited to Rome. "Rome", the pope wrote, "is never unjust, and is always willing to receive the penitent. If you are conscious of innocence, come for a blessing; if guilty, come for the remedy of a suitable repentance". Theutberga was persuaded by Lothair to renew her application for a divorce. She went to Rome in person, and, in addition to the old grounds, alleged that she had ailments which rendered it impossible for her to perform the duties of a wife. But Adrian, like Nicolas, refused her request, on the ground that she was acting under constraint, and desired her to return home.

The absolution of Waldrada had included the condition that she should not keep company with Lothair. By artfully affecting to obey this order, she goaded his passion to madness, so that he resolved at all risks—even leaving his territories open to the restless ambition of his uncle Charles—to sue in person to the pope for a dissolution of his union with Theutberga. He was made to pay heavily for the means of approach to the pontiff, who, by the intervention of Ingilberga, wife of the emperor Lewis, was prevailed on to meet him at Monte Cassino, where it was supposed that Adrian might be more tractable than when surrounded by the partisans of Nicolas at Rome. Adrian refused to dissolve the marriage, but, in consideration of a large sum of money, agreed to administer the holy Eucharist to the king—a favour which Lothair desired in order to dissipate the popular opinion, which regarded him as virtually excommunicate. "If", said the pope at the solemnity, "thou hast observed the charge of Nicolas, and art firmly resolved never to have intercourse with Waldrada, draw near, and receive unto salvation; but if thy conscience accuse thee, or if thou purpose to return to wallow in thine uncleanness, refrain, lest that which is ordained as a remedy for the faithful

should turn to thy damage". Lothair, in surprise and agitation, received the consecrated symbols. His nobles, after being adjured as to their consent or privity to any breach of his oath, communicated after him; and Gunther, the survivor of the deposed archbishops, who had once more repaired to Italy in the hope of obtaining a release, was admitted to communicate as a layman, on presenting a written profession of submission, and swearing that he would never again exercise any spiritual office unless the pope should be pleased to relieve him from his disability.

The king followed Adrian to Rome, but a change had come over the pope's disposition towards him. Instead of being received with the honors usually paid to sovereigns, he found no one of the clergy to meet him when he presented himself at St. Peter's, and he was obliged to approach the Apostle's tomb unattended. On retiring to his lodging in the papal palace, he found it unfurnished, and even unswept; and when, on the following day, which was Sunday, he again repaired to the church, no priest appeared to say mass for him. Next day, however, he dined with the pope in the Lateran palace, and after an exchange of presents, in which the king's vessels of gold and silver were requited with a woollen cloak, a palm-branch, and a rod—they parted on friendly terms. The pope resolved to examine the case of the divorce in a council which was to be held at Rome in the following year. With a view to this investigation, he summoned the bishops of the three Frankish kingdoms to send representatives to the council; and he was about to send commissioners across the Alps for the purpose of inquiry, when he received tidings of Lothair's death. The king had left Rome in the middle of July. At Lucca a fatal sickness broke out among his attendants. He himself died at Piacenza, on the 8th of August; and it is said that before the end of the year all who had partaken of the communion at Monte Cassino were dead, while the few who had abstained from it survived. Theutberga became abbess of a monastery, and bestowed large sums for the soul of the husband who had so cruelly injured her. Waldrada also took refuge in a cloister.

In the question of Lothair's divorce, Nicolas and Hincmar were led by the common interests of justice and morality to act in harmony with each other. But in other cases, where the claims of Rome conflicted with the archbishop's attachment either to his sovereign or to the national church of France, the popes found in him a decided and formidable opponent.

One of these cases arose out of the conduct of Ebbo, who, as we have seen, had been deprived of the see of Reims for his acts of rebellion against Lewis the Pious. During the contests between that emperor's sons, Reims for a time fell into the possession of the emperor Lothair, with whom Ebbo had ingratiated himself. The archbishop returned to his see, carrying with him, in addition to the imperial mandate for his restoration, the favorable judgment of a synod held at Ingelheim, under Lothair's influence, and under the presidency of Drogo of Metz, who had also presided at his deposition. His penitential professions at Thionville were now explained away by the assertion that, in declaring himself "unworthy" of his see, he had meant nothing more than what was signified by the same word in the ordinary style of bishops; he had humbled himself (he said), and therefore had now risen in greater strength than before.

After the battle of Fontenailles, Ebbo fled from Reims in fear of Charles the Bald. He in vain attempted to obtain restitution by means of Sergius II; but the pope, overruling the ancient canons against the translation of bishops, sanctioned his appointment to Hildesheim, on the nomination of Lewis the German, in 844.

Hincmar, soon after his promotion to the archbishopric of Reims in 845, found that some clerks, of whom one Wulfad was the most prominent, had been ordained by Ebbo during his second occupation of the see. He denied the validity of orders conferred by one whom he regarded as an intruder, and, on the application of the clerks to a synod held at Soissons in 853, the case was investigated by a commission of bishops, who declared Ebbo's restoration to have been uncanonical, and the orders which he had given to be void. Wulfad and his brethren would have been excluded even from lay communion, on the ground that, by

charging some members of the synod with having received their consecration from Ebbo, they had incurred the sentence denounced by the council of Elvira against those who should slander bishops; but at the request of Charles the Bald they were released from this penalty. Hincmar, as being a party in the case, and as the regularity of his own appointment had been impugned, desired that the synod's judgment might be fortified by the highest authority, and requested Leo IV to confirm it. The pope refused, on the ground (among other things) that the clerks had appealed to Rome; but Lothair, hitherto the archbishop's enemy, interceded for him, and Leo sent him the pall, by which he was constituted primate of Neustria. Benedict III on Hincmar's application confirmed the privileges thus bestowed on him, and declared that there should be no appeal from his judgment, saving the rights of the apostolic see; he also confirmed the deposition of Wulfad and his companions, provided (as he expressly said) that the facts of the case were as they had been represented to him. And Nicolas, in 863, renewed both the grant to Hincmar and the judgment as to the clerks, with the same condition which had been stated by his predecessor.

But three years later this pope professed to have discovered great unfairness in the statements on which the applications to Benedict and to himself had been grounded, and ordered that Hincmar should restore the clerks, or else should submit the matter to a council, with leave for them, if its judgment should be unfavorable, to appeal to the apostolic see. A second synod was accordingly held at Soissons. Hincmar handed in four tracts, in justification of Ebbo's deposition, of his own appointment, and of the proceedings against the clerks—to whose restoration, however, he professed himself willing to consent, provided that it could be granted without prejudice to the laws of the church. The council decided that the deposition had been right in point of justice, but that it might be reversed by the higher law of mercy, according to the precedent of the Nicene judgment as to the Novatianists, and to the provisions of the African church for the reconciliation of the Donatists. But Nicolas, instead of confirming the acts, strongly censured the council for having omitted to cancel the judgment of that which had been held in 853; he blamed it for having sanctioned the promotion of Wulfad by Charles the Bald to the see of Bourges without requesting the papal consent; he told the bishops that they ought to have sent him all the documents relating to Ebbo, and that they must now do so; and in letters to them, to Charles, and to Hincmar, he charged the archbishop with falsehood, fraud, cunning, and injustice. At the same time he wrote to Wulfad and his brethren, exhorting them to pay due reverence to Hincmar.

The deposition of Ebbo and the appointment of his successor again came into question before a council assembled from six provinces at Troyes in October 867. The decision was in favour of Hincmar; but the council did an important service to the papal interest by requesting Nicolas to decree that no archbishop or bishop should be deposed without the consent of the apostolic see. Hincmar and Nicolas were at last brought nearer to each other on this question by their respective dangers from other quarters. The archbishop was afraid of the influence which Wulfad had acquired over Charles the Bald, while the pope, who was now engaged in a formidable struggle with the patriarch Photius and the eastern church, was unwilling to tempt the Franks to side with his opponents. On receiving the envoys whom Hincmar had sent to Rome after the synod of Troyes, Nicolas expressed approbation of his proceedings, and wrote to request that he and other learned men of France would assist in the controversy with the Greeks. With this request the archbishop complied; and Nicolas was soon after succeeded by Adrian, who confirmed Wulfad in the see of Bourges and bestowed the pall on him, but at the same time behaved with great respect to Hincmar.

Thus the dispute ended peacefully. But in the course of it much had been done to infringe on the independence of the Frankish church. Nicolas claimed that the Frankish synods should be called by order of the pope; that the parties in a cause might appeal from such synods to Rome either before or after judgment; that the synods should report to the pope before pronouncing the sentence; that the bishops who acted as judges should be compelled to

go to Rome for the purpose of justifying their decision; that the pope should have the power of annulling all their acts, so that it should be necessary to begin the process anew. Hincmar and his party, while they had the ancient laws of the church in their favour, felt themselves unable to struggle against the complication of political interests; the archbishop found himself obliged to concede the principle of an appeal to Rome, according to the canon of Sardica, although Charlemagne had excluded that canon from his collection, and it owed its insertion among the Frank capitularies to the forger Benedict the Levite. And the petition of the council of Troyes—suggested, no doubt, by the punishments to which Ebbo and others had been subjected on account of their acts against Lewis the Pious—shows how, under the idea of securing themselves against other powers, the Frankish prelates contributed to aggrandize Rome by investing it with universal control in the character of general protector of the church.

At the same time with the affair as to Ebbo's ordinations another controversy was going on between Nicolas and Hincmar, which exhibited in a yet more striking manner the nature of the new claims set up in behalf of the papacy.

Rothad, bishop of Soissons, in the province of Reims, had occupied his see thirty years, and had long been on unfriendly terms with the archbishop. The accounts which we have of the differences between the bishop and his metropolitan must be received with caution, as they come for the most part from Rothad, or from the Lotharingian bishops, who were hostile to Hincmar on account of his proceedings in the case of Theutberga; while they are in part directly contradicted by Hincmar himself.

Rothad, according to his own report, with the consent of thirty-three bishops, deposed a presbyter who had been caught in the act of unchastity. The man carried his complaint to Hincmar, who, after having imposed on him a penance of three years, restored him to his benefice, excommunicated and imprisoned the clerk whom Rothad had put into it, and persecuted the bishop himself for his share in the affair. Even by this account, it would seem that Rothad had ventured to invade the rights of his metropolitan by holding a synod independently of him. But in addition to this, Hincmar, while disclaiming all personal malice against the bishop of Soissons, charges him with long insubordination, with notorious laxity of life, and with dilapidating, selling, or pledging the property of his see. However their disagreement may have arisen, Hincmar in 861 suspended Rothad from his office until he should become obedient, and threatened him with deposition; whereupon the bishop appealed to Rome.

In the following year, Rothad appeared at a synod held at Pistres, as if no censure been passed against him. His presence was objected to, on which he again appealed to the pope, and asked leave to go to Rome, which Charles the Bald at first granted. But the case was afterwards, with the concurrence of Charles, examined by a synod at Soissons in the end of the same year, when Rothad, who had been imprisoned for his contumacy in refusing to appear, was sentenced to deposition, while an abbey was assigned to him for his maintenance, and another person was appointed to his see. According to Hincmar, he was content with this arrangement, until some Lotharingian bishops, wishing to use him as a tool against the great opponent of their sovereign's divorce, persuaded him to resume his appeal to the pope. Rothad's own statement is, that Hincmar, having got possession of a letter in which he requested a continuance of support from some bishops who had befriended him at Pistres, wrongly represented this as an abandonment of his appeal, and a reference of his cause to those Frankish bishops.

Hincmar and the prelates who had met at Soissons, by way of obviating the pope's objections to their proceedings, requested Nicolas to confirm their acts, while, in excuse for their disregard of Rothad's appeal, they alleged that the old imperial laws forbade such cases to be carried out of the kingdom. But Nicolas had received representations of the affair from the bishops of Lotharingia, and replied by censuring the synod very strongly for the insult which it had offered to St Peter by presuming to judge a matter in which an appeal had been

made to Rome. In consequence of that appeal, he declared its judgment to be null. Temporal laws, he said, are good against heretics and tyrants, but are of no force when they clash with the rights of the church. He tells the members of the assembly that they must either restore Rothad to his see, or within thirty days send deputies to assert their cause against him before the apostolical tribunal. With his usual skill, he assumes the character of a general guardian of the church by remarking that the same evil which had happened to Rothad might befall any one of themselves, and he points out the chair of St. Peter as the refuge for bishops oppressed by their metropolitans. At the same time Nicolas wrote to Hincmar in terms of severe censure. He tells him that, if Rothad had not appealed, he must himself have inquired into the matter—a claim of right to interfere which had not before been advanced by Rome. He asked with what consistency Hincmar could apply to the Roman see for a confirmation of his privileges as metropolitan, or how he could attach any value to privileges derived from Rome, while he did all that he could to lessen its authority; and, as the first letter received no answer, the pope wrote again, telling the archbishop that within thirty days he must either reinstate Rothad, or send him and some representatives of his accusers to Rome, on pain of being interdicted from the celebration of the Eucharist until he should comply. He also wrote to Rothad, encouraging him to persevere in his appeal unless he were conscious of having a bad cause; and, notwithstanding the importunities of Charles and his queen, who entreated him to let the matter rest, he desired the king to send Rothad to Rome. The second letter to Hincmar, and two which followed it, remained unanswered; and Nicolas then wrote a fifth, but in a milder tone, as he was afraid to drive the archbishop to extremities, lest he should join the party of Gunther.

In the beginning of 864, Rothad obtained permission to go to Rome. Hincmar also sent two envoys—not, he said, as accusers, but in order to justify his own proceedings. They carried with them a letter of great length, in which, with profuse expressions of humility and reverence towards the apostolic see, he admits the right of appeal as sanctioned by the Sardican canon, but says that, according to the African canons and to Gregory the Great, Rothad, by referring the case to judges of his own choosing, had foregone the right of carrying it to any other tribunal. He tells the pope that Rothad had for many years been unruly and had treated all remonstrances with contempt, so that he himself had incurred much obloquy for allowing a man so notoriously unfit and incorrigible to retain the episcopal office. He dwells much on the necessity that bishops should obey their metropolitans, and endeavors very earnestly to obtain the pope's confirmation of his past proceedings, assuring him that Rothad shall be well provided for.

Hincmar's envoys were detained on the way by the emperor Lewis, but the letter was sent onwards and reached the pope. Rothad was allowed to proceed to Rome, and, six months after his arrival, presented a statement of his case. On Christmas eve, three months later, Nicolas ascended the pulpit of St. Mary Major, and made a speech on the subject. Even if Hincmar's story were true, he said, it was no longer in the power of Rothad, after he had appealed to the apostolic see, to transfer his cause to an inferior tribunal; since Rothad professed himself willing to meet all charges, and since no accuser had appeared against him, the pope declared him to be worthy of restoration; and, after having waited until the feast of St. Agnes, he publicly invested the bishop with pontifical robes, and desired him to officiate at mass before him.

As Rothad maintained that he had never abandoned his appeal, and as his accusers had suffered judgment to go by default, the proceedings of Nicolas thus far might have been justified by the Sardican canon, which suspended the execution of sentence against a bishop until the pope should have submitted the cause to a fresh examination; and Hincmar had failed in the observance of that canon by appointing another bishop to Soissons. But, in letters which he wrote on the occasion, the pope gave vent to some startling novelties—that the decretals of his predecessors had been violated; that the deposition of Rothad was invalid, because the

council which had pronounced it was held without the apostolic permission, and, further, because the deposition of a bishop was one of those “greater judgments” which belong to the apostolic chair alone. He required Hincmar, under pain of perpetual deposition, either at once to restore Rothad unconditionally, or to reinstate him for the time, and to appear at Rome for the further trial of the question.

Nicolas had originally stood on the Sardican canon, but he now took very different ground; and the change was the more striking, because the new principles which he advanced were really unnecessary to his cause. These principles were derived from the pretended decretals of Isidore, which are for the first time mentioned as being known at Rome in the letter of Nicolas to the French bishops. In 860, Lupus of Ferrières, at the instigation of Wenilo, archbishop of Sens, had written a letter in which he hinted a reference to them by saying that pope Melchiades, the contemporary of Constantine, was reported to have laid down that no bishop could be deposed without the pope’s consent; and the abbot had requested that Nicolas would send a copy of the decretal as preserved at Rome. From the pope’s silence as to this point in his answer, it is inferred that he then knew nothing of the forged collection; and the same was the case in 863, when he spoke of the decretals of Siricius as the oldest that were known. But now—only one year later—he is found citing those of the Isidorian collection: and when some of the French bishops expressed a doubt respecting them, on the ground that they were not in the code of Dionysius Exiguus, he answered that on the same ground they might suspect the decretals of Gregory and other popes later than Dionysius — nay, they might even suspect the canonical Scriptures; that there were genuine decretals preserved elsewhere; that, as Innocent had ordered all the canonical books to be received, so had Leo ordered the reception of all papal decretals; that they themselves were in the habit of using these epistles when favorable to their own interest, and questioned them only when the object was to injure the rights of the apostolical see. It would seem, therefore, that Nicolas had been made acquainted with the forged decretals during Rothad’s stay at Rome—most probably by Rothad himself. That the bishop of Soissons was privy to the forgery, appears likely from the facts that he was already a bishop when it was executed, and that he was connected with the party from which it emanated. But we need not suppose that Nicolas knowingly adopted an imposture. The principles of the decretals had been floating in the mind of the age; on receiving the forgeries, the pope recognized in them his own ideal of ecclesiastical polity, and he welcomed them as affording a historical foundation for it. We may therefore, (in charity at least,) acquit him of conscious fraud in this matter, although something of criminality will still attach to the care with which he seems to have avoided all examination of their genuineness, and to the eagerness with which he welcomed these pretended antiquities, coming from a foreign country, in disregard of the obvious consideration that, if genuine, they must have all along been known in his own city.

Hincmar made no further active opposition, but acquiesced in the restitution of Rothad, although in his chronicle of the time he speaks of it as effected by might in defiance of rule, and argues that it was inconsistent with the Sardican canon. The act was performed by Arsenius, during the mission which has been mentioned in connection with the history of Lothair’s marriages, and Rothad appears to have died soon after, in the beginning of Adrian’s pontificate

If even Nicolas had found Hincmar a dangerous antagonist, Adrian was altogether unequal to contend with him.

On the death of Lothair II, in 869, Charles the Bald immediately seized his dominions. Adrian felt that, after the part which his predecessor and he himself had taken to make the world regard the papal see as the general vindicator of justice, he was bound to interfere in behalf of the nearer heirs — the emperor Lewis, and his uncle the king of Germany. He therefore wrote in terms of strong remonstrance to Charles, to the nobles of Lotharingia, and to the Neustrian bishops; he sent envoys who, during the performance of divine service at St.

Denys, threatened the wrath of St. Peter against the king; he wrote to Hincmar, blaming him for his supineness, desiring him to oppose his sovereign's ambitious projects, and charging him, if Charles should persist in them, to avoid his communion; and, as his letters received no answer, he wrote again, threatening, apparently in imitation of Gregory IV, to go into France in person for the redress of the wrong which had been attempted. In the meantime Hincmar had placed the crown of Lotharingia on the head of Charles, who by the partition of Mersen had made an accommodation with Lewis of Germany, and consequently felt himself independent of the pope. The archbishop took no notice of Adrian's first communication; but he returned a remarkable answer to the second. He disclaimed all judgment of the political question as to inheritance; his king, he says, had required his obedience, and he had felt himself bound to obey. He complains of it as a novel hardship that he should be required to avoid the communion of Charles : for the Lotharingian bishops had not been obliged to break off communion with their late sovereign, although he lived in adultery; the popes themselves had not broken off communion with princes who were guilty of crimes, or even of heresy; and Charles had not been convicted of any breach of faith which could warrant his bishops in refusing to communicate with him.

But the most striking part of the letter was where Hincmar professed to report the language held by the nobles of Lotharingia—a significant hint of his own opinion, and of the reception which the pope might expect if he were to follow out the line of conduct on which he had entered. He tells Adrian that they contrast his tone towards Charles with the submissiveness of former popes towards Pipin and Charlemagne; they recall to mind the indignities which Gregory IV had brought on himself by his interference in Frankish affairs; they loudly blame the pope for meddling with politics, and for pretending to impose a sovereign on them; they wish him to keep to his own affairs, as his predecessors had done, and to defend them by his prayers and by the prayers of the clergy from the Normans and their other enemies; they declare that a bishop who utters unjust excommunications, instead of excluding the objects of them from eternal life, only forfeits his own power of bindings

The pope was greatly incensed. He countenanced a rebellion raised against Charles by one of his sons, Carloman, who had been ordained a deacon; he forbade the French bishops to excommunicate the rebel prince when their sovereign required them to do so. But Hincmar and his brethren, in despite of this, pronounced sentence of degradation and excommunication against Carloman, who, on being taken, was condemned to death, but escaped with the loss of his eyes, and received the abbey of Epternach from the charity of Lewis the German. And Adrian, after having committed himself by threats and denunciations in a style exaggerated from that of Nicolas, found himself obliged to let these acts of defiance pass without taking any further measures against those who were concerned in them.

A yet more remarkable collision arose out of the conduct of Hincmar, bishop of Laon. The archbishop of Reims had in 858 obtained the see of Laon for his nephew and namesake, who is described as entirely dependent on him for the means of subsistence; but he soon found reason to repent of this step, which appears, from the younger Hincmar's character, to have been prompted by family or political considerations rather than by a regard for the benefit of the church. The bishop of Laon received from Charles the Bald a distant abbey and an office at court. For these preferments he neglected his diocese; he made himself odious both to clergy and to laity by his exactions; and he treated his uncle's authority as metropolitan with contempts. In consequence of a disagreement with the king, he was tried before a secular court in 868; he was deprived of his civil office, and the income of his see was confiscated. On this occasion, the elder Hincmar, considering that the cause of the church was involved, forgot his private grounds for dissatisfaction with his kinsman's conduct, and came to the bishop's support. In a letter to Charles (in which, among other authorities, he cites some of the forged decretals), he declared that bishops were amenable to no other judgment than that of their own order; that the trial of a bishop by a secular tribunal was contrary to the ancient laws

of the church, to those of the Roman emperors, and to the example of the king's predecessors; that it was a sign that the end of the world was at hand; that royalty is dependent on the episcopal unction, and is forfeited by violation of the engagements contracted at receiving it. At the diet of Pistres, in 868, the archbishop maintained his nephew's interest, and the younger Hincmar, on entreating the king's forgiveness, recovered the revenues of his see.

But fresh disagreements very soon broke out between the kinsmen, and the bishop of Laon involved himself in further troubles by the violence which he used in ejecting a nobleman who was one of the tenants of his church. The king, after citing him to appear, and receiving a refusal, ordered him to be arrested; whereupon he took refuge in a church and placed himself beside the altar. In April 869 he appeared before a synod at Verberie; but he declined its judgment, appealed to the pope, and desired leave to proceed to Rome for the prosecution of his appeal. The permission was refused, and he was committed to prison. Before setting out for Verberie, he had charged his clergy, in case of his detention, to suspend the performance of all divine offices, including even baptism, penance, the viaticum of the dying, and the rites of burial, until he should return, or the pope should release them from the injunctions. The clergy, in great perplexity and distress, now applied to the archbishop of Reims for direction in the matter. Hincmar by letter desired his nephew to recall the interdict; on his refusal, he cancelled it by his own authority as metropolitan, and produced ancient authorities to assure the clergy that, as their bishop's excommunication was irregular and groundless, they were not bound to obey it.

About the time of Charles's coronation in Lotharingia, the bishop of Laon was set at liberty, his case being referred to a future synod. He forthwith renewed his assaults on his uncle, whom he denounced as the author of his late imprisonment; he espoused the cause of the rebel Carloman; and he sent forth a letter in which he asserted for all bishops a right of appealing to Rome — not against a sentence of their brethren (which was the only kind of appeal hitherto claimed), but in bar of the jurisdiction of local synods. For this claim he alleged the authority of the forged decretals. The archbishop replied, not by denying the genuineness of these documents—which, however he may have suspected it, he was not, after his own use of them, at liberty to impugn—but by maintaining that, as they had been issued on particular occasions, their application was limited to the circumstances which called them forth; that they were valid only in so far as they were agreeable to the ecclesiastical canons, and that some of them had been superseded by the determinations of councils later than their professed date. Such a view of the decretals was evidently even more prejudicial to the new Roman claims than an assertion of their spuriousness would have been.

While Charles was engrossed by the affairs of Lotharingia, the case of the younger Hincmar was postponed. But he was brought before synods at Gondreville and Attigny in 870, and pamphlets were exchanged between him and his uncle—one, by the archbishop, extending to great length, and divided into fifty-five chapters. At Attigny the bishop of Laon submitted to swear obedience to the authority of his sovereign and of his metropolitan; and, after having in vain renewed his request for leave to go to Rome, he asked for a trial by secular judges, who pronounced a decision in his favour. The elder Hincmar was indignant, both because his nephew had abandoned the clerical privileges in submitting to a lay tribunal, and on account of the result of the trial.

The bishop was again brought before a synod which met at Doucy, near Mousson, on the Maas, in August 871, when fresh misdemeanors were laid to his charge—that he had made away with the property of his see, that he had sided with Carloman, had refused to sign the excommunication uttered against the rebel, and had slandered Charles to the pope. It was not until after the third summons that the accused condescended to appear. He charged the king with having invaded his dignity; the archbishop of Reims with having caused his imprisonment: and on these grounds he refused to be judged by them. Charles repelled the charges against himself, and joined with the nobles who were present in swearing that the

imputation against the archbishop was false. In reply to his claim of a right to appeal to Rome, the bishop was reminded of the canons which ordered that every cause should be terminated in the country where it arose, and was told that he could not appeal until after a trial by the bishops of his own province. Notwithstanding his persistence in refusing to answer, the synod proceeded to examine the matter; and the elder Hincmar, after having collected the opinions of the members, pronounced sentence of deposition against his nephew, reserving only such a power of appeal as was sanctioned by the council of Sardica. The synod then wrote to the pope, stating the grounds of their judgment, and expressing a hope that, in consideration of the bishop's incorrigible misconduct, he would confirm the sentence. They limit the right of appealing agreeably to the Sardican canon, and desire that, if the pope should entertain the appeal which had been made to him, he would commit the further trial of the cause to bishops of their own neighborhood, or would send envoys to sit with the local bishops for the purpose; and they beg that in any case he would not restore Hincmar to his see without a provincial inquiry, but would proceed according to the canons.

Adrian replied in a very lofty tone. He censured the synod for having ventured to depose the accused without regard to his appeal, and charged them to send him to Rome, with some of their own number, in order to a fresh inquiry. The answer of the Frankish bishops was firm and decided. They professed that they could only account for Adrian's letter by supposing that, in the multiplicity of his engagements, he had been unable to read the whole of the documents which they had sent to him; they justified their proceedings, and declared that, if the pope should persist in the course which he had indicated, they were resolved to stand on the rights of their national church.

Adrian's letter to the synod had been accompanied by one in a like strain addressed to Charles, who was greatly provoked by it, and employed the elder Hincmar to reply. The archbishop executed his task with hearty zeal. Charles, in whose name the letter was written, is made to tell the pope that the language which he had held was improper to be used towards a king, and unbecoming the modesty of a bishop, and desires him to content himself with writing as his predecessors had written to former sovereigns of France. For a pope to speak of "ordering" a king is said to be a new and unexampled audacity. It is denied that Adrian was entitled to evoke the case of the younger Hincmar to Rome for trial. The privileges of St. Peter depend on the exercise of justice; the king will not violate the principles of Scripture and of the church by interposing to defeat justice in a case where the offences of the accused are so many and so clear. He declines with indignation the office which the pope would impose on him by desiring him to guard the property of the see of Laon; the kings of the Franks had hitherto been reckoned lords of the earth—not deputies or bailiffs of bishops. He threatens, if the matter cannot be ended at home, to go to Rome and maintain the rightfulness of his proceedings. The pope had spoken of decrees; but any decree which would affect to bind a sovereign must have been vomited forth from hell. The letter concludes by declaring the king's willingness to abide by the known rules of Scripture, tradition, and the canons, while he is determined to reject "anything which may have been compiled or forged to the contrary by any person"—the plainest intimation that had as yet been given of Hincmar's opinion as to the Isidorian decretals.

Adrian again felt that he had committed a mistake in advancing pretensions which were thus contested; and a league which had just been concluded between Lewis the German and his nephew the emperor contributed to alarm the pope as to the consequences which might follow from a breach with the king of Neustria. He therefore wrote again to Charles, exchanging his imperious tone for one of soothing and flattery. After some slight allusions to the style of the king's letter, he proceeds, (as he says) "to pour in the oil of consolation and the ointment of holy love". He begs that he may not be held accountable for any expressions which might have seemed harsh in his former letters; and, knowing the intensity of the king's desire for additional territory and power, he volunteers an assurance that, if he should live to

see a vacancy in the empire, no other candidate than Charles shall with his consent be raised to it. The case of the bishop of Laon is treated as of inferior moment; the pope still desires that he may be sent to Rome, but promises that he shall not be restored unless a full inquiry shall have shown the justice of his cause, and that this inquiry shall be held in France. Adrian did not live to receive an answer to this letter; and Hincmar the younger was kept in prison until, by taking part in fresh intrigues, he exposed himself to a severer punishment.

Adrian's conduct in this affair had been alike imprudent and unfortunate. The French bishops had set aside the false decretals; they had insisted on confining the papal right as to appeals within the limits which had been defined by the council of Sardica; they had denied that the examination of all weightier causes belonged to the pope alone; they had denied that he had the right of evoking a cause to Rome before it had been submitted to the judgment of a national synod, and would only allow him the power of remitting it, after such judgment, to be again examined by the bishops of the country in which it arose; and his lofty pretensions had ended in a humiliating concessions. Yet the Roman see had gained something. Hincmar, in all his opposition to the papal claims, carefully mixes up professions of deep reverence for the authority of the apostolic chair; his objections to the Isidorian principles, being addressed to his nephew, were not likely to become much known at Rome, while, as he had not openly questioned the genuineness of the decretals, the popes might henceforth cite them with greater confidence; and a feeling that the power of the papacy was useful to the church restrained him in the midst of his opposition to it. Both bishops and princes now saw in the papacy something which they might use to their advantage; and the real benefit of all applications to Rome for aid was sure to redound to the Roman see itself.

The circumstances of John VIII's election as the successor of Adrian are unknown; but he appears to have belonged to the Frankish party among the Roman clergy, and there is no reason to doubt that the emperor consented to his appointment. In 875 the death of the emperor Lewis II without issue opened up to Charles the Bald the great object of his ambition; and the time was now come for the pope to assume the power of disposing of the empire—an assumption countenanced by the fact that his predecessors had long acted as arbiters in the dissensions of the Carolingian princes. Setting aside the stronger hereditary claims of Lewis the German, John invited Charles to Rome, and on Christmas-day—seventy-five years after the coronation of Charlemagne—placed the imperial crown on his head. Although the pope afterwards declared that this was done in obedience to a revelation which had been made to his predecessor Nicolas, it would appear that influences of a less exalted kind had also contributed to the act. The annalist of Fulda, whose tone towards the “tyrant” of France is generally very bitter, tells us that, in order to obtain the empire, Charles had made a prodigal use of bribery among the senators, “after the fashion of Jugurtha”; nor did the pope himself fail to benefit on the occasion. A writer of later date is undoubtedly wrong in saying that Charles ceded to him certain territories which are known to have then belonged to the Greek empire; but there is reason to believe that he gave up the control of elections to the papacy, released the pope from the duty of doing homage, and withdrew his resident commissioners from Rome, leaving the government in the hands of the pope, while the title of Defender still served to connect the emperor with the city, and entitled the Romans and their bishops to look to him for aid.

Charles now professed that he owed the empire to John, and during the remainder of his days he was solicitous to serve the author of his dignity. Proceeding northwards, he was crowned as king of Italy at Pavia, in February 876, when the estates declared that, as God, through the vicar of St. Peter and St. Paul, had called him to be emperor, so they chose him king. The acts of Pavia were confirmed in an assembly held some months later at Pontyon, where the Neustrian clergy and nobles professed that they chose him for their sovereign, as he had been chosen by the pope and by the Lombards. This change of title from a hereditary to an elective royalty appeared to hold out to the pope a hope of being able to interfere in the

future disposal of the Neustrian and Italian kingdoms; but an attempt which was made in his behalf at Pontyon, although zealously supported by the emperor, met with a strenuous opposition from the Frankish clergy. The papal legate, John, bishop of Tusculum, read a letter by which Ansegis, archbishop of Sens, was constituted vicar apostolic and primate of Gaul and Germany, with power to assemble synods, to execute the papal orders by the agency of bishops, and to bring all important matters to Rome for decision. Hincmar and his brethren requested leave to examine the document; to which the emperor replied by asking them whether they would obey the pope, and telling them that he, as the pope's vicar in the council, was resolved to enforce obedience. He ordered a chair to be set for Ansegis beside the legate; and at his invitation the archbishop of Sens walked past the metropolitans who had held precedence of him, and took his seat in the place of dignity. But Hincmar and the other bishops behaved with unshaken firmness. They repeated their request that they might be allowed to see the pope's letter, and to take a copy of it. They protested against the elevation of Ansegis as uncanonical—as infringing on the primacy granted to the see of Reims in the person of Remigius, and on the privileges bestowed on Hincmar by Benedict, Nicolas, and Adrian; nor could they be brought to promise obedience to the pope, except such as was agreeable to the canons, and to the example of their predecessors. One bishop only, Frotair, was disposed to comply, in the hope of obtaining a translation from the diocese of Bordeaux, which had been desolated by the Northmen, to that of Bourges but his brethren objected to the translation as contrary to the laws of the church. The emperor, provoked by Hincmar's opposition, required him to take a new oath of fealty in the presence of the assembly, as if his loyalty were suspected—an unworthy return for the archbishop's long, able, and zealous exertions for the rights of the crown and of the national church. The council broke up without coming to any satisfactory determination, and Hincmar soon after produced a strong defence of the rights of metropolitans against the new principles on which the commission to Ansegis was grounded. Charles was induced by political reasons to act in a spirit of conciliation, and the pope got over the difficulty as to Ansegis by conferring the primacy of Gaul on the see of Arles, to which it had been attached before the Frankish conquest. But amid the commotions of the time this arrangement had no practical effect.

In the meantime the pope was greatly disquieted at home by the factions of his city, by the petty princes and nobles of the neighborhood, and by the Saracens, who, since the death of Lewis II, carried on their ravages without any effectual check. Sometimes the nobles made alliance with the enemies of Christendom. Naples, Gaeta, Amalfi, and Sorrento, after having suffered much at their hands, entered into a league with them, and united with them in the work of devastation and plunder. Sergius, duke of Naples, made frequent incursions into the papal territory, and John, after having in vain employed gentler means, uttered an anathema against him. On this, the duke's brother, Athanasius, bishop of Naples, took on himself the execution of the sentence, seized Sergius, put out his eyes, and sent him to the pope, who requited the bishop with a profusion of thanks and commendations, quoting the texts of Scripture which enjoin a preference of the Saviour over the dearest natural affections. Athanasius now annexed the dukedom to his spiritual office. But he soon discovered that he was unable to cope with the Saracens, whereupon he allied himself with them, harassed the pope after the same fashion as his brother, and obliged John to buy him off with a large sum of money, in consideration of which he promised to break off his connection with the infidels. But the promise was not fulfilled, and the pope, with a Roman synod, uttered an anathema against the duke-bishop. Beset and continually annoyed as he was by such enemies, John implored the emperor to come to his assistance, and Charles was disposed to comply with the entreaty; but the unwillingness of the Frank chiefs to consent to such an expedition may be inferred from the heavy price which the emperor paid for their concurrence, by allowing the office of his counts to be converted into an hereditary dignity at the council of Quiercy in 887. The pope, on being informed of his protector's approach, set out to meet him, and on the way

held a council at Ravenna, where he passed some canons by which, in accordance with the pseudo-Isidorian principles, the power of bishops was exalted, while that of metropolitans was depressed. He met the emperor at Vercelli, and proceeded in his company to Tortona, where Richildis, the wife of Charles, was crowned as empress. But the emperor, instead of prosecuting his expedition, retired before the advancing force of Carloman, the son and successor of Lewis the German; and he died in a hut on the pass of Mont Cenis. The concessions which this prince had made both to Rome and to his nobles had greatly weakened the power of the Frankish crown, and the policy which he had lately followed in ecclesiastical affairs was very dangerous to the rights of the national church. Yet although, for the sake of his private objects, he had in his latter days behaved with much obsequiousness to the pope, it is clear that he had no intention of allowing the principles of the decretals to be established in their fullness within his dominions north of the Alps.

After the death of Charles, the empire was vacant until 884. The pope, finding himself continually annoyed by Lambert, marquis of Spoleto, and other partisans of the German Carolingians,⁰ declared his intention of seeking aid in France, and, after some forcible detention, which he avenged by anathemas against Lambert and Adalbert of Tuscany, he had embarked on board ship, and landed at Genoa. The reception which he at first met with in France was not encouraging. He had offended the clergy by his attempts against the national church, and especially by the commission to Ansegis; while all classes were irritated on account of the costly and fruitless expedition which he had induced their late sovereign to undertake. John wrote letters to all the Frankish princes, urgently summoning them and their bishops to attend a council at Troyes; but the bishops of Gaul only appeared, and the only sovereign present was the king of France, Lewis the Stammerer, who was crowned anew by the pope, although, in consequence of an irregularity in his marriage, he was unable to obtain that the queen should be included in the coronation. At Troyes, as at Ravenna, John proposed and passed some canons which raised the episcopal privileges to a height before unknown, and he dealt about anathemas with his usual profusion. The bishops joined with him in condemning Adalbert, Lambert, and his other Italian enemies, and in return obtained from him a sentence against the invaders of their own property. But they resolutely stood out for their national rights, insisting on the Sardican canon which limited the power of the Roman see as to appeals, and on those ancient laws of the church which forbade translations such as that of Frotair. And when the pope produced a grant of Charles the Bald, bestowing the abbey of St. Denys on the Roman see, they met him with a positive denial that the king could alienate the possessions of the crown.

John was greatly provoked by Hincmar's steady resistance to the pretensions of Rome; and some of the archbishop's enemies now took advantage of this feeling to annoy him by bringing forward his nephew, who, after having been imprisoned and banished, had at last been blinded by order of Charles on account of his connection with an invasion from the side of Germany. The unfortunate man was led into the place of assembly, and petitioned for a restoration to his see. But the pope, besides that he may have been afraid to venture on a step so offensive to the metropolitan of Reims, was restrained by the circumstance that he had confirmed the deposition of the younger Hincmar, and had consecrated his successor, Hildenulf. He therefore only in so far favored the petition as to give the deposed bishop leave to sing mass, and to assign him a pension out of the revenues of Laon, while he refused to accept the resignation of Hildenulf, who alleged that his health disqualified him for the performance of his duties. The enemies of the elder Hincmar, however, were resolved to make the most of the matter as a triumph over him; they arrayed the blind man in episcopal robes, and, after having with great ceremony presented him to the pope, led him into the cathedral, where he bestowed his benediction on the people. It does not appear what answer the pope obtained to his request for assistance; but it is certain that no assistance was sent.

John had conceived the idea of carrying his claim to the power of bestowing the empire yet further by choosing a person whose elevation should be manifestly due to the papal favour alone—Boso, viceroy of Provence, who had gained his friendship on occasion of his visit to France. The project, however, was found impossible, nor was the pope more successful in an attempt to secure the kingdom of Italy for his candidate. But, on the death of Lewis the Stammerer, Boso was chosen by a party of bishops and nobles as king of Provence, which was then revived as a distinct sovereignty; and it would seem that a belief of the pope's support contributed to his election, although John soon after wrote to the archbishop of Vienne, reproving him for having used the authority of Rome in behalf of Boso, whom the pope denounces as a disturber of the kingdom. John died in December 882; it is said that some of his own relations administered poison to him, and, finding that it did not work speedily, knocked out his brains with a mallet.

In the same month died the great champion of the Frankish church. Towards the end of his life Hincmar had had a serious dispute with Lewis III as to the appointment of a bishop to Beauvais. In answer to the king's profession of contempt for a subject who attempted to interfere with his honor, the archbishop used very strong language as to the relations of the episcopal and the royal powers. He tells him that bishops may ordain kings, but kings cannot consecrate bishops; and that the successors of the apostles must not be spoken of as subjects. "As the Lord said, 'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you', so may I say in my degree, 'You have not chosen me to the prelacy of the church, but I, with my colleagues and the other faithful ones of God, have chosen you to be governor of the kingdom, under the condition of duly keeping the laws'." Hincmar was at length compelled to leave his city by the approach of a devastating force of Northmen. He set out in a litter, carrying with him the relics of St. Remigius, and died at Epernay, on the 21st of December. The Annals of St. Bertin, which are the most valuable record of the period, are supposed to have been written by him from the year 861 to within a month of his death.

The first and second successors of John in the papacy, Marinus (A.D. 882) and Adrian III. (A.D. 884), appear to have been chosen without the imperial licence, and by means of the German interests. On the death of Adrian, which took place as he was on his way to Germany in 885, Stephen V was consecrated without any application for the consent of the emperor, Charles the Fat; but Charles expressed great indignation at the omission, and had already taken measures for deposing the pope, when a Roman legate arrived at the imperial court, and succeeded in appeasing him by exhibiting a long list of bishops, clergy, and nobles who had shared in the election.

Charles the Fat, a younger son of Lewis the German, had received the imperial crown from John VIII in 881, and, by the deaths of other princes, had gradually become master of the whole Carolingian empire. But his reign was disastrous; in 887 he was deposed by Arnulf, an illegitimate son of his brother Carloman; and, after having been supported for some months by alms, he died in the following year—whether of disease or by violence is uncertain. The popular feeling as to this unfortunate prince, the last legitimate descendant of Charlemagne, may be inferred from the tone in which he is spoken of by the annalists of the time. They tenderly dwell on his virtues and amiable qualities; they express a trust that the sufferings which he patiently bore in this world may be found to have prepared his way to a better inheritance; it is even said that at his death heaven was seen to open, and to receive his soul.

CHAPTER III.

THE GREEK CHURCH—PHOTIUS.
AD. 843-898.

Michael III, the son of Theophilus and Theodora, grew up under evil influences. His maternal uncle Bardas founded schemes of ambition on the corruption of the young prince's character. He removed one of the male guardians by death, and another by compelling him to retire into a monastery; and by means of a worthless tutor, as well as by his own discourse, he instilled into the emperor a jealous impatience of the control of his mother and sister. At the age of eighteen Michael threw off this yoke. Theodora called together the senate, showed them the treasures which her economy had amassed, in order that she might not be afterwards suspected of having left her son without ample provision, resigned her share in the regency, and withdrew from the palace.

Michael now gave the loose to his depraved tastes and appetites. His chosen associates were athletes, charioteers, musicians, buffoons, and dancing-girls. He himself entered the lists in the public chariot races, and insisted on receiving his prizes from the band of a consecrated image. He joined in the feasts and drinking bouts of his companions; he became sponsor for their children, and on such occasions bestowed lavish presents; he rewarded acts of disgusting buffoonery with costly gifts, and even encouraged his vile favorites to practise their gross and brutal jests on his mother. The wealth which he had inherited was soon dissipated; and after having endeavoured to supply his necessities by plundering churches of their ornaments, he was reduced to melt down his plate, and even the golden tissues of the imperial robes.

The most outrageous of Michael's extravagances was his profane mimicry of religion. He organized a mock hierarchy, of which one Theophilus, who was known by the name of Gryllus, was the chief. Under this patriarch were twelve metropolitans, the emperor himself being one of the number. They went through a farcical ordination; they were arrayed in costly robes imitated from those of the church; they sang obscene songs to music composed in ridicule of the ecclesiastical chant; they burlesqued the trials, condemnations, and depositions of bishops; they had jewelled altar-vessels, with which they administered an Eucharist of mustard and vinegar. On one occasion this ribald crew encountered the venerable patriarch Ignatius at the head of a solemn procession, when Gryllus, who was mounted on an ass, rudely jostled him, and the attendant mummers twanged their harps in derision, insulted the patriarch with filthy language, and beat the clergy of his train. After the death of their patron, some of the wretches who had shared in these abominations were called to account before the great council of 869, when they pleaded that they had acted through fear of the emperor, and expressed contrition for their offences.

During the course of ages, a change had come over the characters which had formerly distinguished the Greek and the Latin churches respectively. Among the Greeks the fondness for speculation had been succeeded by a settled formalism, while the rigidity of the Latins had yielded to the new life infused by the accession of the barbarian nations to the church. But, although different from that of earlier times, a marked distinction still existed. The influence of Augustine, which had so largely moulded the western mind, and had given prominence to the doctrines of grace above all others, had not extended to the east. From the time of the Trullan council, the churches had been divided by a difference of usages, especially as to the marriage of the clergy; and, although the question as to the procession of the Holy Ghost had

been laid to rest in the days of Charlemagne, it still remained as a doctrinal centre around which other causes of discord might array themselves. The see of Rome had gradually risen to a height far above its ancient rival; and while Constantinople could not but be dissatisfied with this change, there was on the Roman side a wish to make the superiority felt. Political jealousies also contributed to feed the smouldering ill-feeling which any accident might fan into a flame. And now a personal question produced a rupture which tended far towards the eventual separation of the churches.

Nicetas, a son of Michael Rhangabe, had, on his father's deposition, been thrust into a cloister at the age of fourteen. He assumed the name of Ignatius, became a priest, and, having acquired a high character for piety, was, in 846, promoted by Theodora to the see of Constantinople, on the recommendation of a famous hermit. His predecessor, Methodius, had been engaged in differences with Gregory bishop of Syracuse, who, having been driven from his own diocese by the Saracens, usually lived at Constantinople, and the patriarch had uttered an anathema against the bishop. In Ignatius the feeling of religious antagonism could hardly fail to be stimulated by the fact that Gregory was a son of Leo the Armenian, by whom his own father, Michael, had been dethroned. He refused Gregory's assistance at his consecration; in 851 he deposed and excommunicated him for having uncanonically ordained a person of another diocese; and at the patriarch's request the sentence was confirmed by a Roman synod under Benedict III. The inhabitants of the capital were divided between Ignatius and Gregory; but, although the opposition to the patriarch was strong, he earned high and deserved credit by his conduct as a pastor.

His conscientious zeal for the duties of his office induced him to remonstrate with Bardas on the subject of a scandalous imputation—that the minister, after having divorced his wife on some trivial pretext, lived in an incestuous intercourse with the widow of his son; and finding remonstrance ineffectual, the patriarch proceeded so far as to refuse the holy Eucharist to him at Epiphany, 857. Bardas, whose influence over his nephew was continually increasing, resolved on vengeance. He persuaded Michael that, in order to the security of his power, it would be expedient to compel Theodora and her daughters to become nuns, and Ignatius was summoned to officiate at their profession. The patriarch refused, on the ground that it would be a violation of his duty towards the empress and one of her daughter who had been appointed regents, by the will of Theophilus. On this Bardas accused him of treason, adding a charge of connection with the interest of a crazy pretender to the throne, named Gebon; and Ignatius was banished to the island of Terebinthus.

Bardas resolved to fill the vacant throne with a man whose brilliant reputation might overpower the murmurs excited by the deprivation of Ignatius. Photius was a member of a distinguished Byzantine family, a great nephew of the patriarch Tarasius, and connected with the imperial house by the marriage of his uncle to a sister of Theodora. He had lived in the enjoyment of wealth and splendour, he had been ambassador to the caliph of Bagdad, and was now secretary of state and protospathary and in the midst of his occupations he had acquired an amount of learning so far surpassing that of his contemporaries that his enemies even referred it to unhallowed sources. He had been accustomed to carry on a part of his studies in company with his brother Tarasius, and, on taking leave of him when about to set out on the embassy to Bagdad, presented him with another companion, in the shape of a summary of books which Photius had read by himself. This work—the *Myriobiblon* or *Bibliotheca*—contains notices of two hundred and eighty books in classical and ecclesiastical literature, with summaries of the contents, abridgments, extracts, and comments; and, in addition to its value as a treasury of much which would otherwise have perished, it is remarkable in the history of literature as the prototype of our modern critical reviews. Among his other writings are a Dictionary; a book of discussions on questions from Scripture; a considerable number of letters; and a collection of ecclesiastical laws.

With the exception of such information as may be gathered from his own works, our knowledge of Photius comes almost exclusively from his adversaries. The enmity of these in his own time was bitter; and his name has since been pursued by writers in the papal interest with a rancour which can perhaps only be paralleled by their treatment of the protestant reformers. The biographer of Ignatius tells us that the intruding patriarch took part in Michael's drinking bouts, and made no scruple of associating with Gryllus and his gang; and another Greek writer states that on one occasion, when the emperor was overcome by fifty cups, Photius swallowed sixty without any appearance of intoxication. The second of these charges, however, is accompanied by fables so gross as altogether to destroy the credit of the author's evidence against Photius; and such tales are utterly inconsistent with the admission of his enemies, that he had succeeded (although, as they think, undeservedly) in gaining a character for sanctity. Nor was his orthodoxy as yet impeached, although he was afterwards called in question for having taught that man has a reasonable and also a spiritual soul—an opinion countenanced by the authority of many among the earlier fathers. Like Ignatius, he was a supporter of the cause of images, for which he states that his parents had suffered in the times of persecution.

Attempts were made to induce Ignatius to resign his dignity; but, as such a step would have involved an acknowledgment of guilt, he steadfastly withstood both entreaties and severities. At length, however, he was drawn into something which the court could regard as a compliance; and Photius, after having been ordained by Gregory of Syracuse through all the degrees of the ministry on six successive days, was enthroned as patriarch on Christmas-day. He repeatedly declares, even in letters to Bardas himself, that the promotion was forced on him, and tells the pope that he had allowed himself to be imprisoned before he would accept it. Nor need we suppose his reluctance insincere; for even an ambitious man (as Photius certainly was) might well have hesitated to encounter the difficulties of a position which was to be held to the exclusion of such a prelate as Ignatius, and by the favour of such patrons as Bardas and Michael; while, in mitigation of the unseemliness of intruding into the place of a patriarch who was still alive, and whose resignation was only constructive, it is to be considered that Photius had belonged to the party of Gregory, and therefore could have had little personal scruple as to the rights of Ignatius.

It is said that he was required by the metropolitans of his patriarchate to swear that he would honour the deprived patriarch as a father, and that he obtained from Bardas a promise that Ignatius should be kindly treated. But he very soon had the mortification of finding that this promise was disregarded. Ignatius, in the hope of forcing him to a more explicit resignation, was exposed to cold and nakedness, was scourged, chained in a gloomy dungeon, and deprived of the consolation which he might have received from the visits of his friends, while many of his partisans were beaten, imprisoned, and mutilated with the usual Byzantine cruelty; and Photius had to bear the odium of outrages committed in violation of the pledge which he had required, and in contempt of his earnest remonstrances and entreaties.

The adherents of Ignatius were zealous and resolute. They held a synod, at which Photius was excommunicated; whereupon the patriarch, who appears from the bitterness of his letters to have been a man of very irritable temper, retaliated by assembling another synod, and uttering a like sentence against Ignatius. In order to strengthen his position, he now sent a notice of his consecration to Rome, with a request that the pope would depute legates to a council which was to be held at Constantinople for the suppression of the iconoclast party, which had again attempted to make head. His letter was accompanied by one from the emperor, with splendid gifts to the apostolic see. The application for aid against the iconoclasts appears to have been merely a pretext—the real object being to draw the pope into the interest of Photius. In the meantime renewed attempts were made to obtain the resignation of Ignatius, at first by an increase of severity against him and his party, and afterwards by allowing him to return to Constantinople, and offering the restoration of his property.

Nicolas, who had just been raised to the papal chair, was no doubt better informed as to the late events at Constantinople than the patriarch or the emperor imagined he saw in their application to him an opportunity of extending his influence, and affected to regard it as a reference of the case to his decision. He wrote to the emperor in the style of an independent sovereign, and, as a hint of the price which he set on his co-operation, he insisted on the restoration of the provinces which had been withdrawn from his jurisdiction, and of the patrimony of the church in Calabria and Sicily. He expressed surprise that the case of Ignatius should have been decided without the concurrence of Rome, and on evidence of a kind which was forbidden by the laws of the church; nor did he fail to remark on the inconsistency, that, while Photius represented his predecessor as having resigned from age and infirmity, the emperor spoke of him as having been deposed. Two bishops, Rodoald of Portus, and Zacharias of Anagni, were sent to Constantinople as legates, with instructions to inquire into the matter, and not to admit Photius to communion except as a layman. They were charged with a short letter to the patriarch, in which the pope remarked on his hasty ordination, but told him that, if the legates should make a favourable report, he would gladly own him as a brother.

Michael, provoked by the tone of the pope's reply, received the legates with dishonour. They were detained at Constantinople for months, and were plied with threats and with bribery, which did not fail of their effect. At length a synod, styled by the Greeks the First and Second, and consisting, like the Nicene council, of three hundred and eighteen bishops, met in 861. By this assembly Photius was acknowledged as patriarch. The letter from the pope was read, but with the omission of such parts as were likely to give offence—whether it were that the legates had consented to the suppression, or that advantage was taken of their ignorance of Greek. Ignatius was brought before the assembly, and was required to subscribe his own condemnation. He behaved with inflexible spirit, desired the legates to remove the “adulterer”, if they wished to appear as judges, and told them to their faces that they had been bribed. Seventy-two witnesses—a few of them senators and patricians, but for the most part persons of low condition, farriers, ostlers, needle-makers, and the like, while some are described as heretics—were brought forward to sign a paper asserting that he had been promoted by imperial favour, and without canonical election. He was stripped of the patriarchal robes, in which, as the matter was left to his own judgment, he had thought it his duty to appear; he was beaten, and, at last, when exhausted by ill treatment for more than a fortnight, was made, by forcibly holding his hand, to sign with a cross a confession that he had obtained his office irregularly and had administered it tyrannically. It was then announced to him that he must read this document publicly at Whitsuntide, and threats of losing his eyes and his hands were uttered; but he contrived to escape in the disguise of a slave, and found a refuge among the monks of the islands from the search which Bardas caused to be made for him. An earthquake was interpreted as a witness from heaven in his favour, while Photius, by offering another explanation of it, drew on himself a charge of impiety. Bardas, in deference to the general feeling, now permitted the deposed patriarch to return to a monastery in the capital, while Michael jested on the state of affairs by saying that Gryllus was his own patriarch, Ignatius the patriarch of the Christians, and Photius the patriarch of Bardas.

The acts of the council were sent to Nicolas, with a request from the emperor that he would confirm them, and at the same time Photius addressed to the pope a letter which, by the skill displayed in its composition, has extorted the unwilling admiration of Baronius. He professes to deplore in a pathetic strain the elevation which he represents as having been forced on him; the pope, he says, ought rather to pity than to blame him for having exchanged a life of peace, content, and general esteem, for a post of danger, anxiety, unpopularity, and envy. As for the ecclesiastical laws which Nicolas had spoken of in his letters, they were not known at Constantinople. The rule which forbade such ordinations as his was not binding, inasmuch as it had not been sanctioned by a general council; he defends his ordination by the

parallel cases of his predecessors Nicephorus and Tarasius, who had been promoted from among the laity, and by the stronger cases of Ambrose in the west and of Nectarius in the east, who had been chosen to the episcopate while yet unbaptised. He had, he says, sanctioned in the late synod a canon against the elevation of a layman to a bishopric except by regular degrees; and he expresses a wish that the church of Constantinople had before observed the rule, as in that case he would have escaped the troubles which had come on him. The patriarch's tone throughout, although respectful, is that of an equal. In conclusion he reflects with bitter irony on the morals of the Romans, and prays that Rome may no longer continue to be a harbour for worthless persons such as those whom it had lately received without letters of communion—adulterers, thieves, drunkards, oppressors, murderers, and votaries of all uncleanness, who had run away from Constantinople in fear of the punishment for their vices. By this description were intended the refugees of the Ignatian party.

But the Ignatians had also conveyed to the pope their version of the late events, and Nicolas wrote in a lofty strain both to the emperor and to the patriarch. The Roman church, he says, is the head of all, and on it all depend. He sets aside the parallels which Photius had alleged for his consecration, on the ground that the persons in question had not intruded into the room of wrongfully ejected orthodox Bishops, and tells Photius that, if he did not know the laws of the church, it was because they made against his cause. At a synod held in 863, the pope deposed and excommunicated Zacharias for misconduct in his legation, reserving the case of Rodoald, who was then employed on a mission in France; he declared Photius to be deprived of all spiritual office and dignity, and threatened that, in case of his disobedience, he should be excommunicated without hope of restoration until on his deathbed; he annulled all orders conferred by him, and threatened his consecrators and abettors with excommunication. All proceedings against Ignatius were declared to be void, and it was required that he should be acknowledged as patriarch. The pope embodied the resolutions of this council in a letter to the emperor; and he desired the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem to make it known that the Roman church in no way consented to the usurpation of Photius.

Michael replied in violent indignation, that by his application to the pope he had not intended to acknowledge him as a judge, or to imply that his own clergy were not sufficient for the decision of the case; he scoffed at Rome as antiquated, and at the Latin language as a barbarous jargon. Nicolas, who was elated by his recent triumph over Lothair, met the emperor with no less haughtiness. He taxes him with disrespect towards God's priests, and, as Michael had spoken of having "ordered" him to send legates to the council, he tells him that such language is not to be used to the successors of St. Peter. To the reflections on the Latin tongue, he answers that such words, uttered in the "excess of madness", were injurious to Him who made all languages, and were ridiculous as coming from one who styled himself emperor of the Romans. He insists at great length on the privileges of the Roman see, derived not from councils, but from the chief of the apostles. He utters many threats against all who shall take part against Ignatius. He proposes that the rival patriarchs, or their representatives, should appear at Rome for a trial of the cause. He warns the emperor to abstain from interfering with spiritual things, and desires him to burn his late letter, threatening that otherwise he will himself suspend it to a stake, and, to the disgrace of the writer, will burn it in the sight of all the nations which are at Rome; and he invokes curses on the person who is to read his letters to the emperor, if he should in any respect mutilate or mistranslate them. He sent the acts of the Roman council to the clergy of Constantinople, with a long detail of the affair; and at the same time he wrote to Photius, Ignatius, Bardas, Theodora, and the empress Eudoxia.

Michael, provoked by the opposition of Nicolas, and by the manner in which it was carried on, looked out for some means of annoying the pope. Although Charlemagne's imperial title had been acknowledged at Constantinople, it was as emperor of the Franks, not of Rome; and his successors had not obtained from the east any higher title than that of king. Michael now offered to recognize Louis II as emperor, on condition of his acknowledging the

council which was so offensive to the pope; and Louis appeared willing to accept the terms. But events soon occurred which rendered this negotiation abortive.

A new question arose to complicate the differences between the Greek and the Latin churches. The Bulgarians, who are supposed to have been a people of Asiatic origin, of the same stock with the Huns, and at one time seated near the sea of Azov, had, about the year 680, occupied a territory in Moesia and Dardania, where, in consequence of intermarriages with the native Slaves, they had gradually exchanged their original language for a dialect of the Slavonics. They had been engaged in continual hostilities with the Byzantine empire; Nicephoras had lost his life in war with them, and they had endangered the throne of Michael Rhangabe. In the early part of the ninth century, Christianity had been introduced among them by some captives, but with little effect. During the regency of Theodora, however, circumstances occurred which gave a new impulse to the progress of the Gospel among the Bulgarians. A monk named Cupharas, in whom the empress took an interest, fell into the hands of their prince Bogoris; and the empress proposed that he should be exchanged for a sister of Bogoris, who was then a captive at Constantinople. The Bulgarian princess, who had been converted to the Gospel during her captivity, zealously attempted, after returning to her own country, to carry on the work which Cupharas had begun. Bogoris himself held out, until, during a famine, after having in vain addressed himself to other deities, he had recourse to the God of the Christians: the success of his prayer resulted in his conversion; and he was baptized by the patriarch of Constantinople, changing his name for that of the emperor Michael, who by proxy acted as his godfather. The convert requested Michael to supply him with a painter for the decoration of his palace; and a monk named Methodius (for art was then confined to the monasteries) was sent into Bulgaria. Bogoris employed him to paint a hall with subjects of a terrible character, intending that these should be taken from the perils of hunting; whereupon the monk depicted the Last Judgment, as being the most terrible of all scenes. The representation of hell, which was explained as setting forth the future lot of the heathen, alarmed the prince into abandoning the idols which he had until then retained; and many of his subjects were moved by the sight of the picture to seek admission into the church. A rebellion, which soon after broke out in consequence of the prince's conversion, was put down by him with a cruelty which accorded ill with his new profession.

Photius was probably the patriarch who had gone into Bulgaria for the baptism of Bogoris; and he had addressed to him a long letter, or rather treatise, on Christian doctrine and practice, and particularly on the duties of a sovereign. But soon after this we find that the Bulgarian prince made an application to Nicolas, accompanied by valuable presents, for the purpose of obtaining the pope's counsel and assistance towards the conversion of his people. It would seem that he had been perplexed between the claims of rival forms of Christianity—Greek, Roman, and Armenian; and he may very naturally have wished for some instruction better adapted to the state of his knowledge than the somewhat too refined treatise which he had received from the patriarch of Constantinople. But in addition to this, it is most likely that Bogoris was actuated by a jealous dread of the empire which bordered so closely on him, and by an apprehension of the consequences which might result from a religious connection with his ancient enemies. Nicolas replied by sending into Bulgaria two bishops, Paul of Populonia, and Formosus of Portus, with a letter in which the questions proposed to him were answered under 106 heads. This document, while it displays the usual lofty pretensions of Rome, is in other respects highly creditable to the good sense and to the Christian feeling of the writer. He sets aside many frivolous questions, and answers others with a wise treatment of their indifference, and with care to abstain from laying down minutely rigid rules. He rebukes the harshness which had been shown to a Greek who had pretended to the character of a priest; he censures the king for the cruelty which he had used in the suppression of the late rebellion, but tells him that, as he had acted in zeal for the faith, and had erred rather from ignorance than from wickedness, he may hope for forgiveness if he repent; and he exhorts him to refrain from

the use of force against those who continue in their idolatry—to hold no communion with them indeed, but to deal with them by the weapons of reason only. He advises that torture should no longer be used to discover the guilt of criminals, and that such persons should be treated with a gentleness becoming the faith which the Bulgarians had adopted. The cross is to be substituted for the horse's tail which had hitherto been the national standard. Idolatrous practices, charms, and arts of divination are to be forsaken. Those who, as heathens, had married two wives must put away the second, and do penance—polygamy being no less contrary to the original condition of man than to the law of Christ. In answer to the request that a patriarch might be appointed for the country, the pope says that he must wait for the report of his envoys as to the number of Christians; in the meantime he sends a bishop, and undertakes to send more if required; and he promises that, when the church is organized, one with the title of archbishop, if not of patriarch, shall be placed at its head. There are, he says, properly only three patriarchal sees—those of Constantinople and Jerusalem, although so styled, being of inferior honor, because they were not of apostolical foundation; and he concludes by exhorting the Bulgarians, amidst the claims of conflicting teachers, to cleave to the holy Roman church, which had always been without spot or wrinkle.

Bogoris had also applied to Louis of Germany, who sent him a bishop; but it is said that this bishop, on arriving in Bulgaria, found the country sufficiently provided with clergy from Rome, and returned home without having attempted to aid or to disturb their labours.

But at Constantinople the pope's intervention aroused great indignation. Nicolas claimed Bulgaria on the ground that it had belonged to the Roman jurisdiction while it was a province of the empire—that the people had voluntarily placed themselves under him, and that he had provided them with churches and clergy; while Photius insisted on his own right as derived from the conversion of the nation. The patriarch summoned a council to meet at Constantinople, and, in a letter addressed to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, denounced the invasion of Bulgaria. Within the last two years, he says, men from the west, the region of darkness, had intruded into this portion of his fold, corrupting the Gospel with pernicious novelties. They taught a difference of usages as to fasting; they forbade the clergy to marry; they denied the right of presbyters to confirm; and their bishops, in opposition to apostles, fathers, and councils, administered a second unction to persons who had already been confirmed according to the Greek rite. But above all, they adulterated the creed with spurious additions, affirming that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. Photius reprobates this doctrine with all his force, as a denial of the unity of principle in the Godhead, unheard of by Athanasius, Gregory, and Basil—as a blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, or rather against the whole Trinity, such as cannot be exceeded, and is deserving of ten thousand anathemas. He denounces the Romans as apostate and servants of Antichrist; and he invites the oriental patriarchs to send envoys to Constantinople for the purpose of combining with him in resistance to them. Although Photius had great reason to complain both of the interference with his converts, and of the manner in which the pope had depreciated his dignity, and had set aside all but the Roman customs, he appears to be open to the charge of swelling his personal quarrel with Rome into a schism between the churches; and the tone in which he now enlarged on the difference of usages was very unlike that in which he had some years before adverted to them in his elaborate letter to Nicolas. The synod summoned by Photius was held in 867. It replied to the Roman anathemas by pronouncing a like sentence against Nicolas himself; and the patriarch, in the hope of drawing the western emperor into his interest, contrived that acclamations in honor of Louis II and Ingilberga should be mixed with those in honor of the Byzantine rulers.

In the meantime important political changes were in progress. Bardas had gradually acquired a more and more complete ascendancy over his nephew, while the emperor sank continually deeper into degrading pleasures. In 862 Bardas was advanced to the dignity of Caesar; and, although his rule was oppressive and unpopular, it is acknowledged that he

exhibited much talent for government, and that he exerted himself for the revival of learning, which had long been neglected at Constantinople. But in no long time his influence was disturbed by that of a rival, Basil the Macedonian. Basil, although his pedigree was afterwards deduced by flatterers from the Persian Arsacids, from Alexander the Great, and from Constantine, was really of Slavonic race. His birth was humble, and his first appearance at Constantinople was as a needy adventurer, seeking shelter for a night in the porch of a monastery, where the abbot, it is said, was thrice warned in visions by the patron, St. Diomedes, to open the gate and admit him. Basil found employment as servant to a kinsman of the emperor, and after a time was introduced to the notice of Michael, who, in reward of his accomplishments as a wrestler, a jockey, and a toper, raised him to the dignity of the patriciate, and bestowed on him one of his own mistresses in marriage. Bardas began to take alarm at the rapid rise of the new favorite; but Michael and Basil gave him a solemn assurance of safety, signed by the emperor's own hand. Soon after, however, the murder of the Caesar was concerted while he was engaged with the emperor on a military expedition. The assassins, to whom the signal was given by the sign of the cross, hesitated to strike him in the imperial presence; but Basil gave the first blow from behind, and the victim was dispatched while embracing the emperor's feet. After a short interval, during which the vigour of Bardas was missed in the government, and complaints of the general discontent reached even the ears of Michael, Basil was nominated Caesar, and on Whitsunday 867 he was crowned by the emperor's hands with a diadem which had been blessed by Photius. He immediately began to display talents of a different order from those which had won for him the imperial favour, and endeavoured to put some restraint on the increasing grossness of his patron's debaucheries; but the attempt provoked Michael to such a degree that he is said in his drunken frenzy to have given orders for the Caesar's death, and to have announced an intention of promoting a boatman in his room. Basil felt that he must sacrifice the emperor's life or his own, and by his command Michael, after having stupefied himself with wine at supper, in the Caesar's company, was murdered on the 24th of September, 867. The Greek historians can discover no other redeeming fact in the life of this wretched prince than that he bestowed a chalice and a splendid chandelier on the church of St. Sophia. Basil found an exhausted treasury, but exerted himself with vigour and success to replenish it and to restore the empire.

Two days after the death of Michael, Photius was deposed. He had formerly been on friendly terms with Basil, and contradictory accounts are given of the reason for his deposition. By some it is explained in a manner discreditable to him, while others say that he provoked the emperor by refusing the Eucharist to him as a murderer and an usurper.

Nicolas had written to Hincmar, detailing the history of the Bulgarian affair, and requesting the assistance of the Frankish clergy, whose character stood highest for learning among the clergy of the west, to combat the attacks which had been made by the Greeks on the Christianity of the Latins. In consequence of this invitation, Hincmar desired Odo, bishop of Beauvais, and other divines to collect materials for a general defence; and the result was the production of treatises by Odo, Aeneas of Paris, and Ratramn. Of these, the work of Ratramn is regarded as the most valuable. The first three books of it are devoted to the question of the Holy Spirit's procession, while the fourth and last discusses the controversy as to rites and discipline. It is remarkable that, in opposition to the line usually taken by Nicolas, the monk of Corbie dwells on the sufficiency of uniting in faith, and censures the Greeks, not for varying from the Roman usages, but for insisting on their own as exclusively correct and necessary. The Greek doctrine as to the Holy Spirit was also condemned by a synod of bishops from the dominions of Louis of Germany, which met at Worms in 868.

Basil reinstated Ignatius in the patriarchate with great pomp, and sent a member of each party to Rome, accompanied by one of his own officers, for the purpose of representing the state of 372 affairs; but the envoy of Photius was shipwrecked and died on the journey, so that his cause was left without an advocate. The representative of Ignatius was charged with a

letter from the patriarch, in which the authority of St. Peter's successors was acknowledged in terms such as had not been usual at Constantinople. Adrian, who had now succeeded Nicolas, assembled a synod, which renewed the former sentence against Photius. It was ordered that the copy of the Byzantine synod's acts which had been transmitted to Rome should be burnt, and that those at Constantinople should share the same fate.

A council, which is regarded in the Roman church as the eighth general council, met at Constantinople in October 869. It was attended by two bishops and a deacon from Rome; Antioch was represented by the metropolitan of Tyre, Jerusalem by a presbyter; and to these a representative of the Alexandrian see was added at the ninth session. Some high civil officers were present, but the number of bishops was at first exceedingly small and, although afterwards gradually increased, it did not rise beyond 60 at the ninth session, and 102 or 109 at the tenth and last.

On the first day the sentence of the late Roman council against Photius was adopted, and all bishops who afterwards joined the assembly were required to sign it. The second, third, and fourth sessions were chiefly occupied in dealing with bishops and clergy who, after having been ordained by Ignatius or his predecessor, had submitted to Photius. These presented a confession of their offences, alleging that they had been forced or deceived into them; and they were admitted to communion on condition of performing some penitential exercises. At the fourth session there was a sharp discussion with a bishop named Theophilus, who was firm in his adherence to Photius. The patriarch himself was brought forward on the fifth day, and met the questions addressed to him by a dignified silence. When urged to speak, he replied that God would hear him although he said nothing. "You will not", said the Roman legates, "by your silence escape a greater condemnation". "Neither", he replied, "did Jesus by holding his peace escape condemnation"; and he resumed his former silence. When the lay president of the council, Baanes, who treated him with a courtesy unlike the behaviour of the ecclesiastics, afterwards asked him what he could allege in his justification, Photius answered, "My justifications are not in this world".

The emperor appeared at the sixth session, and told the council that he had absented himself from its earlier meetings lest he should be supposed to influence its decision as to Photius. But the affair of the patriarch was not yet concluded. He was cited before the council on the seventh day, and entered leaning on a staff;—"Take away his staff", said the Roman legate Marinus, "it is an ensign of pastoral dignity". The bishops of his party in vain appealed to the canons. Anathemas were pronounced against Photius and his adherents, the most odious epithets being attached to their names; the writings and documents on his side were burnt; and, in token of the exasperation by which the council was animated, it is said that the condemnation of the patriarch was subscribed in the wine of the eucharistic cup.

In the course of the council's proceedings, however, it appeared that the personal question as to the patriarchate was not the only subject of difference between Rome and Constantinople. The Romans complained that the pope's letter had been mutilated in the reading; the Greeks told Ignatius that his church had been made the servant of Rome; and Ignatius himself was as resolute as Photius to assert the jurisdiction of his see over Bulgaria. Some ambassadors from that country were at Constantinople, and their master—by what influence is unknown—had been again induced to waver in his religious allegiance. The ambassadors, on being summoned into the emperor's presence, with Ignatius, the Roman legates, and the representatives of the eastern patriarchs, inquired to which church they must consider their country to belong. The Orientals asked to which church it had belonged while a province of the empire, and whether the clergy at the time of the Bulgarian conquest had been Greeks or Latins. It was answered that the province had been subject to Constantinople, and that the clergy found in it were Greeks; and on these grounds it was adjudged that Bulgaria ought to belong to the patriarchate of Constantinople. The Roman legates, however, disputed the alleged facts, and handed to Ignatius a letter from the pope, charging him not to interfere,

which the patriarch received in a respectful manner, but did not further regard. The emperor dismissed the legates with coolness. Ignatius in the same year consecrated an archbishop for Bulgaria, and within a short time all the Latin clergy were ejected from that country.

John VIII wrote to the Bulgarians, exhorting them to return to the communion of his church, which they had formerly chosen, and warning them as to the danger of a connection with the Greeks, who, he said, were always in one heresy or another. The pope also wrote to Ignatius, telling him that, as he was indebted to the apostolic see for his dignity, so he should lose it if he kept possession of Bulgaria. The Greek clergy, who were already excommunicate for introducing their errors into a church planted by the holy see, must be withdrawn within thirty days; and Ignatius is threatened with excommunication and deposition if he should neglect the order. Letters in a like tone were written to the Bulgarian king, and to the Greek clergy in that country; and a violent collision would probably have ensued, but for the death of Ignatius, which took place in October, 877.

Photius, after his deprivation, had at first been treated with extreme severity. He complains in his letters that he is strictly guarded by soldiers; that he is deprived of all intercourse with relations, friends, monks, and clergy; that his property is confiscated, that he is allowed no attendance of servants, and in his sickness can obtain no medicines. He suffers from hunger, and yet more from “a famine of the word of God”; he is separated from all books—a cruelty unexampled in the persecutions of the orthodox by heretics or by pagans; and in the meantime his adherents are cruelly treated, churches are destroyed, holy things are profaned, the poor, whom he had tended for the benefit of his soul, are left friendless and helpless. He inveighs against the synod of 869 as having neglected all the forms of justice in its dealings with him—as worse than anything that had been known among the most lawless and savage heathens.

But after a time he found means to recover the favour of Basil. According to the biographer of Ignatius, he drew up an imaginary pedigree, tracing the emperor’s ancestry to the Persian kings; this was written in antique letters on parchment of corresponding appearance, and, having been bound in the cover of an old manuscript, it was introduced into the library of the palace by the keeper, who took an opportunity of showing it to Basil, and suggested that Photius was the only man capable of explaining it. A still more unlikely tale asserts that the emperor’s love was won by charms administered in his food and drink. But it would seem that in truth Basil, out of regard for the unequalled learning of Photius, and perhaps also from a wish to conciliate his partisans, whose constancy to the ejected patriarch may have raised some apprehensions, recalled him from banishment, and appointed him tutor to Leo, the heir apparent of the crown. While thus employed he was reconciled with Ignatius, and from that time lived on good terms with him, steadily refusing to become the head of a party in opposition to the aged patriarch.

Photius was now raised to the see as successor of Ignatius, October 878, and announced his promotion to John VIII, with a request that the pope would send legates to a new synod which was to be held at Constantinople. The chief object of this application was to secure the assistance of Rome for the purpose of quieting the Ignatian party; but John seized on it as an acknowledgment that the title of Photius to the patriarchal throne depended on the papal judgment, and supposed that the Byzantines would be willing to bear anything for the sake of obtaining his countenance. Two bishops and a priest were sent as legates, with letters and instructions in which it was said that Photius might be restored if he would make satisfaction for his offences and would ask mercy of the synod; and it was insisted on that he should resign all pretensions to Bulgaria. The ensigns of the patriarchal dignity were transmitted in the same manner which had been usual in bestowing the pall on metropolitans.

The synod—the eighth general council according to the Greek reckoning—was imposing as to numbers, consisting of 380 bishops from the empire, with the three Roman legates, and three deputies from the oriental patriarchs. The precedent set by the second

council of Nicaea, of having representatives from the eastern thrones, had been followed in the council under Photius in 861, and in that under Ignatius in 869. But at the latter of these, the representatives of the east had declared that the Orientals who had taken part in the synod under Photius were impostors, with forged credentials. Photius, however, asserted that those who made that declaration were themselves not only impostors, but agents of the Saracens; and letters were now produced from Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, in which the patriarchs disavowed the persons who had acted in their names, and disowned all connection with the proceedings against Photius.

The Roman legates found that matters were conducted in a very different way from what the courteous behavior of Photius had led them to expect. Instead of submitting himself to their judgment, he assumed the presidency of the council from the beginning, declaring that both his first and his second elevation had been forced on him—that he had committed no wrong, and did not need any mercy. The pope's letters were read, but with omissions of the more violent pretensions, and with insertions to the honor of the patriarch. The demand of Bulgaria was, with great professions of respect for Rome, evaded as being foreign to the question in hand. The Greek bishops all supported the patriarch, and acted as if in entire independence of Rome; yet the legates allowed all these things to pass without a protest, and joined in anathematizing the council of 869, by which Photius had been deposed.

It was only by degrees that John became acquainted with the result of the council. At first he declared himself willing to confirm its restoration of Photius, if he should find that the legates had not disobeyed their instructions. Misconstruing the polite phrases of the Greeks, he supposed that Bulgaria had been given up to him, and wrote to thank the emperor for the concession; while in a letter to Photius he expressed surprise that in some respects his directions had not been followed by the council. When, however, he discovered the real state of the matter, his exasperation was unbounded. He ascended the pulpit of a church, and, holding the book of the Gospels in his hand, threatened to anathematize all who should not regard Photius as one condemned by God's judgment, according to the sentences of Nicolas and Adrian; and he sent Marinus, one of the legates who had attended the council under Ignatius, to insist that matters should be restored to the state which had been established by that council. But the legate was treated with indignity, was imprisoned for a month at Constantinople, and returned without any success. On the death of John, Marinus was raised to the papacy, and the sentence against Photius was renewed by him, by Adrian III, and by Stephen V, who held an angry correspondence on the subject with Basil and his son Leo VI.

Leo, formerly the pupil of Photius, on his accession in 886, deposed the patriarch, confined him in a monastery, and filled the see with his own brother Stephen, a boy of sixteen. The reasons of this step are unknown; the Greek writers in general trace it to a suspicion that Photius was implicated with a monk named Theodore Santabareus, who is said to have gained an influence over the late emperor by magical arts, and had endeavored by a double treachery to alienate him from his son. An inquiry into the conduct of Photius took place; but, although no evidence could be found against him, he did not recover his see, and he died in exile in the year 891. The two parties which had divided the church of Constantinople were reconciled within a few years; but Pope John IX made difficulties as to recognizing the clergy who had been ordained by Photius. At length, however, the churches resumed communion, and the name of Photius himself was among those of the patriarchs acknowledged by Rome. But political jealousies, and the retention of Bulgaria by the Byzantine patriarchate, together with the differences as to rites and doctrine, continued to keep up a coolness between the sees, until at a later time they again broke out into open discord.

CHAPTER IV.

SPAIN—ENGLAND—MISSIONS OF THE NINTH CENTURY.

The Christians of Spain after the Mahometan conquest, who were known by the name of Mustaraba, or Mozarabes, enjoyed the free exercise of their religion, although on condition of paying a heavy monthly poll-tax. They generally lived on friendly terms with their Mussulman masters; many of them held office under the caliphs, and monks and clergy who understood both the Arabic and the Latin languages were employed in diplomatic correspondence.

But, notwithstanding these relations, the difference of religion was a continual source of trouble. The Mahometan mobs often abused Christians in the streets; they shouted out blasphemies against the Christian name, while all retaliation was forbidden by law under very severe penalties. If a marriage took place between persons professing the two religions, the general law against apostasy from Islam made it death for the Mahometan party to embrace Christianity; and the questions which in such marriages naturally arose as to the religion of the issue produced very serious difficulties. Moreover, the hostility of the Mussulmans towards the Christians who dwelt among them was excited by the persevering efforts of those who in other parts of the peninsula carried on a war of independence; while these efforts served also to raise among the Christians under the Mahometan rule a desire to do something for the more public assertion of their faith.

The Christians were divided into two parties. The one of these was bent on preserving peace with their rulers, as far as possible, and enjoying the toleration which was allowed them. The other party regarded this acquiescence as unworthy; they thought that their brethren had been corrupted by intercourse with the Moslems into a blamable laxity of opinions. They declared that the offices of Mahometan courts could not be held without compliances unbecoming a Christian; that those who occupied such offices were obliged to refrain from openly signing themselves with the cross, and from other outward manifestations of their faith; that they were obliged to speak of the Saviour in such terms as might not be offensive to the unbelievers. They complained that the Christian youth preferred the cultivation of "Chaldean" to that of ecclesiastical literature; that they were more familiar with Arabic than with Latin.

About the middle of the ninth century a persecution of the Christians broke out at Cordova under the reign of Abderrahman II. The first sufferer was a monk named Perfectus, who, having fallen in with some Mahometans in the neighborhood of the city, was questioned by them as to the opinion which Christians entertained of the prophet. He attempted to evade the question, on the ground that he was unwilling to offend them; but, as they continued to urge him, and assured him that no offence would be taken, he said that Mahomet was regarded by Christians as one of the false prophets foretold in Scripture; and he remarked on some parts of his history as being scandalous, and as proving the falsehood of his pretensions. The Arabs, in consideration of the promise which they had given, restrained their anger for the time; but when Perfectus next appeared in public, he was seized, was dragged before a judge, on a charge of blasphemy against the prophet, and was executed. The next victim was a merchant, who had given no provocation; but the third, a young monk named Isaac, courted his fate. He

went before the judge of the city, professing an inclination to embrace the religion of the Koran, and begging for some instruction in its doctrines; and when these were explained to him he denounced their falsehood with great vehemence. The execution of Isaac was followed by an outburst of fanatical zeal. Clergymen, monks, nuns, and laity rushed to the Mahometan tribunals, reviling the prophet as an impostor, an adulterer, a sorcerer, and declaring that his followers were in the way to perdition. And, besides those who voluntarily thrust themselves on death, many children of mixed marriages were delated by their Mahometan relations as apostates, although they had probably been brought up from the first in the religion of the Christian parent.

By this wild zeal of the weaker party the Moslems were naturally exasperated. Public outrages against Christians increased; any one who showed himself in the street was insulted, pelted with filth, or stoned: the Mahometans shrank from touching the very garments of Christians, as if it were pollution. The sound of church-bells excited them to a tempest of cursing and blasphemies; and at funerals of Christians the populace followed the corpse with outcries, begging that God would have no mercy on the deceased.

Abderrahman now enacted new laws, of increased severity. The bodies of those who were executed were to be burnt, lest their brethren should convert them into relics. Yet the caliph, wishing, if possible, to quell the excitement by peaceable means, requested the cooperation of the primate Recanfrid, archbishop of Toledo, who issued an order that no Christian should present himself before a Mahometan judge unless he were cited to do so. This order was received with indignation and defiance by the more zealous party, headed by Saul, bishop of Cordova; and Recanfrid, in pursuance of his policy, proceeded to imprison some refractory ecclesiastics—among them a monk and priest of Toledo named Eulogius, who had been very conspicuous in his opposition. From prison Eulogius wrote letters, intended to animate the resolution of his friends; with the fervor of a Tertullian he exhorts all who have any worldly ties to cast them aside and boldly to confess the faith, in the assurance of rejoining their martyred brethren in bliss. A council was held under the archbishops of Toledo and Seville, and determined that no one ought voluntarily to provoke death by his religion. By those who agreed with the spirit of this council the evils which had happened were charged on Eulogius and his associates. They ascribed the conduct of the sufferers to pride, and questioned their right to the name of martyrs—citing against them texts of Scripture, with the canons and practice of the early church. Some went so far as to declare that there was no opportunity of martyrdom at the hands of the Arabs, since these were not idolaters, but worshipped the one true God and acknowledged his laws.

Eulogius and Peter Alvar were the leading spirits of their party. They both (and more especially Alvar, who was an ecclesiastic of Cordova) write in an exalted strain of enthusiasm. Eulogius sets aside the distinction which had been drawn between heathens and Mahometans by saying that the Mahometans deny the Son of God and persecute the faithful. Alvar argues from the prophecies that Mahomet is the forerunner of Antichrist. The sufferings of the Christians, he says, had not been drawn down on them by the violence of zealots—for the first victims had done nothing to provoke their fate—but by the sins of the whole community. He will allow no compliance with circumstances, no forbearance to force the Christian profession on the notice of the infidels. He maintains that our Lord's charge to His disciples, "when persecuted in one city to flee into another", is inapplicable in the present case, since the object of that charge was that the disciples should spread the Gospel more widely—not that they should hide it. He would have Christians to press the truth on the Moslems for the purpose of making them "debtors to the faith"—not (as it would seem) out of love for them, but in order to render their unbelief inexcusable.

Abderrahman was succeeded in 852 by his son Mohammed, who carried the proceedings against the Christians further. On the first day of his reign the new king dismissed all who held any offices about the court or in the public service. He ordered that all churches

which had been lately built should be destroyed, and prohibited all display in the ritual or in the furniture of the older churches which were allowed to stand. The persecution continued for many years. Eulogius himself, who had been elected to the see of Toledo, was arrested in 859 in consequence of having aided a young female convert, named Leocritia, to escape from her parents, who were bigoted Mahometans; and, after having firmly resisted the importunities of some Arabs who, out of respect for his sanctity and learning, endeavored to persuade him to save his life by slight concessions, he was put to death. Four days later, Leocritia also suffered.

During this long persecution many of the more lukewarm Christians openly apostatized to the religion of Islam. The heats on both sides at length died away, and the old relations of the parties were restored. A German abbot, who went on an embassy to Cordova in 954, represents the Christians as living peaceably with their masters, and as thankful for the toleration which they enjoyed; nay, if the information which he received may be trusted, it would appear that they had carried their compliance so far as to submit to the rite of circumcision.

ENGLAND—THE DANES.

England, like France, was harassed and desolated by the ravages of the Northmen. Their first appearance on the coasts was in the year 767; the first descent which was severely felt was in 832; and from that time their invasions were incessant. Devon and Wales felt their fury as well as the eastern coasts; when the attention of the English was concentrated on one point, a fresh band of enemies appeared in an opposite quarter; and they penetrated into the very heart of the country. And here, as in France, the wealth and the defenselessness of the monasteries pointed these out as the chief objects of attack. The chronicles of the time abound in frightful details of their wasting with fire and sword the sanctuaries of Croyland, Medeshamstede (Peterborough), Bardney, and Ely; of Repton and Coldingham; of Lindisfarne, from which a little band of monks carried off the relics of St. Cuthbert over the mountains of Northumbria, in continual fear of the ravagers by whom they were surrounded on every side. At length, in 878, after the victory gained by Alfred over Guthrun at Ethandune, a large territory in the east of England, north of the Thames, was ceded to the Danes, on condition of their professing Christianity, and living under equal laws with the native inhabitants; but the peace thus obtained was only for a time.

Of the lustre of Alfred's reign it is needless to speak to readers who may be presumed to know in any degree the history of their country. Alfred succeeded his father in 871, at the age of twenty-two, and held the throne for thirty years. His character may have been idealized in some respects, that it might fulfill the conception of a perfect sovereign; and institutions have been ascribed to him which are in truth derived from other sources. Yet historical reality exhibits to us this "darling of the English"—"Alfred the Truth-teller"—as the deliverer, the lawgiver, and the wise ruler of his country, as a hero, and as a saint. It sets before us his efforts to revive the public spirit which had become all but extinct during the long calamities of the Danish invasions; his zealous and successful labours to repair in mature years the defects of his early education; his exertions for the restoration of learning among the clergy, which had fallen into melancholy decay, and for the general instruction of the people; his encouragement of learned men, whether natives,—as his biographer Asser, Plegmund, Werfrith, and Neot,—or foreigners whom he invited to impart to the English a culture which was not to be found at home—as Grimbold of Reims, and John of Old Saxony; his care to enrich the vernacular literature by executing or encouraging versions or paraphrases of religious and instructive works—portions of Scripture, writings of Boethius, Gregory the Great, Orosius, and Bede. It shows us that these labours were carried on under the continual tortures of disease, and amidst the necessities of providing for the national defense; it dwells

on his habits of devotion, and on the comprehensive interest in the affairs of Christendom which induced him even to send a mission to the shrine of St. Thomas in India. Small as his kingdom was, he raised it to a high place among the nations; and among great sovereigns no character shines brighter or purer than his. Alfred died in 900 or 901.

MORAVIA

The conversion of Bulgaria, which has been related in the history of the dissensions between the Greek and Latin churches, led to that of the Slavonic inhabitants of Greece and of the Mainotes. The Croats were evangelized by missionaries from Rome; while the victories of Basil, about the year 870, were followed by the labours of Greek missionaries in Servia.

Christianity had been introduced into Moravia by the arms of Charlemagne, who, in 801, according to his usual system, compelled the king to receive baptism. Since that time, attempts had been made to extend the knowledge of the Gospel among the Moravians under the auspices of the archbishops of Salzburg and the bishops of Passau, who employed a regionary bishop for the purpose. But these attempts had little effect; the princes of the country had relapsed into heathenism, the Christians were few, and their religion was very rude. A new and more effectual movement arose out of an embassy which Radislav, king of Moravia, sent into Bulgaria, for the purpose of obtaining aid against Louis of Germany. His nephew Swatopluk or Zwentibold, who was employed on this mission, became a convert to the new faith of the Bulgarians; and on his return he was joined by the queen, who was herself a Christian, in urging it on her husband's attention. An application for Christian teachers was made to the emperor Michael; and two missionaries, Constantine and his brother Methodius—perhaps the same Methodius whose skill as an artist had produced so great an effect at the Bulgarian court—were sent from Constantinople into Moravia.

Constantine—better known under the name of Cyril, which he is said to have assumed towards the end of his life, in obedience to a vision—was a priest and monk, and is designated as a philosopher. He was a native of Thessalonica, and, from the mixture of the Greek and Slave populations in his own country, had probably been acquainted from his early years with a dialect of the Slavonic. He had preached among the Chazars of the Ukraine and the Crimea, who in 843 had applied for instructors from Constantinople, on the ground that they were distracted between the rival pretensions of Judaism, Mahometanism, and Christianity—a mixture of religions which was found in the same regions by a Mussulman traveller seventy years later. The success of his labours among the Chazars is described as complete, and the impression of them was strengthened by his refusal of all recompense except the release of such Christians as were captives in the country; but some of his biographers appear to regard as more important his discovery of a body supposed to be that of St. Clement of Rome, who was said to have been banished by Trajan to the Chersonese, and to have been there martyred. The fame of the mission to the Chazars had reached the Moravian king, who especially requested that Cyril might be sent to him; and in 863 the brothers proceeded into Moravia, taking with them the relics of St. Clement. Their preaching was marked by a striking difference from the ordinary practice of the time—that, whereas the Greek and Latin missionaries usually introduced their own tongues as the ecclesiastical language among barbarian nations, Cyril and Methodius mastered the language of the country, and not only used it in their addresses to the people, but translated the liturgy and portions of the Scriptures into it—Cyril, after the example of Ulfilas, having either invented a Slavonic alphabet, or improved that which before existed. By this innovation the success of the mission was greatly forwarded. Radislav received baptism, his subjects were rapidly converted, churches were built for Christian worship, and the reverence in which the missionaries were held appears from the fact that in Moravia the clergy were styled by a name which signifies *princes*.

After a time a report of these proceedings reached pope Nicolas, who thereupon summoned Cyril and Methodius to appear before him. The Moravians were now more closely connected with the west than with the east; in the difference between the churches of Rome and Constantinople, Cyril, who had formerly been an opponent of Photius, was not inclined to side with the patriarch, whose deprivation probably took place about the time when the papal letter was written; and a refusal of compliance would have thrown the pope on the side of the Germans, from whom Radislav was in imminent danger. The brethren, therefore, resolved to continue their work under such conditions as were possible, rather than to abandon it, and obeyed the summons to Rome, where they arrived shortly after the death of Nicolas. The body of St. Clement, which is said to have wrought many miracles, produced a great sensation among the Romans, and the orthodoxy of the missionaries was proved to the satisfaction of Adrian II, who gratified Radislav's desire for the independence of the Moravian church by consecrating Methodius as archbishop of the Moravians. Cyril is said to have been also consecrated to the episcopate, but died at Rome, where he was buried in the church of St. Clement.

Radislav, after a struggle of many years against Louis of Germany, was at length betrayed by his nephew Swatopluk into the hands of his enemy, by whom he was dethroned and blinded in 870. Swatopluk succeeded to the crown, and greatly extended the bounds of the Moravian kingdom, which now included a large portion of modern Austria and Hungary. Over all this territory Methodius exercised authority, after some differences with Swatopluk, whom it is said that he once found it necessary to excommunicate; and, as his sphere extended, many Christians who had received the Gospel from the Latin church placed themselves under him. This excited the jealousy of the Germans, who appear to have obtained in 873 a mandate from John VIII, forbidding him to employ a barbarous tongue in the service of the church. Methodius, however, persisted, and, in consequence of a renewed complaint, to which it was now added that he taught some erroneous doctrines, he was cited to Rome in 879. The pope in his letter forbade the use of the Slavonic in the liturgy, although he allowed that until further order it might be used in preaching, forasmuch as the Psalmist charges all people to praise the Lord, and that St. Paul says, "Let every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord".

Methodius repaired to Rome, where he succeeded in justifying his orthodoxy before a synod—perhaps not without some concession as to the points of difference between his native church and that of the west. And his arguments in favor of the Slavonic tongue were so successful that, on returning to Moravia, he bore a letter from John to Swatopluk, in which the pope approves of the alphabet invented by Cyril, and sanctions the use of the Slavonic liturgy, on the ground that the Scriptural command, "Praise the Lord, all ye nations", shows that the praises of God are not to be confined to three languages (Hebrew, Greek, and Latin), but that He who formed these languages formed all others also, for His own glory. It is, however, ordered that, as a mark of greater honor, the Gospel shall be read in Latin before being read in the vernacular, and also that the king or any nobleman may, if he think fit, have the service of his private chapel in Latin.

In the same letter it was stated that Methodius was confirmed in his archbishopric, with exclusive jurisdiction over the Moravian church. The pope adds that he has consecrated as bishop an ecclesiastic named Wiching, who had been recommended to him by Swatopluk, and begs the king to send another presbyter who may be raised to the same degree, in order that the primate, having two bishops under him, may be able to perform his functions without external help. By this arrangement it was intended that the Moravian church should be rendered entirely independent of Germany.

From Moravia the Gospel was introduced among the neighboring and kindred people of Bohemia. Fourteen Bohemian chiefs had appeared before Louis of Germany at Ratisbon in 845, and had been baptized by their own desire. But of this conversion, which was most likely

a mere political artifice, no effects are recorded; and Bohemia was heathen many years later, when the duke, Borziwoi, visited the Moravian court. Swatopluk received him with honor, but at dinner assigned him and his followers a place on the floor, as being heathens. Methodius, who sat at the king's table, addressed Borziwoi, expressing regret that so powerful a prince should be obliged to feed like a swineherd. The duke asked what he might expect to gain by becoming a Christian; and, on being told that the change would exalt him above all kings and princes, he was baptized with his thirty companions. His wife, Ludmilla, embraced the Gospel on worthier motives, and earned the title of martyr and saint.

Methodius continued to be much annoyed by the Germans, who saw in the sanction of the Slavonic tongue an insuperable barrier against their influence in Moravia. It would seem also that Swatopluk became unfavorable to him, and that Wiching, who was a German by birth, and a man of intriguing character, instead of cooperating with the archbishop, and rendering him the obedience which had been enjoined in the pope's letter to the king, set up claims to independence of all but the papal authority. The last certain notice of Methodius is a letter of the year 881, in which John VIII encourages him, and assures him that he had given no such privileges as were pretended to Wiching (whose name, however, is not mentioned). The death of Methodius has been said to have taken place at Rome, and has been variously dated, from 881 to 910; but it seems more probable that he died in Moravia about the year 885.

Wiching, after the death of Methodius, persecuted the clergy who maintained the Slavonic liturgy, and, with the aid of Swatopluk's soldiery, compelled them in 886 to seek a refuge in Bulgaria, where it is presumed that they must have adhered to the Greek communion. On the death of Swatopluk, in 894, the kingdom was distracted by a war between his sons, while Arnulf of Germany pressed on it from without. Wiching had in 892 gone over to Arnulf, who appointed him his chancellor, and bestowed on him the bishopric of Passau; but from this dignity he was deposed on his patron's death. In 900, the German jealousy was provoked afresh by the measures which pope John IX took for providing Moravia with a localized hierarchy instead of its former missionary establishment. Hatto, archbishop of Mentz, and Theotmar of Salzburg, with their suffragans, loudly remonstrated against the change; but the strife was ended by the fall of the Moravian kingdom in 908.

The conquests of Charlemagne had brought the Franks into close neighborhood with the northern nations, which were now so formidable to the more civilized inhabitants of other countries. Charlemagne, it is said, refrained from placing his territory beyond the Elbe under any of the bishoprics which he erected, because he intended to establish in those parts an archiepiscopal see which should serve as a center for the evangelization of the north. He built a church at Hamburg, and committed it to a priest who was exempt from episcopal jurisdiction; but the prosecution of the scheme was broken off by the emperor's death. The attention of his son, however, was soon drawn by other circumstances towards Nordalbingia. Policy, as well as religion, recommended the conversion of the Northmen; for, so long as the Saxons were only separated by the Elbe from those who adhered to the religion of their forefathers, there was a continual temptation for them to renounce the Christianity which had been forced on them, and with it the subjection of which it was the token.

Disputes as to the throne of Denmark between Harold and Godfrid led both parties to seek the countenance of Louis the Pious. The emperor was struck with the importance of using this circumstance as an opening for the introduction of Christianity among the Danes; and Ebbo, archbishop of Reims, was willing to withdraw for a time from the enjoyment of his dignity, that he might extend the faith among these barbarians. With the consent of Louis, the archbishop went to Rome, where he obtained a commission from Paschal, authorizing himself and Halitgar, afterwards bishop of Cambrai, to preach the Gospel to the northern nations, and directing them to refer all difficult questions to the apostolic see. The mission was resolved on by the diet of Attigny (the same diet which witnessed the penance 392 of Louis) in 822; and in

that year Ebbo and his companions set out in company with some ambassadors of Harold, Welanao (now Münschdorf, near Itzehoe) being assigned by the emperor for their headquarters. Little is known of their proceedings, but it appears that they preached with much success, and that Ebbo represented the spiritual and the temporal benefits of Christianity to Harold so effectually as to induce him to appear in 826 at Ingelheim, with his queen and a large train of attendants, and to express a desire for baptism, which they received in the church of St. Alban at Mentz (Mayence). Louis was sponsor for Harold, Judith for the queen, Lothair for their son, and the members of their train found sponsors of suitable rank among the Franks. The emperor now resolved to send a fresh mission to the Danes; but the barbarism of the Northmen, their strong hostility to Christianity, and the savage character of their paganism, with its sacrifices of human victims, deterred all from venturing on the hazards of such an expedition, until Wala of Corbie named Anskar, one of his monks, as a person suited for the work.

Anskar, “the apostle of the north”, was born about the year 801, and at an early age entered the monastery of Corbie, where he studied under Adelhald and Paschasius Radbert. He became himself a teacher in the monastery, and, after having for a time held a like office in the German Corbey, resumed his position in the parent society. From childhood he had been remarkable for a devout and enthusiastic character. He saw visions, and it is said by his biographer that all the important events of his life were foreshown to him either in this manner or by an inward illumination, so that he was even accustomed to wait for such direction as to the course which he should take. The death of his mother, when he was five years old, affected him deeply, and he was weaned from the love of childish sports by a vision in which she appeared in company with some bright female forms. He felt himself entangled in mire, and unable to reach them, when the chief of the band, whom he knew to be the blessed Virgin, asked him whether he wished to rejoin his mother, and told him that, if so, he must forsake such vanities as are offensive to the saints. His worldly affections were afterwards further subdued by the tidings of Charlemagne’s death, which deeply impressed on him the instability of all earthly greatness. In another vision, he fancied that his spirit was led out of the body by two venerable persons, whom he recognized as St. Peter and St. John. They first plunged him into purgatory, where he remained for three days in misery which seemed to last a thousand years. He was then conducted into a region where the Divine glory, displayed in the east, streamed forth on multitudes of adoring saints in transcendent brightness, which was yet not dazzling but delightful to the eye; and from the source of inaccessible majesty, in which he could discern no shape, he heard a voice of blended power and sweetness—“Go, and thou shalt return to Me with the crown of martyrdom”. At a later time, the Saviour appeared to him, exhorted him to a full confession of his sins, and assured him that they were forgiven. The assurance was afterwards repeated to him, and in answer to his inquiry, “Lord, what wouldest thou have me to do?” he was told, “Go, and preach to the Gentiles the word of God”.

When the northern mission was proposed to Anskar, he at once declared his readiness to undertake it. He adhered to his resolution, although many endeavored to dissuade him, while Wala disclaimed the intention of enforcing the task on him by his monastic obligation to obedience; and his behavior while preparing himself for the work by retirement and devotion had such an effect on Autbert, a monk of noble birth and steward of the monastery, that he offered himself as a companion.

The missionaries could not prevail on any servant to attend them. On joining Harold they were treated with neglect by him and his companions, who, as Anskar’s biographer says, did not yet know how the ministers of God ought to be honored. But when they had sailed down the Rhine as far as Cologne, the bishop of that city, Hadebold, out of compassion, bestowed on them a vessel with two cabins, and as Harold found it convenient to take possession of one of these, he was brought into closer intercourse with the missionaries, who soon succeeded in inspiring him with a new interest in their undertaking. They fixed the centre

of their operations at Hadeby, on the opposite bank of the Schley to Sleswick, and laboured among both the Christians and the heathens of the Danish border. Anskar established a school for boys—the pupils being partly given to him, and partly bought for the purpose of training them up in the Christian faith. But Harold had offended many of his adherents by doing homage to Louis and by his change of religion; they were further alienated when, in his zeal for the advancement of his new faith, he destroyed temples and even resorted to persecution; and the opposite party took advantage of the feeling. Harold was expelled, and retired to a county in Frisia which the emperor had bestowed on him; and Anskar was obliged to leave Hadeby. Autbert had already been compelled by severe illness to relinquish the mission, and died at Corbie in 829.

A new opening soon presented itself to Anskar. It would appear that some knowledge of the Gospel had already reached Sweden—partly, it is said, by means of intercourse which the inhabitants of that remote country had carried on with the Byzantine empire. In 829 the court of Louis was visited by ambassadors from Sweden, who, in addition to their secular business, stated that their countrymen were favorably disposed towards Christianity, and requested the emperor to supply them with teachers. Louis bethought himself of Anskar, who agreed to undertake the work—regarding it as a fulfillment of his visions. His place with Harold was supplied by another; and Wala assigned him a monk named Witmar as a companion. The vessel in which the missionaries embarked was attacked by pirates, who plundered them of almost everything, including the presents designed by Louis for the Swedish king. But they were determined to persevere, and, after many hardships, made their way to the northern capital, Birka or Sigtuna, on the lake Mälär. The king, Biorn, received them graciously, and, with the consent of the national assembly, gave them permission to preach freely. Their ministrations were welcomed with delight by a number of Christian captives, who had long been deprived of the offices of religion; and among their converts was Herigar, governor of the district, who built a church on his estate. After having labored for a year and a half, Anskar and his companion returned with a letter from Biorn to Louis, who was greatly pleased with their success, and resolved to place the northern mission on a new footing, agreeably to his father's intentions. An archiepiscopal see was to be established at Hamburg, and Anskar was consecrated for it at Ingelheim by Drogo of Metz, with the assistance of Ebbo and many other bishops. He then repaired to Rome, where Gregory IV bestowed on him the pall, with a bull authorizing him to labor for the conversion of the northern nations, in conjunction with Ebbo, whose commission from Paschal was still in force. Louis conferred on him the monastery of Turholt (Thourout, between Bruges and Ypres), to serve at once as a source of maintenance and as a resting-place more secure than the northern archbishopric.

Ebbo, although diverted from missionary work by his other (and in part far less creditable) occupations, had continued to take an interest in the conversion of the north, and appears at this time to have made a second expedition to the scene of his old labors. But as neither he nor Anskar could give undivided attention to the Swedish mission, it was now agreed that this should be committed to a relation of Ebbo named Gauzbert, who was consecrated to the episcopate and assumed the name of Simon. To him Ebbo transferred the settlement at Welanao, with the intention that it should serve the same purposes for which Turholt had been given to Anskar.

Anskar entered with his usual zeal on the new sphere which had been assigned to him. He built at Hamburg a church, a monastery, and a college. According to the system which he had followed at Hadeby, he bought a number of boys with a view to educating them as Christians; some of them were sent to Turholt, while others remained with him. But after a time Hamburg was attacked by a great force of Northmen, under Eric, king of Jutland. The archbishop exerted himself in encouraging the inhabitants to hold out until relief should arrive; but the assailants were too strong to be long resisted; the city was sacked and burnt,

and Anskar was obliged to flee. He had lost his church, his monastery, and his library, among the treasures of which was a magnificent bible, the gift of the emperor; some relics bestowed on the church by Ebbo were all that he was able to rescue. Yet, reduced as he was to necessity, he repeated Job's words of resignation—"The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord". Leutbert bishop of Bremen, who had before looked on the new archbishopric with jealousy, refused to entertain him, and he was indebted for a refuge to the charity of a widow named Ikia, of Bamsloh, where he gradually collected some of his scattered followers. About the same time Gauzbert was expelled from Sweden by a popular rising, in which his nephew Notbert was killed.

To add to Anskar's distress, his monastery of Turholt, being within that portion the empire which fell to Charles the Bald on the death of Louis, was bestowed by the new sovereign on a layman. His monks, finding no means of subsistence, were obliged to leave him: but he found a patron in Louis of Germany, who founded a monastic establishment for him at Ramsloh, and resolved to bestow on him the bishopric of Bremen, which fell vacant by the death of Leutbert. Anskar was himself unwilling to take any active part in the matter, lest he should be exposed to charges of rapacity, and some canonical objections arose; but these were overcome with the consent of the bishops who were interested. The union of the dioceses was sanctioned by the council of Mayence (the same at which Gottschalk was condemned) in 848; and, sixteen years after it had virtually taken effect, it was confirmed by Nicolas I, who renewed the gift of the pall to Anskar, and appointed him legate for the evangelization of the Swedes, the Danes, the Slavons, and other nations of the north.

In the meantime Anskar had been actively employed. Repeated political missions from Louis of Germany had made him known to the Danish king Horic or Eric, who had long been one of the most formidable chiefs of the northern devastators, and had led the force which burnt and plundered Hamburg. Anskar gained a powerful influence over the king, who, although it does not appear that he was himself baptized, granted the missionaries leave to preach throughout his dominions, and to build a church at Sleswick. The work of conversion went on rapidly. Danish traders who had received baptism at Hamburg or Dorstadt now openly professed Christianity, and Christian merchants from other countries ventured more freely into Denmark, so that Eric found the wealth of his kingdom increased by the consequences of the toleration which he had granted. Many of the converts, however, put off their baptism until they felt the approach of death; while it is said that some heathens, after their life had been despaired of, and after they had invoked their own gods in vain, on entreating the aid of Christ were restored to perfect health.

After the withdrawal of Gauzbert, Sweden remained for seven years without any Christian teacher, until Anskar sent into the country a priest and hermit named Ardgar, who preached with great effect—his efforts, it is said, being powerfully seconded by judgments which befell all who had been concerned in the expulsion of Gauzbert. Herigar had throughout remained faithful, notwithstanding all that he had to endure from his unbelieving countrymen; and on his deathbed he was comforted by the ministrations of Ardgar. But Ardgar longed to return to his hermitage, and after a time relinquished his mission. Gauzbert, now bishop of Osnaburg, whom Anskar requested to resume his labours in Sweden, declined, on the ground that another preacher would be more likely to make a favorable impression on the people than one whom they had already ejected from their country. Anskar himself, therefore, resolved to undertake the work—being encouraged by a vision in which his old superior Adelhard appeared to him. He was accompanied by envoys from Eric to king Olof, of Sweden, and bore a letter of warm recommendation from the Danish king. But on landing in Sweden he found the state of things very unpromising. A short time before this a Swede had arisen in the national assembly, declaring that he was charged with a communication from the gods, who had bidden him tell his countrymen that, if they wished to enjoy a continuance of prosperity, they must revive with increased zeal the ancient worship, and must exclude all

other religions. "If", the celestial message graciously concluded, "you are not content with us, and wish to have more gods, we all agree to admit your late king Eric into our number". A great effect had followed on this: a temple had been built to Eric, and was crowded with worshippers; and such was the excitement of the people that Anskar's friends advised him to desist from his enterprise, as it could not but be fruitless and might probably cost him his life. He was, however, resolved to persevere. He invited the king to dine with him, and, having propitiated him by gifts, requested permission to preach. Olof replied that, as some former preachers of Christianity had been forcibly driven out of the country, he could not give the required licence without consulting the gods, and obtaining the sanction of the popular assembly; "for", says Anskar's biographer, "in that nation public affairs are determined less by the king's power than by the general consent of the people". A lot was cast in an open field, and was favorable to the admission of the Christian teachers. The assembly was swayed by the speech of an aged member, who said that the power of the Christians' God had often been experienced, especially in dangers at sea; that many of his countrymen had formerly been baptized at Dorstadt; why then, he asked, should they refuse, now that it was brought to their own doors, that which they had before sought from a distance? The assembly of another district also decided for the admission of Christianity; and the feeling in favor of the new religion was strengthened by miracles performed on an expedition which Olof undertook to Courland. Converts flocked in, churches were built, and Anskar found himself at liberty to return to Denmark, leaving Gumbert, a nephew of Gauzbert, at the head of the Swedish mission.

During the archbishop's absence, Eric had fallen in a bloody battle with a pagan faction, which had used his encouragement of Christianity as a pretext for attacking him. The most powerful of Anskar's other friends had shared the fate of their king; the greater part of Denmark was now in the hands of the enemy; and Eric II, who had succeeded to a part of his father's territory, was under the influence of Hovi, earl of Jutland, who persuaded him that all the late misfortunes were due to the abandonment of the old national religion. The church at Sleswick was shut up, its priest was expelled, and the Christians were cruelly persecuted. Anskar could only betake himself to prayer for a change from this unhappy state of things, when he unexpectedly received a letter from the young king, professing as warm an interest in the Gospel as that which his father had felt, and inviting the missionaries to resume their labors. Hovi had fallen into disgrace, and was banished. The progress of Christianity was now more rapid than ever. The church at Sleswick was for the first time allowed to have a bell; another church was founded at Ripe, the second city of Denmark, on the coast opposite to Britain, and Rimbart, a native of the neighborhood of Turholt, who had grown up under Anskar's tuition, was appointed its pastor.

Anskar's labors were continued until the sixty-fourth year of his age, and the thirty-fourth of his episcopate. Although the progress of the Swedish mission was retarded by the death or the withdrawal of some who were employed in it, he was able to provide for its continuance, chiefly by means of clergy of Danish birth, whom he had trained up in the seminary at Ramsloh. Amidst his trials and disappointments he frequently consoled himself by remembering the assurance which Ebbo, when bishop of Hildesheim, had expressed to him, that God would not fail in his own time to crown the work with success. The biographer Rimbart dwells with delight on his master's strict adherence to the monastic customs, which he maintained to the last; on his mortifications, which he carried to an extreme in youth, until he became aware that such excesses were a temptation to vain glory, and how, when no longer able to bear them, he endeavored to supply the defect by alms and prayers; on his frequent and fervent devotion; on his charitable labors, his building of hospitals, redemption of captives, and other works of mercy. Among the results of his exertions, it deserves to be remembered that in 856 he persuaded the leading men of Nordalbingia to give up the trade which they had carried on in slaves. In addition to works of a devotional kind, he wrote a Life of Willehad,

the first bishop of Bremen, and a journal of his own missions, which is known to have been sent to Rome in the thirteenth century, and, although often sought for in vain, may possibly still exist there. He is said to have performed some miraculous cures, but to have shunned the publication of them, except among his most intimate friends; and when they were once spoken of in his hearing, he exclaimed, "If I were worthy in the sight of my Lord, I would ask Him to grant me one miracle—that He would make me a good man!"

In his last illness Anskar was greatly distressed by the apprehension that his sins had frustrated the promise which had been made to him of the martyr's crown. Rimbart endeavored to comfort him by saying that violent death is not the only kind of martyrdom; by reminding him of his long and severe labors for the Gospel, and of the patience with which he had endured much sickness—especially the protracted sufferings of his deathbed. At length, as he was at mass, the archbishop, although fully awake, had a vision in which he was reproved for having doubted, and was assured that all that had been promised should be fulfilled. His death took place on the festival of the Purification, in the year 865.

When asked to name a successor, Anskar declined to do so on the ground that he was unwilling, by preferring one before others, to add to the offence which he might probably have given to many during his lifetime. But on being questioned as to his opinion of Rimbart, he answered—"I am assured that he is more worthy to be an archbishop than I am to be a sub-deacon". To Rimbart, therefore, the see of Hamburg was committed on Anskar's death; and for nearly a quarter of a century he carried on the work in the spirit of his master, for the knowledge of whose life we are chiefly indebted to his reverential and affectionate biography. Rimbart died in 888.

CHAPTER V.

FROM THE DEPOSITION OF CHARLES THE FAT TO THE DEATH OF POPE
SYLVESTER II.
A.D. 887-1003.

We now for the first time meet with a long period—including the whole of the tenth century—undisturbed by theological controversy. But we must not on this account suppose that it was an era of prosperity or happiness for the church. Never, perhaps, was there a time of greater misery for most of the European nations; never was there one so sad and so discreditable for religion. The immediate necessities which pressed on men diverted their minds from study and speculation. The clergy in general sank into the grossest ignorance and disorder; the papacy was disgraced by infamies of which there had been no example in former days.

Soon after the beginning of this period the Byzantine church was agitated by a question which also tended to increase its differences with Rome. Leo the Philosopher, the pupil of Photius, after having had three wives who had left him without offspring, married Zoe, with whom he had for some time cohabited. According to the Greek historians, the union was celebrated by one of the imperial chaplains before the birth of a child; and, when Leo had become father of an heir, he Zoe to the rank of empress. The marriage would, in any circumstances, have been scandalous, for even second marriages had been discountenanced by the church, and a fourth marriage was hitherto unknown in the east. The patriarch Nicolas, therefore, deposed the priest who had blessed the nuptials; he refused to admit the imperial pair into the church, so that they were obliged to perform their devotions elsewhere; and he refused to administer the Eucharist to Leo, who thereupon banished him to the island of Hiereia. The account given by the patriarch himself is somewhat different—that the son of Leo and Zoe was born before their marriage; that he consented to baptize the child only on condition of a separation between the parents; that Leo swore to comply, but within three days after introduced Zoe into the palace with great pomp, went through the ceremony of marriage without the intervention of any priest, and followed it up by the coronation of his wife. Nicolas adds that he entreated the emperor to consent to a separation until the other chief sees should be consulted, but that some legates from Rome, who soon after arrived at Constantinople, countenanced the marriage, and that thus Leo was emboldened to deprive and to banish him. Euthymius, an ecclesiastic of high character, who was raised to the patriarchate, restored the emperor to communion, but resisted his wish to obtain a general sanction of fourth marriages, although it was supported by many persons of consideration. On the death of Leo, his brother Alexander, who succeeded together with the young son of Zoe, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, not only restored Nicolas, but gave him an important share in the government, while Euthymius on his deposition was treated with barbarous outrage by the clergy of the opposite party, and soon after died. Alexander himself died within a year, when Zoe became powerful in the regency, and urged her son to insist on the acknowledgment of her marriage. But she was shut up in a convent by Romanus Lecapenus, who assumed the government as the colleague of Constantine, and in 920 the rival parties in the church were reconciled. An edict was published by which, for the future, third marriages were allowed on certain conditions, but such unions as that of which the emperor himself was the offspring

were prohibited on pain of excommunication. At Rome, however, fourth marriages were allowed, and on this account an additional coolness arose between the churches, so that for a time the names of the popes appear to have been omitted from the diptychs of Constantinople.

The Greek Church continued to rest on the doctrines and practices established by the councils of former times. The worship of images was undisturbed. The empire underwent frequent revolutions, marked by the perfidy, the cruelty, the ambition regardless of the ties of nature, with which its history has already made us too familiar; but the only events which need be here mentioned are the victories gained over the Saracens by Nicephorus Phocas (A.D. 963-969) and by his murderer and successor John Tzimisce (A.D. 969-976). By these princes Crete and Cyprus were recovered, and the arms of the Greeks were carried even as far as Bagdad. And, although their more distant triumphs had no lasting effect, the empire retained some recompense for its long and bloody warfare in the possession of Antioch, with Tarsus, Mopsuestia, and other cities in Cilicia.

In the west, the age was full of complicated movements, which it is for the most part most difficult to trace, and impossible to remember. After the deposition of Charles the Fat, the only representatives of the Carolingian line were illegitimate—Arnulf, a son of the Bavarian Carloman, and Charles, styled the Simple, the offspring of Louis the Stammerer by a marriage to which the church refused its sanction. Arnulf assumed the government of Germany, which he held from 887 to 899. He ruled with vigor, carried on successful wars with the Obotrites and other Slavonic nations of the north, and broke the terror of the Northmen by a great overthrow on the Dyle, near Louvain, in 891. He also weakened the power of the Moravians; but in order to this he called in the aid of the Hungarians or Magyars, and opened a way into Germany to these formidable barbarians. No such savage enemy of Christendom had yet appeared. They were a people of Asiatic origin, whose language, of the same stock with the Finnish, bore no likeness to that of any civilized or Christian nation. The writers of the time, partly borrowing from the old descriptions of Attila's Huns, with whom the Magyars were fancifully connected, speak of them as monstrous and hardly human in form, as living after the manner of beasts, as eating the flesh and drinking the blood of men, the heart being particularly esteemed as a delicacy. Light in figure and accoutrements, and mounted on small, active horses, they defied the pursuit of the Frankish cavalry, while even in retreat their showers of arrows were terrible. They had already established themselves in the territory on the Danube which for some centuries had been occupied by the Avars. They had threatened Constantinople, and had laid both the eastern empire and the Bulgarians under contribution. They now passed into Germany in seemingly inexhaustible multitudes, overran Thuringia and Franconia, and advanced as far as the Rhine. Almost at the same moment the northern city of Bremen was sacked by one division of their forces, and the Swiss, monastery of St. Gall by another. A swarm of them laid Provence desolate, and penetrated to the Spanish frontier, although a sickness which broke out among them enabled Raymond, marquis of Gothia, to repel them. Crossing the Alps, they rushed down on Italy. Pavia, the Lombard capital, and then the second city of the peninsula, was given to the flames, with, its forty-four churches, while the Magyars glutted their cruelty and love of plunder on the persons and on the property of the inhabitants. The invaders made their way even to the extremity of Calabria, while the Italians, regarding them as a scourge of God, submitted without any other attempt at defense than the prayers with which their churches resounded for deliverance “from the arrows of the Hungarians”

The Saracens also continued to afflict Italy. A force of them from Africa established itself on the Garigliano (the ancient Liris), and from its fortified camp continually menaced Rome. In another quarter, a vessel with about twenty Saracens from Spain was carried out of its course by winds, and compelled to put to land near Fraxinetum. They fortified themselves against the inhabitants of the neighborhood, and, after having subsisted for a time on plunder, they invited others from Spain to join them, so that the handful of shipwrecked strangers was

gradually recruited until it became a formidable band. They carried on their ravages far and wide, seized on pilgrims, stripped them of all they had, and compelled those who were able to raise large sums by way of ransom. Some of them even crossed the Mount of Jupiter (now the Great St. Bernard) and established another settlement at St. Maurice. But the garrison of Fraxinetum was at length surrounded and exterminated by William duke of Aquitaine.

After the death of Arnulf, the Germans were broken up into five principal nations—the Franconians, the Saxons, the Swabians, the Bavarians, and the Lotharingians of the debatable land between France and Germany, which was sometimes attached to the one country and sometimes to the other—being either transferred by its inhabitants, or annexed by force or by intrigue. These nations were generally under the government of dukes; the fear of the Magyars and of the Slaves was the bond which united them in one common interest. Otho of Saxony was regarded as their leader; and on his death, in 912, they chose Conrad of Franconia as king of Germany. Conrad found Henry, the son of Otho and duke of Saxony, his chief opponent; but on his deathbed, in 919, a desire to prevent discord among the Germans prevailed over all other feelings, and he charged his brother Eberhard, who himself might fairly have claimed the succession, to carry to Henry the ensigns of royalty—the holy lance, the crown and mantle, the golden bracelets and the sword. In compliance with Conrad's wish, Henry the Fowler (so styled from the occupation in which he is said to have been engaged when the announcement of his intended dignity reached him) was elected king by the Franconians and Saxons, and the other nations accepted the choice. Henry reigned from 920 to 936, with a reputation seldom equalled for bravery, prudence, moderation, justice, and fidelity. He recovered Lotharingia for Germany, triumphed over the Northern Slaves and the Bohemians, took from the Northmen the country between the Eider and the Schley, and erected the marquisate of Sleswick as a bulwark for the security of Germany on that side. But still more important were his wars with the Hungarians. On an expedition, which was marked by their usual barbarous ravages, one of their most important chiefs—perhaps, as has been conjectured, the king himself—fell into the hands of Henry, who refused to release him except on condition of peace, for which it was agreed that the Germans should pay gifts by way of annual acknowledgment. The peace was to last for nine years. Henry employed the time in preparations for war, and, on its expiration, returned a scornful defiance to an embassy of the Magyars. He twice defeated the barbarians; and in 955 their power was finally broken by his son Otho the First in the great battle of the Lechfeld, near Augsburg. By this defeat the Hungarians lost that part of their territory which may be identified with the modern province of Austria, and were reduced to the limits of Pannonia. On the deposition of Charles the Fat, Odo or Eudes, count of Paris, and son of Robert the Strong, assumed the royal title in France, and held it for ten years, during which he kept up a continual and sometimes successful struggle against the Northmen. At his death, in 898, Charles the Simple, who had in vain attempted to assert his title against Odo, became his successor; and the illegitimate continuation of the Carolingian line lasted (although not without interruption) until 987, when, on the death of Louis V, Hugh Capet, duke of France, a great nephew of Odo, was elected by an assembly at Senlis, hailed as king by the army at Noyon, and anointed by Adalbero, archbishop of Reims, whose possession of that city gave him the chief influence in disposing of the crown. But the royalty of France was little more than nominal. The power of Odo at first reached only from the Meuse to the Loire; the later Carolingians possessed little more than the rock of Laon, while the real sovereignty of the country was in the hands of the great feudatories, whose power had now become hereditary. At the end of the ninth century France was divided into twenty-nine distinct principalities; at the accession of Hugh Capet, the number, exclusive of the independent kingdom of Aries, had increased to fifty-five, and some of these were larger than his own dominions. Hugh, indeed, for the title of king, and for the hope that the royal power might in time become a reality, even sacrificed something of his former strength, by giving up the benefices which he had held to the clergy, and by bestowing

fiefs on the nobles. Fortresses multiplied throughout the land; raised originally during the Norman invasions for the purposes of defense and security, they had become dangerous to the royal power and oppressive to the people. Charles the Bald, at the diet of Pistres, in 864, had forbidden the erection of such strongholds, and had ordered that those which existed should be demolished; but after the dismemberment of the kingdom there was no power which could enforce this law. The nobles everywhere raised their castles, and surrounded themselves with troops of soldiers; and the effects were soon visible both for evil and for good. The martial spirit, which had decayed from the time of Louis the Pious, revived; the dukes and counts, each with an army of his own, encountered the Northmen in fight, or turned against each other in private war the strength which they had gained by the degradation of the crown. And both in France and in Italy the lords of castles betook themselves to plunder, as an occupation which involved nothing discreditable or unworthy of their position.

Notwithstanding the victories of Odo and of Arnulf, the Northmen for a time continued to infest France in all quarters—penetrating even to the very heart of the country. In 911 Charles the Simple, by the treaty of St. Clair on the Epte, ceded to them the territory between that river and the sea, together with Brittany, and bestowed his daughter Gisella on their leader, Rollo, on condition of his doing homage and embracing the Christian faith. In the following year Rollo was baptized at Rouen, by the name of Robert, when, on each of the seven days during which he wore the baptismal garment, he bestowed lands on some church or monastery, as a compensation for the evils which they had suffered at the hands of his countrymen. Ignominious as the cession to the Northmen may appear, it had a precedent in that which the great Alfred had made after victory. The French king lost nothing by it, since the part of Neustria which was given up was actually in possession of the invaders; while, by professing to include Brittany in the gift, he may have hoped to turn the arms of his new liegemen against a population which had already established itself in independence. And in the result, the admission of the Northmen was speedily justified. They settled down in their new possessions; they laid aside their barbarous manners, and, under the teaching provided by the care of Hervé, archbishop of Reim (who, at the request of the archbishop of Rouen, drew up regulations for the treatment of them), their paganism was soon extirpated. They married wives of the country; in two generations the Norse tongue had disappeared, and it was among the offspring of the Scandinavian pirates that French for the first time took the rank of a cultivated and polished language. The country, which had long been desolated by their ravages, recovered its fertility; churches and monasteries rose again out of ruins; strangers of ability and skill in all kinds of arts were encouraged to settle in Normandy; and in no long time it became the most advanced province of France as to orderly government, industry, and literature.

ITALY

Italy suffered severely during this period, not only from the attacks of the Hungarians and of the Saracens, but from the contests of its own princes. On the deposition of Charles the Fat, the Italians were unwilling to acknowledge a foreign ruler. Guy duke of Spoleto, and Berengar duke of Friuli, both connected through females with the Carolingian family, contended for the kingdom of Italy and for the imperial crown, which was conferred on each of them by popes. Arnulf of Germany (A.D. 896) and other princes were also crowned at Rome as emperors; but the first revival of the empire as a reality was in the person of the German Otho the Great (A.D. 961), from whom the dignity was transmitted to his son and to his grandson of the same name. The Italian and German kingdoms were united in the Othos, and this subjection of Italy to a distant sovereign produced an effect important for its later history. The inhabitants of the towns, who had already been obliged to fortify themselves with walls and to organize a militia for defense against the Saracen and Hungarian invaders, now

found that they were thrown still more on their own resources. Each city, consequently, isolated itself, contracted, its interests within its own immediate sphere, and established a magistracy on the ancient model—the germ of the mediaeval Italian republics.

The clergy and monks shared largely in the calamities of the age. In all the kingdoms which had belonged to the Carolingian monarchy, it was usual for princes to take for themselves, or to assign to their favorites, the temporalities of religious houses. Queens and other ladies enjoyed the revenues of the greater monasteries, without being supposed to contract any obligation to duty on that account. In many instances the impropriation of benefices passed as an inheritance in noble families. Great lords seized on bishoprics, gave them to their relatives, or even disposed of them to the highest bidder. In 990 a count of Toulouse sold the see of Cahors, and about the same time a viscount of Beziers bequeathed the bishoprics of that city and of Agde as portions to his daughters. Sometimes mere children were appointed to sees. Thus, in 925, on the death of Seulf of Reims, Herbert, count of Vermandois, who was even suspected of having shortened the archbishop's days by poison, seized the temporalities for himself, and compelled the clergy and people to elect his son Hugh, a child not yet five years old. The election was confirmed by king Rodolph, and by pope John X, and the boy prelate was committed to Guy, bishop of Auxerre, for education, while a bishop was appointed to administer the see. In 932, on a political change, which threw the possession of Reims into the hands of another party, a monk named Artald was nominated as archbishop, received consecration, and was invested with the pall by John XI; but Hugh, on attaining manhood, asserted his title, gained possession of Reims by means of his father's troops, and was consecrated to the archbishopric. The contest was carried on for many years; for Artald, as well as Hugh, was a man of family, was supported by stout retainers, and was backed by political power. At one time Artald would seem to have given up his pretensions on condition that he should be provided for by the immediate gift of an abbey, and by the promise of another see; but he was afterwards reinstated by Louis d'Outremer, and the question as to the archbishopric of Reims was discussed by councils at Verdun and at Mousson, at Ingelheim, Laon, and Treves. Hugh disregarded all citations to appear; but at Mousson and at Ingelheim, where two legates of Agapetus II were present, a rescript bearing the pope's name was produced in his behalf. The councils, however, set aside this document, as being a mere peremptory mandate for the restoration of Hugh, obtained by false representations, and unsupported by argument or canonical authority. Artald exhibited a papal letter of opposite tenor; and the council sentenced his rival to excommunication until he should repent. Artald held possession of the see until his death, in 961, and Hugh, who hoped then to enter on it without opposition, found himself defeated by the influence of Bruno archbishop of Cologne, brother of Otho the Great, and of Gerberga, queen dowager of France, through whom Bruno virtually exercised the regency of the kingdom. It is said that Hugh died of anxiety and vexation.

But the condition of the papacy is the most remarkable feature in the history of this time. From the beginning to the end of the period, it is the subject of violent contests between rival factions. Formosus, bishop of Portus, who had been employed by Nicolas as legate in Bulgaria, was charged by John VIII with having used his position to bind the king of that country to himself, instead of to the Roman see; with having attempted to obtain the popedom, and having entered into a conspiracy against both the pope and Charles the Bald. For these offences he was excommunicated by a synod at Rome, and by that which was held under John, at Troyes, and was compelled to swear that he would never return to Rome, or aspire to any other than lay communion. The next pope, Marinus, released him both from the excommunication and from his oath; and Formosus was raised in 891 to the papacy, which he held for five years. His successor, Boniface VI, after a pontificate of fifteen days, made way for Stephen VI, who, in the contentions of the rival pretenders to the empire, had taken an opposite side to Formosus; and it would seem that this political enmity was the motive of the

extraordinary outrages which followed. By Stephen's command, the body of Formosus was dragged from the grave, was arrayed in robes, placed in the papal chair, and brought to trial on a charge of having been uncanonically translated from a lesser see to Rome—a charge which, as there had already been a precedent for such translation in the case of Marinus, it was thought necessary to aggravate by the false addition that Formosus had submitted to a second consecration. A deacon was assigned to the dead pope as advocate, but it was useless to attempt a defense. Formosus was condemned, the ordinations conferred by him were annulled, his corpse was stripped of the pontifical robes, the fingers used in benediction were cut off, and the body, after having been dragged about the city, was thrown into the Tiber. But the river, it is said, repeatedly cast it out, and, after the murder of Stephen, in 897, it was taken up and again laid in St. Peter's, where, as it was carried into the church, some statues of saints inclined towards it with reverence, in attestation of the sanctity of Formosus. A synod held in the following year under John IX rescinded the condemnation of Formosus, and declared that his translation was justified by his merits, although it ought not to become a precedent. It stigmatized the proceedings of the council under Stephen, ordered the acts of it to be burnt, and excommunicated those who had violated the tomb.

A rapid succession of popes now took place. Elections are followed within a few months or weeks or days by deaths which excite suspicion as to the cause; in some cases violence or poison appears without disguise. With Sergius III, in 904, began the ascendancy of a party which had attempted to seat him in St. Peter's chair after the death of Theodore II in 897-8, but was not then strong enough to establish him. Its head was Adalbert, marquis of Tuscany, who was leagued with a noble and wealthy Roman widow named Theodora. Theodora had a daughter of the same name, and another named Mary or Marozia—both, like herself, beautiful, and thoroughly depraved. For upwards of fifty years these women held the disposal of the Roman see, which they filled with their paramours, their children, and their grandchildren. Sergius, who held the papacy till 911, is described as a monster of rapacity, lust, and cruelty—as having lived in open concubinage with Marozia, and having abused the treasures of the church for the purpose of securing abettors and striking terror into enemies. The next pope, Anastasius III, died in 913, and when the papacy again became vacant in the following year, by the death of Lando, the power of the "Pornocracy" is said to have been scandalously displayed in the appointment of a successor. A young ecclesiastic of Ravenna, named John of Tossignano, when on a mission from his church to Rome, had attracted the notice of Theodora, had been invited to her embraces, and through her influence had been appointed to the bishopric of Bologna. Before consecration he was advanced to the higher dignity of Ravenna, and, as she could not bear the separation from him, she now procured his elevation to St. Peter's chair. Disgraceful as were the means by which his promotion had been earned, John X showed himself an energetic, if not a saintly pope. He crowned Berengar as emperor—probably with a view of breaking the power of the nobles; he applied both to him and to the Greek emperor for aid against the Saracens; and, at the head of his own troops, with some furnished by Berengar, he marched against their camp on the Garigliano, and, by the aid of St. Peter and St. Paul (as it is said), obtained a victory which forced them to abandon that post of annoyance and terror to Rome. But his spirit was probably too independent for the party which he was expected to serve, and they resolved to get rid of him. In 928, some adherents of Guy, duke of Tuscany, the second husband of Marozia, surprised the pope in the castle of St. Angelo; his brother Peter, who was particularly obnoxious to the faction, was murdered before his eyes, and John himself was either starved or suffocated in the castle of St. Angelo.

John XI, who became pope in 931, is said by Liutprand to have been a son of Marozia by pope Sergius, while others suppose him to have been the legitimate offspring of her marriage with Alberic, marquis of Camerino. This pope was restricted to the performance of his ecclesiastical functions, while the government of Rome was swayed by Marozia's third

husband, Hugh the Great, king of Arles, and afterwards by her son, the younger Alberic, who expelled his stepfather, and kept his mother and the pope prisoners in his palace. For twenty-two years Alberic, with the title of prince and senator of all the Romans, exercised a tyrannical power, while the papal chair was filled by a succession of his creatures whom he held in entire subjection. On the death of Agapetus II in 956, the Tuscan party considered that it would not be safe to entrust the papacy to anyone who might divide its interest; and Octavian, son of Alberic, a youth of eighteen, who two years before had succeeded to his father's secular power, was advised to take the office for himself. Perhaps some such step had been contemplated by his father, as Octavian was already in ecclesiastical orders. As pope he assumed the name of John XII—this being the first instance of such a change; but his civil government was still carried on under his original name.

The tyranny and aggressions of Berengar II pressed heavily on the Italians; the pope and many other persons of importance, both ecclesiastics and laity, entreated Otho the Great to come to their deliverance. Otho accepted the invitation; he was crowned with great pomp at Monza, as king of Italy, and proceeded onwards to Rome. On the way he took an oath to defend the territory of St. Peter, and to uphold all the privileges of the pope; and it has been said that he executed a charter, by which the donations of his predecessors to the Roman see were confirmed, with large additions, while the imperial right of ratifying the elections to the papacy was maintained. At Rome, Otho received the imperial crown from the hands of the pope, and he exacted from the chief inhabitants an oath that they would never join with Berengar or with his son Adalbert.

But no sooner had the emperor left Rome than John—perhaps in disgust at finding that Otho was determined to assert for himself something very different from the merely titular dignity to which the pope had hoped to limit time—threw himself into the interest of Adalbert, who, on Otho's appearance in Italy, had sought a refuge among the Saracens of Fraxinetum. Otho, on hearing of this, sent to inquire into the truth of the matter; the answer was a report that the pope lived in the most shameful debauchery, so that female pilgrims were even afraid to visit Rome, lest they should become the victims of his passions; that he scandalously neglected his duties of every kind; and that he had attached himself to Adalbert because he knew that the emperor would not countenance him in his disgraceful courses. Otho remarked that the pope was but a boy, and would amend under the influence of good examples and advice; he attempted to negotiate with him, and John promised to reform his way of life, but in the meantime received Adalbert with welcome into Rome. The emperor returned to the city, and at his approach the pope and Adalbert fled, carrying off all that they could lay their hands on.

The Romans bound themselves by an oath never to choose a pope without the emperor's consent, and prayed for an investigation into the conduct of John. For this purpose a council of Italian, French, and German bishops was assembled at St. Peter's in the presence of Otho and of many lay nobles. The emperor expressed surprise that John did not appear in order to defend himself. The Roman clergy, who all attended the meeting, were for condemning him at once; evidence, they said, was needless in the case of iniquities which were notorious even to Iberians, Babylonians, and Indians—the pope was no wolf in sheep's clothing, but one who showed his character without disguise; but Otho insisted on inquiry. Bishops and clergymen of the Roman province then deposed that the accused had been guilty of offences which are heaped together without any discrimination of their comparative magnitude. He had consecrated the Eucharist without communicating; he had ordained in a stable, and at irregular times; he had sold episcopal ordination,—in one case to a boy of ten; his sacrilegious practices were notorious; he had been guilty of murder, of arson, of revolting cruelties,—of adultery, incest, and every kind of incontinence. He had cast off all the decencies of the ecclesiastical character; he had publicly hunted, and had dressed himself as a soldier, with sword, helmet, and cuirass; he had drunk wine to the love of the devil; he was in

the habit, while gaming, of calling on Jupiter, Venus, and other demons for aid; he omitted the canonical hours, and never signed himself with the cross. Otho, who could not speak Latin, cautioned the accusers, by the mouth of Liutprand, not to bring charges out of envy, as was usual against persons of eminent station; but both clergy and laity, “as one man”, imprecated on themselves the most fearful judgments in this world and hereafter, if all, and worse than all, that they had said were not true; and at their entreaty the emperor wrote to John, desiring him to answer for himself. The pope only replied by threats of excommunication against all who should take part in the attempt to set up a rival against him. The emperor spoke of this as boyish folly, and sent a second letter, which the messengers were unable to deliver, as John was engaged in hunting. Otho thereupon exposed the treachery with which the pope had behaved, after having invited him into Italy for the purpose of aiding against Berengar and Adalbert. John was deposed, and Leo, chief secretary of the see, a man of good character, but not yet in orders, was chosen in his room.

But a conspiracy was already formed against the Germans, by means of the deposed pontiff’s agents. Even while Otho remained at Rome, with only a few of his soldiers to guard him, an insurrection took place, and, after the emperor’s departure, John regained possession of the city. Another council was held, which deposed Leo from all clerical orders, annulled his ordinations, and, borrowing the language of Nicolas I against the synod of Metz, declared the late synod infamous; and the temporary triumph of the Tuscan party was signalized by a cruel vengeance on the hands, the eyes, the tongues, and the noses of their opponents. Otho was on the point of again returning to expel John, when the pope died in consequence of a blow which he received on the head while in the act of adultery—from the devil, according to Liutprand, while others are content to suppose that it was from the husband whom he had dishonoured. The Romans, forgetting their late oath, chose for his successor an ecclesiastic named Benedict; but the emperor reappeared before the city, starved them into a surrender, and reinstated Leo VIII. A council was held, at which Benedict gave up his robes and his pastoral staff to Leo.

The pope broke the staff in the sight of the assembly; the antipope was degraded from the orders above that of deacon, which, at the emperor’s request, he was allowed to retain, and was banished to Hamburg. Benedict, who appears to have been a man of high personal character, met with great veneration in the place of his exile, and died there in the following year.

John XIII, the successor of Leo, was consecrated with the emperor’s approbation, in October 965; but within three months he was driven from Rome and imprisoned in Campania by a party which had become very powerful, and aimed at establishing a government on the republican model, under the names of the ancient Roman magistracy, in hostility alike to German emperors and to the papacy. In consequence of this revolution, Otho found himself obliged again to visit Rome.

The pope was restored; the republican consuls were banished to Germany; the twelve tribunes were beheaded; others of the party were blinded or mutilated; the body of the prefect who had announced the decree of banishment to John was torn from the grave; his successor in the prefecture was paraded about the city, crowned with a bladder and mounted on an ass. So great was the sensation excited by the report of these severities, that, when Liutprand was sent to Constantinople to seek a Greek princess in marriage for the heir of the empire, Nicephoras Phocas reproached him with his master’s “impiety”, and alleged it as a reason for treating the ambassador with indignity. Liutprand boldly replied that his sovereign had not invaded Rome as a tyrant, but had rescued it from the disgraceful oppression of tyrants and prostitutes; that he had acted agreeably to the laws of the Roman emperors, and, had he neglected so to act, he would himself have been “impious, unjust, cruel, and tyrannical”.

Crescentius, who is said (but probably without ground) to have been a grandson of pope John X, by one of the Theodoras, became the chief of the republican party, and governed

Rome with the title of consul. His character has been extolled as that of a hero and a patriot; yet there is not sufficient evidence to show that his patriotism arose from any better motive than selfish ambition. In 974, when the sceptre of Otho the Great had passed into the hands of a young and less formidable successor, Crescentius decoyed pope Benedict VI into the castle of St. Angelo, where he was put to death. While the pope was yet alive, Boniface VII was set up by the Crescentian party, but was obliged to give way to Benedict VII, who was established by the Tusculan interest, and held the see until 983. Otho II, who survived him but a short time, nominated to the papacy Peter, bishop of Pavia, who, out of reverence for the supposed apostolic founder of the Roman church, changed his name to John XIV. But Boniface, who in his flight had carried off much valuable property of the church, and had converted it into money at Constantinople, returned to Rome, seized John, and shut him up in St. Angelo, where he is supposed to have been made away with, either by hunger or by poison; and the intruder, in concert with Crescentius, held the papacy until his death, which took place within a year. His body was then dragged about the streets and treated with indignity, until some of the clergy charitably gave it burial.

The next pope, John XIV, is described as a man of much learning; but it is said that his clergy detested him for his pride, and the biographer of Abbo of Fleury tells us that the abbot, on visiting Rome, found him “not such as he wished him to be, or such as he ought to have been”, but “greedy of base gain, and venal in all his actions”. John was held in constraint by Crescentius, who would not allow any one to approach him without paying for permission, and seized not only the property of the church, but even the oblations. At length, unable to endure this growing oppression, the Pope requested the intervention of Otho III, then a youth of sixteen; but as Otho was on his way to Rome, in compliance with this invitation, he was met at Ravenna by messengers who announced the pope’s death, and, probably in the name of a party among the Romans who were weary of the consul’s domination, requested that the king (although he had not yet received the imperial crown) would nominate a successor. The choice of Otho fell on his cousin and chaplain Bruno, a young man of twenty-four, who was thereupon formally elected; and the first German pope (as he is usually reckoned) assumed the name of Gregory V.

Gregory crowned his kinsman as emperor on Ascension-day 996, and, wishing to begin his pontificate with clemency, obtained the Pardon of Crescentius, whom Otho had intended to send into exile. But scarcely had the emperor left Rome when Crescentius made an insurrection, and expelled Gregory. After an interval of eight months, the consul set up an antipope, John, bishop of Piacenza, by birth a Calabrian and a subject of the Greek empire, who had been chaplain to Otho’s mother, the Byzantine princess Theophano, and had been godfather both to the emperor and to Gregory. The tidings of the Roman insurrection recalled Otho from an expedition against the Slaves. He was met by Gregory at Pavia, advanced to Rome, and besieged Crescentius in St. Angelo. The German writers in general state that he forced the consul to a surrender, while the Italians assert that he got him into his power by a promise of safety. If such a promise was given, it was violated. The consul was beheaded; his body was exposed on a gallows, hanging by the feet, and twelve of his chief partisans were put to death. The antipope John, who had shown an intention of placing Rome under the Byzantine empire, was cruelly punished, although Nilus, a hermit of renowned sanctity, who had almost reached the age of ninety, had undertaken a toilsome journey from Rossano in Calabria, to intercede for him. He was blinded, deprived of his nose and tongue, stripped of his robes, and led through the city riding on an ass, with the tail in his hand; after which, according to some authorities, he was banished to Germany, while others say that he was thrown from the Capitol. The varieties of statement as to the authors of his punishment are still greater: one annalist relates that he was blinded and mutilated by some persons who feared lest Otho should pardon him; some writers state that Otho and Gregory concurred in

the proceedings; while, according to others, the emperor was softened by the prayers of Nilus, and the cruelties exercised on the antipope were sanctioned by his rival alone.

ARNULF OF REIMS.

During the pontificate of John XV the see of Reims had become the subject of a new contest, more important than that between Artald and Hugh. On the death of archbishop Adalbero, in the year 989, Arnulf, an illegitimate son of one of the last Carolingian kings, requested Hugh Capet to bestow it on him, promising in return to serve him faithfully in all ways. The new king granted the petition, chiefly with a view to detach Arnulf from the interest of his uncle Charles, duke of Lorraine, the heir of the Carolingian line. The archbishop, at his consecration, took an oath of fealty to Hugh, imprecating the most fearful curses on himself if he should break it. He even received the Eucharist in attestation of his fidelity, although some of the clergy present protested against such an application of the sacrament. But when the arms of Charles appeared to be successful, the gates of Reims were opened to him, and his soldiers committed violent and sacrilegious outrages in the city. The archbishop was carried off as if a prisoner, and sent forth a solemn anathema against the robbers who had profaned his church; it was, however, suspected that he had a secret understanding with his uncle, and the suspicion was speedily justified by his openly joining Charles at Laon. But Laon was soon betrayed into the hands of Hugh by its bishop, Adalbero; the king got possession of his rival's person, and imprisoned him at Orleans, where Charles died within a few months; and a council of the suffragans of Reims was held at Senlis, A.D. 990, for the examination of their metropolitan's conduct. Letters were then sent to Rome both by Hugh and by the bishops, detailing the treachery of Arnulf, with the wretched state into which his province had fallen, and asking how this "second Judas" should be dealt with. But the pope was influenced by a partisan of Arnulf, who presented him with a valuable horse and other gifts; while the envoys of the opposite party, who made no presents either to John or to Crescentius, stood three days at the gates of the papal palace without being allowed to enter.

But Hugh now found himself strong enough to act without the pope. In June 991, a synod was held at the monastic church of St. Basle, near Reims, under Siguin, archbishop of Sens. The president proposed that, before proceeding to the trial of Arnulf, an assurance of indulgence for the accused should be obtained from the king, since, if his treason were a cause of blood, it would be unlawful for bishops to judge it. Some members, however, remarked that the suggested course was dangerous; if bishops declined such inquiries, princes would cease to ask for ecclesiastical judgments, would take all judicature into their own hands, and would cite the highest ecclesiastics before their secular tribunals; and, in deference to these objections, the proposal appears to have been dropped. Siguin detailed the proceedings which had taken place; the pope, he said, had left the bishops of France a year without any answer to their application, and they must now act for themselves. All who could say anything in favor of the accused were enjoined, under pain of anathema, to come forward; whereupon Abbo, abbot of Fleury, and others produced passages from the Isidorian decretals, to show that the synod had no right to judge a bishop—the trial of bishops being one of those "greater causes" which belong to the pope alone. To this it was answered that all had been done regularly; that application had been made to the pope, but without effect.

Arnulf of Orleans, who was regarded as the wisest and most eloquent of the French bishops, spoke very strongly against the Roman claim to jurisdiction. He did not hint, nor does he appear to have felt, any suspicion of the decretals; but in opposition to their authority he proved by an array of genuine canons, councils, and papal writings, that for the decision of local questions provincial synods were sufficient; and he cited the principles of Hincmar as to appeals. The requirements of the decretals, he said, had already been satisfied by the reference which both the king and the bishops had vainly made to Rome. He denied the power of the Roman pontiff by his silence to lay to sleep the ancient laws of the church, or by his sole

authority to reverse them; if it were so, there would really be no laws to rely on. He enlarged on the enormities of recent popes, and asked how it was possible to defer to the sentence of such monsters—destitute as they were of all judicial qualities, of knowledge, of love, of character—very antichrists sitting in the temple of God, who could only act as lifeless idols. It would, (he said) be far better, if the dissensions of princes would permit, to seek a decision from the learned and pious bishops of Belgic Gaul and Germany than from the venal and polluted court of Rome.

Arnulf of Reims was brought before the council, and protested his innocence of the treachery imputed to him; but he gave way when confronted with a clerk who had opened the gates of the city to the besiegers, and who now declared that he had acted by the archbishop's orders. On the last day of the synod, when the king appeared with his son and colleague Robert, Arnulf prostrated himself before them, and abjectly implored that his life and members might be spared. He was required to surrender the ensigns of his temporalities to the king, and those of his spiritual power to the bishops, and to read an act of abdication modelled on that by which Ebbo had resigned the same dignity a century and a half before. The degraded archbishop was then sent to prison at Orleans, and Gerbert, who had taken no part in the proceedings against him, was chosen as his successor.

This eminent man was born of humble parentage in Auvergne about the middle of the century, and was admitted at an early age into the monastery of Aurillac, where he made extraordinary proficiency in his studies. He had already visited other chief schools of France, when Borel, count of Barcelona, arrived at Aurillac on a devotional pilgrimage, and gave such a report of the state of learning in Spain as induced the abbot to send Gerbert with him on his return to that country. In Spain Gerbert devoted himself especially to the acquirement of mathematical and physical science, which was then almost exclusively confined to the schools of the Saracens; but it is uncertain whether his knowledge was derived immediately from the Moslem teachers of Seville and Cordova, or from Christians who had benefited by their instruction. In 968 he visited Rome in company with his patron Borel, and was introduced to Otho the Great. He then went into France, and became master of the cathedral school at Reims; and on a second visit to Italy, in company with the archbishop Adalbero, he obtained the abbacy of Bobbio through the interest of the empress Adelaide. But he found the property of the abbey dilapidated by his predecessor; he was involved in contentions with the neighboring nobles, who insisted on his confirming grants of the monastic lands which had been wrongfully made to them; while the monks were insubordinate, and his connection with the Germans served to render him generally unpopular. His position became yet worse on the death of Otho, which took place within a year from the time of his appointment; and, after having in vain attempted to obtain support from the pope, he resolved to leave Bobbio, although he still retained the dignity of abbot. "All Italy", he wrote on this occasion to a friend, "appears to me a Rome; and the morals of the Romans are the horror of the world".

Gerbert resumed his position at Reims, where he raised the school to an unrivalled reputation, and effectively influenced the improvement of other seminaries. The study of mathematics, the Arabian numerals, and the decimal notation were now for the first time introduced into France. The library of the see was enriched by Gerbert's care with many transcripts of rare and valuable books; while his mechanical genius and science were displayed in the construction of a clock, of astronomical instruments, and of an organ blown by steam—apparently the first application of a power which has in later times produced such marvelous effects. He also took an important part in the political movements and intrigues of the time, acting as secretary to Adalbero, who, from his position as archbishop of Reims, exercised a powerful influence in affairs of state. Adalbero had fixed on him as his own successor in the archbishopric; but Gerbert's humble birth was unable to cope with the pretensions of Arnulf, which, as he asserts, were supported by simoniacal means. He therefore acquiesced in his defeat, and retained the office of secretary under his successful rival. For a

time he adhered to Arnulf in labouring for the interest of Charles of Lorraine; but he saw reason to change his course, formally renounced the archbishop's service, and wrote to the archbishop of Treves that he could not, for the sake of either Charles or Arnulf, endure to be any longer a tool of the devil, and lend himself to the maintenance of falsehood against truth. Hugh Capet gladly welcomed the accession of so accomplished a partisan, and employed him as tutor to his son Robert.

The council of St. Basle wrote to the pope in a tone of great deference, excusing itself for having acted without his concurrence, on the ground that he had so long left unanswered the application which had been made to him. But John had already sent northward as his legate an abbot named Leo, who had reached Aix-la-Chapelle when he was informed of Arnulf's deposition. On this the legate returned to Rome, and John issued a mandate to the bishops who had been concerned in the council, ordering them to appear at Rome for the trial of Arnulf's case, and in the meantime to reinstate the archbishop, and to abstain from the exercise of ecclesiastical functions. The French bishops, in a synod held at Chela (*Chelles*, seemingly between Paris and Meaux), resolved to maintain the decisions of St. Basle; the king wrote to John, assuring him that nothing had been done in breach of the papal rights, and offering to meet him at Grenoble, if the pope should wish to investigate the affair; while Gerbert protested to John that he had done no wrong, and exerted himself, by correspondence in all directions, to enlist supporters on his side. His tone as to the pretensions of Rome was very decided: thus he tells Siguin of Sens that God's judgment is higher than that of the Roman bishop, and adds, that the pope himself, if he should sin against a brother, and should refuse to hear the church's admonitions, must, according to our Lord's own precept, be counted "as a heathen man and a publican"; he declaims on the hardship of being suspended from the offices of the altar, and urges the archbishop to disregard the pope's prohibition.

John, without making any public demonstration for a time, endeavored, by the agency of monks, to excite discontent among the people of France, so as to alarm the new sovereign. Gerbert found his position at Reims extremely uneasy. Some of his most powerful friends were dead. He tells his correspondents that there is a general outcry against him—that even his blood is required; that not only his military retainers, but even his clergy, have conspired to avoid his ministrations, and to abstain from eating in company with him. In this distress he was cheered by receiving a letter from Otho III, then in his fifteenth year. Gerbert gladly accepted the invitation, and in the end of 994 repaired to the German court, where he found an honorable refuge, and became the young prince's tutor and favorite adviser. In this position, where new hopes were set before his mind, he could afford to speak of his archbishopric with something like indifference. He writes to the empress Adelaide (widow of Otho the Great) that, as the dignity was bestowed on him by bishops, he will not resign it except in obedience to an episcopal judgment; but he will not persist in retaining it if that judgment should be against him. In 995 the pope again sent Leo into France. The legate put forth a letter to Hugh and his son, by way of answer to Arnulf of Orleans, and others who had taken part in the council of St. Basle. He meets the charges of ignorance against Rome by citing passages of Scripture, in which it is said that God chooses the foolish things of this world in preference to the wise. In reply to the charges of venality, he alleges that our Lord himself and His apostles received such gifts as were offered to them. The bishops, by their conduct towards the Roman church, had cut themselves off from it; their behavior to their mother had been like that of Ham to Noah. Arnulf of Orleans, "with his apostate son, whoever he may be", had written such things against the holy see as no Arian had ever ventured to write. The legate cites the expressions of reverence with which eminent men of former times had spoken of Rome: if, he says, the chair of St. Peter had ever tottered, it had now reestablished itself firmly for the support of all the churches. He reflects on the irregularity of the proceedings against Arnulf, and on the cruelty with which he was treated; and he excuses the pope's neglect of the first

application in the matter on the ground of the troubles which were at that time caused by Crescentius.

A council, scantily attended by bishops from Germany and Lotharingia, was held under Leo at Mousson in June 995. The bishops of France had refused to appear either at Rome or at Aix; Gerbert alone, who had already removed to the German court, was present to answer for himself. In a written speech he defended the steps by which he had (reluctantly, as he said) been promoted to the see of Reims, together with his behavior towards Arnulf. He declared himself resolved to pay no heed to the prohibition by which the pope had interdicted him from divine offices—a mandate (he said) which involved much more than his own personal interest; but, at the request of the archbishop of Treves, he agreed, for the sake of example, to refrain from celebrating mass until another synod should be held. Arnulf was restored to his see by a synod held at Reims in 995; but he was detained in prison for three years longer.

Robert I of France, who succeeded his father in October 996, a prince of a gentle and devout, but feeble character, had married as his second wife Bertha, daughter of Conrad king of Burgundy, and widow of a count of Chartres. The union was uncanonical, both because the parties were related in the fourth degree, and because Robert had contracted a “spiritual affinity” with the countess, by becoming sponsor for one of her children; yet the French bishops had not hesitated to bless it, for in the marriages of princes the rigor of ecclesiastical law often bent to political expediency. Robert, however, felt that, on account of this vulnerable point, it was especially his interest to stand well with Rome; and he dispatched Abbo of Fleury as an envoy to treat with the pope in a spirit of concession as to the case of Arnulf. The abbot took the opportunity of obtaining privileges for his monastery from the new pope Gregory V; he returned to France with a pall for Arnulf; and in 998 the archbishop was released, and was restored to his see, which had been miserably impoverished during the long contest for the possession of it.

But if Robert supposed that his consent to this restoration would induce the pope to overlook the irregularity of his marriage, he soon found that he had been mistaken. A synod held at Rome in 998 required him and his queen, on pain of anathema, to separate, and to submit to penance; and it suspended the bishops who had officiated at the nuptials from communion until they should appear before the pope and make satisfaction for their offence. As to the sequel, it is only certain that Robert yielded, and that the place of Bertha was supplied by a queen of far less amiable character. Peter Damiani, in the following century, relates that Bertha gave birth to a monster with the head and neck of a goose; that the king and the queen were excommunicated by the whole episcopate of France; that the horror of this sentence scared all men from them, with the exception of two attendants; that even these cast the vessels out of which Robert or Bertha had eaten or drunk into the fire, as abominable; and that thus the guilty pair were terrified into a separation. But the terror to which Robert really yielded was more probably a dread of the spiritual power of Rome, and of the influence which, by uttering an interdict against the performance of religious offices, it might be able to exercise over his subjects; or it may be that, as is stated by the contemporary biographer of Abbo, he gave way to the persuasions of that abbot, who performed the part of Nathan in convincing him of his sin.

These triumphs of the papacy were very important for it, following as they did after a time during which there had been little communication with France, while at home the papal see had been stained and degraded by so much of a disgraceful kind. They assured the popes that they had lost no power by the change of dynasty which had been effected without their sanction. And if, as has been supposed, the sternness with which Gregory insisted on the separation of Robert and Bertha, was instigated by the wish of Otho to humiliate the French king, “it is one of many proofs that the rise of the papacy to a superiority over all secular

princes was mainly promoted by their attempts to use it as a tool in their jealousies and rivalries against each other”.

The victory over the French episcopate was also important in consequence of the position which the popes took in the affair. They had already gained from the French church as much as was requisite for the admittance of their jurisdiction in the particular case—that a metropolitan of France should not be deposed without the concurrence of the pope. This had been allowed by Hincmar himself; it had even been the subject of a petition from the council of Troyes in 867; it was acknowledged by Hugh Capet and his bishops until the pope’s neglect of their application provoked the inquiry whether they might not act without him. But, not content with this, the popes and their advocates claimed that right of exclusive judgment over all bishops which was asserted for the papacy by the false decretals; and the result was therefore far more valuable for the Roman see than it would have been if the popes had only put forth such claims as were necessary for the maintenance of their interest in the case which was immediately before them.

The German pope died in February 999. It was a time of gloomy apprehensions. The approach of the thousandth year from the Saviour’s birth had raised a general belief that the second advent was close at hand; and in truth there was much which might easily be construed as fulfilling the predicted signs of the end—wars and rumors of wars, famines and pestilences, fearful appearances in the heavens, faith foiling from the earth, and love waxing cold. In the beginning of the century, the council of Trosley (Troli, near Soissons) had urged the nearness of the judgment-day as a motive for reformation; and preachers had often insisted on it, although their opinion had met with objectors in some quarters. The preamble, “Whereas the end of the world draweth near”, which had been common in donations to churches or monasteries, now assumed a new and more urgent significance; and the belief that the long expectation was at length to be accomplished, did much to revive the power and wealth of the clergy, after the disorders and losses of the century. The minds of men were called away from the ordinary cares and employments of life; even our knowledge of history has suffered in consequence, since there was little inclination to bestow labour on the chronicling of events, when no posterity was expected to read the records. Some plunged into desperate recklessness of living; an eclipse of the sun or of the moon was the signal for multitudes to seek a hiding-place in dens and caves of the earth; and crowds of pilgrims flocked to Palestine, where the Saviour was expected to appear for judgment.

In the room of Gregory, Otho raised to the papacy the man who had hitherto been its most dangerous opponent—Gerbert. Gerbert’s learning and abilities had procured for him a great ascendancy over the mind of his imperial pupil, from whom, in the preceding year, he had received the archbishopric of Ravenna. On attaining the highest dignity in the church, he assumed the name of Sylvester II—a name significant of the relation in which he was to stand to a prince who aimed at being a second Constantine. For Otho, who lost his father at the age of three, had been trained by his Greek mother, and by his Italian grandmother, Adelaide, to despise his own countrymen as rude, to value himself on the Byzantine side of his extraction, and to affect the elegancies of Greek and Roman cultivation. He introduced into his court the ceremonies of Constantinople; on revisiting Germany, he carried with him a number of noble Romans, with a view of exhibiting to his countrymen a refinement to which they had been strangers; he even entertained the thought of making Rome the capital of his empire.

The new pope, in order, as it would seem, to reconcile his present position with his earlier career, granted to Arnulf of Reims the pall and all the other privileges which had been connected with the see. It was thus made to appear as if Arnulf had been guilty, and as if his restoration were an act of grace on the part of the rival who had formerly been obliged to give way to him. Arnulf held the archbishopric until the year 1123.

Sylvester’s pontificate was not eventful. He had the mortification of being foiled by Willigis, archbishop of Mayence, a man of great influence, both from his position as primate

of Germany and from his abilities as a politician. The contest is said to have arisen out of the pride of the emperor's sister Sophia, who, being about to enter the nunnery of Gandersheim, disdained to receive the veil from any prelate of less than metropolitan dignity. Willigis was therefore invited to officiate at Gandersheim, and not only did so, but even held a synod there. Osdag, bishop of Hildesheim, within whose diocese the convent was situated, complained of these invasions, and for a time the matter was accommodated in his favor; but Willigis again interfered with the rights of the bishop's successor, Bernward, and a synod held at Rome, in the presence of the pope and of the emperor, decided that Bernward should exercise the rights of diocesan over the community, but left the further settlement of the case to a synod which was to be assembled in Germany, under the presidency of a papal legate. This assembly met in 1001, at Palithi or Polde in Saxony. The archbishop, seeing that its feeling was against him, assumed a tone of insolent defiance towards the legate, broke up the session by means of his disorderly adherents, and had disappeared when the council reassembled on the following day. As the influence of Willigis appeared to render a fair trial hopeless in Germany, it was resolved to summon all the bishops of that country to attend a council in Italy; but, although the papal citation was seconded by the emperor, who needed the aid of their followers for the reinforcement of his army, so powerful were their fears of the primate that hardly any of them appeared. The pope found himself obliged to adjourn the consideration of the question; and on the death of Otho, which followed soon after, the power of Willigis was so much enhanced by the importance attached to his voice in the choice of a new emperor, that Sylvester did not venture to prosecute the matter. In 1007 the controversy was determined in favour of the see of Hildesheim; but by the authority of the emperor Henry, and without the aid of Rome. It was, however, again revived, and was not finally settled until 1030, when Aribio, archbishop of Mayence, acknowledged to Godehard, of Hildesheim, that his pretensions against the diocesan jurisdiction had been unfounded.

The pilgrims who flocked to the Holy Land were subjected to much oppression and annoyance by its Mussulman rulers, and frequent complaints of their sufferings were brought into western Christendom. By these reports Sylvester was excited to issue a letter addressed in the name of Jerusalem to the universal church, beseeching all Christians to sympathize with the afflictions of the holy city, and to aid it by gifts, if they could not do so by arms. The letter was not without effect in its own time, for some enterprises were in consequence undertaken against the Saracens; but the great movement of the crusades, of which it may be regarded as the first suggestion, was reserved for a later generation.

The young emperor appears to have fallen in a morbid state of melancholy. He had been lately shaken by the deaths of his cousin Gregory V, of his aunt Matilda, abbess of Quedlinburg, who in his absence carried on the government of Germany, and of other relations, which left him without any near kindred except two young sisters, who had both entered the cloister. He may, perhaps, have been touched by regret for the cruelties which had been committed in his name against the republicans of Rome; perhaps, also, the millenary year may have aided in filling his mind with sad and depressing thoughts. After having secluded himself for fourteen days, which he spent in prayer and fasting, he was persuaded by Romuald, the founder of the Camaldolite order, to undertake a penitential pilgrimage to Monte Gargano; he visited the hermit Nilus, near Gaeta, where he displayed the deepest humility and contrition; and, after his return to Rome, finding himself still unable to rest, he set out on a long journey through his dominions beyond the Alps. At Gnesen, in Poland, he knelt as a penitent before the tomb of Adalbert, bishop of Prague, who had been known to him, and perhaps little regarded by him, in earlier days, but had since found the death of a martyr in Prussia, and was now revered as a saint. At Aix-la-Chapelle, the emperor indulged his gloomy curiosity by opening the tomb of Charlemagne; and in 1001 he once more arrived at Rome, where he founded in the island of the Tiber a church in honor of St. Adalbert, whom he had already honored by a like foundation at Aix.

An insurrection took place, and Otho was besieged in his palace. It is said that from the walls he indignantly reproached the Romans for their unworthy requital of the favors which he had shown them, even to the prejudice of his own countrymen; that he received the Eucharist with the intention of sallying forth, but was restrained by the exertions of his friends.

The short remainder of his days was spent in restless movements and in penitential exercises, while he cherished the intention of raising his feudatories for the punishment of the Romans; but his projects were cut short by death at Paterno, a castle near Mount Soracte, and within sight of the ungrateful city, on Jan. 24, 1002. Although the German chroniclers in general attribute his end to small-pox, a later story, of Italian origin, has recommended itself to some eminent writers—less perhaps by its probability than by its romantic character. Stephania, it is said, the beautiful widow of Crescentius, provoked by her husband's wrongs and her own to a desire of deadly vengeance, enticed the young emperor to her embraces, and by means of a pair of gloves, administered to him a subtle poison, which dried up the sources of his strength, and brought him to the grave at the age of twenty-two. In Otho became extinct the Saxon line which had ruled over Germany from the time of Henry the Fowler, and which for three generations had filled the imperial throne.

Within little more than a year, Sylvester followed his pupil to the grave. On him, too, it is said that the vengeance of Stephania wreaked itself by a poison which destroyed his voice, if it did not put an end to his life. But a more marvelous tale is related by the zealous partisans of the see which he had so strongly opposed in its assumptions, and which he had himself at length attained. To the authentic accounts of his acquirements and of his mechanical skill they add that he dealt in unhallowed arts, acquired from a book which he had stolen from one of his Saracen teachers. He understood, it is said, the flight and the language of birds; he discovered treasures by magic; he made a compact with the devil for success in all his undertakings; he fabricated, under astral influences, a brazen head, which had the power of answering questions affirmatively or negatively. To his question, "Shall I be apostolic pontiff?" it answered "Yes". When he further asked, "Shall I die before I sing mass in Jerusalem?" the reply was "No". But as is usual in such legends, the evil one deluded his victim; the Jerusalem in which Gerbert was to die was the Roman basilica of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme.

CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE DEATH OF POPE SYLVESTER II TO THE DEPOSITION OF GREGORY VI
A.D. 1003-1046.

The unexpected death of Otho III left his wide dominions without an heir, nor had any successor been provided. After much negotiation, Henry, duke of Bavaria, descended from a brother of Otho the Great, was chosen as king of Germany—chiefly through the influence of archbishop Willigis, by whom he was crowned at Mayence. Henry, who is usually styled the Second, had been intended by his parents for the ecclesiastical state, and was a prince of very devout character, so that he attained the honor of canonization, which was conferred also on his wife Cunegunda; but his piety was not of a kind to unfit him for the active duties of his position. He governed with ability and vigor, in the midst of much opposition and many difficulties, until the year 1024. In illustration of the mixture of saint and statesman in him, we are told that on one occasion he appeared before Richard, abbot of St. Vanne's, at Verdun, in his Lotharingian dominions, and expressed a resolution to become a monk. The abbot, after some consideration, admitted him as a member of his own community, and immediately charged him, by his vow of monastic obedience, to return to the administration of the empire which had been committed to him by God.

The Italians, on the death of Otho, hastily set up a king of their own, Harduin, marquis of Ivrea. But his power was controlled by the quarrels of various parties, which were too much bent on the advancement of their own private interests to combine in any policy for their common country. While the nobles of Italy were desirous of national independence, as being most favorable to their class, the prelates and clergy in general preferred the rule of a German sovereign, as less likely to interfere with their own power than that of a nearer neighbor. Harduin incurred the detestation of the clergy, not only by such oppressions as were usual, but by acts of savage personal violence against bishops who refused to comply with his will. To these causes of disagreement was added the rivalry between the two chief cities of northern Italy—Milan, the residence of the later Roman emperors, and Pavia, the capital of the Lombard kingdom. That Harduin had been set up at Pavia ensured him the opposition of the Milanese, headed by their archbishop, Arnulf, who in 1004 invited Henry into Italy. Harduin found himself deserted by most of his adherents, who flocked to the German standard. Henry was crowned as king of Italy at Pavia; but the popular abhorrence of the Germans displayed itself, as usual, in the form of an insurrection. On the very night after the coronation, the king found himself besieged in his palace. The Germans, in order to divert the attack, set fire to the neighboring houses. Henry's troops, who were at some distance from the city, were recalled by the sight of the flames, and the rising was suppressed; but a great part of Pavia had been destroyed, and the king recrossed the Alps with a feeling of disgust and indignation against his Italian subjects. Harduin renewed his pretensions, but in 1012 was compelled by a second expedition of Henry to abdicate; and, after a vain attempt to recover his power, he ended his days in a monastery—the last Italian of the middle ages who pretended to the crown of Lombardy.

In the meanwhile the Roman factions had taken advantage of the difficulties in which the Germans were involved. John, a son or brother of Crescentius, for some years governed Rome with the title of patrician, as the head of a republican administration. It would seem that

to him three popes, who filled the chair from 1004 to 1012, were indebted for their elevation. But 439 on the death of the last of these, Sergius IV, which followed closely on that of the patrician, the disposal of the papacy was disputed by another party, headed by the counts of Tusculum, who, like the Crescentians, were descended from the notorious Theodora, her daughter Marozia having married their ancestor Alberic. The Tusculan party set up a pope named Benedict, whom they contrived to maintain against all opposition. Gregory, the popular or Crescentian pope, was expelled from the city, and set off to implore the aid of Henry. The king was not unwilling to have a pretext for going to Rome, where he was received with the greatest honors, and was made advocate of the church, which he swore faithfully to protect. But the visit resulted in the establishment not of Gregory, but of his rival Benedict, from whom Henry received the imperial crown.

Benedict VIII enjoyed greater power than his immediate predecessors, who had been subordinate to the Crescentian family. His energy was displayed in opposition both to the Greeks (with whom the Crescentian party had been connected) and to the Saracens. He induced the Pisans to attack the infidels in Sardinia, where the Christian inhabitants were oppressed and persecuted; and the expedition resulted in the conquest of the island. When a Saracen chief sent Benedict a sack full of chestnuts, with a message that he would return at the head of a like number of warriors, the pope sent it back filled with grains of millet, telling the Saracen that, if he were not content with the evil which he had already done, he should find an equal or greater multitude of men in arms ready to oppose him. In 1020 Benedict went into Germany, ostensibly for the consecration of the church of St. Stephen at Bamberg; but the journey had also the more secret object of asking for aid against the Saracens; and he persuaded the emperor once more to lead his troops into Italy, where Henry delivered Rome from its danger by the overthrow of the enemy.

A new power had lately appeared in the south of Italy. The Normans, after their conversion, had caught up with peculiar enthusiasm the passion for pilgrimages which was then so general. Companies of them—usually armed, for defense against the dangers of the way—passed through France and Italy, and, after visiting Monte Gargano, which was famous for an appearance of the archangel Michael, they took ship from the southern harbors of the peninsula for the Holy Land. Early in the eleventh century, a body of about forty Norman pilgrims, who had returned from the east in a vessel belonging to Amalfi, happened to be at Salerno when the place was attacked by a Saracen force. The prince, Guaimar, was endeavoring to raise the means of buying off the infidels; but the Normans, after giving vent to their indignation at the cowardice of the inhabitants, begged him to furnish them with arms, sallied forth against the enemy, and by their example roused the spirit of the Greeks to resistance. The prince rewarded their aid with costly presents, and offered them inducements to remain with him; they declined the invitation, but, at his request, undertook to make his circumstances known in their own country. The sight of the rich and unknown fruits of the south, of the silken dresses and splendid armor which they carried home, excited the adventurous spirit of the Normans. A chief named Osmond Drengot, who was on uneasy terms with his duke in consequence of having slain a nobleman who enjoyed the prince's favor, resolved to go into Italy with his family. He waited on the pope, who advised him to attack the Greeks of Apulia, and, before reaching Monte Gargano, the band was increased to the number of about a hundred warriors. These adventurers entered into the service of the neighboring princes and republics, mixed in their quarrels, and aided them, although not with uniform success, against the Saracens and the Greeks. They were reinforced by outlaws of the neighborhood, and by fresh migrations of their countrymen; they obtained grants from Henry and from the government of Naples, founded and fortified the town of Aversa, in 1029, and established themselves as an independent power, with a territory which was divided into twelve counties—their chief bearing the title of duke of Apulia. But they soon displayed the

habits of robbers, and were at war with all around them. Churches and monasteries were especial sufferers from their rapacity.

Both Henry and Benedict died in 1024. The Tusculans filled the papacy with a brother of the deceased pope, named John, in whose favor they bought the suffrages of the Romans with a large sum of money—a proceeding which the strength which they had by this time acquired would perhaps have rendered unnecessary, but for the circumstance that John was a layman. As Henry was childless, the empire was again without an heir. The choice of the electors fell on Conrad of Franconia, who was descended from a daughter of Otho the Great, and is styled the Salic, probably in order to signify that he sprang from the noblest race of the Franks. A difficulty was raised by some bishops on the ground that Conrad had contracted a marriage within the fifth degree; he was even required to renounce either his wife or the dignity to which he had been chosen. But he firmly refused to consent to a separation, and his queen was crowned at Cologne by the archbishop, Piligrin, who, after having joined in the opposition, requested that he might be allowed to perform the ceremony. The election of Conrad was justified by a course of government which occasioned the saying that his throne stood on the steps of Charlemagne.

It was now considered that the kingdom of Italy depended on Germany, and that the German sovereign was entitled to the empire, but was not actually emperor until his coronation at Rome. In 1026, Conrad was crowned as King of Italy at Milan, by the archbishop, Heribert. He was met by the pope at Como, and, after having suppressed a formidable insurrection at Ravenna, he received the imperial crown at Rome, on Easter-day, 1027. The ceremony was rendered more imposing by the presence of two kings—Canute of England and Denmark, who had undertaken a pilgrimage, and returned with a grant of privileges for the English church; and Rodolph of Provence, to whose dominions Conrad succeeded in 1032, by virtue of a compact which had been made between the king and the late emperor. From Rome Conrad proceeded into the south, where he received the oath of fealty from the local princes, bestowed fresh grants on the Normans, and took measures for organizing a resistance to the Greeks.

On the death of John XIX, in 1033, the Tusculan party appointed to the popedom his cousin Theophylact, a boy of ten or twelve years of age. But this extravagant stretch of their power resulted in its overthrow. The young pope, who styled himself Benedict IX, appeared to be intent on renewing the worst infamies of the preceding century; his shameless debaucheries, although they have been questioned, are established on the testimony of one of his successors—Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, who in 1086 ascended the papal chair as Victor III.

Conrad had chiefly owed his Italian kingdom to the influence of Heribert archbishop of Milan, who had opposed the attempt of the nobles to set up a French rival, Odo of Champagne. The archbishop relied on the interest which he had thus established, and, elated by his spiritual dignity, by his secular power, and by the success which had attended his undertakings, he behaved with great violence in the commotions of the country. These had become very serious. While the nobles cried out against the bishops, their own retainers, or *valvassors*, rose against them; bloody conflicts took place, and Conrad, at Heribert's invitation, again went into Italy for the purpose of investigating the cause of the troubles. The nobles charged the archbishop with having deprived many of them of their fiefs, and with having excited their vassals to insurrection; and Heribert, instead of attempting to clear himself, addressed the emperor with such insolence that an order was given for his arrest. No Italian would dare to touch him; but the Germans were less scrupulous, and he was carried off as a prisoner. The national feeling of the Italians was shocked by such an act against so eminent a prince of the church; even the archbishop's enemies shared in the general indignation and alarm, while his partisans, by means of the clergy and monks, industriously agitated the multitudes. Long trains of penitents in sackcloth and ashes swept solemnly

through the streets, and filled the churches with their litanies, imploring St. Ambrose to deliver his flock. The guardians to whose care Heribert had been committed allowed him to escape; he returned to Milan, and held out the city against the emperor, who, finding himself unable to take it, desolated the surrounding country. Conrad found it convenient to ally himself with pope Benedict, who had lately been expelled by the Romans, and whom, in other circumstances, he would have avoided with disgust; an anathema was uttered against Heribert for his rebellion, and the pope sanctioned the nomination of one of the imperial chaplains to the see of Milan. But both clergy and people adhered to the archbishop, who now offered the crown of Italy to Odo of Champagne. The tempting proposal induced Odo to relinquish an expedition which he had made into Conrad's Lotharingian territory, and to set out towards the Alps; but he was intercepted and killed by Gozzelo, duke of Lorraine, and the emperor became undisputed master of Lombardy. The pope, in reward for his services, was conducted to Rome and reinstated in his office by Conrad; and the vices which he had before displayed were now rendered more odious by the addition of tyrannical cruelty towards those who had opposed him.

After having again visited the south of Italy, the emperor returned to Germany, with health shaken by a sickness which had been fatal to many of his followers. Heribert found means of once more establishing himself in Milan, was reconciled with Conrad's successor, Henry III, and held the see, although not without much disquiet from the contentions between the nobles and the popular party, until his death in 1045. In the spring of 1039, Conrad died at Utrecht. The last months of his life had been spent in visiting various parts of his dominions; and at Arles, in the autumn of 1038, he republished a law which he had before promulgated at Milan, and which became the foundation of the feudal law of Europe — that the inferior vassals, instead of being removable at the will of their lords, should possess a hereditary tenure, which was to be forfeited only in case of felony established by the judgment of their equals.

In 1044 Benedict was again driven from Rome, and John, bishop of Sabino, was set up in his room, under the name of Sylvester III. After three months, however, Benedict was able to expel his rival; and—induced, according to one account, by love for the daughter of a nobleman who refused to allow the marriage except on condition of his vacating the papacy—he sold his interest in it to John Gratian, a presbyter who enjoyed a high reputation for austerity of life. But Benedict was disappointed in his love, and resumed his pretensions to the see, so that Rome was divided between three popes—"three devils", as they are styled by an unceremonious writer of the century— each of them holding possession of one of the principal churches—St. John Lateran, St. Peter's, and St. Mary Major. Benedict was supported by the Tusculan party, and Sylvester by a rival faction of nobles, while Gratian, who had assumed the name of Gregory VI, was the pope of the people. The state of things was miserable; revenues were alienated or intercepted, churches fell into ruin, and disorders of every kind prevailed.

That Gregory was regarded with ardent hope by the reforming party in the church appears from a letter written on his elevation by Peter Damiani, a person who became very conspicuous in the later history of the time. But it is said that the urgency of circumstances obliged him to devote himself to expeditions against the Saracens and the robber chiefs who impoverished the Roman treasury by plundering pilgrims of the gifts intended for it; and that on this account the Romans provided him with an assistant for the spiritual functions of his office.

The scandalous condition of affairs cried aloud for some remedy, and Peter, archdeacon of Rome, went into Germany to request the intervention of Henry III, the son and successor of Conrad. The king resolved to set aside all the claimants of the apostolic chair, and, before setting out for Italy, he gave a token of the course which he intended to pursue by citing before him and depriving Widgers, who had been encouraged by the disorders of Rome

to thrust himself into the archbishopric of Ravenna. At Parma he assembled a council, but, as no pope was present, the investigation into the pretensions of the rivals was adjourned. Gregory met the king at Piacenza, and by his desire convened a second council at Sutri. The other claimants of the papacy were cited, but did not appear; Benedict, who had retired to a monastery, was not mentioned in the proceedings; Sylvester was declared to be an intruder, was deposed from the episcopate and the priesthood, and condemned to be shut up in a cloister. Gregory, who presided over the council, and had perhaps shared in inviting Henry's interference, was then, to his astonishment, desired to relate the circumstances of his elevation. With the simplicity which is described as a part of his character, he avowed the use of bribery (which was perhaps too notorious to be denied); but he said that as, in consideration of his repute, large sums of money had been bestowed on him, which he had intended to expend on pious objects, he had been led to employ a part of them in this manner by a wish to rescue the holy see from the tyranny of the nobles, from its calamities and disgrace. Some members of the council suggested to him that the use of such means was unwarrantable. At these words a new light broke in on the pope; he acknowledged that he had been deceived by the enemy, and requested the bishops to advise him. According to one account, they answered that he would do better to judge himself: whereupon he confessed himself unworthy of the papacy, and stripped off his robes in the presence of the council. Other writers state that he was warned to anticipate a deprivation by resigning; while, according to a third statement, he was deposed. The papacy was vacant; and Henry proceeded to fill it with a pope of his own selection.

CHAPTER VII

THE BRITISH CHURCHES - MISSIONS OF THE TENTH AND ELEVENTH CENTURIES.

The most remarkable subject in the religious history of England between the death of Alfred and the Norman conquest is the struggle between the monks and the secular clergy. The distaste for monachism which had grown up among the Anglo-Saxons has been mentioned in a former chapter. The long-continued invasions of the Danes contributed to the decline of the system, not only by laying waste a multitude of religious houses and butchering or dispersing their inmates, but by compelling men to study almost exclusively the arts of self-preservation and self-defence. Thus the monastic life became extinct in England; and when Alfred attempted to revive it by founding a monastery for men at Athelney and one for women at Shaftesbury, it was found that, although Shaftesbury prospered under the government of one of the king's own daughters, no Englishman of noble or free birth could be persuaded to embrace the monastic profession; so that Alfred was obliged to stock his establishment at Athelney with monks and children from abroad.

In some of the religious houses which had suffered from the Danish ravages, a new class of inmates established themselves. Perhaps (as has been suggested) many of them were persons who had belonged to those inferior orders of the clergy which were not bound to celibacy. Such persons may, in the scarcity of other clerks, have been raised by bishops to the higher degrees without being required to forsake their wives; and the practice thus begun may have been extended to a general neglect of enforcing celibacy on the ministers of the church. From this and other causes it came to pass that the monasteries were occupied by a married clergy, among whom, without too literally understanding the gross accusations of their enemies, we may reasonably believe that there was much of irregularity and of worldly-mindedness. The monastic life, properly so called, was no longer followed; the Englishmen who wished to lead such a life either withdrew to lonely hermitages or betook themselves to foreign monasteries, among which that of Fleury on the Loire—lately reformed by Odo of Cluny, after having fallen into an utter decay of discipline—was the most favorite resort. Such was the state of things when Dunstan entered on his career of reform.

Dunstan was born about the year 925, of noble parentage, in the neighborhood of Glastonbury—a place which enjoyed a peculiar veneration, not only on account of the legends which made it the scene of the first preaching of Christianity in Britain by Joseph of Arimathea, but also from later associations. The fame of St Patrick was fabulously connected with Glastonbury; it was even said to be his burying-place and it was much frequented by Irish, some of whom lived there in the practice of strict devotion, although not bound by any monastic rule, and drew a large number of pupils from the surrounding country. Under these masters Dunstan became a proficient in the learning of the time, and acquired extraordinary accomplishments in calligraphy, painting, sculpture, music, mechanics, and the art of working in metals, so that his skill and ingenuity brought on him the charge of magic. His earlier history abounds in details of rigid asceticism, in tales of strange miracles, of encounters with devils, and of fierce mental conflicts. Having been introduced at the court of king Edmund, he received from the king the church of Glastonbury, with a grant of new privileges; and he erected a magnificent abbey, which he filled with Benedictine monks—the first of their kind who had been seen in England for two hundred years. Dunstan acquired high office and

powerful influence in the state. We are familiar from childhood with some version of the story of his contest with Edwy “the All-fair”—how on the coronation-day he forcibly dragged the king from the society of Ethelgiva, and compelled him to rejoin the boisterous festivity of his nobles; the expulsion of the monks by Edwy from Glastonbury and Abingdon, the only monasteries which then belonged to them; the exile of Dunstan, and his triumphant return as a partisan of the king’s brother Edgar, who forced Edwy to a partition of the kingdom, and soon after became sovereign of the whole. Under Edgar, Dunstan enjoyed an unlimited power. In 958 he obtained the bishopric of Worcester, to which in the following year that of London was added; and in 960 he was advanced to the primacy of Canterbury, as successor of his friend and supporter Odo. He received the pall at Rome from John XII, and, with the approbation of the pope and of the king, he began a reform of the clergy. Edgar, whose cooperation was exacted as a part of the penance incurred by his having carried off a novice or pupil from the nunnery of Wilton, is said to have inveighed at a council in the severest terms against the corruptions of the seculars. The sees of Worcester and Winchester were filled with two of the archbishop’s most zealous partisans—Oswald, a nephew of the late primate, and Ethelwold, abbot of Abingdon, who was styled “the father of monks”, and was a confidential adviser of the king. Seculars were ejected wherever it was possible; all preferment was exclusively bestowed on the regulars; monks were brought from Fleury and other foreign monasteries, to fill the places of the expelled clergy, and to serve as examples to the English of the true monastic life. The canons of Winchester are described by Ethelwold’s biographer as sunk in luxury and licentiousness; they refused to perform the offices of the church, and it is said that, not content with marrying, they indulged themselves in the liberty of changing their wives at pleasure. The bishop, armed with a special authority from the pope, John XIII, summoned them to appear before himself and a commissioner from the king. Throwing down on the floor a number of monastic cowls, he required the clergy either to put on these or to quit their preferments. Three only complied, and the rest were dismissed with pensions from the property of the church. The reformation of Worcester was effected by means of another kind. Oswald, with a company of monks, established in the city a service which rivalled that of the cathedral. The people flocked to the new comers; and the canons of the cathedral, finding themselves deserted, were reduced to acquiesce in the bishop’s measures. In other parts of his diocese, however, Oswald purged the monasteries by a forcible expulsion of the married clergy, and established monks in their room. During the reign of Edgar, forty-seven monasteries were founded, restored, or recovered from the secular clergy. The monks were governed by a rule modified from that of St Benedict, and chiefly derived from Fleury.

Under the next king, Edward the Martyr, a reaction appeared to be threatened. Some noblemen expelled the regulars from monasteries situated on their lands, and reinstated the seculars with their wives and children. Councils were held for the consideration of the matter. At Winchester, Dunstan is said to have gained a victory by means of a crucifix which uttered words forbidding the proposed change. At Calne, where the cause of the seculars was eloquently pleaded by a Scotch or Irish bishop named Beornhelm, Dunstan solemnly told the assembly that he committed the cause of his church to God—on which, it is said, the floor of the hall in which the council was assembled immediately gave way; some were killed and many were severely hurt; while the archbishop and the friends who surrounded him were saved by the firmness of the beam over which they stood. The story of the speaking crucifix appears to be a fiction; the other may be explained without the supposition either that a miracle was wrought in behalf of Dunstan, or that he deliberately contrived a fraud which involved the death or bodily injury of his opponents. The regular clergy got the victory for the time, but it was very imperfectly carried out. With the exception of Worcester and Winchester, no cathedrals were reformed. Dunstan, although he lived to make no attempt to introduce a change at Canterbury—whether it were that he was afraid to venture on such a work, or that reform appeared less necessary there than elsewhere and his coadjutor Oswald,

on being translated to the archbishopric of York, held that see for twenty years (972-992) without disturbing the seculars of his province. The renewal of the Danish invasions diverted the general attention from such matters. Canterbury was transferred to monks by archbishop Aelfric, in 1003; but the other cathedrals remained in possession of the seculars until the end of the Anglo-Saxon period, and throughout the kingdom the triumph of the one or of the other party depended on their strength in each locality. At the council of Eanham, in 1009, it was laid down that all marriage of the clergy is improper; but the council seems to have practically contented itself with attempting to suppress the greater evils which had arisen from such prohibitions—that clerks took more than one wife at a time, or discarded one for another. The secular clergy of England continued to marry, and their issue was regarded as legitimate.

IRELAND.

In common with other western countries, Ireland suffered severely from the ravages of the Northmen, and in resistance to these enemies the clergy frequently took to arms. Favored by the discords of the native chiefs, the Danes made extensive settlements in Ireland; their princes were established at Dublin, Limerick, and Waterford—the last of these a town altogether of their own foundation. Various tribes of Northmen contended for the possession of Dublin. But the power of the strangers was weakened by their internal feuds, and was at length irrecoverably broken at the great battle of Clontarf, fought on Good Friday 1014, where Brian Boru, king of all Ireland, fell at the age of eighty-eight in leading on his countrymen to victory. Dublin, Waterford, and Limerick, however, still remained in possession of the Danes.

The Danes (or *Ostmen*) of Dublin were gradually converted to Christianity. They would not, however, receive bishops from the Irish, but sought consecration for their pastors from the English church, with which their own race had become closely connected. And it was by means of this Danish intercourse with England that Ireland was for the first time brought into connection with the Roman church.

SCOTLAND.

The obscurity which hangs over the church-history of Scotland during this period has been lamented by all who have made that history the special subject of their inquiries. The ancient chronicles have perished, and the story, instead of resting, as elsewhere, on the satisfactory evidence of contemporary narratives, must be sought out and pieced together by the laborious industry and the doubtful guesses of the antiquary. Scotland was much infested by the Danes, who succeeded in establishing themselves in the country to such a degree that a large Scandinavian element may to this day be traced among its population. In 806 they attacked Iona, where sixty-eight of the monks were slain; and it appears that, in consequence of the dangers to which St. Columba's island sanctuary was exposed, Kenneth III in 849 translated the patron's relics, and removed the seat of the Scottish primacy, to Dunkeld. From that time the abbots of Dunkeld exercised the same authority over the church which had before been vested in the abbots of Iona; but the abbot of Iona continued to be the head of the Columbite order of monks. About 905 it is believed that Dunkeld itself became unsafe, and that the primacy was translated to St. Andrews; and in this more permanent seat it acquired a character more nearly resembling the primacy of other countries, by being vested in the bishops of St. Andrews, who were styled "Episcopi Scotorum", while the other bishops of the kingdom were subject to them in the same manner as they had formerly been to the successors of Columba in Iona and Dunkeld.

In the absence of certain information, writers of Scottish history have freely indulged in fables and wild conjectures. Nor has the national fondness for claiming eminent men as our countrymen been limited to those cases in which the ambiguous term Scotus might give some

plausibility to the claim—such as that of the philosopher John, whose other designation, Erigena, has been interpreted as meaning a native of Ayr! Thus it has been attempted, in opposition to clear historical evidence, to maintain that Alcuin was a Scotsman; that Einhard the biographer of Charlemagne was a Scot whose real name was Kineard; that Raban Maur was a Scot, and a monk of Melrose; and even one of the more critical writers, although he grants the English birth of Alcuin, yet imagines that in the same age there was another Albinus, a native of Scotland, to whom he ascribes the authorship of the Caroline Books.

It is unnecessary here to go into a controversy which has been waged as to a class of ecclesiastics styled Culdees, in whom a precedent has been sought for the Presbyterian form of church-government. Their name, which signifies *servants of God*—a designation specially restricted to monks,— is first found in Ireland; and the Culdees of Scotland appear to have been in reality a species of monks, representing the ancient Irish order of St. Columba, although with a discipline which, like that of the English monasteries, had been relaxed in consequence of the Danish invasions. But so far were they from rejecting the episcopal polity, that in many cases they were attached to cathedrals, (as in the archiepiscopal church of York); and in some places, as at St. Andrews, they claimed a share in the election of the bishops. At St. Andrews they retained until the twelfth century the Scottish or Irish ritual, which had been used at York until the time of Alcuin—celebrating their services in a retired corner of the church; but, notwithstanding this and other peculiarities, the contentions which are recorded between such societies and bishops related, not to any difference in religion, but to questions of property or privileges.

RUSSIA

The Greek church in this period extended its communion by the conversion of a nation destined to play an important part in later history the Russians.

The ruling tribe of Russia were Scandinavians, or Northmen, who, while their kinsmen infested the countries of the west, carried their adventurous arms into the vast territory which lies to the south-east of their original seats. The first mention of them in history is under the year 839, when some Russians, who had been sent to Constantinople, accompanied the eastern emperor's ambassadors to the court of Louis the Pious. In 864 the Russian monarchy was founded by Rurik. The northern conquerors gradually enlarged their boundaries; their race intermingled with the older inhabitants of the country, and their Teutonic language was forgotten. They became known to the Greeks by commerce carried on across the Euxine, and by repeated attempts which they made to get possession of Constantinople. Some of Rurik's companions, leaving him in possession of his conquests, proceeded to the eastern capital, where they entered into the imperial service; and the *Varangian* guard, which was thus formed, was recruited by adventurers of kindred race from England and the Scandinavian countries.

The story of the first introduction of Christianity into Russia is embellished by fable. According to the Greek writers, Basil the Macedonian, on concluding a peace with the Russians, sent a bishop and other missionaries into their country. The bishop, in the presence of the Russian prince and nobles, dwelt on the evidence borne by miracles to the truth of the Gospel revelation. They listened attentively, but answered that they would not believe unless they might themselves witness a miracle. The bishop warned them not to tempt God; but, as they had been especially struck by the story of the three youths delivered from the furnace, he proceeded to show a miracle of a similar kind. At his prayer, the book of the Gospels was cast into a fire, and after many hours it was taken out uninjured.

Photius, in his letter to the oriental patriarchs, states that the fierce and barbarous Russians had been converted by the Greek church. But his language greatly overstates any effect which the Christian teachers had at that time produced among them; and although his

predecessor Ignatius is said to have consecrated a bishop for Russia, and to have taken measures for spreading the Gospel in that country, paganism was, in the middle of the following century, again all but universal among the Russians.

In 955, Olga, widow of the Grand-Prince Igur, and regent of Russia, appeared with a large train at Constantinople, where she was received with much honour by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, and was baptised. It is uncertain whether she had undertaken the expedition in consequence of some Christian instruction which had reached her in her own land, or whether, having gone to Constantinople with a view to secular business, she there received impressions which led her to seek for admission into the church. Olga, who at baptism took the name of Helena, endeavored, after her return to Novogorod, to spread her new faith among her subjects. Her son, Svatoslaff, however, withstood her attempts to convert him, alleging that his nobles would despise him if he should change his religion.

Vladimir, the son and successor of Svatoslaff, was importuned, it is said, by the advocates of rival religions of Judaism, of Islam, and of Greek and Latin Christianity. He saw reason for rejecting the Jewish and Mahometan systems, and, in order that he might be able to decide between the two forms of Christianity, he sent commissioners to observe the religion of Germany, of Rome, and of Greece. When at Constantinople, they were deeply impressed by the magnificent building of the patriarchal church, and by the solemn, majestic, and touching character of the Eucharistic service which they witnessed; they told the Greeks who were with them that daring the performance of the rite they had seen winged youths circling through the church and chanting the *Trisagion*. By the report of these envoys Vladimir was determined to adopt the Christianity of the Greeks. In 988, having taken the city of Korsun from the empire, he made proposals for the hand of a Greek princess, Anna, sister of the emperor Basil II and of Theophano, wife of Otho II. To the difficulties raised on the ground of religion, he answered that he was willing to become a Christian. His resolution was shaken by a temporary blindness, which he ascribed to the vengeance of the gods against his apostasy; but at Anna's urgent request he consented to be baptized, and his change of religion was justified by the recovery of his sight as he received the imposition of the bishop of Korsun's hands. The marriage took place forthwith, and Korsun either was restored to the empire, or became the dowry of Vladimir's bride. According to Russian writers, Vladimir, who at baptism had taken the name of Basil, renounced the laxity of his former life for a strict observance of conjugal fidelity, and of other Christian duties; and both he and Anna are numbered among the saints of their church. The Latins, however, assert that his actions did no credit to his new profession.

On his return to Kief the grand-prince ordered the idol of Perun, the chief Russian god, to be dragged through the streets at a horse's tail, and thrown into the Dnieper. Many of the Russians burst into tears at the sight; but, when a proclamation summoned them to repair to the river next day, on pain of being regarded as rebels, the dutiful people argued that, if the proposed change of religion were not good, the prince and nobles would not recommend it. A general baptism of the population took place. "Some", says Nestor, "stood in the water up to their necks, others up to their breasts, holding their young children in their arms; the priests read the prayers from the shore, naming at once whole companies by the same name". Bishoprics were now established, churches were built on the Byzantine model by Greek architects, relics were imported, schools were opened, and children were obliged to attend them, although it is said that the mothers wept, and were as much afraid to send their children for instruction as if they had been sending them to death. The Scriptures, in Cyril's Slavonic version, were introduced a fact which, in defiance of chronology, has been turned into the statement that Cyril himself laboured as a missionary among the Russians.

On the death of Vladimir, in 1015, the division of his dominions among his twelve sons, and the bloody family discords which ensued, interfered with the progress of the Gospel. But Yaroslaff, who at length became the sole ruler of the country, A.D. 1019, zealously

carried on the work. He caused translations of some edifying Greek books to be made for the benefit of his subjects, encouraged the composition of original religious works, and even himself took part in the literary labor. The 'Nomocanon', or collection of ecclesiastical laws, by Photius, was introduced as the rule of discipline. The clergy were exempted from taxes, and from civil duties; but, whereas they had until then been subject to the patriarch of Constantinople, Yaroslaff was careful to place the church on a national footing, with a native Russian for its primate.

BOHEMIA

Although Bohemia had been reckoned among Christian countries, the Gospel was but very imperfectly established in it. On the death of duke Radislav, in 925, his mother Ludmilla (whose conversion has been already mentioned) undertook the care of his two sons, Wenceslav and Boleslav. But the widow of Radislav, Dragomira, who was a zealous pagan, contrived that Ludmilla should be murdered, a crime to which she was instigated alike by the violence of religious enmity and by a fear of losing her share in the administration. Notwithstanding his mother's efforts to turn him away from Christianity, Wenceslav was deeply devoted to it. He lived a life of the strictest sanctity, and is supposed to have been on the point of exchanging his crown for the monastic cowl when his reign was violently brought to an end. His brother Boleslav attacked him when on his way to perform his devotions in a church. Wenceslav, being the stronger of the two, disarmed the traitor, threw him to the ground, and uttered the words "God forgive thee, brother!". But the cries of Boleslav brought his servants to the spot, and, supposing their master to have been attacked, they fell on the duke and slew him.

Boleslav, who is styled "the Cruel", usurped the government. On the birth of a son, soon after, he was led by a strange mixture of motives to devote the child to a religious life by way of expiation; but for many years he carried on a persecution of his Christian subjects, expelling the clergy, and destroying churches and monasteries. In 950, after a long struggle against the power of Otho I, he was obliged to yield, and the emperor, in granting him a peace, insisted that he should establish freedom of religion, and should rebuild the churches which he had demolished.

During the remaining seventeen years of Boleslav's reign the church enjoyed peace; but the complete establishment of Christianity was the work of his son Boleslav "the Pious", who took vigorous measures for the suppression of paganism, and with the consent of the emperor, and that of Wolfgang bishop of Ratisbon, to whose see Bohemia had been considered to belong, founded in 973 the bishopric of Prague. The diocese was to include the whole of Boleslav's dominions, and was to be subject to the archbishop of Mentz (Mayence), as a compensation for the loss of the suffragan see of Magdeburg, which had lately been erected into an independent archbishopric.

The second bishop of Prague was a Bohemian of noble family, who had studied under Adalbert, archbishop of Magdeburg, and, at receiving confirmation from him, had adopted the prelate's name instead of the Bohemian Woytiech. The bishop displayed great activity in his office. He persuaded the duke to build churches and monasteries, and, as his German education had rendered him zealous for the Latin usages, he exerted himself to suppress the Greek rites which had been introduced by way of Moravia. He found that much paganism was still mixed with the Christian profession of his flock, and that gross disorders and immoralities prevailed among them; that the clergy lived in marriage or concubinage; that the people practised polygamy, and marriage within the forbidden degrees; that they sold their serfs and captives to Jewish slave dealers, who disposed of them to heathens and barbarians sometimes for the purpose of sacrifice. Adalbert set himself to reform these evils; but the rigor of his character and his somewhat intemperate zeal excited opposition, which was greatly swelled by

his attempting to introduce the Roman canons without regard to the national laws, and to assert for the church an immunity from all secular judgments. The feuds of his family were also visited on the bishop, and such was the resistance to his authority that he twice withdrew from Bohemia in disgust, and made pilgrimages to Rome and to Jerusalem. In obedience to a Roman synod, he resumed his see; but he finally left it in 996, and, with the sanction of Gregory V, who gave him the commission of a regional archbishop, he set out on a missionary expedition to Prussia, where, after ineffectual attempts to convert the barbarous people, he was martyred on the shore of the Frische Haff in April 997.

Boleslav, duke of Poland, who had encouraged the mission, redeemed the martyr's corpse, and placed it in a church at Gnesen, where, as we have seen, it was with great devotion by Otho III in the year 1000. On that occasion the emperor erected Gnesen into an archbishopric, which he bestowed on one of Adalbert's brothers. In 1039, while the Polish throne was vacant, and the country was a prey to anarchy, the Bohemians, under Bretislav I, took possession of Gnesen, seized on the vast treasures which had been accumulated around the shrine of Adalbert, and resolved to carry off the body of the saint, whose memory had risen to great veneration in his native country. Severus, bishop of Prague, who had accompanied the army, took advantage of the feeling. He declared that Adalbert had appeared to him in a vision, and had made him swear that the Bohemians, as a condition of being allowed to enjoy the presence of his relics in their own land, would bind themselves to the observance of such laws as he had in his lifetime unsuccessfully attempted to establish among them. The relics were then with great solemnity translated to Prague : but Polish writers assert that the invaders were mistaken in their prize, and that the real body of St. Adalbert still remained at Gnesen.

The Slavonic liturgy, which had been sanctioned by pope John VIII for Moravia, was introduced from that country into Bohemia, and naturally excited opposition on the part of the German clergy who laboured among the Slavonic nations. A letter bearing the name of John XIII, which, in professing to confirm the foundation of the see of Prague, requires the Bohemian church to use the Latin language and rites, is said to be spurious. But the use of the Slavonic liturgy was represented by its opponents as a token of heresy. The abbey of Sazawa, founded in 1038, became the chief school of the native Bohemian monasticism, and maintained the Slavonic form. In 1058 the Slavonic monks were expelled from it by duke Spitiuhnew; but five years later they were restored by duke Wratislav, who endeavored to obtain from Gregory VII an approbation of their vernacular service-book. The pope, however, in 1080, replied in terms of strong disapprobation. It was, he said, God's pleasure that Holy Scripture should not be everywhere displayed, lest it might be held cheap and despised, or should give rise to error; the use of the vernacular had been conceded only on account of temporary circumstances, which had now long passed away. Wratislav, who adhered to the emperor Henry IV in his contest with Gregory, continued to sanction the Slavonic ritual at Sazawa; but in 1097 it was again suppressed by his successor, Bretislav II, and the monastery was filled with monks of the Latin rite, who destroyed almost all the Slavonic books. Yet the liturgy thus discountenanced by Rome and its partisans was revived from time to time in Bohemia; and in the convent of Emmaus, at Prague, founded in the fourteenth century by the emperor Charles IV, it was especially sanctioned by pope Clement VI, although with the condition that the use of it should be limited to that place.

In some cases, where people of Slavonic race bordered on the Greek empire, the popes found it expedient to gratify their national feelings by allowing the vernacular service; but elsewhere they endeavored to root it out. Thus, although Alexander II, in 1067, permitted the Slavonic rite in the province of Dioclea, a council held at Spalatro in the following year, under a legate of the same pope, condemned it, on the ground that the Slavonic letters (to which the name of "Gothic" was given) had been invented by Methodius, a heretic, who had written many lying books in the Slavonic tongue against the Catholic faith. The Slavonic liturgy,

however, has continued to be used in many churches of Illyria down to the present time, although unhappily its antiquated language has not only become unintelligible to the people, for whose edification it was originally intended, but is said to be little understood even by the clergy who officiate in it.

POLAND.

It has been supposed that some knowledge of Christianity found its way into Poland from Moravia, and more especially by means of Christian refugees after the ruin of the Moravian kingdom. Yet nothing considerable had been effected towards the conversion of the Poles, when in 965 their duke, Mieceslav, married Dambrowka, a daughter of Boleslav the Cruel of Bohemia. Two years later Dambrowka persuaded her husband to embrace the Christian faith, and he proceeded to enforce it on his subjects under very severe penalties; thus, any one who should eat flesh between Septuagesima and Easter was to lose his teeth. The German chronicler who relates this, Thietmar or Ditmar, bishop of Merseburg, adds that among a people so rude, who needed to be tended like cattle and beaten like lazy asses, means of conversion akin to the severity of their barbaric laws were more likely to be useful than the gentler methods of ordinary ecclesiastical discipline.

The story that the Polish church was organized under the superintendence of a papal legate, with seven bishoprics and two archbishoprics, is now exploded. Posen was the only bishopric in the country, and was subject to the archbishops of Magdeburg, until in 1000 Gnesen was made an archiepiscopal and metropolitan see by Otho III. Although the original Christianity of Poland was derived from Greek sources, the fourth wife of Mieceslav, Oda, daughter of a German marquis, influenced the duke in favor of the Latin system. This princess was active in the encouragement of monks, and in works of piety and charity; and the clergy, in consideration of the benefits which the church derived from her, were willing to overlook the fact that her marriage was a breach of the vows which she had taken as a nun. The establishment of the Latin Christianity was completed under Boleslav, who has been already mentioned as the patron of Adalbert's mission to Prussia. The popes were careful to draw close the bonds which connected Poland with Rome; and from an early time (although the precise date is disputed), a yearly tribute of a penny was paid by every Pole, with exception of the clergy and nobles, to the treasury of St. Peter.

The title of king, which Boleslav acquired, was probably bestowed on him by Otho III on the occasion of his visit to Gnesen. If, however, the dignity was conferred by the imperial power, the popes, according to a story of doubtful authority, soon found a remarkable opportunity of exhibiting and increasing their spiritual jurisdiction over the new kingdom. After the death of king Mieceslav or Miesco II, in 1034, Poland fell into a miserable state of confusion. Paganism again reared its head; there was much apostasy from the Gospel, bishops and clergy were killed or hunted out, churches and monasteries were burnt, and the Bohemian invasion, already mentioned, was triumphant. The Poles, it is said, at length resolved to offer the crown to Casimir, a son of the late king, who had been driven into banishment; and, after much inquiry, he was discovered in a monastery either that of Cluny or the German abbey of Braunweiler. Casimir had taken the monastic vows, and had been ordained a deacon; and the abbot declared that, although grieved for the misery of Poland, he could not release the prince from these engagements, unless by the pope's permission. For this, application was made to Benedict IX, by whom, after much entreaty, Casimir was discharged from his ecclesiastical obligations, and was given up to the Poles, with permission to marry and to undertake the government; but the pope stipulated that, in remembrance of their having received a king from the church, every male of the nation should use a certain sort of tonsure, and that other marks of subjection should be shown to the see of St. Peter.

NORTH GERMANY

During the tenth century the German sovereigns especially Henry the Fowler and Otho the Great labored to provide for the suppression of paganism in the northern part of their dominions. With a view to this, bishoprics were established at Meissen, Merseburg, and elsewhere, and Magdeburg was erected into a metropolitan see. But little impression could be made on the Slavonic tribes in those quarters. A natural prejudice was felt against the Gospel as a religion which offered to them by the Germans; the German missionaries were ignorant of Slavonic; and it is said that the clergy showed greater eagerness to raise money from the people than to instruct them. From time to time extensive insurrections against the foreign power took place, and in these insurrections churches were destroyed and clergy were slain. In 1047, the kingdom of the Wends was established by Gottschalk, who zealously endeavored to promote Christianity among his subjects. He founded churches and monasteries, and, like the Northumbrian Oswald, he himself often acted as interpreter while the clergy preached in a tongue unintelligible to his people. But in 1066 Gottschalk was murdered by the pagans; many Christians were massacred at the same time, among whom the aged John, a native of Ireland and bishop of Mecklenburg, was singled out as a victim for extraordinary cruelties; and Christianity appeared to be extirpated from the country.

HUNGARY

The history of the introduction of Christianity into Hungary has been the subject of disputes, chiefly arising from the question whether it was effected by the Greek or by the Latin church. It appears, in truth, that the first knowledge of the Gospel came from Constantinople, where two Hungarian princes, Bolosudes and Gyulas, were baptized in the year 948. Bolosudes relapsed into paganism, and, after having carried on hostilities against both empires, he was taken and put to death by Otho the Great in 955. But Gyulas remained faithful to his profession, and many of his subjects were converted by the preaching of clergy who were sent to him from Constantinople, with a bishop named Hierotheus at their head.

The great victory of Otho in 955 opened a way for the labors of the neighboring German bishops among the Hungarians. About twenty years later, Pilligrin, bishop of Passau, reported to pope Benedict VII that he had been entreated by the people of Hungary to assist them; that he had sent clergy and monks, who had baptized about five thousand of them; that the land was full of Christian captives, who had formerly been obliged to conceal their religion, and had only been able to get their children baptized by stealth, but that now the hindrances to the open profession of Christianity were removed; that not only the Hungarians, but the Slavonic tribes of the neighborhood, were ready to embrace the Gospel; and he prayed that bishops might be appointed for the work. This representation of the state of things may probably have been heightened by Pilligrin's desire to obtain for himself the pall, with the title of archbishop of Lorch, which had been conferred on some of his predecessors, while the rest, as simple bishops of Passau, had been subject to the archiepiscopal see of Salzburg. The pope rewarded him by addressing to the emperor and to the great German prelates a letter in which he bestows on Pilligrin, as archbishop of Lorch, the jurisdiction of a metropolitan over Bavaria, Lower Pannonia, Moesia, and the adjoining Slavonic territories. Yet little seems to have been done in consequence for the conversion of the Hungarians; Wolfgang, who was sent as a missionary to them, met with such scanty success, that Pilligrin, unwilling to waste the energies of a valuable auxiliary in fruitless labors, recalled him to become bishop of Ratisbon.

Geisa, who from the year 972 was duke of Hungary, married Sarolta, daughter of Gyulas, a woman of masculine character, and by her influence was brought over to Christianity. Although the knowledge of the faith had been received by Sarolta's family from

Greece, her husband was led by political circumstances to connect his country with the western church, and he himself appears to have been baptized by Bruno, bishop of Verdun, who had been sent to him as ambassador by Otho I. But Geisa's conversion was of no very perfect kind. While professing himself a Christian, he continued to offer sacrifice to idols, and, when Bruno remonstrated, he answered that he was rich enough and powerful enough to do both. In 983, or the following year, a bishop named Adalbert probably the celebrated bishop of Prague appeared in Hungary, and baptised Geisa's son Waik, then four or five years old. The young prince, to whom the name of Stephen was given, became the most eminent worthy of Hungarian history. Unlike his father, he received a careful education. In 997, he succeeded Geisa, and he reigned for forty-one years, with a deserved reputation for piety, justice, bravery, and firmness of purpose. A pagan party, which at first opposed him, was put down; he married a Bavarian princess, Gisela, sister of duke Henry (afterwards the emperor Henry II), and in 1000 he obtained the erection of his dominions into a kingdom from Otho III. In fulfillment of a vow which he had made during the contest with his heathen opponents he earnestly exerted himself for the establishment of Christianity among his subjects. His kingdom, which he extended by the addition of Transylvania and part of Wallachia, (a territory known as Black Hungary), was placed under the special protection of the blessed Virgin. He erected episcopal sees, built many monasteries and churches, and enacted that every ten villas in the kingdom should combine to found and endow a church. Monks and clergy from other countries were invited to settle in Hungary, and it appears that the services which Stephen had done to the church procured for him a commission to act as vicar of the Roman see in his dominions, a privilege which his successors continued to claim. He founded a college for the education of Hungarians at Rome; he built hospitals and monasteries for his countrymen at Rome, Ravenna, Constantinople, and Jerusalem; and such was his hospitality to pilgrims that the journey through Hungary came to be generally preferred to a sea voyage by those who were bound for the Holy Land. The means which Stephen employed to recommend the Gospel and the observance of its duties were not always limited to pure persuasion; thus a free Hungarian who should refuse to embrace Christianity was to be degraded to the condition of a serf; any one who should be found laboring on Sunday was to be stopped, and the horses, oxen, or tools used in the work were to be taken away from him; and any persons who should converse in church were, if of higher station, to be turned out with disgrace; if of "lesser and vulgar" rank, to be publicly flogged into reverence for the sanctity of the place.

Stephen died in 1038. His son Emmerich or Henry, for whom he had drawn up a remarkable code of instructions, had died some years before; and the king bequeathed his dominions to a nephew named Peter, who was soon after dethroned. A period of internal discord followed; and twice within the eleventh century, the paganism which had been repressed so forcibly that king Andrew, in 1048, had even enacted death as the punishment for adhering to it, recovered its ascendancy in Hungary so as for a time to obscure the profession of the Gospel.

DENMARK

Among the nations to which Anskar had preached, Christianity was but very partially adopted. Its progress was liable to be checked by the paganism of some princes; it was liable to be rendered odious by the violent measures which other princes took to enforce it on their subjects; while the barbarism and ignorance of the Northmen opposed a formidable difficulty to its success. Hamburg and Bremen, the sees planted for the evangelization of Nordalbingia and Scandinavia, were repeatedly attacked both by the Northmen and by the Slaves; but the victories of Henry I established the Christian power, and he erected the Mark of Sleswick as a protection for Germany against the northern inroads. The conversions in Denmark had been

limited to the mainland; the islands were still altogether pagan, and human victims continued to be offered in Zealand, until Henry obtained from Gorm, who was the first king of all Denmark, that Christians should be allowed freedom of religion throughout the kingdom, and that human sacrifices should cease. Unni, archbishop of Bremen and Hamburg, undertook the work of a missionary in Denmark. His endeavors to make a convert of Gorm were unsuccessful; but he baptised one of the inferior kings named Frode, and found a supporter in Gorm's son, Harold Blaatand (Blue-tooth or Black-tooth), who had derived some knowledge of the Gospel from the instructions of a Christian mother. The prince, however, was still unbaptized; he retained the cruelty, the rapacity, and the other usual vices of the northern plunderers, and for many years his religious belief was of a mixed kind. In 966 a missionary named Poppo, while enjoying Harold's hospitality, fell into an argument with some of the guests, who, although they allowed Christ to be God, maintained that there were other Gods of higher dignity and power. In proof of the exclusive truth of his religion, Poppo (it is said) underwent the ordeal of putting on a red-hot iron gauntlet, and wearing it without injury to his hand, until the king declared himself satisfied. From that time Harold attached himself exclusively to Christianity, although he was not baptized until Otho the Great, after defeating him in 972, insisted on his baptism as a condition of peace. The intemperate zeal with which the king now endeavored to enforce the reception of the Gospel provoked two rebellions, headed by his own son Sweyn; and, after a reign of fifty years, Harold was dethroned, and died of a wound received in battle.

Although Sweyn had been brought up as a Christian, and had been baptized at the same time with his father, he persecuted the faith for many years, until, towards the end of his life, when his arms had been triumphant in England, he was there brought back to the religion of his early days. In 1014 he was succeeded by Canute, who, both in England and in his northern dominions, endeavored, by a bountiful patronage of the church, to atone for his father's sins and for his own. When present at the coronation of Conrad as emperor, he obtained from him a cession of the Mark of Sleswick. Monasteries were founded in Denmark by Canute, and perhaps the payment of Peter's pence was introduced by him; hospitals for Danish pilgrims were established at Rome and at some stations on the way to it. Three bishops and a number of clergy were sent from England into Denmark; but Unwan, archbishop of Bremen, regarding these bishops as intruders into his province, caught one of them, compelled him to acknowledge the metropolitan rights of Bremen, and sent him to Canute, who thereupon agreed to submit the Danish church to the jurisdiction of that see. Sweyn Estrithsen, who, eight years after the death of his uncle Canute, obtained possession of the Danish throne, although a man of intemperate and profligate life, was very munificent to the church, and did much for the extension of Christianity in the islands of his kingdom. The English missionaries had preached in their native tongue, while at every sentence their words were explained by an interpreter; but Sweyn, to remedy this difficulty for the future, provided that such foreigners as were to labor in the instruction of his subjects should be previously initiated in the Danish language by the canons of Hamburg. Among the memorable events of this reign was the penance to which the king was obliged to submit by William, bishop of Roskiel, for having caused some refractory nobles to be put to death in a church a penance imitated from that of Theodosius. Sweyn died in 1076.

CHRISTIANITY IN SWEDEN

The Christianity planted by Anskar in Sweden was almost confined to the neighborhood of Birka, and for about seventy years after the apostle's death the country was hardly ever visited by missionaries. Unni, archbishop of Bremen, after the expedition to Denmark which has been mentioned, crossed the sea to Sweden in 935, and labored there until his death in the following year. A mixture of paganism and Christianity arose, which is

curiously exemplified in a drinking song still extant, where the praises of the divine Trinity are set forth in the same style which was used in celebrating the gods of Walhalla.

The reign of Olave Stotkonung, who became king towards the end of the tenth century, and died about 1024, was important for the propagation of the Gospel in Sweden. Some German clergy, and many from England, were introduced into the country; among them was Sigfrid, archdeacon of York, who labored among the Swedes for many years. Two of his relations, who had joined him in the mission, were murdered by heathens. The chief murderer escaped, and his property was confiscated; some of his accomplices, who were found, were, at Sigfrid's intercession, allowed to compound for their crime by payment of a fine; and the funds thus obtained served to found the bishopric of Wexio, to which Sigfrid was consecrated by the archbishop of Bremen. Olave had meditated the destruction of the temple at Upsal, which was the principal seat of the old idolatry; he was, however, diverted from his intention by the entreaties of his heathen subjects, who begged him to content himself with taking the best portion of the country, and building a church for his own religion, but to refrain from attempting to force their belief. On this he removed to Skara, in West Gothland, and founded a see there, to which Thurgot, an Englishman, was consecrated. The ancient Runic characters were superseded among the Swedes by the Latin alphabet, and the influence of Christianity triumphed over the national love of piracy.

But the violence of the measures by which Olave endeavored to advance the Gospel excited a general hatred against him among the adherents of the old religion, and he was obliged to admit his son Emund to a share in the government. Emund, after his father's death, had a disagreement with the archbishop of Bremen, and set up some bishops independent of that prelate's metropolitan jurisdiction having obtained consecration for them in Poland. But this arrangement was given up by his second successor, Stenkil, whose mild and wise policy was more favorable to the advancement of the faith than the more forcible proceedings of Olave had been. Under Stenkil, the number of churches in Sweden was increased to about eleven hundred. His death, which took place in 1066, was followed by bloody civil wars, and for a time paganism resumed its ascendancy; but in 1075 king Inge forbade all heathen worship, and, although this occasioned his expulsion, while his brother-in-law Soen was set up by the heathen party, Inge eventually recovered his throne, and, after much contention, Christianity was firmly established in the country. According to Adam of Bremen, a contemporary of the king, the scandal produced by the covetousness of too many among the clergy had been the chief hindrance to the general conversion of the Swedes, whom he describes as well disposed to receive the Gospel.

NORWAY

Among the Norwegians, some converts had been made in the time of Anskar, and the more readily, because the profession of Christianity opened to them the trade of England and of Germany. Yet such converts, although they acknowledged the power of Christ, and believed him to be the God of England, had greater confidence in the gods of Odin's race, whom they regarded as still reigning over their own laud; and it was not until a century later that a purer and more complete Christianity was introduced into Norway.

Eric "of the Bloody Axe", whose cruelties had rendered him detested by his subjects, was dethroned in 938 by his brother Haco. The new king had been educated as a Christian in the English court, under Athelstan, and was resolved to establish his own faith among his subjects. Some of his chief adherents were won to embrace the Gospel. He postponed the great heathen feast of Yule from midwinter in order that it might fall in with the celebration of the Saviour's nativity; and while the other Norwegians were engaged in their pagan rejoicings, Haco and his friends, in a building by themselves, kept the Christian festival. Clergy were brought from England, and some congregations of converts were formed. But when the

reception of Christianity was proposed in the national assembly, a general murmur arose. It was said that the rest of Sunday and Friday, which was required by the new faith, could not be afforded. The servants who had attended their masters to the meeting cried out that, if they were to fast, their bodies would be so weakened as to be unfit for work. Many declared that they could not desert the gods under whom their forefathers and themselves had so long prospered; they reminded the king how his people had aided him in gaining the crown, and told him that, if he persisted in his proposal, they would choose another in his stead. Haco found himself obliged to yield. He was forced to preside at the next harvest sacrifice, where he publicly drank to the national gods; and, as he made the sign of the cross over his cup, Sigurd, his chief adviser, told the company that it was meant to signify the hammer of their god Thor. The heathen party, however, were still unsatisfied. Eight of their chiefs bound themselves to extirpate Christianity; they assaulted and killed some of the clergy, and at the following Yule-feast Haco was compelled to submit to further compliances : to drink to the gods without making the sign of the cross, and to prove himself a heathen by partaking of the liver of a horse which had been offered in sacrifice. Feeling this constraint intolerable, he resolved to meet his opponents in arms; but an invasion by Eric's sons, who had obtained aid from Harold Blaatand of Denmark, induced the Norwegian parties to enter into a reconciliation, and to turn their arms against the common enemy. From that time Haco lived in harmony with his people, not only tolerating their heathenism, but himself yielding in some degree to the influence of a heathen queen. In 963 his nephews renewed their attack, and Haco was mortally wounded. He expressed a wish, in case of recovery, to retire to some Christian land, that he might endeavor by penance to expiate his compliances, which weighed on his conscience as if he had been guilty of apostasy. But when his friends proposed that he should be carried to England for burial, he answered that he was unworthy of it that he had lived as a heathen, and as a heathen should be buried in Norway. His death was lamented by a scald in a famous song, which celebrates his reception into Walhalla, and intimates that, in consideration of the tolerance which he had shown towards the old religion, his own Christianity was forgiven by the gods.

Harold, the son of Eric, who now became master of the kingdom, endeavored to spread Christianity by forcible means. After some commotions, in the course of which the son of Eric was slain, Harold Blaatand added Norway to his dominions, and appointed a viceroy, named Haco, who, unlike his master, was so devoted a pagan that he sacrificed one of his own children. The viceroy exerted himself for the restoration of paganism, and, by the help of the party who adhered to it, established himself in independence of the Danish king. But the oppressed Christians invited to their relief Olave, the son of a petty prince named Tryggve, and Haco was dethroned in 995.

Olave Tryggvesen is celebrated in the northern chronicles as the strongest, the bravest, and the most beautiful of men. After a life of wild adventure, in the course of which he had visited Russia and Constantinople, and had spread terror along the coasts of the western ocean, he had been baptized by a hermit in one of the Scilly Islands, and had been confirmed by Elphege, bishop of Winchester, in the presence of the English king Ethelred. Although his Christian practice was far from perfect (for, among other things, he married his stepmother, and endeavored to obtain a knowledge of the future by the arts of divination), yet his zeal for his religion was unbounded, and manifested itself in exertions for the spreading of the faith, which savoured less of the Christian spirit than of his old piratical habits, and of the despotism which he had seen in Russia and in the eastern empire. Gifts and privileges of various kinds, and even marriage with the king's beautiful sisters, were held out to the chiefs as inducements to embrace the Gospel; while those who should refuse were threatened with confiscation of property, with banishment, mutilation, tortures, and death. In the most blamable of his proceedings, Olave was much influenced by the counsels of Thangbrand, a German priest from whom he had derived his first knowledge of the Gospel, but whose character was so violent that he did not scruple even to kill those who offended or thwarted him. The king

visited one district after another, for the purpose of establishing Christianity. “Wheresoever he came”, says Snorro Sturleson, in describing one of his circuits, “to the land or to the islands, he held an assembly, and told the people to accept the right faith and to be baptized. No man dared to say anything against it, and the whole country which he passed through was made Christian”.

Strange stories are related of the adventures which he encountered in destroying idols and temples, and of the skill and presence of mind with which he extricated himself from the dangers which he often incurred on such occasions. In one place Olave found eighty heathens who professed to be wizards. He made one attempt to convert them when they were sober, and another over their horns of ale; and, as they were not to be won in either state, he set fire to the building in which they were assembled. The chief of the party alone escaped from the flames; but he afterwards fell into the king’s hands, and was thrown into the sea. Another obstinate pagan and sorcerer had a serpent forced down his throat; the creature ate its way through his body, and caused his death. A less unpleasing tale relates Olave’s dealings with a young hero named Endrid, who at length agreed that his religion should be decided by the event of a contest between himself and a champion to be appointed by the king. Olave himself appeared in that character; in a trial which lasted three days, he triumphantly defeated Endrid in swimming, in diving, in archery, and in sword-play; and having thus prepared him for the reception of Christian doctrine, he completed his conversion by instructing him in the principles of the faith. The insular parts of Olave’s dominions were included in his labors for the extension of the Gospel; he forced the people of the Orkneys, of the Shetland, the Faroe, and other islands, to receive Christianity at the sword’s point. In obedience to a vision which he had seen at a critical time, Olave chose St. Martin as the patron of Norway, and ordered that the cup which had been usually drunk in honor of Thor should in future be dedicated to the saint. In 997, he founded the bishopric of Nidaros or Drontheim.

Olave’s zeal for Christianity at length cost him his life. Sigrid, the beautiful widow of a Swedish king, after having resisted the suit of the petty princes of Sweden so sternly that she even burnt one of them in his castle, in order (as she said) to cure the others of their desire to win her hand, conceived the idea of marrying the king of Norway, and with that view visited his court. Olave was inclined to the match; but, on her refusal to be baptized, he treated her with outrageous indignity, which filled her with a vehement desire of revenge. Sigrid soon after married Sweyn of Denmark. Her new husband, and the child of her first marriage, Olave Stotkonung, combined, at her urgent persuasion, in an expedition against Norway, and their force was strengthened by a disaffected party of Norwegians, under Eric, son of that Haco whom Olave had put down. A naval engagement took place, and the fortune of the day was against Olave, His ship, the “Long Dragon”, after a desperate defence, was boarded; on which the king and nine others, who were all that remained of the crew, threw themselves into the sea, in order that they might not fall into the hands of their enemies. Rude and violent as Olave was, he was so beloved by his subjects that many are said to have died of grief for him, and even the heathens cherished his memory. He was believed to be a saint; it was said that he had performed miracles, and that angels had been seen to visit him while at his prayers; and legends represented him as having long survived the disastrous fight. Nearly fifty years later, it is told, a Norwegian named Gaude, who had lost his way among the sands of Egypt, was directed by a dream to a monastery, where, to his surprise, he found an aged abbot of his own country. The old man’s questions were such that the pilgrim was led to ask whether he were himself king Olave. The answer was ambiguous; but the abbot charged Gaude, on returning to Norway, to deliver a sword and a girdle to a warrior who had sought death with Olave but had been rescued from the waves; and to tell him that on the fatal day no one had borne himself more bravely than he. Gaude performed his commission, and the veteran, on receiving the gifts and the message, was assured that the Egyptian abbot could be no other than his royal master.

The progress of the Gospel in Norway was slow during some years after the end of Olave Tryggvesen's reign. But his godchild Olave, the son of Harold, who became king in 1015, was bent on carrying on the work. Many missionaries were invited from England; at their head was a bishop named Grimkil, who drew up a code of ecclesiastical law for Norway. Although his own character was milder than that of Olave Tryggvesen, the king pursued the old system of enforcing Christianity by such penalties as confiscation, blinding, mutilation, and death, and, like the elder Olave, he made journeys throughout his dominions, in company with Grimkil, with a view to the establishment of the faith. He found that under the pressure of scarcity the people were accustomed to relapse into the practice of sacrificing to their old gods. He often had to encounter armed resistance. At Dalen, in 1025, the inhabitants had been excited by the report of his approach, and on arriving he found 700 exasperated pagans arrayed against him. But, although his own party was only half the number, he put the peasants to flight, and a discussion on the merits of the rival religions ensued. Grimkil "the horned man", as the heathens called him from the shape of his cap or mitre maintained the cause of Christianity; to which the other party, headed by a chief named Gudbrand, replied that their own god Thor was superior to the Christians' God, inasmuch as he could be seen. The king spent a great part of the following night in prayer. Next morning at daybreak the huge idol of Thor was brought to the place of conference. Olave pointed to the rising sun as a visible witness to his God, who created it; and, while the heathens were gazing on its brightness, a gigantic soldier, in fulfillment of orders which he had before received from the king, raised his club and knocked the idol to pieces. A swarm of loathsome creatures, which had found a dwelling within its body, and had fattened on the daily offerings of food and drink, rushed forth; and the men of Dalen, convinced of the vanity of their old superstition, consented to be baptized.

The forcible means which Olave used in favor of his religion, the taxes which he found it necessary to impose, and the rigor with which he proceeded for the suppression of piracy and robbery, aroused great discontent among his subjects. Canute of Denmark and England was encouraged to claim the kingdom of Norway; his gold won many of the chiefs to his interest, and Olave, finding himself deserted, fled into Russia, where he was honorably received by Yaroslaff, and was invited to settle by the offer of a province.

But, while hesitating between the acceptance of this offer and the execution of an idea which he had entertained of becoming a monk at Jerusalem, he was diverted by a vision, in which Olave Tryggvesen exhorted him to attempt the recovery of the kingdom which God had given him. The Swedish king supplied him with some soldiers; and on his landing in Norway, multitudes flocked to his standard. Olave refused the aid of all who were unbaptized; many received baptism from no other motive than a wish to be allowed to aid him; and his soldiers marched with the sign of the cross on their shields. On the eve of a battle he gave a large sum of money to be laid out for the souls of his enemies who should fall; those who should lose their lives for his own cause, he said, were assured of salvation. But the forces of the enemy were overpowering, and Olave was defeated and slain.

After a time his countrymen repented of their conduct towards him. It was rumored that he had done miracles in Russia, and on his last fatal expedition his blood had healed a wound in the hand of the warrior who killed him; a blind man, on whose eyes it had been accidentally rubbed, had recovered his sight; and other cures of a like kind were related. A year after his death his body was disinterred by Grimkil, when no signs of decay appeared, and the hair and nails had grown. The remains of the king were removed to the church of St. Clement at Nidaros, which he himself had built, and when, in the following century, a cathedral was erected by the sainted archbishop Eystein (or Augustine) they were enclosed in a magnificent silver shrine, above the high altar. St. Olave was chosen as the patron of Norway; his fame was spread far and wide by a multitude of miracles, and pilgrims from distant countries flocked to his tomb for cure : tribute was paid to him by Norway and

Sweden; and churches were dedicated to his honor, not only in the western countries, but in Russia and at Constantinople.

Canute, after becoming master of Norway, encouraged religion there as in his other dominions. By him the first Benedictine monastery in the kingdom was founded near Nidaros. Harold Hardrada, Olave's half-brother, a rough and irreligious man, who became king in 1047, had some differences with pope Alexander II, and with Adalbert archbishop of Bremen. The king said that he knew no archbishop in Norway except himself, and obtained ordination for bishops from England and from France; while Adalbert, declaring that he had but two masters, the pope and the emperor, paid no regard to the northern sovereign, and without his consent erected sees in his dominions. Norway, like the rest of western Christendom, submitted to the dominion of Rome.

ICELAND

Iceland became known to the Norwegians in 860, when a Norwegian vessel was cast on its coast. In 874, the first Norwegian colonist, Ingulf, settled in the island; and in the following years many of his countrymen resorted to it, especially after the great victory of Harold the Fairhaired at Hafursfiord, in 883, by which a number of petty kings or chiefs were driven from their native land to seek a home elsewhere. The colonists were of the highest and most civilized class among the Northmen, and the state of society in the new community took a corresponding character. The land was parcelled out, and the Icelanders, renouncing the practice of piracy, betook themselves to trade exchanging the productions of their island for the corn, the wood, and other necessaries which it did not afford. A republican form of government was established, and lasted for four hundred years. It had its national and provincial assemblies; its chief was the "lawman", elected for life, whose office it was to act as conservator of the laws; and with this magistracy the function of priest was joined. The worship of Odin was established, but it would seem that there was an entire freedom as to religion.

It is said that the colonists found in Iceland traces of an Irish mission such as service-books, bells, and pastoral crooks although the natives, having been left without any clergy, had relapsed into paganism. Some of the Norwegians themselves may also have carried with them such mixed and imperfect notions of Christianity as were to be gathered in the intercourse of their roving and adventurous life; but the knowledge of the Gospel was neither spread among the other members of the community nor transmitted to their own descendants. In 981, an Icelander named Thorwald, who had formerly been a pirate, but even then had been accustomed to spend such part of his plunder as he could spare in redeeming captives from other pirates, brought with him to the island a Saxon bishop named Frederick, by whom he had been converted. A church was built, and Frederick's instructions were well received, although most of his proselytes refused to be baptized being ashamed, it is said, to expose themselves naked at the ceremony, and to wear the white dress which in their country was worn by children only. An influential convert, named Thorkil, before submitting to baptism, desired that it might be administered by way of experiment to his aged and infirm father-in-law; and, as the old man died soon after, Thorkil put off his own baptism for some years. The worshippers of Odin were roused to enmity by the rough manner in which Thorwald proceeded to spread his religion. After five years he and the bishop were expelled, and took refuge in Norway, where Thorwald, meeting with one of those who had most bitterly opposed him in Iceland, killed him. Frederick, hopeless of effecting any good in company with so lawless an associate, returned to his own country, and it is supposed that Thorwald, after many years of wandering, in the course of which he had visited the Holy Land, founded a monastery in Russia or at Constantinople, and there died.

Olave Tryggvesen, partly, perhaps, from political motives was desirous of establishing the Gospel in Iceland, and, after some earlier attempts to forward its progress, sent Thangbrand, the German priest who has been already mentioned, into the island in 997. The choice of a missionary was unfortunate; Thangbrand, it is said, performed some miracles; but he proceeded with his usual violence, and, after having killed one of his opponents, and two scalds who had composed scurrilous verses on him, he was expelled. Olave, on receiving from Thangbraud a report of the treatment which he had met with, was very indignant, and was about to undertake an expedition for the punishment of the Icelanders, when Gissur and Hialte, two natives of the island, obtained his consent to the employment of milder measures for the conversion of their country-men. By the promise of a sum of money (which, however, was rather a lawful fee than a bribe), they secured the cooperation of the lawman Thorgeir, who, after addressing the national assembly in an exhortation to peace and unity, proposed a new law by way of compromise. All the islanders were to be baptized, the temples were to be destroyed, and public sacrifices were to cease; but it was to be allowed to eat horseflesh, to expose children, and to offer sacrifice in private. The proposal was adopted, and Christian instruction gradually prevailed over such remnants of heathenism as the law had sanctioned. St. Olave took an interest in the Christianity of Iceland; he sent an English bishop named Bernard to labour there, and exerted himself to procure the acceptance of Grimkil's ecclesiastical laws, and the abolition of the practice of exposing children.

Although Iceland was from time to time visited by bishops, the need of a fixed episcopate was felt, and in 1056 the see of Skalholt was erected. Isleif, a son of Gissur, who had been educated at Erfurt and had made a pilgrimage to Rome, was elected a bishop, and, in obedience to an order from the pope, was consecrated by Adalbert of Bremen. With the consent of a younger Gissur, who had succeeded his father Isleif in the bishoprick of Skalholt, a second see was founded at Hollum in 1105. The bishops, being taken from the most distinguished families, and invested, like the priests of the old idolatry, with secular power, became the most important members of the community. Adam of Bremen, who draws a striking picture of the contented poverty, the piety, and the charity of the islanders, tells us that they obeyed their bishop as a king. In 1121 the first Icelandic monastery was founded, and at a later time the island contained seven cloisters for men and two for women. The Icelanders traded to all quarters; their clergy, educated in Germany, France, and England, carried back the knowledge and the civilization of foreign countries. And in this remote and ungenial island grew up a vernacular literature of annals, poems, and sagas or historical legends the oldest literature of the Scandinavians, and the only source of information as to a great part of northern history. This literature flourished for two centuries, until, on the reduction of Iceland to tribute by the Norwegians in 1261, Latin became there, as elsewhere, the language of letters.

GREENLAND

From Iceland the Gospel made its way into a yet more distant region. In 982, a Norwegian named Eric the Red, who had fled to Iceland in consequence of having killed a man, and was there sentenced to banishment on account of a feud in which he was involved, determined to seek out a coast which had some years before been seen by one Gunnbiorn. Four years later, when the time of his banishment was expired, Eric revisited Iceland, and induced many of his countrymen to accompany him to the land of his refuge, to which with a design, as is said, of attracting adventurers by the promise which it conveyed the name of Greenland was given. In 999, Leif, the son of Eric, made a voyage to Norway, where Olave Tryggvesen induced him to receive baptism; and on his return to Greenland he was accompanied by a priest. The colony flourished for centuries. In 1055 (a year before the foundation of the first Icelandic see), a bishop was consecrated for it by Adalbert of Bremen.

There were thirteen churches in the eastern part of Greenland, four in the western, and three or four monasteries. Sixteen bishops in succession presided over the church of Greenland. From the year 1276 they took their title from the see of Gardar; they were subject to the archbishop of Nidaros, and were in the habit of attending synods in Norway as well as in Iceland. And even from this extremity of the earth tribute was paid to the successors of St. Peter. But from the middle of the fifteenth century Greenland was lost to the knowledge of Europeans. The ice accumulated on its shores, so as to render them inaccessible, and the seventeenth bishop destined for the church was unable to land. The pestilence known as the "Black Death" wasted the population, and it is supposed that, when thus weakened, they were overpowered by tribes of Skrallings (Esquimaux) from the continent of North America, the ancestors of the present inhabitants.

The Northmen appear to have pushed their discoveries from Greenland to the American continent. In the year 1000, Leif, the son of Eric the Red, incited by the narrative of Biorn, the son of Heriulf, as to his adventures when in search of Greenland, sailed southward, and explored several coasts, to one of which the name of Vinland (or Vineland) was given, because one of his companions, a native of southern Germany, recognized the vine among its productions. Further explorations were afterwards made in the same direction; and settlements were for a time effected on the shores of the great western continent. A bishop named Eric is said to have accompanied an expedition to Vinland in 1121; but nothing further is known of him, and it would seem that no confidence can be placed in the conjectures or inquiries which profess to have found in America traces of a Christianity planted by the Scandinavian adventurers of the middle ages.

CHAPTER VIII.

HERESIES. A.D. 1000-1052.

The beginning of the eleventh century is remarkable for the appearance of heretical teachers in various parts of Italy and France. It would appear that the doctrines professed by some of these persons had long been lurking among the Italians, and that now the discredit into which the church had fallen combined with the general suffering and distraction of the time to draw them forth into publicity and to procure adherents for them. From the fact that Gerbert, at his consecration as archbishop of Reims (A.D. 991), made a profession of faith in which he distinctly condemned (among other errors) some leading points of the Manichæan system, it has been inferred that heresy of a Manichæan character was then prevalent in some neighboring quarter; but perhaps it may be enough to suppose that the Manichæism which Gerbert wished to disavow was one of the many errors with which he was personally charged by the enmity or the credulity of his contemporaries. The opinions which were now put forth were of various kinds. One Leutard, a man of low condition, who about the year 1000 made himself notorious in the neighborhood of Châlons-on-the-Marne, would seem to have been a crazy fanatic. He professed to have received commands from heaven while sleeping in a field; whereupon he went home, put away his wife “as if by evangelic precept”, and, going into a church, broke the crucifix. He denounced the payment of tithes, and said that some parts of Scripture were not to be believed, although, when summoned before the bishop of the diocese, he alleged scriptural texts as evidence of his mission. For a time Leutard found many proselytes; but the greater part of them were recovered by the bishop, and their leader drowned himself in a well.

In another quarter, Vilgard, a grammarian of Ravenna, who was put to death for his heresy, attempted a revival of the classical paganism—maintaining “that the doctrines of the poets were in all things to be believed”; and we are told that demons used to appear to him by night under the names of Virgil, Horace, and Juvenal. The historian from whom we derive our knowledge of Vilgard and Leutard relates also that paganism was very common in Sardinia, and that many professors of it went from that island into Spain, where they attempted to spread their opinions, but were driven out by the Catholics.

A sect of Manicheans is said to have been detected in Aquitaine in 1017, and in 10223 a more remarkable party of the same kind was discovered at Orleans. These are reported to have derived their opinions from a female teacher, who came out of Italy, and was so “full of the devil” that she could convert the most learned clerks. For a time the sect grew in secret. Its leaders were two ecclesiastics named Stephen and Lisoï—both respected for their piety, their learning, and their charity, while Stephen was confessor to Constance, the queen whom Robert of France had espoused on his forced separation from Bertha. Among the proselytes were ten canons of the cathedral, and many persons of rank, not only in Orleans and its neighborhood, but, even in the royal court

The discovery of these sectaries is variously related. The most circumstantial account ascribes it to Arefast, a Norman noble, who, having allowed a chaplain named Herbert to go to Orleans for the purpose of study, was startled by finding on his return that he had there imbibed new and heretical opinions. At the desire of King Robert, to whom, through the medium of the duke of Normandy, he reported the matter, Arefast proceeded to Orleans for the purpose of detecting the heretics, and by the advice of a clergyman of Chartres, whom he had consulted on the way, he affected to become a pupil of Stephen and Lisoï. They taught

him that Christ was not really born of the virgin Mary; that He was not really crucified, buried, or risen; that baptism had no efficacy for the washing away of sin; that priestly consecration did not make the sacrament of the Redeemer's body and blood; that it was needless to pray to martyrs or confessors. On Arefast's asking how he might attain salvation, if the means to which he had hitherto looked were unavailing, the teachers replied that they would bestow on him the imposition of their hands, which would cleanse him from all sin and fill him with the Holy Spirit, so that he should understand the Scriptures in their depth and true dignity; that they would give him heavenly food, by which he would be enabled to see visions and to enjoy fellowship with God. By this mysterious food, which was represented as having the power to confirm disciples immovably in the doctrines of the party, was doubtless meant something of a spiritual kind—the same with the *consolamentum* of somewhat later sectaries. But a wild story was imagined in explanation of it—that the heretics at some of their meetings recited a litany to evil spirits; that the devil appeared in the form of a small animal; that the lights were then extinguished, and each man embraced the woman nearest to him—even if she were his mother, his sister, or a consecrated nun. A child born of such intercourse was, at the age of eight days, burnt at a meeting of the sect; the ashes were preserved, to be administered under the name of “heavenly food”; and such was the potency of this “diabolical” sacrament that any one who received it became irrevocably bound to the heresy.

Robert, on receiving information from Arefast, repaired to Orleans, where the whole party of the sectaries was apprehended, and Arefast appeared as a witness against them. They avowed their doctrines, and expressed an assurance that these would prevail throughout the world. They professed to entertain views far above the apprehension of ordinary Christians—views taught to them inwardly by God and the Holy Spirit. They spoke with contempt of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the miraculous evidence of Scripture. They maintained that the heavens and the earth were eternal and uncreated. They appear to have also maintained that the sins of sensuality were not liable to punishment, and that the ordinary duties of religion and morality were superfluous and useless.

After a vain attempt to reclaim the sectaries, they were condemned to death. Such of them as were clerks were deposed and were stripped of their robes. While the trial was proceeding, queen Constance, by her husband's desire, had stood on the steps of the church in which it was held, in order that her presence might restrain the populace from rushing in and tearing the accused to pieces. Bent on proving that her abhorrence of heresy prevailed over old personal attachment, she thrust her staff into one of her confessor's eyes as he was led out after condemnation. Two of the party, a clerk and a nun, recanted; thirteen remained steadfast, and approached the place of execution with a smiling and triumphant air, in the expectation of deliverance by miracle. One historian of the time relates that, when the flames were kindled around them, yet no interposition took place, they cried out that the devil had deceived them; but, according to another account, they retained their exultant demeanor to the last. Some dust, which was supposed to be the “heavenly food”, was thrown into the flames with them. The body of a canon named Theodatus, who had been a member of the sect but had died three years before, was taken from the grave and cast into unconsecrated ground.

In 1025, Gerard, bishop of Arras and Cambay, a pupil of Gerbert, discovered in the former city some sectaries who professed to have received their opinions from an Italian named Gundulf. The bishop placed them before a council, and drew forth an acknowledgment of their doctrines. They denied the utility of baptism and the Eucharist, resting their objections to baptism on three grounds—the unworthiness of the clergy; the fact that the sins renounced at the font were afterwards actually committed; and the idea that an infant, being incapable of faith or will, could not be benefited by the profession of others. They were charged with denying the use of penance, with setting at nought the church, with condemning marriage, with refusing honor to the confessors, and limiting it to apostles and martyrs alone. They held that churches were not more holy than other buildings; that the altar was merely a heap of

stones, and the cross was but like other wood. They condemned episcopal ordination, the distinction of orders and ranks in the ministry, the use of bells, incense, images, and chanting, and the practice of burying in consecrated ground, which they asserted that the clergy encouraged for the sake of fees. It would seem also that they denied the resurrection of the body. In answer to the bishop, they professed that their opinions were scriptural; that their laws bound them to forsake the world, to abstain from fleshly lusts, to earn their maintenance by the work of their hands, to show kindness to those who opposed them. If they observed these rules, they had no need of baptism; if they neglected the rules, baptism could not profit them.

Gerard combated the opinions of the party at great length, with arguments agreeable to the theology of the age; and, although we may smile at the miraculous stories which he adduced, we must honor his wisdom and excellent temper. He blamed them especially for holding an opinion of their own merits which was inconsistent with the doctrine of divine grace. The sectaries, who appear to have been men of simple mind and of little education, were convinced—rather, it would seem, by the bishop's legends than by his sounder reasons. They prostrated themselves before him, and expressed a fear that, since they had led others into error, their sin was beyond forgiveness. But he comforted them with hopeful assurances, and, on their signing a profession of orthodoxy, received them into the communion of the church.

Heresy of a Manichaean character was also taught at Toulouse, where the professors of it who were detected were put to death, although their opinions continued to spread in the district; and in 1044 Heribert, archbishop of Milan, when on a visitation of his province, discovered a sect at Monteforte, near Turin. The chief teacher of this sect was named Gerard; it was patronized by the countess of Monteforte, and among its members were many of the clergy. When questioned as to his belief, Gerard gave orthodox answers; but on further inquiry it proved that these answers were evasive. The sectaries held that by the Son of God was meant the human soul, beloved by God and born of Holy Scripture; that the Holy Spirit was the understanding of divine things; that they might be bound and loosed by persons who were authorized for the work, but that these were not the clergy of the church. They said that they had a high priest different from the pontiff of Rome—a high priest who was not tonsured, besides whom there was no other high priest and no sacrament; that he daily visited their brethren who were scattered throughout the world, and that, when God bestowed him on them, they received forgiveness of all sin. They had a peculiar hierarchy of their own; they lived rigidly, ate no flesh, fasted often, kept up unceasing prayer by alternate turns, and observed a community of goods. They inculcated the duty of virginity, living with their wives as mothers or sisters, and believed that, if all mankind would be content to live in purely spiritual union, the race would be propagated after the manner of bees. They considered it desirable to suffer in this life in order to avert sufferings in the life to come; hence it was usual that those among them who had escaped outward persecution should be tortured and put to death by their friends.

The members of the sect were seized and were removed to Milan. Attempts were made to reclaim them, but without effect; and the magistrates, on learning that they had endeavored to gain converts among the country people, ordered them, although without the archbishop's consent, to be carried to a place outside the city, where they were required, on pain of burning, to bow to the cross, and to profess the catholic faith. Almost all refused; they covered their eyes with their hands, and rushed into the fire which was prepared for them.

It is generally assumed by modern writers, on grounds which it is impossible to discover, that the statement of Heribert's freedom from any share in the fate of these unfortunate fanatics is untrue. But in another quarter, at least, a voice was raised by a bishop in behalf of Christian principle and humanity as to the treatment of religious error. Wazo, bishop of Liege, who died in 1048, received a letter from Roger, bishop of Châlons-on-the

Marne, reporting the appearance of some heretics who avowed the doctrines of Manes, and supposed him to be the Holy Ghost. Among other things, Roger states that even the most uneducated persons, when perverted to this sect, became more fluent in their discourse, than the most learned clerks; and he asks how he should deal with them. Wazo tells him in reply, that forcible measures are inconsistent with our Lord's parable of the tares; that bishops do not at their ordination receive the sword; that their power is not that of killing but of making alive; that they ought to content themselves with excluding those who are in error from the church, and preventing them from spreading the infection. The writer who has preserved the correspondence enforces this advice by the authority of St. Martin, and expresses a belief that the bishop of Tours would have strongly reprobated the punishment of some sectaries who were put to death at Goslar in 1052.

The origin of the sects which thus within a short period appeared in so many quarters is matter of doubt and controversy. The heretical parties north of the Alps professed for the most part to have received their opinions immediately from Italy; but it is asked whether they had been introduced into that country by Paulician refugees, the offspring of the Paulicians who, in 969, had been transported by John Tzimisces from Armenia to Thrace, and established as guards of the western frontiers of his empire, with permission to retain their religion;—or whether they were derived from Manicheans who, notwithstanding the vigorous measures of Leo the Great and other popes for the suppression of the sect, had continued to lurk in Italy. The avowal of the party at Monteforte, that they did not know from what part of the world they had come, which had been cited in behalf of the connection with Paulicianism, appears rather to favor the opposite view, inasmuch as it would seem to imply not only a foreign origin (which was common to both Manicheans and Paulicians), but an establishment of their doctrines in Italy long before the then recent time at which Paulicianism had been introduced into Europe. Moreover the sectaries of Monteforte differed from the Paulicians in the rejection of flesh and of marriage, in the system of their hierarchy, in maintaining the distinction between elect and hearers; and the western sects in general paid honor to Manes, whereas the Paulicians anathematized him. The indistinctness with which the Manichean tenets appear in some of the cases has been accounted for by supposing that the obscure followers of Manes, lurking in corners for centuries, were kept together rather by external observances than by any accurate knowledge of the system which they professed; while something must also be allowed for the defectiveness of the notices which have reached us. It seems, therefore, possible that the new heretics may have derived their opinions from the Manicheans; and, according to the advocates of this view, it was not until the east had been brought into communication with the west by the crusades that the western sectaries learnt to trace a likeness between themselves and the Paulicians, which, by means of fabulous inventions, was then referred to a supposed connection in earlier times. But there seems to be a deficiency of proof for the supposition that the Manichean sect had continued to exist in Italy—the only evidence of its existence after the time of Gregory the Great being apparently the mention of some heretics who are styled Arians, but may have been Manicheans, at Padua in the tenth century.

In the east also the beginning of the eleventh century was marked by the rise or by the increased activity of some heretical sects—as the Athinggani, the Children of the Sun, and the Euchites; but their influence was so limited that it is unnecessary here to give any particular account of them.

CHAPTER IX.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

The Hierarchy.

THE relations of the papacy with secular powers, and especially with the emperors of the west, were governed rather by circumstances than by any settled principles. On each side there were claims which were sometimes admitted and sometimes denied by the other party; but even when they were admitted, the enforcement of them depended on the questions whether the claimant were strong and whether circumstances were favourable to him.

The German emperors still retained the same rights of sovereignty over Rome which had been held by the Carolingians. The imperial share in the appointment of the pope by means of commissioners continued, and popes were even glad to sanction it afresh, as a means of averting the disorders incident to an election carried on amid the fury of the Roman factions and the violence of the neighbouring nobles. A synod under John IX in 898, when Lambert had been crowned as emperor, enacted that, for the prevention of such tumults and scandals as had taken place through the absence of imperial commissioners, the presence of commissioners should be necessary at future elections; and in another canon it threatens the emperor's indignation, as well as spiritual penalties, against any who should renew the disorders which had been usual on the death of a pope, when the palace was invaded by plunderers, who often extended their depredations over the city and its suburbs. And, although the document bearing the name of Leo VIII, which confers on Otho the Great and his successors the power of nominating to the papacy as well as to the empire, is probably spurious, its provisions agree with the state of things which actually existed at the time. The emperor was regarded as having the right to decide the appeals of Roman subjects who had been aggrieved by the pope. Emperors even deposed popes, and that not by any wanton exercise of force, but as if in the fulfilment of a duty attached to their office; thus we have seen that Otho the Great was extremely reluctant to proceed against the wretched young debauchee John XII. It was considered that even the pope was not irresponsible on earth, and that for the execution of manifest justice on the chief pastor of the church the highest secular authority was entitled to intervene. Yet on the whole the popes were gaining, and were preparing to secure advantages for their successors.

It seems probable that Charlemagne, in projecting the revival of the Roman empire, may have hoped to become master of the popes; but the event redounded to the benefit of the papacy. Leo III surprised Charlemagne himself into receiving the crown from his hands; and although the great emperor was careful that his son should assume it in such a manner that it should appear to be held independently of the Roman sanction, Louis submitted to be crowned afresh by Stephen IV. The popes continued to crown the emperors until an opinion was settled in the minds of men that the highest of secular dignities could only be conferred by God himself through the instrumentality of His chief minister, the successor of St. Peter; and, although the possession of the Italian kingdom was regarded as implying a title to the empire, the imperial name was not assumed by the German sovereigns of Italy until after a coronation at Rome by the pope.

As the eastern bishops, by appealing to the emperor in their differences, had established an imperial supremacy in spiritual things, so the princes of the west, by referring

their quarrels to the pope, and by asking him to ratify their conquests, contributed to invest him with a power of arbitration and control which more and more claimed a superiority over all secular government. And this was enhanced by the pope's assumption of an universal censorship of morals, and by his wielding the terrors of excommunication, which were able to make kings tremble, not only by the direct exclusion from spiritual privileges, but through the apprehension of the effects which such a sentence might produce among their people. The wideness and variety of the scene on which the popes acted were also conducive to the growth of their authority, since an attempt which was foiled by the energy of one opponent succeeded elsewhere against the weakness of another, and thenceforth became a precedent for general application. In newly-converted kingdoms, such as Hungary and Poland, the power of the pope over the national church was from the first established as a principle; nor did the shameful degradation of the papacy during a large portion of the time now under review produce any considerable effect on its estimation in foreign countries, where little or nothing was heard of the pope as an individual, and he was regarded only as the successor of the chief apostle.

The territorial power and income of the papacy were limited by the encroachments of the Italian nobles and by the invasions of the Saracens. But the popes found new sources of wealth in the practice of annexing to their see the revenues of bishoprics and abbeys in various parts of Christendom, and in payments levied from countries which were in communion with them, such as the Peter-pence of England and the tribute paid by Poland. And a continual succession of forgeries made it appear that such territories as the see of Rome possessed were but portions of a far larger inheritance, which of right belonged to it by virtue of donations bestowed by emperors and other sovereigns from the time of Constantine the Great.

The policy of the popes towards the church aimed at centralising all authority in the papacy. The principles of the forged decretals were taken as a foundation of their claims. Titles more pompous than before were given by those who wished to pay court to them, and were not refused. The epithet *universal*, which Gregory the Great had declared to be unfit for any Christian prelate, was addressed to Nicolas I by Adventius bishop of Metz and by Charles the Bald; and it afterwards became usual. Adventius styles Nicolas "Your Majesty", a phrase which was very commonly used by Peter Damiani in addressing the popes of his time. Theotmar, archbishop of Salzburg, and his suffragans addressed John IX as "Supreme Pontiff and Universal Pope, not of a single city but of the whole world". Some bishops avowed that they held their episcopate from God through St. Peter. *i.e.* through the apostle's successors in the see of Rome. The claims involved in the new pretensions of the papacy were at first somewhat indefinite. What was meant by the pope's universal episcopate? What was his supreme judicature? When and how was this to be exercised? But when once such vague and sounding titles had been impressed on the general mind, it was in the power of the popes to make almost any deductions whatever from them. The claim which Nicolas advanced for obedience to all the decrees of popes rested on a different ground from that which had sometimes been put forward by his predecessors. In earlier times, such a claim was founded on the supposition that Rome was the most faithful guardian of apostolic faith and practice, or, at the utmost, that the pope was the highest expounder of the law not that he pretended to a power of legislation. But now it was rested simply on the ground that Rome was Rome; and the matter set forth under the sanction of such a pretension consisted of a forgery which professed to derive a new and unheard-of system of papal domination from the earliest ages of the church.

The party which relied on the authority of the decretals was bent on humbling the class of metropolitans. There are circumstances which seem to indicate that metropolitans had begun to assume power greater than that which had in earlier times belonged to them. But the design was not limited to reducing them within their ancient bounds; they were not to be allowed any power of judicature over bishops; and when they were stripped of their judicial

power, their authority as superintendents or inspectors was not likely to be much regarded. It was the interest of bishops to aid the popes in a course which annihilated the power of metropolitans and provincial synods over members of the episcopate, and subjected these to the pope alone. There were even inducements which might persuade metropolitans to consent to sacrifice the independence of their own order. They, in common with other bishops, were strengthened against secular princes by an alliance with the papacy. They felt that their dignity was enhanced by a connection with a power which exalted religion above all earthly authority; and the use of the pall was of great effect in reconciling them to the change.

The pall, originally a part of the imperial attire, had been at first bestowed by the eastern emperors on the patriarchs of their capital. In the fifth and sixth centuries it was conferred on other patriarchs; and in time it was given by popes and patriarchs to bishops, although the imperial consent was necessary before the honor could be conferred on a bishop whose predecessors had not enjoyed it.

The pall was sent by the popes to their vicars; it was regarded as the mark of a special connexion with the Roman see, to which the receiver was bound by a strict oath of subjection and obedience. When some metropolitans had thus received it, others, wishing to be on a level with them, made application for a like distinction, so that it came to be regarded as the ensign of metropolitan dignity, and that this dignity came to be regarded as a gift of the pope. Nicolas I, in his answer to the Bulgarians, lays it down that their future archbishop shall not exercise his office until he receive the pall from Rome; such, he says, is the usage in Gaul, Germany, and other countries; and John VIII, at the synod of Ravenna, in 877, enacted that every metropolitan should, within three months after his election, send to Rome a statement of his faith, together with a petition for the pall. While the metropolitans, thus received some compensation for the loss of their independent power, in their special connexion with Rome, and in their exercise of jurisdiction as delegates of the pope, the pall became not only a mark of their subjection, but a source of profit to the Roman treasury.

Although Gregory I had positively forbidden that anything should be given for it, fees were now exacted, and so heavy were they in some cases that Canute, on his pilgrimage to Rome, complained to the pope of the oppressive amount required from English archbishops, and obtained a promise of an abatement in future. That metropolitans submitted to exorbitant payments for the sake of obtaining this ensign, is a proof that the advantage of such a sanction for their authority must have been strongly felt.

The metropolitans lost less in England and in Germany than elsewhere. In England the whole foundation of the church rested on the primacy of Canterbury. In Germany the metropolitans of Mayence, Cologne, Treves, and Salzburg, held high dignities of the empire as annexed to their sees. Yet, in the case of the great German prelates, there was the disadvantage that the popular opinion unconsciously referred their power not to their spiritual but to their secular offices.

In addition to their vicars, the popes appointed legates to exercise some of their functions, such as that of holding councils for the investigation of cases which had been referred to Rome, or in which the popes took it on themselves to interfere. These legates were sometimes ecclesiastics sent from Italy; but, as foreign ecclesiastics were regarded with suspicion by princes, it was more usual to give the legatine commission to some bishop of the country in which the inquiry was to take place. Even kings were sometimes invested with the authority of papal deputies, as we have seen in the instance of Charles the Bald at the council of Pontyon.

The claim of the popes to exclusive jurisdiction over bishops was uncontested from the time of the victory gained by John XV and Gregory V in the affair of Arnulf of Reims. Persons nominated to bishoprics, if they found any difficulty in obtaining consecration from their own metropolitan, sought it at the hands of the pope; and a Roman synod under Benedict VI, held probably in 983, with a view to the suppression of simony, directed that not only

bishops but priests or deacons should repair to Rome for ordination, if it were not to be obtained without payment at home. Yet to the end of the period the prelates of France and Germany resisted some attempts of the popes to encroach on their rights.

The title of “universal bishop” was admitted only as implying a power of general oversight not as entitling the popes to exercise episcopal functions in every diocese. This resistance was especially shown when the popes attempted to interfere with the penitential discipline. Every bishop had been formerly regarded as the sole judge in cases of penance within his own diocese, as the only person who could relax the penance which he had himself imposed. The bishop's power of absolution was still unassailed; there were not as yet any cases reserved for the decision of the pope alone. But the popes began to claim a jurisdiction as to penance similar to that which they were gradually establishing over the church in other respects; they asserted a right of absolving from the penance to which offenders had been sentenced by other bishops. The resort of penitents to Rome had been encouraged by various circumstances. In many instances bishops had themselves consulted the pope, or had recommended an application to him, either with a view of escaping responsibility in difficult cases, or in order that the long and toilsome journey to Rome might itself in some measure serve as a penitential exercise. But when penitents began to flock to Rome for the purpose of obtaining from the pope the absolution which was refused by their own diocesans, or in the belief that the absolution of St. Peter's successor was of superior virtue, the practice drew forth strong and frequent protests from councils and from individual bishops. Ahyto (or Hatto) of Basel, about 820, orders that penitents who wish to visit the apostolic city should first confess their sins at home, “because they are to be bound or loosed by their own bishop or priest, and not by a stranger”. When an English earl, who had been excommunicated by Dunstan for contracting an unlawful marriage, had succeeded, by the employment of influence and money at Rome, in obtaining from the pope a mandate that the archbishop should restore him, Dunstan firmly refused to comply. “I will gladly obey”, he said, “when I see him repentant; but so long as he rejoices in his sin, God forbid that, for the sake of any mortal man, or to save my own life, I should neglect the law which our Lord has laid down for His church”. And to the end of the period a like opposition to the papal assumptions in this respect was maintained. All that was as yet conceded to the pope was a power of granting absolution on the application, or with the consent, of the bishop by whom penance had been imposed. But in this, as in other matters, principles had already been introduced by which the popes were in no long time entirely to overthrow the ancient rights of the episcopal order.

The secular importance of bishops increased. They took precedence of counts, and at national assemblies they sat before dukes. In France many prelates took advantage of the weakness of the later Carolingians, or of the unsettled state of the new dynasty, to obtain grants of royalties (*regalia*), privileges especially belonging to the crown, such as the right to coin money, to establish markets, to levy tolls, to build fortifications, and to hold courts of justice, even for the trial of capital offences. Towards the end of the period, however, these bishops for the most part found it necessary, for the sake of security against the aggressions of the nobles, to place themselves under the feudal protection of the sovereign, and in consideration of this the royalties were again resigned.

But it was in Germany that the bishops acquired the greatest power. The repeated changes of dynasty in that country were favorable to them. Each new race found it expedient to court them; and the emperors, partly out of respect for religion, partly from a wish to strengthen themselves by the support of the clergy, and to provide a counterpoise to the lay nobility, favored the advance of the order by bestowing on them grants of royalties, and whole counties or even duchies, with corresponding rights of jurisdiction.

In proportion as the bishops became more powerful, it was more important for princes to get the appointment of them into their own hands. The capitulary of Louis the Pious, which enacted a return to the ancient system of free elections, had never taken effect to any

considerable extent. In France, in England, and in Germany, the choice of bishops was really with the sovereign; even where the right of nomination was contested (as it was by Hincmar in the cases of Cambrai and Beauvais), the opponents allowed that the royal licence must precede the election of a bishop, and that the royal confirmation must follow on it. Although the church petitioned for free elections, it would have been well content to secure a right of rejecting persons who were unfit in respect of morals or of learning. Even a pope, John X, allows that, by ancient custom, the king's command is required in order to the appointment of a bishop, although he also mentions the necessity of election by the clergy, and acclamation by the laity. Election was for the most part nothing more than acquiescence in the sovereign's nomination; so that while Adam of Bremen always speaks of bishops as being appointed by the emperor, Thietmar generally speaks of them as elected. A sovereign might refuse to confirm an election, and any substitute proposed by him in such a case was sure to be accepted by the electors. And it was in vain that complaints were raised against the system of royal control, or that attempts were made to limit it by laying down new rules as to the qualifications requisite for the episcopate.

A remarkable proof of the degree in which the German sovereigns believed the disposal of bishoprics to be a right of their own office, is found in the fact that Henry the Fowler granted to Arnulf duke of Bavaria the privilege of appointing bishops within that territory. The saintly emperor Henry II made bishops by direct nomination, possibly (as has been suggested) from a wish to secure the appointment of better men than the flocks would have been likely to choose for themselves; and it is said that a comparison between the bishops who owed their sees to his patronage and those who were afterwards elected by the clergy bears out the wisdom and the honesty of his policy. We are told that the emperors were sometimes directed by visions to promote certain deserving persons to vacant bishoprics, or to refrain from opposing their election.

In the Greek church also the emperors continued to nominate to the most important sees. Nicephorus Phocas enacted that no bishop should be appointed without the imperial consent, and when a see was vacant, he committed the revenues to the care of an officer, who was bound to limit the expenditure to a certain sum, and to pay over the residue to the treasury. The patriarch Polyeuctus refused to crown John Tzimisce, unless on condition that the law of his predecessor should be abrogated; but the emperor, immediately after his coronation, proceeded to exercise his prerogative by nominating a patriarch for Antioch.

Bishoprics became objects of ambition for persons of noble or even royal birth, so that it was at length a rare and surprising case, and even serious objections were raised, when any one of obscure origin was elevated to such a position. Attempts were made to render the possession of sees hereditary in certain families; and in Germany these attempts took a peculiar and remarkable turn. A prelate was often able to secure the succession to his see for a nephew or a cousin; and the interest of families in such cases led them not to impoverish but to enrich the see, with a view to the benefit of their own members who were to hold it. It was regarded as a part of the family property, and the bishop might rely on the support of his kinsmen in all his differences and feuds with his other neighbours. Henry II was fond of bestowing bishoprics on wealthy persons, who might be likely to add to the riches of their sees, such as Heinwerc, of Paderborn, of whose relations with his imperial patron and kinsman many humorous tales are told by his biographer.

But the disposal of bishoprics from motives of family interest naturally introduced great abuses. Atto bishop of Vercelli, who, in the earlier part of the tenth century, wrote a treatise "On the Grievances of the Church", tells us that the princes of his time were indifferent as to the character of those whom they nominated to high spiritual office, that wealth, relationship, and subserviency were the only qualities which they looked for; and not only unfit persons but boys were appointed to sees, from those of Rome and Constantinople downwards. Atto describes one of these boy prelates, at his consecration, as answering by rote

the questions which were put to him, either having been crammed with the answers or reading them from a memorandum; as dreading, in case of failure, not lest he should lose the grace of consecration, but lest he should fall under the rod of his tutor; and having no conception either of the responsibilities of his office, or of the temptations which would beset him.

A particularly scandalous case was that of Theophylact, whom his father, the emperor Romanus, resolved to raise to the patriarchate of Constantinople on a vacancy which occurred in 928. As the prince was only eleven years of age, a monk named Trypho was made temporary patriarch; but when desired to resign his office, three years later, he was unwilling to comply. It is said that Theophanes, bishop of Caesarea, waited on him, and, with great professions of friendship, told him that the emperor intended to eject him on the ground that he was ignorant of letters : "If", he said, "you can disprove this objection, you have nothing to fear". At the suggestion of his insidious visitor, Trypho wrote his name and style on a paper, which was afterwards annexed to another, containing an acknowledgment that he was unfit for the patriarchate, and expressing a wish to retire from it. Trypho was thus set aside, and, after a vacancy of a year and a half, Theophylact, at the age of sixteen, became patriarch in 933, being installed in his office by legates of pope John XI. During three and twenty years Theophylact disgraced the patriarchal throne. He introduced indecent music and dances into the service of the church; but he was chiefly distinguished by his insane fondness for horses, of which he kept more than two thousand. Instead of the ordinary diet, they were fed with dates, figs, raisins, almonds, and other fruits which were steeped in costly wines and flavoured with the most delicate spices. It is related that once, while performing the eucharistic rites on Thursday before Easter, the patriarch was informed that a favourite mare had foaled. He immediately left the church, and, after having gratified himself by the sight of the mother and her offspring, returned to finish the service of the day. In order to provide for the vast expenses of his stud, he shamelessly sold all sorts of spiritual offices. Theophylact's end was worthy of his life; his head was dashed against a wall in riding, and, after having lingered two years, he died in consequence of the accident.

Complaints of simony in the appointment to ecclesiastical offices, whether high or low, are incessant during this period. The simoniacal practices of sovereigns are supposed to have originated from the custom of offering gifts on being admitted to their presence. Those who were promoted by them to ecclesiastical dignities testified their gratitude by presents, which in course of time took the nature of stipulated payments. The working of the system became worse when bishops, instead of making payment at the time of their promotion, relied on the revenues of their sees for the means of raising the money, as in such cases they were tempted to dilapidate the episcopal property, to oppress their tenants, to engage in unseemly disputes, and to allow their churches to go to ruin.

In respect of simony the German emperors were pure, as compared with other western princes; they sometimes made formal resolutions to refrain from selling their patronage, and to restrain the simoniacal practices of others; but their necessities interfered with the fulfilment of their good intentions. Cardinal Humbert, who had enjoyed an opportunity of observing the Greek church, when engaged on a mission to Constantinople, states that the sale of bishoprics was not practised there as in the west. The practice of paying for preferments, as distinguished from ordination, found defenders; but the defence was indignantly met by such writers as Humbert and Peter Damiani. The distinction between orders and benefices, says Peter, is as absurd as if one were to say that a man is father of his son's body only, and not of his soul.

Bishops were invested in their sees by the western sovereigns. Symbolical forms of investiture are mentioned as early as the time of Clovis, and it is said that Louis the Pious invested bishops by delivering to them the pastoral staff. But the use of such ceremonies does not appear to have been introduced as a regular practice until the age of the Othos, and was perhaps not completely established until the end of the tenth century.

The investiture related to the temporalities of the see, which the sovereign was supposed to bestow on the bishops. Hincmar, in his answer to Adrian II, when desired to renounce communion with Charles the Bald, marks the distinction between his temporalities, which were at the king's disposal, and his spiritual office, in which he regarded himself as independent. "If I were to act according to your judgment", he tells the pope, "I might continue to chant at the altar of my church, but over its property, its income, and its retainers, I should no longer have any power".

When the feudal system was established, it was natural that bishops, as well as dukes and counts, should be invested in their possessions, and they may have found their advantage in a tie which entitled them to the protection of their liege lord. But it became a matter of complaint that the estates and temporal privileges of bishops were conferred on them by means of instruments which symbolised their spiritual character the ring, the figure of marriage with the church, and the crozier or crook, the ensign of pastoral authority. The use of such instruments provoked objections, because they were liable to be interpreted as signifying that the spiritual powers of the episcopate were derived from the gift of earthly princes.

By the institution of investiture sovereigns gained new means of control over bishops. They not only held over them the fear lest their gifts might be withdrawn, but were able to use the investiture so as to secure for themselves the patronage of sees. In order to elude the royal nomination, bishops sometimes consecrated to a see immediately on the occurrence of the vacancy, and thus threw on the sovereign the difficulty and the odium of dislodging a prelate who was already in possession. But princes were now able to prevent such consecrations, by providing that on a bishop's death his ring and staff should at once be seized and sent to them by their officers; for without these insignia the consecration of a successor could not proceed. Hence, as we shall see hereafter, it was complained that by the system of investiture the right of canonical election was annulled.

Sometimes the election of a bishop was notified to the court, with a petition for his investiture, and in such cases it was always in the prince's power to substitute another person for him who had been chosen. Sometimes investiture was given in the name of the sovereign by the prelate who took the chief part in the consecration.

Notwithstanding all the lofty pretensions which ecclesiastics now set up as to the superiority of spiritual over royal power, they did not practically gain much. Hincmar and his brethren of the council of Quiercy told Louis of Germany that bishops ought not, like secular men, to be bound to vassalship; that it was a shameful indignity that the hands which had been anointed with holy chrism, and which daily consecrated the Redeemer's body and blood, should be required to touch the hands of a liege-lord in the ceremony of homage, or that the lips which were the keys of heaven should be obliged to swear fealty. But they did not obtain any exemption in consequence of this representation; and Hincmar himself was afterwards, as a special affront, required to renew his oath of fealty to Charles the Bald.

Although bishops were exempt from the power of all inferior judges, kings still retained their jurisdiction over them. Hincmar, in his greatest zeal for the immunities of the clergy, went only so far as to maintain that the royal judgment must be guided by the laws of the church. The enactments of some synods, that a bishop should not be deposed except by twelve members of his own order, are not to be regarded as withdrawing bishops from the judgment of the sovereign, but as prescribing the manner in which this should be exercised. And, in cases of treason, princes deposed by their own immediate authority. When Hugh Capet brought Arnulf of Reims to trial before the synod of St. Basle, no complaint was made of his having already imprisoned him; the presiding archbishop's proposal, that before proceeding to the investigation the synod should petition for the security of Arnulf's life, is a proof that the king's power to inflict capital punishment on the accused prelate was admitted; and it was only through the weakness of Robert and through the support of the emperor Otho that the pope was able in that case eventually to triumph.

While feeble princes yielded to the hierarchy, powerful princes often dealt forcibly with its members. Otho the Great, in punishment of political misdeeds, banished an archbishop of Mayence to Hamburg, and shut up a bishop of Strasburg in the monastery of Corbey; and, for the offence of having received a duke of Saxony with honors too much resembling those which were paid to the imperial majesty, he obliged Adalbert, archbishop of Magdeburg, to compound by heavy penalties a horse for every bell which had been rung and for every chandelier which had been lighted. Conrad II, on his last expedition to Italy, carried about with him a train of captive bishops; and when Henry III. deposed Widgers from the archbishopric of Ravenna, the act was highly extolled by the greatest zealot for the privileges of the church, Peter Damiani.

Although the German emperors, like the Carolingians, assembled synods, took part in them, and ratified their proceedings, they did not, like the Carolingians, publish the decrees as their own enactments. And the privileges of sovereigns in general with respect to such assemblies were diminished. Although it was still acknowledged that they had the power of summoning councils, their right in this respect was no longer regarded as exclusive, so that both in France and in Germany councils were gathered without asking the sovereign's permission.

Through the carelessness of the bishops, the custom of holding regular synods fell into disuse; and when they were revived in a later age, the powers which kings and emperors had formerly exercised in connexion with them were forgotten.

It was regarded as a right of sovereigns to found bishoprics and archbishoprics, and the German emperors exercised it by erecting and endowing sees, some of them perhaps as much from motives of policy as of devotion. The consent of the prelates whose interest was affected by the new foundation was, however, regarded as necessary, and, in order to obtain it, the founders were sometimes obliged to submit to concession and compromise. Henry II even prostrated himself before a council at Frankfort in 1006, that he might obtain its assistance in overcoming the objections raised by the bishop of Würzburg against the proposed see of Bamberg; and when Otho III took it on himself to erect the archbishopric of Gnesen without asking the consent of the metropolitan of Posen, out of whose province that of Gnesen was to be taken, the chronicler who relates this speaks doubtfully as to the legality of the act. The popes now began to claim the right of confirming these foundations; but, from the fact that princes labored to propitiate the local prelates, instead of invoking the pope to overrule their objections, it is clear that the popes were not as yet supposed to have supreme jurisdiction in such cases.

Towards the middle of the ninth century there were considerable dissensions on the subject of the chorepiscopi in France. They had become more and more dissatisfied with their position; they complained that their emoluments bore no proportion to their labor, as compared with those of the diocesan bishops, while on the other side there were complaints that the chorepiscopi were disposed to exceed the rights of their commission. The decretals, fabricated in the interest of the bishops, were adverse to the claims of the chorepiscopi. Raban Maur, however, in consequence of an application from Drogo of Metz, wrote in favour of them, and especially in support of their power to ordain priests and deacons with the licence of their episcopal superiors. The troubles occasioned by Gottschalk may perhaps have contributed to exasperate the difference between the two classes, for Gottschalk had been ordained by a chorepiscopus during the vacancy of the see of Reims; and, notwithstanding the powerful authority of the German primate, the order of chorepiscopi was abolished throughout Neustria by a council held at Paris in 849.

In the eleventh century a new species of assistant bishops was for the first time introduced. Poppo, bishop of Treves, in 1041 requested Benedict IX to supply him with a person qualified to aid him in pontifical acts, and the pope complied by sending an ecclesiastic named Gratian, who must doubtless have already received episcopal consecration. The

novelty of the case consisted in the application to the pope, and in the fact that the coadjutor was appointed by him. It was not, however, until a later time that such coadjutors became common in the church.

The practice of taking part in war, which had so often been condemned by councils, became more general among bishops during this period. When the feudal relations were fully established, a bishop was bound, as a part of his duty towards his suzerain, to lead his contingent to the field in person, and it was only as a matter of special favor that a dispensation from this duty could be obtained. The circumstances of the time, indeed, appeared in some measure to excuse the warlike propensities of bishops, who might think themselves justified in encouraging their flocks, even by their own example, to resist such determined and pitiless enemies of Christendom as the Saracens, the Northmen, or the Hungarians. Some prelates distinguished themselves by deeds of prowess, as Michael, bishop of Ratisbon, in the middle of the tenth century, who, after losing an ear and receiving other wounds in a battle with the Hungarians, was left for dead on the field. While he lay in this condition, a Magyar fell on him, with the intention of despatching him; but the bishop, "being strengthened in the Lord", grappled with his assailant, and, after a long struggle, succeeded in killing him. He then with great difficulty made his way to the camp of his own nation, where he was hailed with acclamations both as a priest and as a warrior, and his mutilation was thenceforth regarded as an honourable distinction.

Although donations of land were still made to the church, its acquisitions of this kind appear to have been less than in earlier times partly, perhaps, because such gifts may have seemed to be less required. The clergy, therefore, felt the necessity of turning to the best account the revenues to which they were already entitled, and especially the tithes. Tithe had originally been levied from land only, but the obligation of paying it was now extended to all sorts of income. "Perhaps", says the council of Trosley, "some one may say, 'I am no husbandman; I have nothing on which to pay tithe of the fruits of the earth or even of flocks'. Let such an one hearken, whosoever he be, whether a soldier, a merchant, or an artisan : The ability by which thou art fed is God's, and therefore thou oughtest to pay tithes to Him". Many canons are directed to the enforcement of tithes on land newly brought into cultivation; and many are directed against claims of exemption. Such claims were sometimes advanced by persons who held lands under ecclesiastical owners, and pretended that it was an oppression to require a second rent of them under another name. The council of Ingelheim, held in 948, in the presence of Otho I, enacted that all questions as to tithes should be subject to the decision of the bishops alone; and a great council at Augsburg, four years later, confirmed the rule

The amount thus added to the revenues of the clergy must, after all possible deductions for difficulties of collection, for waste, and for other allowances, have been very large; but the individual members of the body were not proportionably enriched. The number of the clergy was greatly increased; and, although the principle had been established that "benefice is given on account of office or duty", it was considered to be satisfied by imposing on the superfluous clerks the duty of reading the church-service daily, and thus they became entitled to a maintenance. The bishops, as their state became greater, found themselves obliged to keep a host of expensive retainers. Knights or persons of higher rank who were attached to the households of the great prelates, often by way of disarming their hostility, were very highly paid for their services; the free men whom the bishops contributed towards the national force, or whom they hired to fight their feuds, were costly, and, as the prelates found themselves considered at the national musters in proportion to the number of their followers, they often, for the sake of supporting their dignity, led more than the required number with them.

According to the system of the age, all these adherents were paid by fiefs, which were either provided out of the estates of the church or by assigning them the tithes of certain lands.

Such fiefs in general became hereditary, and thus the episcopal revenues were consumed by the expense of establishments which it was impossible to get rid of.

The vidames or advocates in particular pressed heavily on the church. The wealth and privileges of the clergy continually excited the envy and cupidity of their lay neighbours, who were apt to pick quarrels with them in order that there might be a pretext for seizing their property. Every council has its complaints of such aggressions, and its anathemas against the aggressors. But the denunciations of councils, or even of popes, were of little or no avail; force alone could make any impression on the rough and lawless enemies of the clergy. The vidames, therefore, if they discharged their office faithfully, had no easy task in defending the property of the churches or monasteries with which they were connected. But not only was the price of their assistance often greater than the damage which they averted; they are charged with neglecting their duty, with becoming oppressors instead of defenders, with treating the property of the church as if it were their own.

The oppression, of the advocates was especially felt by monastic bodies, which often found it expedient to pay largely to the sovereign for the privilege of being able to discharge these officers. The advocateship became hereditary; in some monasteries it was reserved by the founder to himself and his heirs, who, thus, by the power of preying not only on the original endowment, but on such property as the community afterwards acquired, were in no small degree indemnified for the expense of the foundation. In some cases, the advocates appointed deputies, and thus the unfortunate clients had two tyrants under the name of defenders. Vast, therefore, as the revenues of the church appear, much of its wealth was merely nominal. A large part passed from the clergy to lay officials, and the rest was exposed to continual danger in such rude and unsettled times.

The condition of the Greek clergy is described by Liutprand as inferior to that of their Latin brethren. Their manner of life struck him as sordid; and, although some of the bishops were rich and others were poor, they were all alike inhospitable. The bishops were obliged to pay tribute to the emperor; the bishop of Leucate swore that his own tribute amounted to a hundred pieces of gold yearly; and Liutprand cries out that this was a manifest injustice, inasmuch as Joseph, when he taxed all the rest of Egypt, exempted the land which belonged to the priests.

An important change took place in the canonical bodies, which, as we have seen, had originated towards the end of the preceding period. Although the canonical life was attractive as offering almost all the advantages of monasticism with an exemption from some of its drawbacks, the restraints and punctilious observances of Chrodegang's rule were felt as hardships by many who had been accustomed to the enjoyment of independence. The canons had taken a high position. From living with the bishop they were brought into a close connexion with him : their privileged body acquired something like that power which in the earliest ages had belonged to the general council of presbyters; and they claimed a share in the government of the diocese. The bishop, however, had at his disposal the whole revenues of the church, and although he might be obliged to set aside a certain portion for the maintenance of the canons, he had yet in his hands considerable means of annoying them. He could stint them in their allowances, he could increase their fasts, he could be niggardly in providing for occasions of festivity. Complaints of bishops against canons and of canons against bishops became frequent.

The first object of the canons was to get rid of the bishop's control over their property. The composition made between Gunther of Cologne and his chapter, at a time when he had especial reason to court the members, is the earliest instance of its kind. By this the canons got into their own hands the management of their estates, and were even enabled to bequeath their houses or other effects to their brethren without any reference to the archbishop. The instrument was confirmed by a great council held at Cologne in 873 under archbishop

Willibert, whose reasons for consenting to it are unknown; and the new arrangement was soon imitated elsewhere.

After having gained this step, the canons in various places, and more or less rapidly, advanced further. They abandoned the custom of living together, and of eating at a common table; each had a separate residence of his own within the precincts of the cathedral. They divided the estates of the society among themselves, but in such a way that the more influential members secured an unfair proportion; while many of them also possessed private property. The canons purchased special privileges from kings and emperors, from bishops and from popes. The vacancies in each chapter were filled up by the choice of the members, and nobility of birth came to be regarded as a necessary qualification. Marriage and concubinage were usual among this class of clergy; and their ordinary style of living may be inferred from the statement of Ratherius, bishop of Verona, that the simplicity of his habits led his canons to suppose him a man of low origin, and on that account to despise him. At length the duties of the choir the only duties which the canons had continued to acknowledge were devolved on "prebendaries" engaged for the purpose, and the canons, both of cathedral and of collegiate churches, lived in the enjoyment of their incomes, undisturbed even by the obligation of sharing in the divine offices.

Thus by degrees the system which Chrodegang had instituted became extinct. The revivals of it which were attempted by Adalbero of Reims, by Willigis of Mayence, and other prelates, were never of long continuance; and in a later time that which had been a violation of the proper canonical discipline became the rule for the foundation of cathedral chapters on a new footing.

The dissolute morals of the clergy are the subject of unceasing complaint. The evils which arose out of the condition of domestic chaplains increased, notwithstanding all the efforts of bishops and of councils to introduce a reform. The employers of these chaplains engaged them without any inquiry as to their morals, their learning, or even their ordination; they claimed for them the same exemption from episcopal jurisdiction which was allowed to the clergy of the royal chapel, and every employer considered it a point of honour to support his chaplain in any violation of canons or in any defiance of bishops.

The mischiefs connected with this class of clergy were in great measure chargeable on the practice of the bishops themselves in conferring orders without assigning a particular sphere of labour to the receiver. The origin of such ordinations has been already traced; but now even the higher orders of the ministry were thus bestowed, for the sake of the fees which had become customary. Canons were passed that no one should be allowed to officiate in a church without the bishop's licence, and without producing a certificate of his ordination; while other canons forbade the appointment of chaplains without the bishop's consent. The council of Ravenna, under John VIII, in 877, enacted that every presbyter should, at ordination, be appointed to some particular church; but the custom of ordaining without such a title was already too firmly established.

Among the many abuses which arose out of the sale of spiritual preferments was the practice of patrons who insisted on presenting their nominees without allowing the bishop to inquire into their qualifications, or even into the validity of their ordination. In opposition to this the council of Seligenstadt, in 1022, ordered that no layman should present a clerk without submitting him for examination to the bishop.

But the chief subject of complaint and of ecclesiastical legislation is the neglect of celibacy and chastity by the clergy. The older canons, which forbade clergymen to entertain in their houses any women except their nearest relations, were found, instead of acting as an effective restraint, to tempt them to more frightful kinds of sin; and even the company of mothers, aunts, and sisters was now prohibited. Riculf, bishop of Soissons, ordains, in 889, that, lest the sins of Absalom and of Lot should be repeated, not even the nearest kinswomen of the clergy should dwell with them; if a clergyman should invite his mother, his sister, or his

aunt to dinner, the women must return before nightfall to their own home or lodging, which must be at a distance from the parsonage. As experience seemed to point out more and more the expediency of relaxing the law of celibacy, councils became stricter in their requirements. Subdeacons were required at ordination to promise that they would never marry, or, if already married, they were required to renounce their wives; a council at Augsburg in 952 enacted that all manner of clerks of mature age should be compelled to observe continency, even although unwilling.

The clergy, however, when forbidden to marry, indemnified themselves by living in concubinage sometimes, as appears from a canon passed at Poitiers in 1000, resorting to strange expedients for the purpose of concealing their female companions; and they married in contempt of the prohibitions. Atto describes clergymen as openly living with *meretriculoe* a term which he would probably have applied to wives no less than to unmarried companions as making them the heads of their establishments, and bequeathing to them the money which had been gained from the holy oblations; thus diverting to harlots that which of right belonged to the poor. In consequence of these scandals, he says, many persons, to their own spiritual hurt, withheld their oblations; and the clergy, when called to account for their misconduct by bishops, had recourse to secular protectors, whose alliance enabled them to defy their ecclesiastical superiors. From the bishops downwards, it was common both in Germany and in Italy for the clergy to have wives, and that without any disguise; and the same was the case in Normandy, as well as in the independent church of Brittany. In order to judge fairly of such persons we must not regard them from the position of either the modern opponents or advocates of clerical celibacy. Living and holding office as they did under a law which forbade marriage, we cannot respect them for their violation of that law. Yet if they believed the prohibition to be merely a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, and not enforced by the Divine word, if they saw that the inexpediency of such discipline was abundantly proved by experience, and if they found that those who were charged with the maintenance of the canons were willing to tolerate a breach of them in this respect, provided that it were managed without any offence to public decency, we may suppose that the clergy in question were reasonably justified to their own consciences. We may hold them excusable, if we cannot join with those who would admire them as heroic or enlightened.

The acts of Dunstan in England have been already related, and we have seen that his reformation, which for the time appeared to be triumphant, was not of any long continuance at least in its full extent. Reformers in other quarters failed to obtain even a temporary success. Among the most remarkable of these was Ratherius, a native of Liege, who acquired great fame for learning, eloquence, and strictness of life, and in 931 was advanced to the see of Verona by Hugh the Great of Provence, in fulfilment of a promise which Hugh was disposed to evade, but which was enforced by the authority of the pope.

Ratherius represents the Italian clergy in the darkest colours : they were, he says, so grossly ignorant that many of them did not know the Apostles' creed, while some were anthropomorphites; and their obstinate unwillingness to chant the Athanasian creed suggested suspicions of Arianism. They were stained by all manner of vices; the bishops were altogether secular in their manners, and even in their dress limiting, hawking, gaming, delighting in the company of jesters and dancing-girls. They were luxurious in their food and drink; they were utterly careless of their duties, and set the church's laws at nought; instead of dividing their revenues according to the canons, they appropriated all to themselves, so that the poor were robbed, and churches, which had suffered from the negligence of bishops or from the violence of pagans, lay in ruins; they despised all who showed the fear of God; they took pride in splendid furniture and equipages, without any thought of Him who was laid in a manger and rode on an ass. Unhappily Ratherius was altogether wanting in the prudence which would have been requisite for dealing with such persons; his intemperate zeal, his personal assumption, his passionate impatience of opposition, his abusive language and unmeasured

severity in reproof alienated the clergy, laity, and monks, with whom he had at first been popular, while his independent spirit and his determination to maintain the rights of his see provoked the licentious and cruel king. Hugh, on a charge of treason, imprisoned him at Pavia for two years and a half, while the bishopric was given to Manasses, archbishop of Arles, who also held the sees of Trent and Mantua, and had the effrontery to justify his pluralities by alleging that St. Peter had been bishop of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. In 939, Hugh for reasons of policy restored RATHERIUS; but the bishop was again obliged to leave his see, and his impracticable character provoked his expulsion or compelled his withdrawal from other preferments which he successively obtained from Liege, to which he had been promoted by the influence of Bruno of Cologne; in a third time from Verona, which he had recovered through the patronage of Otho the Great, by the ejection of a more popular bishop (A.D. 963); from the abbey of St. Amand, which he is said to have purchased of king Lothair; from the abbey of Haumont, and from that of Lobach or Lobbes, on the Sambre, the place of his education, which he had held with the bishopric of Liege, and of which in his latter days he again became the head through the expulsion of his predecessor Folcuin. RATHERIUS died at Namur, in 974, at the age of 82. He was throughout a vehement opponent of marriage among the clergy; yet he seems at last to have been convinced that the attempt was hopeless, and to have contented himself with endeavouring to preserve the hierarchy from becoming hereditary, by desiring that the married priests should choose laymen as husbands for their daughters, and should not allow their sons to become clerks.

It was not on religious grounds only that the celibacy of the clergy was enforced; for the possessions of the church were endangered by the opposite practice. The married clergy often contrived to make their livings hereditary; or they alienated ecclesiastical property to their children, whom, in order to render such alienations secure, they placed under vassalage to some powerful layman. Clergymen of servile birth were careful to choose women of free condition for wives and concubines, so as to ensure for their offspring the privileges of freemen, by virtue of the legal principle that the child must follow the condition of the mother. Benedict VIII, at a council held at Pavia in 1022, inveighed with great severity against those who by such means impoverished the church. "Let the sons of clergy be null", he says; "and especially the sons of such clerks as belong to the family (i. e. to the serfs) of the church. Yea, let them let them, I say, I say they shall, be null". They shall neither follow their mother in freedom nor their father in inheritance; they shall be serfs of the church for ever, whether born of wives or of concubines; they may in mercy be allowed to serve as, Nethinims hewers of wood and drawers of water, but must not aspire to any higher ministry. Their mothers shall be driven out, and shall be compelled to leave behind them all that they have gotten from the church. The pope's address to the council is followed by canons which enact that no member of the clergy shall have a wife or a concubine; that the children of clerks shall be condemned to hopeless servitude; and that no judge shall, under pain of anathema, promise them freedom or the power of inheriting; and these canons were confirmed by the authority of the emperor Henry II.

Some canons forbade, not only that any one should give his daughter in marriage to a clerk, but that any lay person should intermarry with the child of a clerk; and there were canons which forbade the ordination, of the sons of clergymen, as being an "accursed seed". In this respect, however, the humaner principle that the innocent should not suffer for the sins of their parents appears to have more generally prevailed.

Dearly as the benefit was bought, we must not overlook one great good which resulted from the enforcement of celibacy that to this is chiefly to be ascribed the preservation of the clergy during the middle ages from becoming, like other classes whose dignity had at first been personal and official, a hereditary caste.

Monasticism.

During the earlier part of this period, the monastic life was on the decline. Some of the abuses which had arisen among the Greeks may be gathered from the canons of the synod which was held at Constantinople in 861, and which is known as the "First and Second". It is there stated that many persons professed to consecrate their substance by founding monasteries, yet contrived to make such foundations a source of profit; and that some assumed the monastic habit with the view of gaining a reputation for piety, but lived with the freedom of laymen. In order to guard against these evils, it is enacted that no monastery shall be built without leave of the bishop in whose diocese it is situated, and that no one shall be admitted to the monastic profession until after a noviciate of three years. Another canon orders that bishops shall not dilapidate the property of their sees for the purpose of founding monasteries.

In the west, the reform undertaken by Louis the Pious soon passed away. The practice of appropriating the revenues of abbeys (an abuse which was also largely practised in the eastern church) increased. Abbacies were granted by French kings to laymen as hereditary possessions; some of them were even assigned to queens or other ladies. Kings took the revenues of abbeys into their own hands, and bishops were not slow to imitate the example; thus Hatto of Mayence, who died in 912, annexed to his archiepiscopal dignity the abbacies of twelve monasteries, and some abbacies were fixedly attached to certain sees.

The want of due superintendence which arose from this practice combined with other causes to produce a great decay of monastic discipline. Such was this decay in France that the monks are said to have been generally unacquainted with the rule of St. Benedict, and even ignorant whether they were bound by any rule whatever. In many monasteries the abbots openly lived with wives or concubines

The council of Trosley, in 909, laments the general corruption. Some monasteries, it is said, have been burnt or destroyed by pagans, some have been plundered of their property, and those of which the traces remain observe no form of a regular institute. They have no proper heads; the manner of life is disorderly; some monks desert their profession and employ themselves in worldly business; as the fine gold becomes dim without the workman's care, so the monastic institution goes to ruin for want of regular abbots. Lay abbots with their wives and children, with their soldiers and their dogs, occupy the cloisters of monks, of canons, and of nuns; they take it on themselves to give directions as to a mode of life with which they are altogether unacquainted, and the inmates of monasteries cast off all regard for rule as to dress and diet. It is the predicted sign, the abomination of desolation standing in the place where it ought not. About the same time we are told that John, afterwards abbot of Gorze, on resolving to become a monk, could not find any monastery north of the Alps, and hardly any one in Italy, where the regular discipline was observed.

Soon after this a reformation was set on foot in various quarters. The lead was taken by Berno, abbot of Beaume, and founder and abbot of Gigni. He had already established a reform in these two societies, when in 912 he was invited to Cluny by William, duke of Auvergne or Upper Aquitaine, who desired him to choose a spot within the dukedom for the foundation of a monastery; and Berno made choice of Cluny itself. A society of canons had been founded there in the preceding century, but the buildings were then occupied by the duke's hunting establishment. In his "testament", or charter, William declares that he gives the estate for the foundation of a monastery in honour of St. Peter and St. Paul; first, for the love of God, then for the souls of the late king Odo, of his own wife, kindred, and friends, for the good of the catholic faith, and of all orthodox Christians in times past, present, or to come. Berno is to be the first abbot, and after his death the monks are to enjoy the uncontrolled election of their superior. They are to be exempt from all interference of the founder and his family, of the king's majesty, and of every other earthly power. The duke solemnly charges all popes, bishops, and secular princes to respect their property; he prays the two apostles and the

pope to take the monastery under their special protection, and imprecates curses on any one who shall invade it.

Berno, like St. Benedict and other monastic founders, began with a company of twelve monks. The institutions of Cluny excited emulation, and other monasteries were committed to the abbot for reform. In 927, Berno was succeeded by his disciple Odo, whose fame so much eclipsed that of his master that even some members of the Cluniac order have spoken of Odo as their founder. To the rule of St. Benedict Odo added many minute observances. Thus the monks were required at the end of meals to gather up and consume all the crumbs of their bread. There was at first a disposition to evade this regulation; but when a dying monk exclaimed in horror that he saw the devil holding up in accusation against him a bag of crumbs which he had been unwilling to swallow, the brethren were terrified into obedience. Periods of strict silence were enforced; and stories are told of the inconveniences to which the Cluniacs submitted rather than break this rule as that one allowed his horse to be stolen, and that two suffered themselves to be carried off prisoners by the Northmen. For their communications among themselves at such times a code of signals was established, which the novices were obliged to learn. The monks were bled five times a year, and it is doubtful whether Odo permitted the use of any medical treatment except bleeding and the application of cautery. When two of his monks entreated him to allow them some medicine, he consented, but told them in anger that they would never recover; and the result justified his foresight, if not his humanity.

The fame of Cluny spread. Odo, at the request of popes, thrice visited Italy for the purpose of reconciling princes, and he availed himself of these opportunities to introduce his reforms in that country. Under his successor, Aymard, no fewer than 278 charters, either bestowing or confirming gifts, attest the wealth which was attracted to the monastery by the spectacle which it exhibited of revived austerity. A series of conspicuous saints maintained and advanced the renown of the Cluniacs. Majolus, or Mayeul, who, in consequence of Aymard's having lost his sight, was appointed his coadjutor in 948, and became sole abbot in 965, had before joining the congregation refused the archbishopric of Besançon, and on the death of Benedict VI, in 974, he declined the popedom. The fifth abbot, Odilo, was equal to any of his predecessors in reputation and in influence. Popes treated him as an equal; kings and emperors sought his friendship and were guided by his advice; bishops repaired to Cluny, to place themselves as simple monks under his governments. His contemporary Fulbert of Chartres styles him "the archangel of the monks"; another contemporary, the notorious Adalbero of Laon, in a satirical poem calls him "King Odilo of Cluny". He was believed to have the power of miracles, and an extraordinary efficacy was ascribed to his prayers. Benedict VIII, it is said, appeared to John bishop of Porto, telling him that he was suffering torments, but that he could be delivered by the prayers of Odilo. The abbot, on being informed of this, engaged in the charitable work, and after a time the release of the pope was shown in a vision to one of the monks of Cluny. In days when the popes were far from saintly, the people looked away from them to the great head of the monastic society, whose position was such that he refused to exchange it for an archbishopric, or even for St. Peter's chair.

The reform begun at Cluny extended far and wide. When a revival of the true monastic asceticism had been displayed in any province, a regard for public opinion and for self-preservation urged the imitation of it on the other communities of the neighborhood. A general zeal for monachism sprang up; multitudes of men became monks, many offered their children, some even devoted themselves and their posterity as serfs to a monastery, in the hope of a reward in heaven. Princes or bishops often employed the Cluniacs in carrying out a forcible reformation; many monasteries of their own accord conformed to the Cluniac rule, and placed themselves in connexion with the mother society.

The nature of this connexion was various; in some cases, the affiliated monastery was in strict subjection, so that it not only looked to Cluny for its abbots and priors, but did not

even receive a novice without a reference to the “archabbot”; in other cases the lesser monastery enjoyed independence in the administration of its own concerns and in the choice of its superiors, while it acknowledged the great abbot as its chief, and regarded him as invested with a supreme authority and authorised to watch over its discipline. Thus was formed the “Congregation of Cluny”, the first example in the west (if we except the peculiar system of St. Columba) of an organisation which had been introduced into Egypt by Pachomius in the earliest age of monasticism. The work of establishing this organisation was accomplished by the sixth abbot, Hugh, who succeeded Odilo at the age of twenty-five in 1049, and governed the society for sixty years.

The number of monasteries connected with Cluny, in France, in Germany, in Italy, in England, and in Spain, amounted by the end of the twelfth century to two thousand.

Another famous society was founded by Romuald, a nobleman descended from the ducal family of Ravenna. Romuald’s early life was dissolute, but at the age of twenty he was suddenly reclaimed from it. His father, Sergius, had been engaged in a dispute as to some property with a kinsman. The two met, each at the head of his partisans, and Sergius slew his opponent. Romuald, who had been concerned in the fray, although he had not himself shed blood, was so much shocked by the result, that he entered the monastery of St. Apollinaris with the intention of doing penance for forty days, and while there, he was determined, by visions in which the patron saint of the house appeared to him, to embrace the monastic life.

After having spent three years in the monastery, he placed himself under the tuition of a hermit named Marinus, who was in the habit of daily reciting the whole psalter, saying thirty psalms under one tree and forty under another. Romuald was required to respond in these exercises, and whenever he failed (as often happened from his slowness in reading), he received a blow from the hermit's staff. By the frequent repetition of this, he lost the hearing of his left ear, whereupon he humbly begged that the chastisement might be transferred to the right ear. Although he used afterwards to relate the story of his training as a matter of amusement, his own piety savoured too much of his eccentric master's zeal.

When living on the borders of Spain as a hermit, he heard that his father, who had withdrawn into a monastery, was inclined to return to the world, and he resolved to prevent such a step. The people of the neighborhood, on learning that he was about to leave them, were unwilling to lose so holy a man, and, by a strange working of superstition, laid a plan for murdering him, in order that they might possess his relics. Romuald escaped by feigning madness, and made his way barefoot to Ravenna, where he assailed his father with reproaches and blows, fastened his feet in stocks, and loaded him with chains until the old man was brought to a better sense of the monastic duty of perseverance.

Throughout his life Romuald was involved in a succession of troubles with monks in various places, on whom he attempted to force a reform with too great violence and rigour. Among his own ascetic performances, it is related that he was once silent for seven years.

Stirred to emulation by the labours of his friend Bruno or Boniface, who had been martyred by the heathens of Prussia, he undertook a mission to Hungary. On the way he fell ill, and thought of returning, whereupon he suddenly recovered; but as often as he resumed his intention of proceeding, his sickness again attacked him. At length he yielded to what he supposed to be a providential intimation that the work was not for him; but fifteen of his companions went on, and labored in Hungary with good effect.

Romuald’s great work was the foundation of Camaldoli among the Apennines in the year 1018. He began by building five cells and an oratory. The inmates were to live as hermits, and were not to associate together except for worship. Their duties as to devotion, silence, and diet, were very rigid; but Romuald, although he often passed days in entire abstinence, would not allow his disciples to attempt a like austerity; they must, he said, eat every day, and always be hungry. A vision of angels ascending Jacob’s ladder induced him to prescribe a white dress, whereas that of the Benedictines was black. Romuald died in 1027, at

the age of a hundred and twenty. Rudolf who was “general” of the Camaldolese from 1082, mitigated the severity of the rule, and added to the hermits an institution of coenobites, whose habits gradually became very different from those of the original foundation. These monks became an order, with monasteries affiliated to Camaldoli, but it did not spread to any great extent, although it has continued to the present day.

Another monastic reformer was John Gualbert, a Florentine of noble birth, whose conversion, like that of Romuald, arose out of one of the feuds which were characteristic of his age and country. Having been charged by his father to avenge the death of a kinsman, he met the murderer on Good Friday in a narrow pass near the bottom of the hill on which stands the monastery of St. Miniato, and was about to execute his vengeance; but when the guilty man threw himself from his horse and placed his arms in the form of a cross, as if expecting certain death, Gualbert was moved to spare him in reverence for the holy sign and for the solemn day. He then ascended the hill in order to pay his devotions in the monastic church, and while engaged in prayer, he saw a crucifix incline its head towards him, as if in acknowledgment of the mercy which he had shown. By this miraculous appearance, Gualbert was moved to become a monk, but his father, on hearing of his design, rushed to St. Miniato, assailed him with reproaches, and threatened to do mischief to the monastery. Gualbert, however, persevered in his resolution, and distinguished himself so much by his asceticism that ten years later his brethren wished to elect him abbot. But he declined the dignity, and soon after left the monastery in disgust at the election of a simoniacal abbot, according to some authorities, while others suppose that he withdrew out of a desire to avoid the distraction occasioned by crowds of visitors. After a sojourn at Camaldoli (where he learnt from Romuald’s institutions although the founder was already dead), Gualbert fixed himself at Vallombrosa, and there founded a society of hermits in 1039. To these coenobites were afterwards added, and the organisation of the order was completed by the institution of lay-brethren, whose business it was to practise handicrafts and to manage the secular affairs of the community, while by their labors the monks were enabled to devote themselves wholly to spiritual concerns. The rigour of the system was extreme; novices were obliged to undergo a year of severe probation, during which they were subjected to degrading employments, such as the keeping of swine, and daily cleaning out the pigsty with their bare hands; and Gualbert carried his hatred of luxury so far as to condemn the splendour of monastic buildings. His anger against offences is said to have been so violent that delinquents “supposed heaven and earth, and even God Himself, to be angry with them”; but to the penitent he displayed the tenderness of a mother. For himself he declined ordination, even to the degree of ostiary. He deviated from the Benedictine rule by attiring his monks in gray, but the colour was afterwards changed to brown, and eventually to black. Gualbert built and reformed many monasteries, and in obedience to pope Alexander II he reluctantly became head of the order which he had founded. His death took place in 1093.

In Germany the attempts at monastic reform met with much stubborn resistance. The monks sometimes deserted their house in a body, as when Godehard, afterwards bishop of Hildesheim, attempted to improve Hersfeld, although he at length succeeded in bringing them back. Sometimes they rose in rebellion against their reforming abbots, beat them, blinded them, or even attempted their lives. The general feeling of his class is expressed by Widukrod of Corbey, who gravely tells us that a “grievous persecution” of the monks arose about the year 945, in consequence of some bishops having said that they would rather have a cloister occupied by a few inmates of saintly life than by many careless ones, a saving which the chronicler meets by citing the parable of the tares. Yet in Germany some improvement was at length effected. Among the agents of this improvement William abbot of Hirschau is especially eminent. He raised the number of his monks from fifteen to a hundred and fifty, founded some new monasteries, reformed more than a hundred, and in 1069 formed the monks into a congregation after the pattern of Cluny, adopting the system of lay-brethren

from Vallombrosa. The virtues of William were not limited to devotion, purity of life, and rigour of discipline; he is celebrated for his gentleness to all men, for his charity to the poor, for the largeness of his hospitality, for his cheerful and kindly behaviour, for his encouragement of arts and learning. He provided carefully for the transcription of the Bible and of other useful books, and, instead of locking them up in the library of his abbey, endeavoured to circulate, them by presenting copies to members of other religious houses. The sciences included in the Quadrivium, especially music and mathematics, were sedulously cultivated at Hirschau, and under William the monks were distinguished for their skill in all that relates to the ornament of churches in building, sculpture, painting, carving of wood, and working in metals.

In the course of these reforms, the lay impropriations were very generally got rid of. Many of the holders spontaneously resigned their claims; others were constrained by princes to do so, and new grants of like kind were sparingly made. The practice, however, was not extinct, and monasteries, as we have seen, suffered grievously from the exactions of the advocates whose duty it was to protect them. Kings often interfered in their affairs, and the privileges of free election which monastic bodies had received, or even purchased, from bishops, from princes, and from popes, were found in practice to be utterly unavailing against a royal nomination of an abbot.

The change of dynasty in France had a very favourable effect for monasteries. Hugh Capet, before his elevation to the throne, had held the abbacies of St. Denys and St. Germain, and was styled abbot-count. But from a wish, probably, to secure to himself the interest of the monks, he resigned his abbacies, restored to the monastic communities the power of choosing their superiors, and on his deathbed charged his son Robert to refrain from alienating monastic property, and from interfering with the right of free election.

The power of bishops over monasteries was diminished during this period. Any impression which the decay of monastic discipline might have made on the popular mind in favor of episcopal superintendence was neutralised by the sight of the disorders which prevailed among the bishops themselves, and by the fact that many of them, by impropriating the revenues of abbacies, contributed largely to the evils in question. And when the monks had been restored to reputation and influence by the reforms of the tenth century, they began to set up claims against the episcopal authority. Abbo of Fleury led the way by refusing to make the customary profession of obedience to his diocesan, the bishop of Orleans. A spirit of strong hostility arose between the two classes, and was signally displayed when a council at St. Denys, in 997, proposed to transfer to the parochial clergy the tithes which were held by monastic bodies, as well as those which were in the hands of laymen. The monks of St. Denys rose in tumult, and with the aid of the populace dispersed the assembled prelates; the president of the council, Siguin archbishop of Sens, as he fled, was pelted with filth, was struck between the shoulders with an axe, and almost killed. Abbo, as the leader of the monastic opposition, was charged with having instigated the rioters; and, although he vindicated himself in a letter addressed to king Hugh and his son, it is evident, from the relish with which his biographer relates the flight of the bishops, that the monastic party were not unwilling to see their opponents discomfited by such means. Abbo went to Rome for the assertion of the monastic privileges, and afterwards, when sent on a mission as to the question of the archbishopric of Reims, he obtained from Gregory V a grant that the bishop of Orleans should not visit the monastery of Fleury except by invitation from the abbot.

Monastic communities were naturally disposed to connect themselves immediately with the papal see since the pope was the only power to which they could appeal against bishops and princes. Some of them, as that of Cluny, were placed by their founders under the special protection of the pope, and a small acknowledgment was paid to Rome in token of such connexion. Yet the exemption which monasteries thus obtained from the control of their diocesan bishops was not as yet intended to debar the bishop from exercising his ordinary

right of mural oversight, but to secure the monks against abuses of the episcopal power against invasion of their property, interference in the choice of abbots, unfair exactions, or needless and costly visitations. And such papal grants as affected to confer privileges of greater extent were set aside. Sylvester II acknowledged, in a question as to a monastery at Perugia, that a monastic body could not transfer itself to the pope's immediate jurisdiction without the consent of the diocesan. The contest between the abbey of Fleury and its diocesans was not concluded by the grant bestowed on Abbo; for some years later we find John XVII complaining to king Robert that the archbishop of Sens and the bishop of Orleans treated the apostolical privileges with contempt, and had even ordered Gauzelin, the successor of Abbo, to throw them into the fire; while Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, who endeavoured to act as a mediator, declares that it was impossible for the abbot to escape from his duty of canonical obedience. Gregory V failed in an attempt to exempt Hirschau from the authority of the bishop of Constance; and when a later pope, John XVIII, granted the abbot of Hirschau a licence to say mass in the episcopal habit (for this was one of the forms in which the assumption of abbots displayed itself) the bishop complained to Conrad the Salic. Pressed at once by the emperor and by the bishop, the abbot was obliged to give up to his diocesan the episcopal staff and sandals which he had received from the pope, and these insignia were publicly burnt at the next diocesan synod. In 1025, at the synod of Anse (near Lyons) a complaint was made by the bishop of Macon, within whose diocese Cluny was situated, that the archbishop of Vienne had officiated at consecrations and ordinations in the abbey. The abbot, Odilo, produced a privilege from the pope, authorising the brotherhood to invite any bishop whom they might choose for the performance of such offices; but the council declared that no privilege could be valid against the ancient canons which invested bishops with jurisdiction over the monasteries within their dioceses. As the question continued to be disputed, Alexander II, in 1063, committed the investigation of it to cardinal Peter Damiani, who (as might have been expected from his monastic character and prejudices) gave a decision in favour of the abbot; and the pope renewed the grant, allowing the Cluniacs to call in any other bishop than their diocesan, and ordering that no bishop should lay them under interdict or excommunication. Although the time was not yet ripe for the full display of monastic independence, the course of things was rapidly tending in that direction.

The continued popularity of monachism is shown, among other instances, by the means which secular persons took to connect themselves with it. Carrying out the principle of the brotherhoods which from the sixth century had been formed for the purpose of commending their deceased members to the Divine mercy by prayers and masses, it became usual to seek enrolment as *confraters* of a monastery, and by such a connection the *confrater* was entitled to expect spiritual benefits from the prayers of the society. In this manner Conrad I was associated with St. Gall, and Henry II with Cluny. Another practice, which has been traced by some as high as the seventh century, was that of putting on the monastic habit in dangerous sickness, a new form, apparently, of the obligation to penance which had been more anciently undertaken in such circumstances. If one who had taken the habit, on recovering, returned to secular life, his relapse was disapproved; but it was sometimes found that even the monastic habit, where it was retained, was no security against a return to the sins of the earlier life.

Monasteries or monastic orders were often connected with each other by the bond of mutual intercession and by mutual commemoration of deceased brethren; and the deaths of abbots or of other distinguished members in any monastery were in such cases announced to the other houses of the association by circulars which were conveyed by special messengers.

In the eleventh century, then, monasticism was again in the fullness of its influence. The scandals of its past decay were more than retrieved by the frequent and widely extended reformations which had taken place each of them displaying in freshness and fervour a zeal

and a rigour which for the time captivated the minds of men, and forbade them to admit the thought that that which was now so pure might itself also in time decline.

Rites and Usages.

The ninth century saw the rise of a class of ritualists, who wrote commentaries on the services of the church. The first of them was Amalhart or Amalarius, a chorepiscopus of Metz (already mentioned in the history of the predestinarian controversy), who about 820 composed a treatise "On the Offices of the Church", in which he applied to these the system of mystical torture which had long been exercised on Holy Scripture. All the incidents of Divine service, every attitude and gesture, the dresses of the clergy, the ornaments of the church, the sacred seasons and festivals, were expounded as pregnant with symbolical meanings. Raban Maur and Walafrid Strabo, abbot of Reichenau, followed with liturgical writings in a similar style before the middle of the century; but another eminent writer of the time, Agobard, had taken a strongly different line. Being offended by the mass of irrelevant matter which he found in the service-books of the church of Lyons, he ejected from them all hymns and anthems but such as were taken from Scripture. For this he was censured by Amalarius in a book "On the Order of the Antiphony"; and he replied in tracts which, with much display of indignation against his opponent, maintain the principle on which his liturgical reforms had been executed. The archbishop declares the pieces which he had expunged to be "not only unfit and superfluous, but even profane and heretical"; he denounces the practice of devoting excessive attention to music, while the study of Scripture is neglected a practice, he says, which puffs up clerks who know nothing but music with a conceit of their accomplishments; and, when Amalarius published his work on the *Divine Offices*, Agobard not only reprobated the idle character of his comments, but charged him with errors in doctrine. At a later time, Florus, master of the cathedral school at Lyons, who had been opposed to Amalarius in the case of Gottschalk, assailed him with much asperity for his ritual system, and cited him before two councils, the second of which, on finding that his mystical theories rested on no better a foundation than his own fancy, pronounced them to be dangerous. But the style of exposition which Amalarius introduced was followed by the ritualists of the middle ages; it has been kept up in the Roman church; and attempts (which, however, can hardly be regarded as serious) have even been made to revive it in the English church of our own day.

In the ninth century were formed some collections of lives of saints, arranged according to the order of the calendar, and bearing the title of Martyrologies. Among the compilers of these were Florus, Ado, archbishop of Vienne, Usuard, a monk of St. German's, at Paris, and Notker of St. Gall. Biographies of individual saints were produced in vast numbers. Older lives were re-written; new legends were composed, as substitutes for the more authentic records which had perished in the ravages of the Northmen; many narratives, with the holy men and women who were the subjects of them, sprang from the invention of the monks. Not only was there much likeness of detail between stories of this kind, but even the whole accounts of some saints were identical in everything except the names. Few men in those days shared the scruples of Letald, a monk of Mici, who, in the preface to a biography, blames the practice of attempting by falsehoods to enhance the glory of the saints, and says that, if the saints themselves had been followers of lies, they could never have reached their perfection of holiness.

From the time when St. Dionysius, the martyr of Paris, was identified with the Areopagite, other churches endeavored to invest their founders with a like venerable character. Among them was the church of Limoges, which, as its first bishop, Martial, had been reckoned by Gregory of Tours with the companions of Dionysius in the third century, now referred him, as well as the founder of the see of Paris, to the apostolic age. At a council held at Limoges in 1023, a question arose as to the proper designation of the saint : the bishop,

Jordan, was for styling him confessor, but Hugh, abbot of St. Martial's, insisted that his patron was entitled to be called apostle, as having been one of the seventy disciples. Among the most strenuous advocates of the abbot's view was the chronicler Ademar, who had received his education in the monastery of St. Martial : in a vehement letter on the subject, he professes his belief in a legendary life of the saint, as being of apostolic antiquity, and no less authentic than the four Gospels; and he strongly declares that no mortal pope can deprive of the apostolical dignity one whom St. Peter himself reveres as a brother apostle. The matter was taken up by councils at Poitiers and at Paris; whosoever should refuse the title of apostle to St. Martial was branded as being like the Ebionites, who, out of enmity against St. Paul, limited the number of apostles to the original twelve; and John XVIII, on being appealed to, declared that it would be madness to question the saint's right to a name which was given not only to the companions of the first apostles, but to St. Gregory for the conversion of England, and to others for their eminent labours as missionaries. The apostolic dignity of Martial, which raised him above martyrs, to whom as a confessor he would have been inferior, was confirmed by councils at Bourges and at Limoges in 1031, and bishop Jordan acquiesced in the decision.

The number of saints had increased by degrees. Charlemagne, as we have seen, found it necessary to forbid the reception of any but such as were duly accredited; but the multiplication went on, the bishops being the authorities by whom the title of sanctity was conferred. In the end of the tenth century, a new practice was introduced. At a Roman council, held in 993, Ludolf, bishop of Augsburg, presented a memoir of Ulric, one of his predecessors who had died twenty years before, and referred it to the judgment of the bishops who were present, as being an assembly guided by the Holy Spirit. The sanctity of Ulric was attested by stories of miracles, wrought both in his lifetime and after death; and the pope, John XV, with the council, ordered his memory should be venerated as that of a saint, in words which, while they refer all holiness and religious honour to the Saviour, yet contain the dangerous error of interposing his saints as mediators between Him and mankind.

This was the first authentic instance in which canonisation (*i.e.* the insertion of a name in the canon or lists of saints) was conferred by the decree of a pope. The effect of such a decree was to entitle the saint to reverence throughout the whole of Western Christendom, whereas the honor bestowed by bishops or provincial councils was only local. But the pope did not as yet claim an exclusive right; metropolitans continued to canonise, sometimes with the consent of popes, sometimes by their own sole authority, until Alexander III, in 1170, declared that, "even although miracles be done by one, it is not lawful to reverence him as a saint without the sanction of the Roman church". Yet, in whatever hands the formal sanction might be lodged, the character of saintship was mainly conferred by the people. When a man of reputed holiness died, miracles began to be wrought or imagined, an altar was built over the grave, and an enthusiasm was speedily raised which easily made out a case for canonisation. Bishops and popes felt the expediency of complying with the popular feeling, and thus the catalogue of saints was continually swelled by fresh additions.

Stories of miracles done by the saints abounded, and they show how the belief in such interpositions, as probable in every variety of occasions and circumstances, was likely to place these lower mediators in the way of the Author of all miracles. The oppressiveness of too frequent miracles, and the bad effects which the possession of wonder-working relics produced on monks, were felt by many abbots, and some of them, like Hildulf a of Moyen-Moutier in an earlier time, took means to deliver their monasteries from such dangerous privileges.

The honours paid to the blessed Virgin were continually advancing to a greater height. The most extravagant language was used respecting her, and was addressed to her. Peter Damiani speaks of her as "deified", as "exalted to the throne of God the Father, and placed in the seat of the very Trinity". "To thee", he says, "is given all power in heaven and in earth; nothing is impossible to thee, to whom it is possible even to raise again the desperate to the

hope of bliss. For thou approachest the golden altar of man's reconciliation, not only asking but commanding; as a mistress, not as a handmaid". He revels in the mystical language of the Canticles, which he interprets as a song in celebration of her nuptials with the Almighty Father. Saturday was regarded as especially consecrated to the Virgin, and offices of prayer to her were framed. The *Ave*, or angelic salutation, became an ordinary part of devotion, and traces are found of what was afterwards styled the Rosary the repetition of a certain number of prayers (as the Paternoster fifteen times, and the *Ave* a hundred and fifty times) in her honour. New titles were invented for her; thus Odo of Cluny styled her "mother of mercy". The newly converted Hungarians were taught by a Venetian, on whom king Stephen had bestowed a bishopric, to call her "lady" or "mistress", and they were placed under her special protection as "the family of St. Mary".

The festival of All Saints, which had been instituted at Rome in the eighth century, and had been already known in England, was in 835 extended to France, Germany, and Spain, by Gregory IV. In the end of the tenth century a new celebration was annexed to it. A French pilgrim, it is said, in returning from Jerusalem, was cast on a little island of the Mediterranean, where he met with a hermit who told him that the souls of sinners were tormented in the volcanic fires of the island, and that the devils might often be heard howling with rage because their prey was rescued from them by the prayers and alms of the pious, and especially of the monks of Cluny. On reaching his own country, the pilgrim, in compliance with the hermit's solemn adjuration, reported this to abbot Odilo, who in 998 appointed the morrow of All Saints to be solemnly observed at Cluny for the repose of all faithful souls, with psalmody, masses, and a copious distribution of alms and refreshment to all poor persons who should be present. The celebration was early in the next century extended to the whole Cluniac order; and eventually a pope (it is not certain who) ordered its observance throughout the church.

The passion for relics was unabated, and was gratified by the "invention" (as it was somewhat ambiguously called) of many very remarkable articles. Among those discovered in France during the tenth century were one of our Lord's sandals at St. Julien in Anjou, part of the rod of Moses at Sens, and a head of St. John the Baptist (for more than one such head were shown) at St. Jean d'Angely. Vendome boasted the possession of one of the tears shed by our Lord over Lazarus, which had been caught by an angel, and given by him to St. Mary Magdalene. The discoveries extended far back into the Old Testament history; there were relics of Abraham and hairs of Noah's beard; for of any additional improbability arising from the greater remoteness of time the age was altogether insensible. These relics drew vast crowds of pilgrims, and became important sources of wealth to the monasteries or churches which possessed them. For the sake of such sacred objects, theft had always been reckoned venial; and now, as we have seen, the peasantry of Catalonia were even ready to murder St. Romuald in the hope of obtaining benefits from his remains.

The impostures connected with this superstition were numberless, and in some cases they were detected. Relics were sometimes tested by fire, as those found in the Arian churches on the conversion of Spain to orthodoxy had been. Radulf the Bald gives an account of a fellow who went about under different names, digging up bones and extolling them as relics of saints. At a place in the Alps he displayed in a portable shrine some fragments which he styled relics of a martyr, St. Just, and pretended to have discovered by the direction of an angel. A multitude of cures were wrought a proof, says the chronicler, that the devil can sometimes do miracles; and the people of the neighborhood flocked to the relics, "each one regretting that he had not some ailment of which he might seek to be healed". The impostor grew into high favor with a marquis who had founded a monastery at Susa; and when a number of bishops had met for the consecration, the pretended relics, together with others, were placed in the church; but in the course of the following night, some monks who were watching saw a number of figures, black as Ethiops, arise out of the box and take to flight.

Although, however, the fraud was thus miraculously discovered, we are told that the common people for a time adhered to their belief in the relic-monger. Nor were the dealers in relics the only persons who practised on the popular credulity in this respect; another class made it their trade to run about from one shrine to another, pretending to be cured by the miraculous virtue of the saints.

Contests sometimes arose as to the genuineness of relics. The monks of St. Emmeran, at Ratisbon, disputed with the great French abbey of St. Denys the possession of its patron's body. The body of St. Gregory the Great was believed at once to be in St. Peter's at Rome, and to have been secretly carried off to St. Medard's at Soissons; while Sens, Constance, and somewhat later Torres Novas in Portugal could each display his head. The monks of Monte Cassino denied the genuineness of the remains which had been translated to Fleury as those of St. Benedict, and that saint himself was said to have confirmed the denial by visions; Canterbury and Glastonbury had rival pretensions to St. Dunstan; and we have seen that both Gnesen and Prague claimed to possess the real body of St. Adalbert, the apostle of Prussia.

Pilgrimages were more frequent than ever. Rome was, as before, the chief resort, and the hardships of the way were sometimes enhanced by voluntary additions, such as that of walking barefoot. Compostella became another very famous place of pilgrimage from the time when the relics of St. James the Greater were supposed to be found there in 816. Many ventured to encounter the dangers of the long and toilsome journey to Jerusalem, where, from the ninth century, was displayed at Easter the miracle of the light produced without human hand "considering the place, the time, and the intention, probably the most offensive imposture to be found in the world". This pilgrimage was often imposed as a penance; and the enthusiasm for voluntarily undertaking it was intensely excited by the approach of the thousandth year from the Saviour's birth, and the general expectation of the end of the world. Beginning among the humblest of the people, the feeling gradually spread to the middle classes, and from them to the highest to bishops, counts, and marquises, to princes and noble ladies; to die amid the hallowed scenes of Palestine was regarded as an eminent blessing, as an object of eager aspiration; and, after the alarm of the world's end had passed away, the pilgrimage to Jerusalem still continued to be frequented. In 1010 the church of the Holy Sepulchre was destroyed by the caliph Hakem, a frantic tyrant, who invented a new religion, still professed by the Druses of Lebanon. It was believed that the caliph was instigated to this by some western Jews, who alarmed him by representing the dangers likely to result from the interest with which the Sepulchre was regarded by Christians; and the Jews of France and other countries paid heavily in blood and suffering for the suspicion. After the assassination of Hakem the caliphs resumed the former system of toleration. Hakem's mother, a Christian, began the rebuilding of the church; increasing crowds of pilgrims flowed eastward, carrying with them gifts in aid of the work, and returning laden with relics; and the fashion continued to become more general, until in the last years of the century it produced the crusades.

ARCHITECTURE.

The beginning of the eleventh century was marked by an extraordinary activity in church-building. There had been little disposition to undertake such works while the expected end of all things forbade the hope of their endurance; but when the thousandth year was completed, the building of churches became a passion. It was not limited to the work of providing for necessity by the erection of new buildings or by enlargement of the old, nor even to the addition of embellishments; but churches which had in every way been found amply sufficient were destroyed in order that more costly structures might be raised in their stead. "It was", says a chronicler, "as if the world were re-awaking, as if it everywhere threw away its old dress, and put on a white vesture of churches". And the effect on the art of architecture was important. Charlemagne's great church at Aix had been copied (although not

without the introduction of original features) from the Byzantine type, as exhibited at Ravenna, and after it many churches along the Rhine had displayed Byzantine characteristics, especially the surmounting cupola. St. Mark's at Venice, a church of very oriental style, was built between 977 and 1071. But in general the ecclesiastical architecture of the west was Roman, and the plan of the basilica was preserved. The churches of the eleventh century maintain the continuity of Roman art, but have yet a new character of their own. It is no longer Roman art in debasement, but a style fresh and vigorously original, the solemn, massive, and enduring architecture which, in its various modifications, has been styled Romanesque, Lombard, or Norman.

It would appear that the art of staining glass, which afterwards became so important in the decoration of churches, was already invented, although the date of the invention is unknown. There has, indeed, been much confusion on this subject, through the mistaken assumption that passages which contain any mention of coloured windows must relate to the painting of figures on the glass, whereas the older descriptions of such windows in reality mean nothing more than the arrangement of pieces of coloured glass in variegated patterns. Perhaps the earliest distinct notice of stained glass is in Richer's history, where we are told that, towards the end of the tenth century, Adalbert, archbishop of Reims, adorned his cathedral with windows "containing divers histories."

EXCOMMUNICATION AND ANATHEMA.

The system of Penance underwent some changes. Things which had been censured by councils in the earlier part of the ninth century became authorised before its end; thus the penitential books, proscribed (as we have seen) by the council of Châlons in 813, are named by Regino among the necessary furniture of a parish priest's library, as to which the bishop is to inquire at his visitation. By means of these books any re-enactments of old canons, or any new canons which appeared to increase the severity of penance, were practically evaded. The rich could commute their penance for payments to churches for works of public utility, such as the building of bridges and making of roads, for alms to the poor, for liberation of slaves or redemption of captives, for the purchase of masses and psalms; while for the poorer classes the Penitentials provided such commutations as pilgrimages, recitations of psalms or other devotional exercises, visiting the sick and burying the dead. The system of vicarious penances, which has been already noticed as existing in England, was, with some varieties, practised in other countries also. Councils might and did enact that with the outward acts which were prescribed the right dispositions of the heart should be joined. But how were these to be secured or ascertained? how were the penitents to be preserved from the delusions which a formal prescription of external acts, as equivalent to repentance, could hardly fail to engender? And the dangers of such a system were the more serious, because, by a departure from the view taken in the early ages, penance was now supposed able not only to restore the offender to the church on earth, but to assure him of the divine forgiveness.

With a view of increasing the hold of church-discipline on the minds of men, a distinction was invented between excommunication and anathema, and the assistance of the secular power was called in to enhance by civil penalties the terror of these sentences. Excommunication was exclusion from the privileges of the church; the heavier doom of anathema placed the offender under a curse. The council of Pavia in 850 enacted that the excommunicate person should be incapable of holding any military office or any employment in the service of the state, and should be debarred from ordinary intercourse with Christians. But anathema inflicted further punishments; the culprit against whom it was pronounced could not be a party in ecclesiastical suits, he could not make or establish a will, he could not hold any property under the church, he could not even obtain justice in secular courts where an oath was required, because he was not admissible to swear. No priest would bless the

marriage of such a person; the last sacraments were denied to him, and he was to be shut out from Christian burial, penalties which, if the sinner himself were unmoved by them, were likely to act powerfully on the minds of some who were connected with him, and often drew from these large offers of payment for the reconciliation which it was supposed that the church could bestow even after the offender had passed from the world. The forms of curse became more elaborately fearful, and tales are told of the effect which they took on the unhappy men against whom they were launched, causing them to die suddenly in their impiety, or to wither away under the tortures of long and hopeless disease.

There were, however, some for whom the disabilities annexed to anathema or excommunication had little terror. Emperors and kings, counts and dukes, were strong enough to get justice for themselves, although under a sentence which would have debarred meaner men from it : they could obtain the ministrations of religion from chaplains, in defiance of all ecclesiastical censures; they held their secular positions unaffected by the denunciations of the church. In order to bring such powerful offenders under control, the Interdict was devised a sentence which placed a whole district or kingdom under ban, closing the churches, silencing the bells, removing the outward tokens of religion, and denying its offices to the people, except in such a measure and with such circumstances as tended to impress the imagination with a deeper horror. The infliction of penalties which involved alike the innocent and the guilty had been disapproved in earlier days. The first known attempt at imposing an interdict, that of the younger Hincmar, was defeated by his metropolitan and by his brother-bishops; and the earliest certain instance in which a bishop actually enforced such a sentence was that of Alduin, bishop of Limoges, in 994. An interdict pronounced against a sovereign was expected to act on him not so much in a direct way as by exciting the minds of his subjects; but the terrors of its indirect action were found to be such as few of the boldest, or of those who were least sensible to spiritual impressions, would venture to provoke or to defy.

In the earlier part of the eleventh century, a remarkable attempt was made by the clergy of France to mitigate the violence and the discords of the time. Radulf the Bald dates its origin from 1033, when the promise of an abundant harvest, after three years of terrible famine, appeared likely to open men's minds to the religious impressions connected with the completion of a thousand years from the Saviour's passion. But it would seem that the movement had really begun somewhat earlier, and that the subject had already been treated by councils, as by that of Limoges in 1031 the same which decreed the apostolic dignity of St. Martial.

With a view of putting an end to the feuds or private wars which had long wasted the population and the soil of France, it was proposed to bind men to the observance of peace; that they should abstain from wrong-doing and revenge, that every one should be able to go unarmed without fear of old enmities; that churches should shelter all but those who should be guilty of breaking the "peace of God". At the council of Limoges it was ordered that, if the chiefs of the district refused to comply, it should be laid under an interdict; that during the interdict no one, with the exception of the clergy, beggars, strangers, and infants, should receive Christian burial; that the offices of religion should be performed as if by stealth; that the churches should be stripped of their ornaments, that no marriage should be celebrated, that mourning habits should be worn, that no wine should be drunk on Friday, and no flesh should be eaten on Saturday. When the movement became more general, a bishop professed to have received a letter from heaven, commanding the observance of the peace. Gerard, bishop of Cambay (the same who has been mentioned as having converted a party of heretics to the church) alone opposed the scheme, as he had opposed a somewhat similar project some years before. He maintained that it was an interference with matters which belonged to the state; that the exercise of arms was sanctioned by Scripture; that it was lawful to require the restoration of things taken by violence, and amends for bodily injuries; that the proposed fasts ought not to be enforced on all, inasmuch as men were neither alike able to bear them nor

alike guilty so as to require such chastisement. The bishop's enemies, however, were able to misrepresent his conduct in such a manner that his flock rose against him as being an enemy to peace; and he found it advisable to withdraw his opposition. The people, it is said, were eager to accept the proposal, as if it had been a revelation from heaven, and from Aquitaine the movement spread into other provinces of France. A harvest equal to that of five years was gathered in; another and another fruitful season followed. But the enjoyment of plenty wore out the popular enthusiasm; violence and vice became more rife than ever and the decrees of councils were little heeded.

In 1038, Anno archbishop of Bourges, as if distrusting the efficacy of purely spiritual threats, assembled the bishops of his province, and agreed with them that an oath should be exacted from their people, by which every male above the age of fifteen should bind himself to wage implacable war against all robbers, oppressors, and enemies of holy church. The clergy were not exempted from the oath, but were to carry their sacred banners on the expeditions undertaken for the pacification of the country; and in consequence of this compact, many castles, which had been the strongholds of violence and tyranny, were destroyed, and ruffians, who had been a terror to their neighbours, were reduced to live peaceably. About the year 1041, a modified scheme was brought forward under the name of the "truce of God". It was now proposed, not that an unbroken peace should be established, but that war, violence, and all demands of reparation should be suspended during Advent, Lent, and certain festival seasons, and also from the evening of Wednesday in each week to the dawn of the following Monday a time which included the whole interval from the Saviour's betrayal to his resurrection. And in connection with this other decrees were passed for the protection of the weaker classes the clergy, monks, nuns, and women for securing the privilege of sanctuary, and for mitigating the injuries which were inflicted on the labours of husbandry, as that shepherds and their flocks should not be injured, that olive-trees should not be damaged, that agricultural tools should not be carried off, or, at least, should never be destroyed.

Henry I of Neustria refused to sanction this project, and it is said that, in punishment of his refusal, his dominions were visited by an extraordinary disease, a "fire from heaven", which was fatal to many of his subjects and crippled the limbs of others. But the truce, which found zealous and powerful advocates, such as Odilo of Cluny, was received throughout the rest of France and in other countries; and it became usual for the inhabitants of a diocese or a district to bind themselves by compact to the observance and to organise measures for the enforcement of it. The weekly period of rest was, however, too long to be generally adopted. A council held in 1047 at Elne, an episcopal city of the Spanish march, reduced it to the interval between the ninth hour on Saturday and the daybreak of Monday; and it appears thus abridged in the laws of Edward the Confessor. Yet at a later time we again find the longer weekly rest of four days enacted by councils; and it was in this form that the truce received for the first time the papal sanction from Urban II at Clermont, and was confirmed in the second and third councils of the Lateran. The frequent re-enactments of the truce would, if there were no other evidence, be enough to show that it was but irregularly observed. Yet, imperfect as was the operation of this measure, its effects were very beneficial in tending to check the lawlessness and disorder of the times by the influence of Christian humanity and mercy. "We must", says a historian nowise favorable to the church of the middle ages, "regard it as the most glorious of the enterprises of the clergy, as that which most conduced to soften manners, to develop the sentiments of compassion among men without injury to the spirit of bravery, to supply a reasonable basis for the point of honor, to bestow on the people as much of peace and happiness as the condition of society would then admit, and, lastly, to multiply the population to such a degree as was able afterwards to supply the vast emigrations of the Crusades".

Chivalry.

It was in these times that the institution of chivalry, so powerful in its influence on the middle ages, grew up, and at the end of the period embraced in this book the system was nearly complete

We have seen that during the distractions of France castles multiplied throughout the land; that each castle became an engine of aggression and defence, a centre of depredation. In this state of society every man's hand was against every man; the lord of the castle lived within its walls, cut off from intercourse with his neighbors, and only sallying forth for war, for private feuds, or for plunder. Yet the isolation of the nobles was not without its good effects. Debarred from other equal society, the feudal lord was obliged to cultivate that of his wife and children; and hence resulted a peculiar development of the family life. The lady, who in her husband's absence acted as the guardian of the castle, was invested with new responsibilities and a new dignity; while the training of youth occupied much of the time which might otherwise have hung heavily. The sons of vassals were sent to be educated under the roof of the superior, where they grew up together with his own sons; and thus a tie was formed which at once assured the lord of the fidelity of his vassals, and the vassals of their lord's protection. The nobly-born youths were able, like the deacon in the church, to perform offices of service without degradation. In the evening hours they were admitted to the society of the ladies, and from such intercourse a general refinement of manners arose among the higher classes.

That among the Germans the admission of a young man to the rank of warriors was marked by a public investiture with arms, we know from the evidence of Tacitus; and the continuance of the custom after the Frankish conquest of Gaul is to be traced from time to time in the annals. This ancient national usage now acquired a new importance, and assumed a form which at once signified the admission of the youth to the order of knighthood, and symbolized the tie between the vassal and the superior. It was celebrated with religious ceremonies which gave it the character of a military ordination. The candidate, a son of the lord or one of his vassals, was stripped of his dress, was bathed as if in a baptism, was clothed afresh with garments of symbolical meaning; he watched his arms in the castle chapel; he confessed and communicated; his armour was put on, his weapons were blessed, an exhortation as to his duties was addressed to him; he solemnly vowed to serve God, to protect the ladies and the weak, to be faithful and humble, gentle, courteous, honourable, and disinterested. According to a practice which was common in attesting documents and the like, he received a blow in remembrance of his new obligations, and by this blow, for which a stroke of the sword was afterwards substituted, the ceremony was completed.

The nature of these ceremonies proves that the clergy had taken up the old Teutonic rite of initiation, and had converted it to purposes of religion and humanity; and this is no less evident from the engagements to which the knight was bound differing so widely as they did from the general character of the laity in the times when they were introduced. The warriors, whose rude force was naturally dangerous to the church and to social order, were to be enlisted in the service of both, and bound to it by solemn engagements. And poetry as well as religion soon threw itself around the new institution. The legends of saints, which for centuries had been the only popular literature, were now rivalled by lays and romances of knightly adventure; and the ideal embodied in these compositions "noble chivalry, courtesy, humanity, friendliness, hardiness, love, friendship" became the model which the knights aspired to imitate. The history of the ages in which chivalry prevailed shows indeed a state of things far unlike the pure and lofty precepts of the institution; yet, however the reality may have fallen short of the ideal, it was a great gain for civilisation that such a pattern should be established as authoritative that men should acknowledge a noble and elevating standard in

their hearts, although their actual lives too commonly presented a sad and discreditable contrast to it.

BOOK VI.
FROM THE DEPOSITION OF POPE GREGORY VI. TO THE DEATH
OF POPE CELESTINE III, A.D. 1046-1198.

CHAPTER I.

THE PONTIFICATES OF CLEMENT II, DAMASUS II, LEO IX, VICTOR II,
STEPHEN IX, NICOLAS II, AND ALEXANDER II. A.D. 1046-1073.

THE deposition of Gregory VI and his rivals by the council of Sutri left the papacy vacant. It was said that the Roman clergy were almost universally disqualified for the dignity by ignorance, simony, or concubinage, and Henry III resolved to bestow it on one of the prelates who had accompanied him from Germany—Suidger, a Saxon by birth, and bishop of Bamberg. The nomination of Suidger is said by some authorities to have taken place at Sutri; but his formal inauguration was, according to ancient custom, reserved to be performed at Rome. On Christmas-eve 1046, the day after his arrival in the city, Henry desired the Romans, assembled in St. Peter's, to proceed to the election of a pope. They answered that they were bound by an oath to choose no other pope during the life-time of Gregory, but begged that the king would give them one who might be useful to the church; whereupon Henry was invested with the ensigns of the patriciate, and in the character of chief magistrate of Rome presented Suidger to the assembly. In answer to his question whether any worthier pope could be named from among the Roman clergy, no voice was raised by way of objection; and the king, leading Suidger by the hand, seated him in St. Peter's chair, where he was hailed with acclamations as Clement the Second. On Christmas day, the anniversary of the day on which, nearly two centuries and a half before, Charlemagne had been crowned by Leo III—the imperial coronation of Henry and his queen Agnes was celebrated with extraordinary splendour and solemnity.

The emperor was earnestly bent on a reformation of the church, and had selected Suidger as a fit agent for the execution of his plans. Soon after his election (Jan. 1047) the pope held a council with a view to the correction of abuses, and it was decreed that any one who had received ordination from a simoniac, knowing him to be such, should do penance for forty days. But beyond this little or nothing is known of Clement, except that he visited the south of Italy, and that after a pontificate of less than ten months he died at a monastery near Pesaro, in October 1047; whereupon Benedict IX, supported by his kinsmen, and by Boniface, the powerful marquis of Tuscany, seized the opportunity of again thrusting himself for a time into possession of the vacant see.

The emperor had returned to Germany in June 1047, carrying with him the deposed pope, Gregory. At a great assembly of bishops and nobles, which appears to have been held at Spire, Henry strongly denounced the simony which had generally prevailed in the disposal of church preferment. He declared himself apprehensive that his father's salvation might have been endangered by such traffic in holy things. The sin of simony, which infected the whole hierarchy, from the chief pontiff to the doorkeeper, had drawn down the scourges of famine, pestilence, and the sword; and all who had been guilty of it must be deposed. These words spread consternation among the prelates, who felt that they were all involved in the charge,

and implored the emperor to have pity on them. He replied by desiring them to use well the offices which they had obtained by unlawful means, and to pray earnestly for the soul of Conrad, who had been a partaker in their guilt. An edict was published against all simoniacal promotions, and Henry solemnly pledged himself to bestow his ecclesiastical patronage as freely as he had received the empire.

But while the emperor projected a reformation of the church by means of his own authority, there was among the clergy a party which contemplated a more extensive reform, and looked to a different agency for effecting it. This party was willing for the time to accept Henry's assistance; for his sincerity was unquestionable, his power was an important auxiliary, and his objects were in some degree the same with its own. Like the emperor, these reformers desired to extirpate simony, and to deliver the papacy from the tyranny of the Italian nobles. But their definition of simony was more rigid than his; with simony their abhorrence connected the marriage and concubinage of the clergy—offences which Henry (perhaps from a consciousness that his own character was not irreproachable as to chastity) did not venture to attack; and above all things they dreaded the ascendancy of the secular power over the church. To the connection of the church with the state, to the feudal obligations of the prelates, they traced the grievous scandals which had long disgraced the hierarchy—the rude and secular habits of the bishops, their fighting and hunting, their unseemly pomp and luxury, their attempts to render ecclesiastical preferments hereditary in their own families. And what if the empire were to achieve such an entire control over the papacy and the church as Henry appeared to be gaining? What would be the effect of such power, when transferred from the noble, conscientious, and religious emperor to a successor of different character? The church must not depend on the personal qualities of a prince; it must be guided by other hands, and under a higher influence; national churches, bound up with and subject to the state, were unequal to the task of reformation, which must proceed, not from the state, but from the hierarchy, from the papacy, from heaven through Christ's vicegerent, the successor of St. Peter; to him alone on earth it must be subject; and for this purpose all power must be centred in the papacy.

Henry had exacted from the Romans an engagement, for which he is said to have paid largely, that they would not again choose a pope without his consent. A deputation in the interest of the reforming party now waited on him with a request that he would name a successor to Clement. They would have wished for the restoration of Gregory VI; but, as such a proposal was likely to offend the emperor, they begged that he would appoint Halinard, archbishop of Lyons, who was well known and highly esteemed at Rome in consequence of frequent pilgrimages to the “threshold of the apostles”. Halinard, however, had no wish for the promotion, and sedulously abstained from showing himself at the imperial court. Henry requested the advice of Wazo, bishop of Liège, a prelate of very high reputation, whose wise and merciful views as to the treatment of heretics have been mentioned in a former chapter; the answer recommended the restoration of Gregory, whose deposition Wazo ventured to blame on the ground that the pope could not be judged except by God alone. But before this letter reached the emperor, his choice had already fallen on Poppo, bishop of Brixen, who assumed the name of Damasus II (Dec. 25, 1047). The new pope was conducted to Rome by Boniface, marquis of Tuscany, and Benedict fled at his approach; on the 17th of July, 1048, he was installed in St. Peter's chair; and on the 9th of August he was dead. The speedy deaths of two German popes were ascribed by some to poison; the opinion of another party is represented by Bonizo, bishop of Sutri, who tells us, in the fierceness of national and religious hatred, that Damasus, “a man full of all pride”, was appointed by the patricial tyranny of Henry, and that within twenty days after his invasion of the pontifical chair he “died in body and in soul”.

The emperor was again requested to name a pope, and fixed on his cousin Bruno. More than twenty years before this time Bruno had been chosen as bishop by the clergy and

people of Toul, had accepted that poor see against the will of the emperor Conrad, who had destined him for higher preferment; he enjoyed a great reputation for piety, learning, prudence, charity, and humility; he was laborious in his duties, an eloquent preacher, a skillful musician, and was not without experience in public affairs. From unwillingness to undertake the perilous dignity which was now offered to him, he desired three days for consideration, and openly confessed his sins with a view of proving his unfitness. But the emperor insisted on the nomination, and at a great assembly at Worms, in the presence of the Roman envoys, Bruno was invested with the ensigns of the papacy. After revisiting Toul he set out for Italy in pontifical state; but at Besançon it is said that he was met by Hugh abbot of Cluny, accompanied by an Italian monk named Hildebrand; and the result of the meeting was memorable.

Hildebrand was born of parents in a humble condition of life near Suana (now Sovana), an ancient Etruscan city and the seat of a bishopric, between 1010 and 1020. From an early age he was trained at Rome for the ecclesiastical profession under an uncle, who was abbot of St. Mary's on the Aventine. He embraced the most rigid ideas of monachism, and, disgusted by the laxity which prevailed among the Italian monks, he crossed the Alps, and entered the austere society of Cluny, where it is said that the abbot already applied to him the prophetic words, "He shall be great in the sight of the Highest". After leaving Cluny he visited the court of Henry, and on his return to Rome he became chaplain to Gregory VI, whose pupil he had formerly been. On the deposition of Gregory, Hildebrand accompanied him into Germany, and at his patron's death, in the beginning of 1048, he again withdrew to Cluny. There it may be supposed that, he brooded indignantly over that subjection of the church to the secular power which had been exemplified in the deprivation and captivity of Gregory; and that those theories became matured in his mind which were to influence the whole subsequent history of the church and of the world.

The character of Hildebrand was lofty and commanding. His human affections had been deadened by long monastic discipline; the church alone engrossed his love. Filled with magnificent visions of ecclesiastical grandeur, he pursued his designs with an indomitable steadiness, with a far-sighted patience, with a deep, subtle, and even unscrupulous policy. He well knew how to avail himself of small advantages as means towards more important ends, or to forego the lesser in hope of attaining the greater. He knew how to conciliate, and even to flatter, as well as how to threaten and denounce. Himself impenetrable and inflexible, he was especially skilled in understanding the characters of other men, and in using them as his instruments, even although unconscious or unwilling.

In his interviews with Bruno, Hildebrand represented the unworthiness of accepting from the emperor that dignity which ought to be conferred by the free choice of the Roman clergy and people. His lofty views and his powerful language prevailed; the pope laid aside the ensigns of the apostolical office and, taking Hildebrand as his companion, pursued his journey in the simple dress of a pilgrim. It is said that miracles marked his way; that at his prayer the swollen waters of the Teverone sank within their usual bounds, to give a passage to him and to the multitude which had gathered in his train; and his arrival at Rome, roughly clad and barefooted, raised a sensation beyond all that could have been produced by the display of sacerdotal or imperial pomp. In St. Peter's he addressed the assembled Romans, telling them that he had come for purposes of devotion; that the emperor had chosen him as pope, but that it was for them to ratify or to annul the choice. The hearers were strongly excited by his words; they could not but be delighted to find that, renouncing the imperial nomination as insufficient, he chose to rest on their own free election as the only legitimate title to the papacy. Nor was Bruno an unknown man among them; for yearly pilgrimages to Rome had made them familiar with his sanctity and his virtues and he was hailed with universal acclamations as Pope Leo the Ninth.

Hildebrand was now the real director of the papacy. Leo ordained him subdeacon, and bestowed on him the treasurership of the church, with other preferments. Among these was the abbacy of St. Paul's, on the Ostian way, which he restored from decay and disorder, and to which he was throughout life so much attached that, whenever he met with a check in any of his undertakings, he used to send for some of the monks, and ask them what sin they had committed to shut up God's ear against their intercessions for him. The party of which Hildebrand was the soul was further strengthened by some able men whom Leo brought from beyond the Alps, and established in high dignities—such as the cardinals Humbert, Stephen, and Hugh the White, Frederick, brother of Godfrey duke of Lorraine, and Azoline, bishop of Sutri. But above all these was conspicuous an Italian who was now introduced among the Roman clergy—Peter Damiani.

This remarkable man was born at Ravenna, in the year 1007. His mother, wrought to a sort of frenzy by the unwelcome addition to a family already inconveniently large, would have left the infant to perish; but when almost dead he was saved by the wife of a priest, whose upbraidings recalled the mother to a sense of her parental duty. Peter was early left an orphan, under the care of a brother, who treated him harshly, and employed him in feeding swine; but he was rescued from this servitude by another brother, Damian, whose name he combined with his own in token of gratitude. Through Damian's kindness he was enabled to study; he became famous as a teacher, pupils flocked to hear him, and their fees brought him abundant wealth. His life meanwhile was strictly ascetic; he secretly wore sackcloth, he fasted, watched, prayed, and, in order to tame his passions, he would rise from bed, stand for hours in a stream until his limbs were stiff with cold, and spend the remainder of the night in visiting churches and reciting the psalter. In the midst of his renown and prosperity Peter was struck by the thought that it would be well to renounce his position while in the full enjoyment of its advantages, and his resolution was determined by the visit of two brethren from the hermit society of Fonte Avellano in Umbria. On his giving them a large silver cup as a present for their abbot, the monks begged him to exchange it for something lighter and more portable; and, deeply moved by their unworldly simplicity, he quitted Ravenna without the knowledge of his friends, and became a member of their rigid order. Peter soon surpassed all his brethren in austerity of life, and even gained the reputation of miraculous power. He taught at Fonte Avellano and in other monasteries, and was raised to the dignity of abbot. The elevation of Gregory VI was hailed by Peter with delight, as the dawn of a new era for the church, and, although his hopes from that pope were soon extinguished by the council of Sutri, he was able to transfer his confidence to Henry III, so that he even rejoiced in the emperor's obtaining a control over elections to the papacy. He still, therefore, continued hopefully to exert himself in the cause of reform, and he was employed by Henry III to urge on Pope Clement the necessity of extirpating the simony which the emperor had found everywhere prevailing as he returned homewards through northern Italy.

The character of Peter Damiani was an extraordinary mixture of strength and of weakness. He was honest, rigid in the sanctity of his life, and gifted with a ready and copious eloquence; but destitute of judgment or discretion, the slave of an unbounded credulity and of a simple vanity, and no less narrow in his views than zealous, energetic, and intolerant in carrying them out. His reading was considerable, but very limited in its nature, and in great part of a very idle character. His letters and tracts present a medley of all the learning and of all the allegorical misinterpretations of Scripture that he can heap together; his arguments are seasoned and enforced by the strangest illustrations and by the wildest and most extravagant legends. The humour which he often displays is rather an oddity than a talent or a power; he himself speaks of it as "buffoonery", and penitentially laments that he cannot control it. In our own age and country such a man would probably be among the loudest, the busiest, the most uncharitable, and the most unreasonable enemies of Rome; in his actual circumstances Peter Damiani was its most devoted servant. Yet his veneration for the papacy did not prevent him

from sometimes addressing its occupants with the most outspoken plainness, or even from remonstrating against established Roman usages, as when he wrote to Alexander II against the decretal principle that a bishop should not be accused by a member of his flock, and against the practice of annexing to decrees on the most trivial subjects the awful threat of an anathema. In such cases it would seem that he was partly influenced by a strong and uncompromising feeling of right, and partly by his passion for exercising in all directions the office of a monitor and a censor. If Hildebrand understood how to use men as his tools, Peter was fitted to be a tool. He felt that Hildebrand was his master, and his service was often reluctant; but, although he vented his discontent in letters and in epigrams, he obeyed his “hostile friend”, his “saintly Satan”.

The superstitions of the age had no more zealous votary than Peter Damiani. His language as to the blessed Virgin has already been noticed for its surpassing extravagance. From him the practice of voluntary flagellation, although it was not altogether new, derived a great increase of popularity. He recommended it as “a sort of purgatory”, and defended it against all assailants. If, he argued, our Lord, with his apostles and martyrs, submitted to be scourged, it must be a good deed to imitate their sufferings by inflicting chastisement on ourselves; if Moses in the Law prescribed scourging for the guilty, it is well thus to punish ourselves for our misdeeds; if men are allowed to redeem their sins with money, surely those who have no money ought to have some means of redemption provided for them; if the Psalmist charges men to “praise the Lord on the timbrel”, then, since the timbrel is an instrument made of dried skin, the commandment is truly fulfilled by him who beats by way of discipline his own skin dried up by fasting. Cardinal Stephen ventured to ridicule this devotion, and induced the monks of Monte Cassino to give up the custom of flogging themselves every Friday, which had been adopted at the instance of Peter, but the sudden and premature deaths of Stephen and his brother soon after gave a triumph to its champion, who represented the fate of the brothers as a judgment on the cardinal’s profanity.

In addition to other writings, Peter contributed to the cause of flagellation a life of one Dominic, the great hero of this warfare against the flesh. Dominic had been ordained a priest; but, on discovering that his parents had presented a piece of goat-skin leather to the bishop by whom he had been ordained, he was struck with such horror at the simoniacal act that he renounced all priestly functions, and withdrew to the rigid life of a hermit. He afterwards placed himself under Damiani, at Fonte Avellano, where his penances were the marvel of the abbot and of his brethren. Next to his skin he wore a tight iron cuirass, which he never put off except to chastise himself. His body and his arms were confined by iron rings; his neck was loaded with heavy chains; his scanty clothes were worn to rags; his food consisted of bread and fennel; his skin was as black as a negro’s from the effects of his chastisement. Dominic’s usual exercise was to recite the psalter twice a day, while he flogged himself with both hands at the rate of a thousand lashes to ten psalms. It was reckoned that three thousand lashes—the accompaniment of thirty psalms—were equal to a year of penance; the whole psalter, therefore, with its due allowance of stripes, was equivalent to five years. In Lent, or on occasions of special penitence, the daily average rose to three psalters; he “easily” got through twenty—equal to a hundred years of penance—in six days; once, at the beginning of Lent, he begged that a penance of a thousand years might be imposed upon him, and he cleared off the whole before Easter. He often performed eight or even nine psalters within twenty-four hours, but it was long before he could achieve ten; at length, however, he was able on one occasion to accomplish twelve, and reached the thirty-second psalm in a thirteenth. These flagellations were supposed to have the effect of a satisfaction for the sins of other men. In his latter years, for the sake of greater severity, Dominic substituted leathern thongs for the bundles of twigs which he had before used in his discipline. He also increased the number of the rings which galled his flesh, and the weight of the chains which hung from his neck; but we are told that sometimes, as he prayed, his rings would fly asunder, or would become soft and pliable. The

death of Dominic, who had become prior of a convent on Mount Soavicino (or San Vicino) in the march of Ancona, appears to have taken place in the year 1060.

The marriage of the clergy was especially abominable in the eyes of Peter Damiani. He wrote, preached, and laboured against it; his language on such subjects is marked by the grossest and most shameless indecency. Soon after Leo's accession he presented to him a treatise, the contents of which may be guessed from its frightful title—*The Book of Gomorrha*. The statements here given as to the horrible offences which resulted from the law of clerical celibacy might have suggested to any reasonable mind a plea for a relaxation of that discipline; but Peter urges them as an argument for increasing its severity. He classifies the sins of the unchaste clergy, and demands the deposition of all the guilty. Leo thanked him for the book, but decided that, although all carnal intercourse is forbidden to the clergy by Scripture and the laws of the church, all but the worst and the most inveterate sinners should be allowed, if penitent, to retain their offices. A later pontiff, Alexander II, obtained possession of the manuscript under pretence of getting it copied; but he showed his opinion of its probable effects by locking it up, and the author complains that, when he attempted to reclaim it, the pope jested at him and treated him like a player.

The act of Leo in renouncing the title derived from the imperial nomination might have been expected to alarm and offend Henry. His kinsman, the object of his patronage, had become the pope of the clergy and of the people, and might have seemed to place himself in opposition to the empire. But the emperor appears to have regarded Leo's behaviour as an instance of the modesty for which he had been noted. He made no remonstrance; and Hildebrand was careful to give him no provocation by needless displays of papal independence.

Leo found the treasury so exhausted that he even thought of providing for his necessities by selling the vestments of the church. But by degrees the rich and various sources which fed the papal revenue began to flow again, so that he was in a condition to carry on his administration with vigour, and to undertake measures of reform.

A synod was held (A.D. 1049) at which he proposed to annul the orders of all who had been ordained by simoniacs. It was, however, represented to him that such a measure would in many places involve a general deprivation of the clergy, and a destitution of the means of grace. The definition of simony had in truth been extended over many things to which we can hardly attach the idea of guilt. The name was now no longer limited to the purchase of holy orders, or even of benefices: it was simony to pay anything in the nature of fees or first-fruits, or even to make a voluntary present to a bishop or patron; it was simony to obtain a benefice, not only by payment, but as the reward of service or as the tribute of kindness. "There are three kinds of gifts", says Peter Damiani; "gifts of the hand, of obedience, and of the tongue". The service of the court he declares to be a worse means of obtaining preferment than the payment of money; while others give money, the price paid by courtly clerks is nothing less than their very selves. In consideration of the universal prevalence of simony, therefore, Leo found himself obliged to mitigate his sentence, and to revert to the order of Clement II, that all who had been ordained by known simoniacs should do penance for forty days. It would seem also that at this assembly the laws for the enforcement of celibacy were renewed—the married clergy being required to separate from their wives, or to refrain from the exercise of their functions, although it was probably at a later synod that Leo added cogency to these rules by enacting that any "concubines" of priests who might be discovered in Rome should become slaves in the Lateran palace.

Leo entered on a new course of action against the disorders of the church. The bishops were so deeply implicated in these that from them no thorough reformation could be expected; the pope would take the matter into his own hands, and would execute it in person. Imitating the system of continual movement by which Henry carried his superintendence into every corner of the empire, he set out on a circuit of visitation. On the way he visited Gualbert of

Vallombrosa, an important ally of Hildebrand and the reforming party. He crossed the Alps, and redressing wrongs, consecrating churches, and conferring privileges on monasteries as he proceeded, he reached Cologne and Aix-la-Chapelle. At Aix he effected a reconciliation between the emperor and Godfrey duke of Lower Lorraine, who for some years had disturbed the public peace. The duke was sentenced to restore the cathedral of Verdun, which he had burnt; he submitted to be scourged at the altar, and laboured with his own hands at the masonry of the church.

As bishop of Toul (which see he retained for a time, as Clement II had retained Bamberg) Leo had promised to be present at the consecration of the abbey church of St. Remigius at Reims. He now announced his intention of fulfilling the promise, and from Toul issued letters summoning the bishops of France to attend a synod on the occasion. The announcement struck terror into many—into prelates who dreaded an inquiry into their practices, and into laymen of high rank whose morals would not bear examination; and some of these beset the ears of the French king, Henry I. It was, they said, a new thing for a pope to assume the right of entering France without the sovereign's permission; the royal power was in danger of annihilation if he allowed the pope to rule within his dominions, or countenanced him by his presence at the council. Henry had already accepted an invitation, but these representations alarmed him. He did not, however, venture to forbid the intended proceedings, but excused himself on the plea of a military expedition, and begged that Leo would defer his visit until a more settled time, when the king might be able to receive him with suitable honours. The pope replied that he was resolved to attend the dedication of the church, and that, if he should find faithful persons there, he intended to hold a council.

The assemblage at Reims was immense. The Franks of the east met with those of Gaul to do honour to the apostle of their race, the saint at whose hands Clovis had received baptism; and even England had sent her representatives. There were prelates and nobles, clergy and monks, laymen and women of every condition, whose offerings formed an enormous heap. All ranks were mingled in the crowd; they besieged the doors of the church on the eve of the ceremony, and thousands passed the night in the open air, which was brilliantly lighted by their tapers. The pope repeatedly threatened to leave the great work undone, unless the multitude would relax its pressure. At length the body of St. Remigius was with difficulty borne through the mass of spectators, whose excitement was now raised to the uttermost. Many wept, many swooned away, many were crushed to death. The holy relics were lowered into the church through a window, as the only practicable entrance, whereupon the crowds, excluded by the doors, seized the hint, and swarmed in at the windows. Instead of being at once deposited in its intended resting-place, the body was placed aloft above the high altar, that its presence might give solemnity to the proceedings of the council.

On the day after the consecration the assembly met. Some of the French bishops and abbots who been cited were unable to attend, having been compelled to join the royal army; but about twenty bishops and fifty abbots were present—among whom were the bishop of Wells, the abbot of St. Augustine's at Canterbury, and the abbot of Ramsey. The pope placed himself with his face towards the body of St. Remigius, and desired the prelates to sit in a semicircle on each side of him. It was announced that the council was held for the reformation of disorders in the church and for the general correction of morals; and the bishops and abbots were required to come forward, and to swear that they had not been guilty of simony either in obtaining their office or in their exercise of it. The archbishops of Treves, Lyons, and Besançon took the oath. The archbishop of Reims requested delay; he was admitted to two private interviews with the pope, and at the second session he obtained a respite until a council which was to be held at Rome in the following April.

Of the bishops, all but four took the oath; of the abbots, some swore, while others by silence confessed their guilt. Hugh bishop of Langres (who, before the investigation of his own case, had procured the deposition of an abbot of his diocese for incontinence and other

irregularities), was charged with many and grievous offences : witnesses deposed that he had both acquired and administered his office simoniacally; that he had borne arms and had slain men; that he had cruelly oppressed his clergy, and even had used torture as a means of exacting money from them; that he had been guilty of adultery and of unnatural lust. After having been allowed to confer with the archbishops of Lyons and Besançon, he requested that these prelates might be admitted to plead his cause. The archbishop of Besançon, on standing up for the purpose, found himself unable to utter a word, and made a sign to Halinard of Lyons, who acknowledged his client's simony and extortion, but denied the other charges. The bishops of Nevers and Coutances professed that their preferments had been bought for them by their relations, but without their own knowledge or consent, and, on their submission, were allowed to retain their sees. The bishop of Nantes, who confessed that he had purchased the succession to his father in the bishopric, was degraded to the order of presbyter.

At the end of the first session it was asked, under the threat of anathema, whether any member acknowledged any other primate of the church than the bishop of Rome. The pope's claim, and the lawfulness of his proceedings, were admitted by a general silence; and he was then declared to be primate of the whole church and apostolic pontiff.

At the second session it was found that the bishop of Langres had absconded during the night. The archbishop of Besançon acknowledged that his dumbness when he had attempted to defend the delinquent on the preceding day was the infliction of St. Remigius; the pope and the prelates prostrated themselves before the relics of the saint, and Hugh of Langres was deposed. The council lasted three days. Twelve canons were passed, of which the first declared that no one should be promoted to a bishopric without the choice of his clergy and people. Excommunications were pronounced against the archbishop of Sens and other prelates who, whether from fear of the pope's inquisition, or in obedience to the king's summons, had neglected the citation to the council; and we are told that within a year the judgments of heaven fell heavily on the counsellors who had influenced Henry against the pope. The bishop of Compostella was excommunicated for assuming the title of apostolic, and attempting to set up an independent Spanish papacy. The Breton bishops, whose church had long been separate from that of Rome, and whose chief styled himself archbishop of Dol, had been summoned to Reims, but as they did not attend, were charged to appear at Rome.

From Reims Leo proceeded to Mayence, where a council was held in the emperor's presence and in this assembly Sibicho, bishop of Spire, purged himself of a charge of adultery by receiving the holy Eucharist.

The pope returned to Italy in triumph. He had assured himself of the support of Germany, and had crushed the tendencies to independence which had appeared in the churches of France and Spain. The system of visitations which he had thus commenced was continued throughout his pontificate, and its result was greatly to increase the influence of Rome. He practically and successfully asserted for himself powers beyond those which had been ascribed to the papacy by the forged decretals. The pope entered kingdoms without regard to the will of the sovereign; he denounced the curses of the church against prelates whose allegiance to their king interfered with obedience to his mandate. He was not only to judge, but to originate inquiries; and these were carried on under the awe of his personal presence, without the ordinary forms of justice. Bishops were required by oath to accuse themselves, and the process of judgment was summary. Yet, startling as were the novelties of such proceedings, Leo was able to venture on them with safety; for the popular feeling was with him, and supported him in all his aggressions on the authority of princes or of bishops. His presence was welcomed everywhere as that of a higher power come to redress the grievances under which men had long been groaning; there was no disposition to question his pretensions on account of their novelty ; rather this novelty gave them a charm, because the deliverance which he offered had not before been dreamt of! And the manner in which his judgments were conducted was skillfully calculated to disarm opposition. Whatever there

might be of a new kind in it, the trial was before synods, the old legitimate tribunal; bishops were afraid to protest, lest they should be considered guilty; and, while the process for the discovery of guilt was unusually severe, it was, in the execution, tempered with an appearance of mildness which took off much from its severity. Offenders were allowed to state circumstances in extenuation of their guilt, and their excuses were readily admitted. The lenity shown to one induced others to submit, and thus the pope's assumptions were allowed to pass without objection.

Leo again crossed the Alps in 1050, and a third time in 1052. This last expedition was undertaken in part for the purpose of attempting a reconciliation between the emperor and Andrew, king of Hungary, who had become a Christian, and had reestablished the profession of the gospel in his dominions; but the pope's mediation proved unsuccessful. Another object of the journey was to request the emperor's aid against the Normans. These had now firmly established themselves in southern Italy; they warred against both empires, or took investiture from either, according to their convenience. As far as their enterprise could reach, there was no safety from their aggressions; they invaded the patrimony of St. Peter, assaulted the pope's own train, and threatened Rome itself. They spared neither age nor sex; the pope was deeply afflicted by the sight of miserable wretches who crowded into the city from the Apulian side, having lost eyes or noses, hands or feet, by the barbarity of the Normans; while reports continually reached him of monasteries sacked or burnt, and their inmates slain or cruelly outraged. His grief and indignation overflowed, and, finding remonstrances, entreaties, and denunciations vain, he endeavoured to engage both the Greek and the German emperors in a league against his formidable neighbours.

The pope found that by allying himself with the Italian party he had excited the jealousy of his own countrymen—a feeling which was significantly shown at Worms, where he spent the Christmas of 1052 with the emperor. On Christmas-day, as Luitpold, archbishop of Mayence and metropolitan of the diocese, was officiating at mass in the cathedral, a deacon chanted a lesson in the German fashion, which was different from that of Rome. Leo, urged by the Italians of his train, commanded him to stop; and, as the order was unheeded, he called the deacon to him at the end of the lesson, and degraded him from his office. The German primate begged that he might be restored, but met with a refusal. The service then proceeded; but at the end of the offertory Luitpold, indignant at the slight offered to the national usage, declared that it should go no further unless the deacon were restored; and the pope found himself obliged to yield.

A feeling of jealousy against Rome would seem also to have dictated the answer to a request which the pope made for the restoration of the bishopric of Bamberg, and of the abbey of Fulda, to St. Peter, on whom they had been bestowed by Henry II. Instead of these benefices, which might have given a pretext for interfering with his German sovereignty, the emperor conferred on the pope the city of Benevento, the adjoining territory having already been granted to the Normans.

The success of Leo's application for aid against the Normans was frustrated by the emperor's chancellor, Gebhard, bishop of Eichstedt. Whether from apprehension of danger on the side of Hungary, from overweening contempt of the Normans, or from German jealousy of the papacy, he persuaded Henry to recall the troops which had already been placed at the pope's disposal; and Leo, on his return to Italy, was followed by only seven hundred men, chiefly Swabians and Lotharingians, but including many outlaws and desperate adventurers from other quarters. It was the first time that a pope had appeared as the leader of an army against a professedly Christian people. Although Leo, when a deacon, had led the contingent of Toul in the imperial force, his own synods had renewed the canons against warrior bishops and clergy, and Peter Damiani was scandalized at the indecency of the spectacle :—"Would St. Gregory, he asked, have gone to battle against the Lombards, or St. Ambrose against the Arians?". But as Leo moved along, multitudes of Italians flocked to his standard, so that,

when the armies met near Civitella, he had greatly the advantage in numbers, while his sturdy Germans derided the inferior height and slighter forms of the enemy. The Normans attempted to negotiate, and offered to hold their conquests under the apostolic see; but they were told that the only admissible terms were their withdrawal from Italy and a surrender of all that they had taken from St. Peter. No choice was thus left them but to fight with the courage of despair. The armies engaged on the 18th of June, 1053; the pope's Italian troops ran away; his Germans stood firm, and were cut to pieces; he himself fled to Civitella, but the gates of the town were shut against him, and he fell into the hands of the Normans. But defeat was more profitable to the papacy than victory could have been. The victors—some probably from rude awe, and others from artful policy—fell at the captive's feet; they wept, they cast dust on their heads, they poured forth expressions of penitence, with entreaties for his forgiveness and blessings. An accommodation was concluded, by which Leo granted them the conquests which they had already made, with all that they could acquire in Calabria and Sicily, to be held under the holy see. Thus the Normans, who had hitherto been regarded as a horde of freebooters, obtained the appearance of a legal, and even a sanctified, title to their possessions; while the pope, in bestowing on them territories to which the Roman see had never had any right (except such as might be derived from Constantine's fabulous donation), led the way to the establishment of an alliance which was of vast importance to his successors, and of a claim to suzerainty over the kingdom of Naples which lasted down to our own times.

Leo was carried to Benevento, where he was detained in a sort of honourable captivity. His hours were spent in mournful thoughts of the past and of the future. He engaged in the strictest practices of asceticism and devotion; he celebrated mass daily for the souls of the soldiers who had fallen on his side, and at length was comforted by a vision which assured him that, as having been slain for the Lord, they were partakers in the glory of martyrs. At the end of nine months, feeling himself seriously ill, he obtained leave to return to Rome. He caused his couch to be spread in St. Peter's, and his tomb to be placed near it. To the clergy, who were assembled around him, he addressed earnest exhortations to be watchful in their duty, and to exert themselves against simony; he commended his flock to Christ, and prayed that, if he had been too severe in dealing the censures of the church on any, the Saviour would of His mercy absolve them. Then, looking at his tomb, he said with tears, "Behold, brethren, how worthless and fleeting is human glory. I have seen the cell in which I dwelt as a monk changed into spacious palaces; now I must again return to the narrow bounds of this tomb". Next morning he died before the altar of St. Peter. Tales of visions and miracles were circulated in attestation of his sanctity, and the doubts which some expressed on account of the part which he had taken in war were overpowered by the general veneration for his memory".

During the last days of Leo IX, important communications were in progress between the churches of Rome and Constantinople. From the time of Photius these churches had regarded each other with coolness, and their intercourse had been scanty. But the eastern emperors were induced by political interest to conciliate the pope, whose hostility might have endangered the remains of their Italian dominion; and about the year 1024 a proposal was made to John XVIII, on the part of Basil II and of the Byzantine patriarch Eustathius, that the title of Universal should be allowed alike to the patriarch and to the bishop of Rome. The gifts with which the bearers of this proposal were charged made an impression on the notorious cupidity of the Romans, and the pope was on the point of yielding. But the rumour of the affair produced a great excitement in Italy and France. William, abbot of St. Benignus at Dijon, an influential ecclesiastic of Italian birth, addressed a very strong remonstrance to the pope. Although, he said, the ancient temporal monarchy of Rome is now broken up into many governments, the spiritual privilege conferred on St. Peter is inalienable; and, after some severe language, he ended by exhorting John to be more careful of his own duties in the

government and discipline of the church. The pope yielded to the general feeling, and the negotiation came to nothing.

In 1053 Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, and Leo, archbishop of Achrida and metropolitan of Bulgaria—alarmed perhaps at the progress of the Norman arms, which seemed likely to transfer southern Italy from the Greek to the Latin church—addressed a letter to the bishop of Trani in Apulia, warning him against the errors of the Latins. The point of difference on which they most insisted was the nature of the eucharistic bread.

It would appear that although our Lord, at the institution of the sacrament, used unleavened bread, as being the only kind which the Mosaic law allowed at the paschal season, the apostles and the early church made use of common bread. Such had continued to be the custom of the Greeks, nor had any difference in this respect been mentioned among the mutual accusations of Photius and his western opponents. But, whether before or after the days of Photius, the use of unleavened bread had become established in the west, and Michael inveighed against it, as figurative of Judaism and unfit to represent the Saviour's death. The Greek word by which bread is spoken of in the Gospels signifies, he said, something *raised*; it ought to have salt, for it is written, "Ye are the salt of the earth"; it ought to have leaven, which a woman—the church—hid in three measures of meal, a symbol of the Divine Trinity. The other charges advanced against the western church were the practice of fasting on the Saturdays of Lent, the eating of things strangled and of blood, and the singing of the great Hallelujah at Easter only. The patriarch and his associate concluded by requesting that the bishop of Trani would circulate the letter among the western bishops and clergy.

Humbert, cardinal-bishop of Sylva Candida, one of the most zealous among the Roman clergy, who happened to be at Trani when this letter arrived, translated it, and communicated it to Leo; who was also soon after informed that Cerularius had closed the Latin churches and had seized on the Latin monasteries at Constantinople. On this the pope addressed from Benevento a letter of remonstrance to the patriarch. He enlarges on the prerogatives conveyed by St. Peter to the Roman see; he cites the donation of Constantine, almost in its entire length. St. Paul, he says, had cast no imputation on the faith of the Romans, whereas in his epistles to Greeks he had blamed them for errors in faith as well as in practice. It was from the Greeks that heresies had arisen; some of the patriarch's own predecessors had been not only patrons of heresy but heresiarchs; but by virtue of the Saviour's own promise the faith of St. Peter cannot fail. He blames Michael for having shut up the Latin churches of his city, whereas at Rome the Greeks were allowed the free exercise of their national rites.

After some further communications, Leo in January 1054 despatched three legates to Constantinople—Humbert, Frederick of Lorraine, chancellor of the Roman church, and Peter, archbishop of Amalfi,—with a letter entreating the emperor Constantine Monomachus to join in an alliance against the Normans, and one to Cerularius, in reply to a letter which the patriarch had addressed to Leo. The tone of this answer is moderate, but the pope defends the Latin usages which had been attacked; he adverts to a report that the patriarch had been irregularly raised to his dignity; he censures him for attempting to subjugate the ancient thrones of Alexandria and Antioch; and he expresses disapprobation of the title Universal. It had, he said, been decreed to the bishops of Rome by the council of Chalcedon; but as St. Peter did not bear it, so his successors, to whom, if to any man, it would have been suitable, had never assumed it.

On arriving at Constantinople the legates were received with honour by the emperor, who was anxious to secure the pope's interest, and had been annoyed at the indiscretion of his patriarch. Humbert put forth a dialogue between a champion of the Byzantine and one of the Roman church, in which the Greek retails the topics of the letter to the bishop of Trani, while the Latin refutes him point by point, and retorts by some charges against the Greeks. To this a Studite monk, Nicetas Pectoratus, replied by a temperately-written tract, which, in addition to

points already raised, discussed the enforced celibacy of the western clergy. Humbert rejoined in a style of violent and insolent abused and ended by anathematizing Nicetas with all his partisans. But he did not leave the victory to be decided by the pen; the emperor, in company with him and the other envoys, went to the monastery of Studium, where Nicetas was compelled to anathematize his own book, together with all who should deny the prerogatives or impugn the faith of Rome. At the request of the legates Constantine ordered the book to be burnt; and next day the unfortunate author, of his own accord (as we are asked to believe), waited on the legates, retracted his errors, and repeated his anathema against all that had been said, done, or attempted against the Roman church. Humbert's answers to the patriarch and to Nicetas were translated into Greek by the emperor's order.

Michael, however, continued to keep aloof from the Roman envoys, declaring that he could not settle such questions without the other patriarchs. The legates, at length, finding that they could make no impression on him, entered the church of St. Sophia, and laid on the altar, which had been prepared for the celebration of the Eucharist, a document in which, after acknowledging the orthodoxy of the people of Constantinople in general, they charged the patriarch and his party with likeness to the most infamous heresies, and solemnly anathematized them with all heretics, "yea, with the devil and his angels, unless they repent". Having left the church, they shook off the dust from their feet, exclaiming, "Let God look and judge!"; and, after charging the Latins of Constantinople to avoid the communion of such as should "deny the Latin sacrifice", they set out on their return, with rich presents from the emperor.

A message from Constantinople recalled them, as Michael had professed a wish to confer with them. But it is said that the patriarch intended to excite the multitude against them, and probably to bring about some fatal result, by reading in the cathedral a falsified version of the excommunication. Of this the legates were warned by the emperor, who refused to allow any conference except in his own presence; and, as Michael would not assent, they again departed homewards. The further proceedings between the emperor and the patriarch are variously related by the Greeks and by the Latins. The points of controversy were discussed for some time between Michael, Dominic patriarch of Grado, on the Latin side, and Peter, patriarch of Antioch, who attempted to act as a mediator. A legation was also sent to Constantinople by Stephen IX (who had been one of the Roman legates); but it returned on hearing of Leo's death, and the breach between the churches remained as before. Cerularius himself was deposed by the emperor Isaac Comnenus in 1059, and ended his days in exile.

On the death of Leo, which took place soon after the departure of his legates for the east, the clergy and people of Rome were desirous to bestow the see on Hildebrand, to whose care the dying pope had solemnly committed his church. But Hildebrand was not yet ready to undertake the administration in his own name, and was unwilling to forego the advantage of the emperor's support. He therefore persuaded the Romans to entrust him with a mission for the purpose of requesting that, as no one among themselves was worthy, Henry would appoint a pope acceptable to them; and he suggested Gebhard, bishop of Eichstedt, the same by whom the emperor had been induced to withdraw his troops from Leo's expedition against the Normans. The policy of this choice would seem to have been profound; for whereas Gebhard, as an imperial counsellor, was likely to use his powerful influence against the papacy, he could hardly fail, as pope, to be guided by the interests of his see. Henry, unwilling to lose him, proposed other names; but Hildebrand persisted, and the emperor felt himself unable to oppose the choice of a prelate who had long held the highest place in his own esteem. Gebhard himself made earnest attempts to escape the dignity which was thrust upon him, and is said to have shown his resentment of Hildebrand's share in his promotion by a general dislike of monks during the remainder of his life. But he justified the expectation that his policy would change with his position. As a condition of accepting the papacy, he required of the emperor a promise to restore all the rights of St. Peter; and we are told that, whenever he

found himself crossed in any of his undertakings, he regarded it as a just punishment for his undutiful opposition to Leo.

In April 1055 the new pope arrived at Rome, where Hildebrand took care that, like his predecessor, he should be formally elected by the clergy and people; and he assumed the name of Victor II. In principle his papacy was a continuation of the last. The system of reforming synods was kept up, but instead of being conducted by the pope in person, they were left to his legates. At one of these synods, which was held in Gaul by Hildebrand, a remarkable incident is said to have taken place. An archbishop, who was charged with simony, had bribed the witnesses to silence, and boldly demanded, "Where are my accusers?" The legate asked him whether he believed the Holy Ghost to be of the same substance with the Father and the Son, and, on his answering that he believed so, desired him to say the doxology. On coming to the name of that Divine Person in whose gifts he had trafficked, the archbishop was unable to proceed. After repeated attempts he fell down before Hildebrand, acknowledging his guilt, and forthwith he recovered the power of pronouncing the whole form. Such a scene would perhaps be now explained by the ascendancy of a powerful will, combined with the assumption of a prophetic manner, over a weaker mind disturbed by the consciousness of guilt. But it was then held to be a miracle, and the terror of it led many other bishops and abbots to confess their simony and to resign their dignities.

In 1056 Victor was invited by the emperor to Germany, where he was received with great honour. But soon after his arrival an illness from which Henry had been suffering became more serious : and on the 5th of October the emperor died in his fortieth year, at the hunting-seat of Bothfeld in the Harz. To the pope, from whom he received the last consolations of religion, he bequeathed the care of his only son, Henry, a child under six years of age; and, although the young prince had already been crowned as his father's colleague and successor in the German kingdom, the good offices of Victor were serviceable in procuring a peaceful recognition of his rights from the princes, prelates, and nobles who had been gathered around the emperor's death-bed. The virtual government of the empire seemed to be now vested in the same hands with the papacy. But the union was soon dissolved by the death of Victor, who, after having returned to Italy and presided over a council at Florence, expired at Acerra on the 28th of July, 1057.

FREDERICK OF LORRAINE.

The Romans had felt themselves delivered from restraint by the death of Henry, and now proceeded to show their feeling by not only choosing a pope for themselves, but fixing on a person who was likely to be obnoxious to the German court—Frederick, the brother of duke Godfrey of Lorraine. Godfrey, after his submission to Henry III, had gone into Italy, and had obtained the hand of the emperor's cousin Beatrice, widow of Boniface, marquis of Tuscany, and mother of the Countess Matilda, who, by the death of her young brother soon after the marriage, became the greatest heiress of the age. The connection appeared so alarming to Henry, whose rights as suzerain were involved in the disposal of Tuscany, that it led him to cross the Alps in 1055. Beatrice waited on him in order to assure him that her husband had no other wish than to live peaceably on the territory which he had acquired by marriage; but the emperor distrusted his old antagonist, and carried off both Beatrice and her daughter as hostages to Germany, where they were detained until Godfrey succeeded in appeasing him by waiting on him in Franconia, and solemnly promising fidelity.

While Godfrey thus raised himself by marriage from the condition of a discredited adventurer to a position of great power, wealth, and influence, his brother was ascending the steps of ecclesiastical promotion. Frederick, a canon of Liège, had accompanied Leo IX to Rome after the reconciliation of Godfrey with Henry in 1049, and had been appointed chancellor of the holy see. He was a leader in the expedition against the Normans, and was one of the legates who excommunicated the patriarch of Constantinople. The rumour of the wealth which he had brought back from his eastern mission excited the suspicions of Henry;

and Frederick, apprehending danger from the emperor, became a monk at Monte Cassino. About two years after his admission into the monastery a vacancy occurred in the headship; when the monks, who claimed the right of electing their superior and presenting him for the papal benediction, made choice of one Peter as abbot. Pope Victor, however, was inclined to question their privileges, and sent Cardinal Humbert to inquire on the spot whether any defect could be found in the election. Four monks, supposing that the cardinal came to depose their abbot, raised the neighbouring peasantry to arms; and Peter felt that their unwise zeal had fatally injured his cause. He told them that it was they who had deposed him from a dignity of which he could not otherwise have been deprived; he resigned the abbacy, and the monks, under Humbert's presidency, elected Frederick in his room. At the council of Florence, Frederick was confirmed in his abbacy by the pope, who also created him cardinal of St. Chrysogonus; and he was at Rome, engaged in taking possession of the cure annexed to that title, when he was informed of Victor's death. The Romans, dreading the interference of the neighbouring nobles, took on themselves the choice of a pope, and, in answer to their request that he would name some suitable candidates, Frederick proposed Humbert of Sylva Candida, with three other bishops, and the subdeacon Hildebrand; but the Romans insisted that he should himself be pope, and on August 2, 1057, he was hailed as Stephen IX, taking his name from the saint to whom the day was dedicated, Stephen the antagonist of St. Cyprian.

Stephen was a churchman of the stern and haughty monastic school. His behaviour at Constantinople is significant of his character, and the acts of his short pontificate were consistent with it. Synods were held which passed fresh canons against the marriage of the clergy.

Hildebrand's influence continued unabated, it was probably by Stephen that he was ordained deacon, and was appointed archdeacon of Rome. And by Hildebrand's recommendation Peter Damiani was raised to the bishopric of Ostia, the second dignity in the Roman church—his distaste for such preferment having been overpowered by a threat of excommunication in case of his refusal.

In addition to the interests of his see, it is supposed that Stephen was intent on advancing those of his own family—that he meditated the expulsion of the Normans from Italy, and the elevation of Godfrey to the imperial dignity. He had retained the abbacy of Monte Cassino, and, with a view to the prosecution of his designs, he ordered that all the treasures of the monastery should be sent to Rome. But when they were displayed before him, and he saw the grief of the provost and other monks who had executed his order, a feeling of compunction seized him; and the provost, observing his emotion, told him that a novice, who knew nothing of the intended transfer, had seen a vision of St. Scholastica weeping over the loss of the precious spoil, while her brother St. Benedict endeavoured to comfort her. The pope burst into tears, and ordered that the treasure should be restored.

Within a few months after his election Stephen felt that his health was failing, and resolved to provide for the future disposal of his offices. At Monte Cassino, where he spent the Christmas season, he procured the election of Desiderius as his successor in the abbacy and on his return to Rome he exacted an oath that no pope should be chosen without the advice of Hildebrand, who was then engaged in a mission to Germany, probably with a view of conciliating the empress-mother, to whom Stephen must have felt that neither he himself nor the manner of his election could be acceptable. From Rome the pope proceeded to Florence, the capital of his brother's dominions; and there he died in the arms of Gualbert of Vallombrosa, on the 29th of March, 1058.

Immediately on receiving the tidings of Stephen's death, the nobles of the Campagna, headed by Count Gregory of Tusculum, rushed into Rome, seized on St. Peter's by night, plundered the church, and set up as pope John, cardinal-bishop of Velletri, a member of the Crescentian family under the name of Benedict X. That John's part in this affair was forced on him appears even from a letter of Peter Damiani, who speaks of him as so stupid, ignorant,

and slothful, that he could not be supposed to have planned his own elevation. But his reluctance may be more creditably explained. His moral character is unassailed; he was one of the five ecclesiastics whom Stephen IX, before his own promotion, had named to the Romans as worthy of the papacy and the charges of ignorance and dullness which are brought against him by the almost blind enmity of Damiani may be the less regarded, since the pope of Peter's own party is described by Berengar of Tours as grossly illiterate, and in both cases such charges seem to have been prompted rather by passion than by justice.

The chief of the Roman clergy refused to share in the election of Benedict. Damiani would not perform the ceremonies of installation, which belonged to his office as cardinal-bishop of Ostia; and the pope was installed by a priest of that diocese, who was compelled by force to officiate, and whom Peter describes as so ignorant that he could hardly read. The cardinals withdrew from the city, threatening to anathematize the intruder, and envoys were sent by a party at Rome to the empress-mother Agnes, with a request that she would nominate a pope. Hildebrand, in returning from Germany, met these envoys, and suggested to them the name of Gerard, bishop of Florence, a Burgundian by birth, who at their desire was nominated by the empress, while Hildebrand, in order that this nomination might not interfere with the claims which were now advanced in behalf of the Roman church, contrived that he should almost at the same time be elected by the cardinals at Siena. The pope, who took the name of Nicolas II, advanced towards Rome under the escort of Godfrey of Tuscany, whose interest had doubtless been consulted in choosing the bishop of his capital as the successor of his brother in the papacy. At Sutri Nicolas held a council, which condemned and excommunicated Benedict as an intruder. The antipope fled from Rome, but, after the arrival of Nicolas in the city, he returned, and submitted to him, saying that he had acted under compulsion; whereupon he was readmitted to communion, although degraded from the episcopate and the priesthood, and confined for the remainder of his days within the suburban monastery of St. Agnes.

Immediately on gaining possession of the papacy Nicolas found his attention drawn to the affairs of Milan. The Milanese church had long held a very lofty position, and it had gained in reputation by the contrast which it presented to the degraded state of the papacy. The archbishop was a great secular prince, and in the absence of the emperor was the most important person in northern Italy. Heribert had long ruled the church with great vigour; he had maintained his title to the archbishopric in defiance of Conrad II and Benedict IX, and had held it in peace after the accession of Henry III, until 1045, when he died, leaving among his flock the reputation of a saint. The clergy of Milan bore a high character in all that related to the administration of their office; there was a proverb—"Milan for clerks, Pavia for pleasures, Rome for buildings, Ravenna for churches". Their learning was above the average of the time; their discipline was strict, their demeanour regular, their services were performed with exemplary decency; they were sedulous in their labours for the education of the young, and in the general discharge of their pastoral duties. The Milanese church differed from the Roman in allowing the marriage of the clergy under certain conditions. St. Ambrose, the great glory of Milan, and the author of its peculiar liturgy, was believed to have sanctioned the single marriage of a priest with a virgin bride and this had become so much the rule that an unmarried clergyman was even regarded with suspicion. The same practice was generally observed throughout Lombardy, and the effect of the liberty thus allowed was seen in the superior character of the clergy, which struck even those witnesses who were least able or least willing to connect the effect with its cause. Thus Peter Damiani acknowledged that he had never seen a body of clergy equal to the Milanese, and he also bestows a very high commendation on those of Turin, whose marriage was sanctioned by the bishop, Cunibert.

On the death of Heribert, who, according to some writers, had himself been a married man, the see of Milan was bestowed by Henry III on Guy of Velate, a clerk of humble birth, to the exclusion of four eminent ecclesiastics whom the Milanese had sent to him for his choice.

The new archbishop appears to have been a man of mean and feeble character; he is described as deficient in learning, and he was charged with the practice of habitual simony—a charge which probably meant nothing worse than the exaction of fees from the clergy.

The first movement against the marriage of the Milanese clergy was made by Anselm of Baggio, a priest who had been proposed as successor to Heribert in the archbishopric. On Guy's application to Henry III, Anselm was removed from the scene by promotion to the see of Lucca, but the work which he had begun was soon taken up by others. One of these, Ariald, was a deacon, who is said to have been convicted of some gross offence before the archbishop. He held a cure in his native village, near Como, where he began to denounce the iniquities of clerical marriage, but met with little encouragement from his parishioners, who told him that it was not for ignorant people like themselves to refute him; that he would do better to transfer his preaching to Milan, where he might meet with persons capable of arguing with him. Ariald went accordingly to the city, where his admonitions were unheeded by the clergy, to whom he first addressed himself but he gained an important ally in Landulf, a man of noble family, and with a great talent for popular oratory, who appears to have been in one of the minor orders of the ministry, and is said to have aspired to the archbishopric. Anselm, on revisiting Milan, was provoked by the admiration which the clergy of his train expressed for the eloquence of the Milanese; he saw in Ariald and Landulf fit instruments for carrying on the movement which he could himself no longer direct; and he bound them by oath to wage an implacable warfare against the marriage of the clergy.

The two began publicly to inveigh with great bitterness against the clergy, and their exaggerated representations were received with the greedy credulity which usually waits on all denunciation of abuses. The populace, invited by means of tickets or handbills which were distributed, of little bells which were rung about the streets, and of active female tongues, flocked to the places where the oratory of Landulf and his companion was to be heard; and the reformers continually grew bolder and more unmeasured in their language. They told the people that their pastors were Simoniacs and Nicolaitans, blind leaders of the blind; their sacrifices were dog's dung; their churches, stalls for cattle; their ministry ought to be rejected, their property might be seized and plundered. Such teaching was not without its effect; the mob attacked the clergy in the streets, loaded them with abuse, beat them, drove them from their altars, exacted from them a written promise to forsake their wives, and pillaged their houses. The clergy were supported by the nobles, and Milan was held in constant disquiet by its hostile factions, while the emissaries of Ariald communicated the excitement to the surrounding country. The followers of Ariald and Landulf were known by the name of Patarines—a word of disputed etymology and meaning, which became significant of parties opposed to the clergy, whether their opposition were in the interest of the papacy or of sectarianism.

Archbishop Guy, by the advice of Stephen IX, cited Ariald and Landulf before a synod, and, on their scornfully refusing to appear, excommunicated them; but the pope released them from the sentence. Stephen then summoned them to a synod at Rome, where they asserted their cause, but were opposed by a cardinal named Dionysius, who, having been trained in the church of Milan, understood the circumstances of that church, and strongly denounced the violence with which they had proceeded in their attempts at reform. Stephen, although his feeling was on the side of Ariald, affected neutrality between the parties, and sent a commission to Milan; but his short pontificate ended before any result appeared.

The intervention of Nicolas II was now requested by Ariald, and Peter Damiani was sent to Milan as legate, with Anselm, the original author of the troubles, as his colleague. They found the city in violent agitation. The Milanese, roused by the alarm that their ecclesiastical independence was in danger, were now as zealous on the side of the clergy as they had lately been against them. Loud cries were uttered against all aggression; the Roman pontiff it was said, had no right to force his laws or his jurisdiction on the church of St.

Ambrose. Bells pealed from every tower, handbells were rung about the streets, and the clangour of a huge brazen trumpet summoned the people to stand up for their threatened privileges. The legates found themselves besieged in the archbishop's palace by angry crowds; they were told that their lives were in jeopardy; and the popular feeling was excited to frenzy when, on the opening of the synod, Peter Damiani was seen to be seated as president, with his brother legate on his right hand, while the successor of St. Ambrose was on the left. Guy—whether out of real humility, or with the design of inflaming yet further the indignation of his flock—professed himself willing to sit on a stool at the feet of the legates, if required. A terrible uproar ensued, but Peter's courage and eloquence turned the day. Rushing into the pulpit, he addressed the raging multitude, and was able to obtain a hearing. It was not, he said, for the honour of Rome, but for their own good, that he had come among them. He dwelt on the superiority of the Roman church. It was founded by God, whereas all other churches were of human foundation; the church of Milan was a daughter of the Roman, founded by disciples of St. Peter and St. Paul; St. Ambrose himself had acknowledged the church of Rome as his mother, had professed to follow it in all things, and had called in pope Siricius to aid him in ejecting that very heresy of the Nicolaitans which was now again rampant. "Search your writings", exclaimed the cardinal, "and if you cannot there find what we say, tax us with falsehood". Since Damiani himself reports his speech, it is to be supposed that he believed these bold assertions; at all events, the confidence and the fluency with which he uttered them, the authority of his position, and his high personal reputation, prevailed with the Milanese. The archbishop and a great body of the clergy forswore simony, bound themselves by oath to labour for the extirpation of it, and on their knees received the sentence of penance for their past offences. The result of the legation was not only the condemnation of the practices which had been complained of, but the subjection of the Milanese church to that of Rome.

In April 1059 Nicolas held a council at Rome, which was attended by a hundred and thirteen prelates, among whom was Guy of Milan. The archbishop was treated with studious respect; he was seated at the pope's right hand, and, on his promising obedience to the apostolic see, Nicolas bestowed on him the ring, which the archbishops of Milan had usually received from the kings of Italy. Ariald stood up to accuse him, but was reduced to silence by Cunibert of Turin and other Lombard bishops. It was enacted that no married or concubinary priest should celebrate mass, and that the laity should not attend the mass of such a priest; that the clergy should embrace the canonical life; that no clerk should take preferment from a layman, whether for money or gratuitously, that no layman should judge a clerk, of whatever order. The council also discussed the case of Berengar, a French ecclesiastic, who was accused of heresy as to the doctrine of the Eucharist. But its most important work was the establishment of a new procedure for elections to the papal chair.

The ancient manner of appointing bishops, by the choice of the clergy and people, had been retained at Rome, subject to the imperial control; but the result had not been satisfactory. The nobles and the people were able to overpower the voice of the clergy; to them were to be traced the ignominies and the distractions which had so long prevailed in the Roman church—the disputed elections, the schisms between rival popes, the promotion of scandalously unfit men to the highest office in the hierarchy. It was therefore an object of the reforming party to destroy the aristocratic and popular influences which had produced such evils. Independence of the imperial control, which had of late become an absolute power of nomination, was also desired; but the imperial interest was ably represented in the council by Guibert, the chancellor of Italy, and the Hildebrandine party were for the present obliged to be content with a compromise. It was enacted that the cardinal-bishops should first treat of the election; that they should then call in the cardinals of inferior rank, and that afterwards the rest of the clergy and the people should give their assent to the choice. The election was to be made "saving the due honour and reverence of our beloved son Henry, who at present is accounted king and hereafter will, it is hoped, if God permit, be emperor, as we have already granted to

him; and of his successors who shall personally have obtained this privilege from the apostolic see”.

By this enactment the choice of pope was substantially vested in the cardinals. The term *cardinal* had for many ages been used in the western church to signify one who had full and permanent possession of a benefice, as distinguished from deputies, assistants, temporary holders, or persons limited in the exercise of any rights belonging to the incumbency. But at Rome it had latterly come to bear a new meaning. The cardinal-bishops were the seven bishops of the pope's immediate province, who assisted him in his public functions—the bishop of Ostia being the chief among them; the cardinal-priests were the incumbents of the twenty-eight “cardinal titles” of chief parish churches in the city. By the constitution of Nicolas, the initiative in the election was given to the cardinal-bishops. The other cardinals, however, were to be afterwards consulted, and a degree of influence was allowed to them; while the part of the remaining clergy and of the laity was reduced to a mere acceptance of the person whom the cardinals should nominate. The imperial prerogative is spoken of in words of intentional vagueness, which, without openly contesting it, reserve to the pope the power of limiting or practically annihilating it, as circumstances might allow; and whatever might be its amount, it is represented not as inherent in the office of emperor, but as a grant from the pope, bestowed on Henry out of special favour, and to be personally sought by his successors. The time for venturing on this important innovation was well chosen; for there was no emperor, and the prince for whom the empire was designed was a child under female guardianship, the sovereign of an unruly and distracted kingdom.

In the same year Nicolas proceeded into southern Italy, and held a council at Melfi, with a view to extirpating the Greek usages and habits which prevailed among the clergy of that region—especially the liberty of marriage. But a more important object of his expedition was the settlement of his relations with the Normans, whose most considerable leader was now Robert, styled Guiscard—the Wise, or rather the Crafty—one of the twelve sons of Tancred, a banneret or valvassor of Hauteville in Normandy. Three of Tancred's sons by his first marriage had in 1035 joined their countrymen in Italy, and had been gradually followed by seven half-brothers, the children of their father's second marriage, of whom Robert was the eldest. These adventurers rose to command among the Normans of the south, and formed the design of expelling the Greeks from their remaining territories in Italy. The eldest and the second brothers died without issue; on the death of the third, Humphrey, in 1057, Robert set aside the rights of his nephews, the children of the deceased, and was himself raised aloft on a buckler, and acknowledged as Humphrey's successor. Under this chief, who was distinguished for his lofty stature, his strength and prowess, his ambition, his rapacity, his profound and unscrupulous cunning, the Normans carried on a course of incessant and successful aggression on every side. Their numbers were swelled by large bands from Normandy, while the more spirited among the natives of Apulia and Calabria assumed their name and habits, and were enrolled in their armies.

The Normans had not spared the property of St. Peter. Guiscard had been excommunicated by Nicolas for refusing to give up the city of Troia, which he had taken from the Greeks, and to which the Roman church laid claim; but mutual convenience now brought the warrior and the pontiff together. Instead of the schemes which his predecessors had formed for driving the Normans out of Italy, Nicolas conceived the idea of securing them to his alliance. On receiving an application from Guiscard for the withdrawal of his excommunication, he proposed that a conference should take place at the intended synod of Melfi; and the conference led to the conclusion of a treaty. By this the pope bestowed on Guiscard the investiture of Apulia, Calabria, and such territories in Italy or Sicily as he might in future wrest from the Greeks or the Saracens; and he conferred on him or confirmed to him the title of duke. At the same time Richard of Aversa, the representative of the earlier Norman settlement, received the title of prince of Capua, a city which he had lately taken from the

Lombards. On the other side, “Robert, by the grace of God and of St. Peter, duke of Apulia and Calabria, and, with the help of both, hereafter to be of Sicily”, swore to hold his territories as a fief of the Roman see, and to pay an annual quit-rent. He was never to give them up to any of the ultramontanes. He was to be faithful to the holy Roman church and to his lord the pope; he was to defend him in all things, and to aid him against all men towards establishing the rights of his see. He was to maintain the pope’s territories, to subject all the churches within his own dominions to Rome, and, in case of his surviving Nicolas, he was to see that the successor to the papacy should be legitimately chosen. For both parties this treaty was an important gain. The Normans acquired, far more than by the earlier treaty with Leo IX, an appearance of legitimacy—a religious sanction for their past and for their future conquests. The pope converted them from dangerous neighbours into powerful allies, obtained from them an acknowledgment of his suzerainty, and especially bound them to maintain his late ordinance as to the election of future popes. In fulfillment of their new engagements, the Normans advanced towards Rome, reduced the castles of the nobility of the Campagna, and, having thus established the pope in security, they resumed the career of conquest which had been authorized by his sanction. The acquisition of Sicily, however, which Guiscard, in the enumeration of his titles, had claimed by anticipation, was reserved for another member of his family. While the elder sons of Tancred of Hauteville were pursuing their fortunes in Italy, Roger, the youngest, had remained to watch over his father’s decline, until he was released from his duty by the old man’s death. He then followed his brethren to the south, where he soon gave proofs of his valour and daring; but he was unkindly treated by Guiscard, and, being left to his own resources, was reduced for a time to find a subsistence by robbing travellers and stealing horses—a fact which was afterwards preserved by the historian of his exploits, at Roger’s own desire. The brave and adventurous youth gathered by degrees a band of followers, which became so strong as even to be formidable to Guiscard. The brothers were reconciled in 1060, and combined for the siege of Reggio. After the taking of that city Roger carried his arms into Sicily under a banner blessed by Alexander II. His force at first consisted of only sixty soldiers; its usual number was from 150 to 300 horsemen, who joined or left him at their pleasure. Roger was often reduced to great distress, as an instance of which we are told that, when shut up in the city of Traina, he and his countess had but one cloak between them, in which they appeared in public by turns. But his indomitable courage and perseverance triumphed over all difficulties. The Saracens, effeminated by their long enjoyment of Sicily, and weakened by the division of their power, were unable to withstand him, even although aided by their brethren from Africa; and after thirty years of war, Roger was master of the island. He assumed the title of Grand Count, and his family became connected by marriage with the royal houses of Germany, France, and Hungary.

Nicolas, like Leo IX, had offended his own countrymen by the zeal with which he devoted himself to the Italian interest. An opposition to him was formed in Germany, headed by Hanno, archbishop of Cologne, who, in conjunction with other prelates, drew up an act of excommunication and deposition against the pope. Nicolas was already ill when this document reached him; he is said to have read it with a great appearance of grief, and his death followed almost immediately, on the 27th of July, 1061.

Each of the Roman parties now took measures for securing the succession to the papacy. The nobles and imperialists, under the guidance of Cardinal Hugh the White, who had lately deserted the high ecclesiastical party in disgust at the superior influence of Hildebrand, despatched an embassy to the German court, under Gerard, count of Galeria, who had repeatedly been excommunicated by popes, and had lately incurred a renewal of the sentence for plundering the archbishop of York, with other English prelates and nobles, on their return from a visit to Rome. The ambassadors, who were instructed to offer the patriciate and the empire to the young king, were favourably received; while the envoys of Hildebrand and his friends waited five days without obtaining an audience of Henry or of his mother. Hildebrand,

on learning this result, resolved to proceed to an election. By the promise of a large sum, he induced Richard, prince of Capua, to repair to Rome; the cardinals, under the protection of the Norman troops, chose Anselm of Lucca, who assumed the name of Alexander II; and, after a bloody conflict between the imperialists and the Normans, the pope was enthroned by night in St. Peter's. In this election even the vague privilege which had been reserved by Nicolas to the emperor was set aside, in reliance on the weakness of Henry's minority and on the newly-acquired support of the Normans.

The report of these proceedings reached Agnes at Basel, where a diet of princes and prelates was assembled, and among them some representatives of the Lombard bishops, who, under the direction of the chancellor Guibert, had resolved to accept no pope but one from their own province, which they styled "the paradise of Italy". The tidings of Alexander's election naturally raised great indignation. Henry was acknowledged as patrician of Rome; the late pope's decree as to the manner of papal elections was declared to be null; and, with the concurrence of the Roman envoys, Cadalous or Cadolus, bishop of Parma, was elected as the successor of Nicolas. The imperialist pope, who took the name of Honorius II, was, no doubt, favourable to those views on the subject of clerical marriage which distinguished the Lombard from the Hildebrandine party; but little regard is to be paid to the assertions of his violent opponents, who represent him as a man notoriously and scandalously vicious.

Honorius advanced towards Rome, where Benzo, bishop of Alba, a bold, crafty, and unscrupulous man, was employed to prepare the minds of the people for his reception. The talents of Benzo as a popular orator, his coarse and exuberant buffoonery, and the money which he was able to dispense, were not without effect on the Romans. On one occasion he had a public encounter with Alexander, whom (as he boasts) he compelled to retire amid the scoffs and curses of the mob. Honorius was received with veneration in many cities. At Tusculum, where he established his camp, he was joined by the count of the place, envoys from the patriarch of Constantinople waited on him, and his troops were successful in an encounter with the small force which was all that the Normans could then spare for the assistance of Alexander. But the appearance of Godfrey of Tuscany, with a formidable army, induced both parties to an accommodation. Cadalous was to retire to Parma, Anselm to Lucca, and the question between them was to be decided by the imperial court, to which Godfrey, who affected the character of a mediator, undertook to represent their claims. Honorius relied on the favour which he already enjoyed; Alexander, on the interest of Godfrey. But at this very time a revolution was effected which gave a new turn to affairs.

The upright and firm administration of the empress-mother was offensive to many powerful persons, who felt it as interfering with their interests; and the princes of Germany, who had been galled by the control of Henry III, especially during the last years of his reign, had conceived hopes of establishing their independence during the nonage of his son. Groundless slanders were spread as to the intimacy of Agnes with Henry, bishop of Augsburg, on whom she chiefly relied for counsel, and a plot was laid to remove the young king, who was now in his twelfth year, from her guardianship. Hanno, archbishop of Cologne, a severe, proud, and ambitious prelate, undertook the execution of the scheme. He caused a vessel to be prepared with extraordinary richness of ornament, and, while at table with Henry on an island of the Rhine, he described this vessel in such terms as excited in the boy a wish to see it. No sooner was Henry on board than the rowers struck up the river. The king, suspecting treachery, threw himself overboard, but was rescued from the water by Count Eckhardt, one of the conspirators; his alarm was soothed, and he was landed at Cologne. The people of that city rose in great excitement, but were pacified by the archbishop's assurances that he had not acted from any private motives, but for the good of the state; and, by way of proving his sincerity, Hanno published a decree that the administration of government and justice should be vested in the archbishop of that province in which the king should for the time be resident.

Hanno had thus far supported the Lombard pope, but he now found it expedient to make common cause with the Hildebrandine party; indeed it is probable that his late enterprise had been known beforehand to Godfrey of Tuscany, if not to Hildebrand and the other ecclesiastical leaders. Peter Damiani, who had already, by letters written with his usual vehemence, urged Henry to put down the antipope, and Cadalous himself to retire from the contest, now addressed Hanno in a strain of warm congratulation—comparing the abduction of Henry to the good priest Jehoiada’s act in rescuing the young Joash from Athaliah, and exhorting the archbishop to take measures for obtaining a synodical declaration against Cadalous. Guibert, the chief supporter of the imperial interest in Italy, was deprived of his chancellorship; and in October 1062 a synod was held at Osbor, where Peter appeared, and presented an argument for Alexander in the form of a dialogue between an *Advocate of the Royal Power* and a “Defender of the Roman Church”. The Roman champion, as might be expected, is fortunate in his opponent. The advocate of royalty, ill acquainted with the grounds of his cause, and wonderfully open to conviction, is driven from one position after another. His assertion that popes had always been chosen by princes is confuted by an overwhelming array of instances to the contrary. The donation of Constantine is triumphantly cited. The royalist then takes refuge in the reservation which the late pope’s decree had made of the imperial prerogative; but he is told that, as the Almighty sometimes leaves His promises unfulfilled because men fail in the performance of their part, so the grant made by Nicolas to Henry need not be always observed; that the privileges allowed to the king are not invaded, if during his childhood the Roman church—his better and spiritual mother—exercise a guardian care like that which his natural mother exerts in the political administration of his kingdom.

The pamphlet was read before the synod, which acknowledged Alexander as pope, and excommunicated his rival. It was the feast of St. Simon and St. Jude, the anniversary of the antipope’s election; and a prediction which Damiani had confidently uttered, that, if he should persist in his claims, he would die within the year, was proved to be ridiculously false. The prophet, however, was not a man to be readily abashed, and professed to see the fulfillment of his words in the excommunication—the spiritual death—of Cadalous.

Peter had by this time withdrawn from the eminent position to which Stephen IX had promoted him. His reforming zeal had been painfully checked by the supineness of those with whom he was associated. His brother cardinals, to whom he addressed an admonitory treatise on their duties, continued to live as if it had never been written. His attempts to stimulate pope Nicolas to a thorough purification of the church were but imperfectly successful, although he cited Phineas as a model, and Eli as a warning. Moreover, in his simple monkish earnestness for a religious and moral reformation, he was unable to enter into Hildebrand’s deeper and more politic schemes for the aggrandizement of the hierarchy; he felt that Hildebrand employed him as a tool, and he was dissatisfied with the part. He had therefore repeatedly entreated Nicolas to release him from his bishopric, on the plea of age, and of inability to discharge his duties. The pope refused his consent, and Hildebrand, unwilling to lose the services of a man so useful to his party, told the cardinal that he was attempting under false pretences to escape from duty; but Peter persisted in his suit, and in the first year of Alexander’s pontificate he was allowed to retire to his hermitage of Fonte Avellano. There he spent part of his time in humble manual works; among his verses are some which he sent to the pope with a gift of wooden spoons manufactured by himself. But he continued to exercise great influence by his writings; he was consulted by multitudes as an oracle; and from time to time he left his wilderness, at the pope’s request, to undertake important legations. The empress-mother Agnes, after the death of bishop Henry of Augsburg, placed herself under the direction of Damiani; and, having been brought by him to repent of her policy towards the church, she submitted to penance at the hands of Alexander, and became a nun in the Roman convent of St. Petronilla.

Hanno and his associates had loudly censured Agnes for the manner in which she educated her son; but when they had got the young king into their own hands, his education was utterly neglected. No care was taken to instruct him in the duties of a sovereign or of a Christian man. His talents, which were naturally strong, and his amiable dispositions were uncultivated; the unsteadiness of character which was his chief defect was unchecked; no restraint was opposed to his will; he was encouraged to waste his time and his energies in trifling or degrading occupations—in hunting, gaming, and premature indulgence of the passions. Hanno, finding that he himself was distasteful to Henry, both on account of the artifice by which he had obtained possession of the king's person and because of his severe and imperious manners, called in the aid of Adalbert, archbishop of Bremen and Hamburg. The character of this prelate has been very fully depicted by the historian of northern Christianity, Adam, who, as a canon of his church, had ample opportunities of knowing him. Adalbert was a man of many splendid qualities. His person was eminently handsome; he was distinguished for eloquence and for learning; his morals, by a rare exception to the character of the age, were unimpeached; his devotion was such that he wept at the celebration of the eucharistic sacrifice. He had laboured with zeal and success for the spreading of the gospel among the northern nations—extending his care even to the Orkneys and to Iceland. He had conceived the idea of exalting Bremen to the dignity of a patriarchate, and it was a desire to promote the interest of his see which first led him to frequent the imperial court. He acquired the confidence of Henry III, whom he attended into Italy in 1046; it is said that the emperor even wished to bestow the papacy on him, and that Suidger of Bamberg, who had been a deacon of the church of Hamburg, was preferred by Adalbert's own desire. The hope of erecting a northern patriarchate ended with the death of the archbishop's patrons, Henry and Leo IX, and from that time he devoted himself to political ambition. The faults of his character became more and more developed. His pride, vanity, ostentation, and prodigality were extravagantly displayed. His kindness and his anger were alike immoderate. The wealth which he had before spent on ecclesiastical buildings was now lavished on castles; he maintained a numerous and costly force of soldiers; and to meet the expenses of his secular grandeur he oppressed the tenants of his church and sold its precious ornaments. He entertained a host of parasites,—artists, players, quacksalvers, minstrels, and jugglers; one was a baptized Jew, who professed the science of alchemy; others flattered their patron with tales of visions and revelations, which promised him power, long life, and the exaltation of his church. While engaged in the society of these familiars, the archbishop would refuse an audience to persons who wished to see him on the gravest matters of business; sometimes he spent the night in playing at dice, and slept throughout the day. His eagerness to extend the possessions of his see, and to render it independent of lay control, involved him in many quarrels with neighbouring nobles; and his favourite table-talk consisted of sarcasms on these powerful enemies—the stupidity of one, the greed of another, the boorishness of a third. At the same time he was proud of his own descent from the counts palatine of Saxony; he spoke with contempt of his predecessors in the archbishopric as a low-born set of men, and even claimed kindred, through the family of the Othos, with the emperors of the east. To the poor his behaviour was gentle and condescending; he would often wash the feet of thirty beggars; but to his equals he was haughty and assuming.

The young king was won by the fascination of Adalbert's society, and after a time Hanno found it expedient to admit his brother archbishop to a share in the administration. The misgovernment of these prelates was scandalous. Intent exclusively on their own interest and on that of their partisans, they appropriated or gave away estates belonging to the crown, while they used the royal name to sanction their plunder of other property. The wealth of monasteries, in particular, was pillaged without mercy. To Hanno his rapacity appeared to be justified by the application of the spoil to religious uses; Adalbert was rapacious in order to obtain the means of maintaining his splendour. Hanno, a man of obscure birth, practised the

most shameless nepotism in the bestowal of ecclesiastical dignities, while Adalbert disdained such expedients for enriching his kindred. The sale of church preferment was openly carried on; a historian of the time tells us that money was the only way to promotion. The feuds and insubordination of the nobles became more uncontrollable; nor were ecclesiastics slow to imitate their example. Thus, in consequence of a question as to precedence between the bishop of Hildesheim and the abbot of Fulda, a violent affray took place between their retainers in the church of Goslar, at Christmas 1062, and the quarrel was renewed with still greater fury at the following Whitsuntide, when the king's presence was no more regarded than the holiness of the place. Henry was even in personal danger, and many were slain on both sides. The great monastery of St. Boniface was long disturbed by the consequences of these scenes, and was impoverished by the penalties imposed on it for the share which its monks had taken in them.

Adalbert gradually supplanted Hanno. At Easter 1065, he carried Henry to Worms, where the young king, then aged fifteen, was girt with the sword, and was declared to be of age to carry on the government for himself. Thus the regency of Hanno ceased, while Adalbert, as the minister of Henry, for a time enjoyed undivided power. Under his administration the state of things became continually worse. Simony was more shamelessly practised than ever; the pillage of monasteries was carried on without measure; for the archbishop taught the young king to regard monks as merely his stewards and bailiffs. Adalbert's private quarrels were turned into affairs of state, and he took advantage of his position to inspire Henry with a dislike of the Saxons and others who had offended him. The discontent of his enemies and of those who suffered from his misgovernment rose at length to a height, and at a diet which was held at Tribur, in January 1066, Henry was peremptorily desired by a powerful party of princes and prelates to choose between the resignation of his crown and the dismissal of the archbishop of Bremen. Adalbert was compelled to make a hasty flight; he was required to give up almost the whole revenue of his see to his enemies; and his lands were plundered, so that he was reduced to support himself by appropriating religious and charitable endowments, and by oppressive exactions which are said to have driven some of the victims to madness and many to beggary. Hanno resumed the government. His rapacity and nepotism were unabated, but sometimes met with successful resistance. A nephew named Conrad, whom he had nominated to the archbishopric of Treves, was seized by the people, who were indignant at the denial of their elective rights; the unfortunate man was thrice thrown from a rock, and, as he still lived, was despatched with a sword. And an aggression on the property of the monks of Malmedy was defeated by the miraculous power of their patron St. Remailus.

The antipope Honorius had made a fresh attempt on Rome in 1063, when he gained possession of the Leonine city, and was enthroned in St. Peter's; but many of his partisans deserted him as his money decreased, the Romans rose against him, and, after much fighting with a Norman force which Hildebrand had called in to oppose him, he was compelled to shut himself up in the castle of St. Angelo, under the protection of Cencius, a disorderly noble who had made himself master of the place. For two years he held out in the fortress; but his condition became more and more hopeless. It was in vain that he implored the assistance of Henry and Adalbert; and at length he felt himself obliged to withdraw, paying three hundred pounds of silver for the consent of Cencius to his departure. Hanno, after the recovery of his power, proceeded into Italy with a view of putting an end to the schism. At Rome he held a synod, where Alexander appeared. The archbishop asked him how he had ventured to occupy the apostolical chair without the sovereign's permission; whereupon Hildebrand stood forward as the champion of his party, and maintained that the election of the pope had been regularly conducted—that no layman had any right to control the disposal of the holy see. Hanno was disposed to be easily satisfied, and adjourned the consideration of the case to a synod which was to be held at Mantua in Whitsun-week. At this synod Alexander presided, and defended all his acts. Honorius, who had retired to his bishopric of Parma, refused to attend, unless he

might be allowed to sit as president, and attempted, at the head of an armed force, to disturb the sessions of the council. But the attempt was put down by Godfrey of Tuscany, Alexander was formally acknowledged as pope, and in that character he was escorted by Godfrey to Rome. The antipope held possession of Parma until his death, but, although he continued to maintain his pretensions to the papacy, he made no further active attempts to enforce them.

The pacification effected by Peter Damiani at Milan had too much the nature of a surprise to be lasting. The promulgation of the decrees against the marriage of the clergy which were enacted by the Roman synod of 1059 became the signal for great commotions in northern Italy. Many bishops refused to publish them; the bishop of Brescia, on attempting to do so, was almost torn to pieces by his clergy. And in Milan itself disorders soon broke out again.

Landulf died, but his place as an agitator was taken by his brother Herlembald. The new leader had been a valiant soldier; his views as to the marriage of the clergy had been bitterly influenced by finding that his affianced bride had been guilty of levity with a clerk. On this discovery he broke off the match, went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and at his return would have become a monk, but that Ariald persuaded him to continue in secular life, and to serve the church by defending it. The character of Herlembald was bold, violent, and resolute; he was possessed of a fiery eloquence, and was devoted to his cause with the narrow, reckless, and intolerant zeal which not uncommonly marks the religious partisanship of men trained to martial professions. He now accompanied Ariald to Rome, where Alexander received them as old friends, and bestowed on Herlembald a consecrated banner, charging him to unfurl it against heresy. On returning to Milan, the two began a fresh course of aggression against the married and concubinary clergy. They excited the multitude by their addresses; they won the poor by large distributions of money, and the young by the skillful use of flattery. A company of youths was formed, sworn to extirpate concubinage among the clergy, and with it was joined a rabble composed of low artisans and labourers, of men rendered desperate by want of employment, and of ruffians attracted by the hope of plunder. Some Manicheans, or adherents of the Monteforte heresy, are also mentioned as associates in the cause. For eighteen years Herlembald exercised a tyrannic power in Milan. Yet the populace was not entirely with him; for while he and Ariald, in their enthusiasm for Roman usages, went so far as to disparage the Milanese ritual, they furnished their opponents with a powerful cry in behalf of the honour of St. Ambrose. The reformers were very unscrupulous as to the means of carrying out their plans; Herlembald, when in want of money, proclaimed that any priest who could not swear that he had strictly kept the vow of continence since his ordination should lose all his property; and on this his adherents conveyed female attire by stealth into the houses of some of the clergy, where the discovery of it exposed the victims of the trick to confiscation, plunder, and outrage. The streets of Milan were continually disquieted by affrays between the hostile parties. Peter Damiani by his correspondence stimulated the reformers, and Gualbert of Vallombrosa sent some of his monks to aid them. The persecuted clergy, on the other hand, found allies in many Lombard bishops, who urged them to leave the city, and offered them hospitable entertainment. It is said that even Ariald was at one time touched by remorse, and expressed penitence on seeing the misery, and the destitution of religious ordinances, which had arisen from his agitations

A conference was held, at which a priest named Andrew especially distinguished himself by pleading for the marriage of the clergy. He rested the warrant for it on Scripture and on ancient usage, and spoke forcibly of the worse evils which had resulted from a denial of the liberty to marry. It was said that St. Ambrose had sanctioned the marriage of the clergy; that, by representing continency as a special gift of grace, he implied that it was something which ought not to be exacted of all. Ariald replied that marriage had been allowed in the times when babes required to be fed with milk, but that all things were now new. The conference was broken off by an attack of the mob on the clergy. The discomfited party

alleged that miracles were wrought among them in behalf of clerical marriage, but their stories produced no effect.

In 1066, Herlembald, leaving Ariald to keep up the excitement of the Milanese, went again to Rome, and before a synod accused archbishop Guy of simony. The pope was unwilling to proceed to extremities, but Hildebrand persuaded him to pronounce a sentence of excommunication, which was conveyed to Milan by Herlembald. On Whitsunday the archbishop ascended the pulpit of his cathedral, holding the document in his hand. He inveighed against Herlembald and Ariald as the authors of the troubles which had so long afflicted the city. He complained of their behaviour towards himself and concluded his speech by desiring that all who loved St. Ambrose would leave the church. Out of a congregation of seven thousand, all withdrew except the two agitators and about twelve of their adherents. These were attacked by the younger clergy, with some lay partisans of the archbishop. Ariald was nearly killed; Herlembald fought desperately, and cut his way out of the church. The Patarines, on hearing of this, rose in the belief that Ariald was dead, and their numbers were swollen by a multitude of peasants from the neighbourhood, who had repaired to Milan for the festival; they stormed the cathedral and the archiepiscopal palace, dragged the archbishop out, handled him roughly, and left him hardly alive. Next day, when the peasantry had left the city, the nobles and clergy resolved to take vengeance for these outrages. Ariald fled in disguise, pursued by two clerks with a party of soldiers, while the archbishop laid an interdict on the city until he should be found. The unfortunate man was betrayed by a companion into the hands of a niece of the archbishop named Oliva, who directed five of her servants to conduct him to an island in the Lago Maggiore. On arriving there, his guards asked him whether he acknowledged Guy as archbishop of Milan. "He is not", said Ariald, "nor ever was, for no archbishop-like work is or ever was in him". The servants then set on him, cut off his members one by one, with words of savage mockery, and at length put an end to his life, and threw his body into the lake. Some months after the murder, the corpse was found, and Herlembald compelled the archbishop to give it up; it was carried in triumph to Milan, and miracles were reported to be performed by it. By these scenes the exasperation of Herlembald and his party was rendered more intense than ever.

In the following spring, the pope visited Milan, on his way to the council of Mantua, where he made some regulations as to discipline, and canonized Ariald as a martyr. Two Roman cardinals were soon afterwards sent as legates to Milan. They entered on their commission in a temperate and conciliatory spirit (Aug. 1, 1067).

It was decreed that the clergy should separate from their wives or concubines; that such of them as should persist in defying this order should be deprived of their office; but that no one should be deprived except on confession or conviction, and that the laity should not take the punishment of offending clergymen into their own hands. These orders, however, had little effect. Herlembald, dissatisfied with the moderation of the commissioners, again went to Rome, where Hildebrand joined him in maintaining the necessity of appointing a new archbishop instead of Guy, whose title they declared to be invalid, as being derived from the imperial nomination.

Guy himself at length became weary of his uneasy dignity. He expressed a wish to resign, and sent his ring and crosier to the king, with a request (which is said to have been supported by money) that a deacon named Godfrey might be appointed as his successor; but, although Henry accepted the recommendation, and nominated Godfrey to the see, the Milanese refused to receive him. Nor were Herlembald's party able to establish a young ecclesiastic named Atto, whom they set up as a rival archbishop; on the day of his consecration he was driven from the city, after having been compelled to forswear his pretensions. The church was in a state of utter confusion. Hildebrand declared the oath extorted from Atto to be null, and procured a like declaration from the pope. Godfrey was excommunicated by Alexander, and was persecuted by Herlembald, who, by intercepting the

revenues of the archbishopric, rendered him unable to pay a stipulated pension to Guy; and the old man, in distress and discontent, allowed himself to be decoyed into a reconciliation with Herlembald. He was allowed to retain the title of archbishop, but was kept as a virtual prisoner in a monastery, while Herlembald wielded the ecclesiastical as well as the secular power in Milan. Guy died in 1071, but the troubles of his church were not ended by his death.

While these scenes were in progress at Milan, disturbances of a similar kind took place at Florence, where John Gualbert and the monks of Vallombrosa publicly accused the bishop, Peter, of simony, and declared the ministrations of simoniac and married clergy to be invalid. After much contention and some bloodshed, they proposed to decide the question by ordeal. The bishop refused to abide such a trial, and the pope, who had been appealed to, discouraged it; but a monk named Peter undertook to prove the charge. Two piles of wood were erected, ten feet in length, and with a narrow passage between them. The monk celebrated the Eucharist, and proceeded to the place of trial, clothed in the sacerdotal vestments. After praying that, if his charge against the bishop of Florence were just, he might escape unhurt, he entered between the burning piles, barefooted and carrying the cross in his hands. For a time he was hidden by flames and smoke; but he reappeared uninjured, and was hailed by the spectators with admiration and triumph. The bishop, a man of mild character, yielded to the popular clamour by withdrawing from Florence; but he retained his office until his death, and the diocese was administered in his name by a deputy. The zeal of the monk Peter, who acquired the name of "the Fiery", was rewarded by promotion to high dignity in the church. Under Gregory VII he became cardinal-bishop of Albano, and was employed as legate in Germany.

Henry III had chosen as a wife for his son, Bertha, daughter of the marquis of Susa, whose powerful interest in Italy he hoped to secure by the connection. The princess was beautiful, and, as appeared in the varied trials of her life, her character was noble and affectionate; but the young king, from unwillingness to forsake his irregularities, was reluctant to fulfill the engagement. After recovering from an illness which his physicians supposed to be desperate, he was persuaded by the entreaties of his nobles to marry Bertha in 1066; but regarding her as forced on him by his enemies, he felt a repugnance towards her, and three years later he formed a design of repudiating her. With a view to this, he endeavoured to secure the interest of Siegfried, archbishop of Mayence, by a promise of aiding him in enforcing the payment of tithes from Thuringia to his see, and Siegfried willingly listened to the inducement. He wrote to the pope on behalf of the divorce, although in a tone which showed that he was somewhat ashamed of his part; he had (he said) threatened the king with excommunication unless some definite reason were given for his desire of a separation. Peter Damiani was once more sent into Germany, and assembled a synod at Mayence, from which city, at Henry's summons, it was transferred to Frankfort. After a discussion of the matter, the legate earnestly entreated Henry to desist from his purpose, for the sake of his own reputation, if he were indifferent to the laws of God and man. He told him that it was an accursed project, unworthy alike of a Christian and of a king; that it was monstrous for one whose duty bound him to punish misdeeds, to give so flagrant an example; that the pope would never consent to the divorce, nor ever crown him as emperor if he persisted in urging it. The king submitted, although unwillingly, and soon resumed his licentious habits. But the character of Bertha gradually won his affection, and, so long as she lived, her fidelity supported him in his troubles.

About this time Adalbert, after a banishment of three years from the court, recovered his position, and for a time conducted the government with absolute power. He resumed his ambitious project of erecting his see into a patriarchate. The evils of his former administration were renewed, and even exceeded. Ecclesiastical preferments were put up to open sale in the court; and it is said that a general disgust was excited by the sight of the shameless traffic in which monks engaged, and of the hoarded wealth which they produced, to be expended in

simoniacal purchases. Feuds, intrigues, discontent, abounded. The writer to whom we are indebted for the fullest account of Adalbert's career describes his last years with a mixture of sorrow and awe—dwelling fondly on his noble gifts, relating his errors with honest candour, and lamenting his melancholy perversion and decline. It seemed as if the archbishop's mind were disordered by the vicissitudes through which he had passed. His days were spent in sleep, his nights in waking. His irritability became intolerable; to those who provoked him he spoke with an indecent violence of language; or he struck them, and sometimes so as even to draw blood. He showed no mercy to the poor; he plundered religious and charitable foundations, while he was lavish in his gifts to the rich, and to the parasites whose flatteries and prophecies obtained an ever-increasing mastery over him. Yet his eloquence was still unabated, and gave plausibility to his wildest extravagances and to his most unwarrantable acts. His nearest relations believed him to be under the influence of magic, while he was himself suspected by the vulgar of unhallowed arts—a charge for the falsehood of which the historian solemnly appeals to the Saviour and to all the saints. His health began to fail; a woman, who professed to be inspired, foretold that he would die within two years unless he amended his life; but he was buoyed up by the assurances of other prophets, that he would live to put all his enemies under his feet, and almost to the last he relied on these assurances in opposition to the warnings of his physicians. Omens of evil were observed at Bremen: crucifixes wept, swine and dogs boldly profaned the churches, wolves mingled their dismal howlings with the hooting of owls around the city, while the pagans of the neighbourhood burnt and laid waste Hamburg, and overran Nordalbingia. The archbishop gradually sank. It was in vain that the highest dignitaries of the church sought admittance to his chamber; he was ashamed to be seen in his decay. The king alone was allowed to enter; and to him Adalbert, after reminding him of his long service, committed the protection of the church of Bremen. On the 16th of March 1072 the archbishop expired at Goslar—unlike Wolsey, with whom he has been compared, in the recovery of his power, and in the retention of it to the last; but, like Wolsey, lamenting the waste of his life on objects of which he had too late learnt to understand the vanity. His treasury, into which, by rightful and by wrongful means, such vast wealth had been gathered, was found to be entirely empty; his books and some relics of saints were all that he left behind him.

On the death of Adalbert, Henry, in deference to the solicitations of his nobles and to the cries of his people, requested Hanno to resume the government. The archbishop reluctantly consented, and, although his rapacity and sternness excited complaints, the benefits of his vigorous administration speedily appeared. Nobles were compelled to raze their castles, which had been the strongholds of tyranny and insubordination; justice was done without respect of persons; it seemed, according to the best annalist of the age, as if for a time the minister had infused into the indolent young king the activity and the virtues of his father. But Hanno was weary of his position, and under the pretext of age and infirmity, resigned it at the end of nine months; when Henry, feeling (according to Lambert's expression) as if he were delivered from a severe schoolmaster, plunged into a reckless career of dissipation and misgovernment. He neglected public business; violences were committed against nobles, the property of churches and monasteries was bestowed on worthless favourites, the hills of Saxony and Thuringia were crowned with fortresses intended to coerce the inhabitants, and the garrisons indulged without restraint their love of plunder and destruction, their insolence and their lust. In Thuringia, the prosecution of Siegfried's claim to tithes was used as a pretext for the military occupation of the country; it had been agreed that the king was to enforce the claim by arms, on condition of sharing in the spoil. Siegfried, by a letter in which he plainly hinted a bribe, endeavoured to draw Hildebrand into his interest. In March 1073 a synod met at Erfurt, in the king's presence, for the consideration of the question; when the abbots of Fulda and Hersfeld appeared in opposition to the archbishop. The Thuringians made an appeal to the pope, but Henry threatened ruin and death against any one who should attempt to

prosecute it; and when the synod agreed on a compromise unfavourable to the Thuringians, he forbade the abbots to report the result to Rome. Henry had incurred the general detestation of his subjects, which was swollen by exaggerated and fabulous tales of his misconduct; the Saxons, the Thuringians, and the Swabians, exasperated by the wrongs which they had suffered and by the dread of further evils, were ready to break out into rebellions

The cries of Germany at length reached Alexander, who summoned the archbishops of Meayence and Cologne, with the bishop of Bamberg, to Rome, and reproved them for their slackness in discouraging simony. Hanno was gently treated, and was presented with some precious relics; Siegfried's offer of a resignation was declined; Otho of Bamberg confessed his guilt, but it is said that he appeased the papal anger by valuable gifts, and he received the honour of the pall. The greatest prelates of Germany were at the pope's feet; the two metropolitans of England had just been compelled to appear before him—Lanfranc of Canterbury, that he might personally receive the pall which he had in vain endeavoured to obtain without such appearance; and Thomas of York, that he might refer to the successor of St. Peter and of St. Gregory a question as to the English primacy. By these triumphs over national churches, Alexander was encouraged to enter on a contest with the chief representative of the secular power. In October, 1072, he had held a conference at Lucca with Beatrice and her daughter Matilda on the means of reforming their royal kinsman; and, as it was agreed that gentle measures would be ineffectual, he proceeded, at a synod in the following Lent, to excommunicate five counsellors who were charged with exerting an evil influence over Henry, and summoned the king himself to make satisfaction to the church for simony and other offences. Hanno and the bishop of Bamberg, who were on the point of returning home, were charged with the delivery of the mandate; but on the 21st of April 1073, Alexander died, and it remained unanswered and unenforced.

Peter Damiani had died in the preceding year, on his return from a mission to Ravenna, where he had been employed in releasing his fellow-citizens from the excommunication brought on them by their late archbishop, as a partisan of the antipope Cadalous.

CHAPTER II.

GREGORY VII.

HILDEBRAND was now to assume in his own person the majesty and the responsibility of the power which he had so long directed.

At the death of Alexander II, Rome, by a fortune rare on such occasions, was undisturbed by the rage of its factions. Hildebrand, as chancellor of the see, ordered a fast of three days, with a view to obtaining the Divine guidance in the choice of a pope. But next day, while the funeral rites of Alexander were in progress, a loud outcry arose from the clergy and the people, demanding Hildebrand as his successor. The chancellor ascended the pulpit, and attempted to allay the uproar by representing that the time for an election was not yet come; but the cries still continued. Hugh the White then stood forth as spokesman of the cardinals, and, after a warm panegyric on Hildebrand's services to the church, declared that on him the election would fall, if no worthier could be found. The cardinals retired for a short time, and, on their reappearance, presented Hildebrand to the multitude, by whom he was hailed with acclamations.

The name which the new pope assumed—Gregory the Seventh—naturally carried back men's thoughts to the last Gregory who had occupied St. Peter's chair. By choosing this name, Hildebrand did not merely testify his personal attachment to the memory of his master and patron; it was a declaration that he regarded him as a legitimate pope, and was resolved to vindicate the principles of which Gregory VI had been the representative and the confessor against the imperial power by which he had been deposed.

At the outset, however, Hildebrand did not wish prematurely to provoke that power. The proceedings which Alexander had commenced against Henry were allowed to drop; and, although the pope at once took on himself the full administration of his office, he sent notice of his election to the king, and waited for the royal confirmation of it. The German bishops, who knew that his influence had long governed the papacy, and dreaded his imperious character and his reforming tendencies, represented the dangers which might be expected from him; and, in consequence of their representations, two commissioners were despatched to Rome, with orders to compel Hildebrand to resign, if any irregularity could be found in his election. The pope received them with honour; he stated that the papacy had been forced on him by a tumult, against his own desire, and that he had deferred his consecration until the choice should be approved by the king and princes of Germany. The commissioners reported to Henry that no informality could be discovered, and on St. Peter's day 1073 Hildebrand was consecrated as the successor of the apostle. It was the last time that the imperial confirmation was sought for an election to the papacy.

In the letters which he wrote on his elevation, Hildebrand expresses a strong reluctance to undertake the burden of the dignity which had been thrust on him; and his professions have been often regarded as insincere. But this seems to be an injustice. Passionately devoted as he was to the cause which he had espoused, he may yet have preferred that his exertions for it should be carried on under the names of other men; he had so long wielded in reality the power which was nominally exercised by Leo, Victor, Stephen, Nicolas, and Alexander, that he may have wished to keep up the same system to the end. If he had desired to be pope, why did he not take means to secure his election on some earlier vacancy? Why should we suppose that his promotion as the successor of Alexander was

contrived by himself, rather than that it was the natural effect of the impression which his character and his labours had produced on the minds of the Roman clergy and people? And even if he thought that matters had reached a condition in which no one but himself, acting with the title as well as with the power of pope, could fitly guide the policy of the church, why should we not believe that he felt a real unwillingness to undertake an office so onerous and so full of peril? His letters to princes and other great personages might indeed be suspected; but one which he addressed in January 1075 to his ancient friend and superior, Hugh of Cluny, seems to breathe the unfeigned feeling of his heart. Like the first pope of his name, and in terms partly borrowed from him, he laments the unhappy state of ecclesiastical affairs. The eastern church is failing from the faith, and is a prey to the Saracens. Westward, southward, northward, there is hardly a bishop to be seen, but such as have got their office by unlawful means, or are blameable in their lives, and devoted to worldly ambition; while among secular princes there is no one who prefers God's honour and righteousness to the advantages of this world. Those among whom he lives—Romans, Lombards, and Normans—are worse than Jews or pagans. He had often prayed God either to take him from the world or to make him the means of benefit to His church; the hope that he may be the instrument of gracious designs is all that keeps him at Rome or in life.

But, whatever his private feelings may have been, Hildebrand, when raised to the papacy, entered on the prosecution of his schemes with increased energy. The corruptions of the church, which he traced to its connection with the state, had led him to desire its independence; and it now appeared that under the name of independence he understood sovereign domination. In the beginning of his pontificate, he spoke of the spiritual and the secular powers as being like the two eyes in the human body, and therefore apparently on an equality; but afterwards they are compared to the sun and the moon respectively—a comparison more distinctly insisted on by Innocent III, and which gives a great superiority to the priesthood, so that Gregory founds on it a claim to control “after God” the actions of kings; and still later (as we shall see hereafter), his statements as to the power of temporal sovereigns became of a far more depreciatory character. And, as he brought out with a new boldness the claims of the church against the state, it was equally his policy to assert a despotic power for the papacy against the rest of the church, while all his aggressive acts or claims were grounded on pretexts of ancient and established rights. The principles of his system are embodied in a set of propositions known as his “Dictate”, which, although probably not drawn up by himself, contains nothing but what may be paralleled either from his writings or from his actions. These maxims are far in advance of the forged decretals. It is laid down that the Roman pontiff alone is universal bishop; that his name is the only one of its kind in the world. To him alone it belongs to depose or to reconcile bishops; and he may depose them in their absence, and without the concurrence of a synod. He alone is entitled to frame new laws for the church—to divide, unite, or translate bishoprics. He alone may use the ensigns of empire; all princes are bound to kiss his feet; he has the right to depose emperors, and to absolve subjects from their allegiance. His power supersedes the diocesan authority of bishops. He may revise all judgments, and from his sentence there is no appeals. All appeals to him must be respected, and to him the greater causes of every church must be referred. With his leave, inferiors may accuse their superiors. No council may be styled general without his command. The Roman church never has erred, and, as Scripture testifies, never will err. The pope is above all judgment, and by the merits of St. Peter is undoubtedly rendered holy. The church, according to Gregory, was not to be the handmaid of princes, but their mistress; if she had received from God power to bind and to loose in heaven, much more must she have a like power over earthly things. His idea of the papacy combined something of the ancient Jewish theocracy with the imperial traditions of Rome.

Gregory boldly asserted that kingdoms were held as fiefs under St. Peter. From France he claims tribute as an ancient right; he says that Charlemagne acted as the pope's collector,

and bestowed Saxony on the apostle. He declares that Spain had of old belonged to St. Peter, although the memory of the connection had been obscured during the Mahometan occupation; and on this ground he grants to the count of Roucy (near Reims) all that he may be able to regain from the Arabs, to be held under the apostolic see. To Solomon, king of Hungary he writes that that kingdom had been given by the holy Stephen to St. Peter; he rebukes him for taking investiture from the king of Germany, tells him that therefore his reign will not be long, and in writing to the next king, Geisa, he traces Solomon's fall to this unworthy submission. He makes similar claims to Bohemia, to Denmark, to Poland, to Provence, Corsica, Sardinia, England, and Ireland. By conferring the title of king on the duke of Dalmatia, he binds him to be the vassal of the holy see; where he does not pretend an ancient right, he offers to princes—even to the sovereign of Russia among them—a new and better title from St. Peter; and in the event it was found that the hope of a title which professed to consecrate possession, to heal all irregularities, and to silence all questions as to the mode of acquisition, was the most powerful means of inducing princes to submit to the pretensions of Rome. The sternness of Gregory's resolution to carry out his principles was expressed by the frequent citation of a text from Jeremiah—"Cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood". But in his dealings with princes he showed nothing of that fanaticism which disregards persons and circumstances. He could temporize with the strong, while he bent all his force against the weak. He was careful to strike where his blows might be most effective.

Philip I of France had succeeded his father at the age of seven, and, with a natural character far inferior to that of Henry IV, had grown up in a like freedom from wholesome restraint, and in a like want of moral training. Gregory, soon after his election, addressed a letter to the king, censuring the disorders of his government and Philip answered by promising amendment, but took little pains to fulfill his promise. On this the pope wrote to some French bishops and nobles, in terms of the severest denunciation against their sovereign. Philip, he said, was not a king but a tyrant—a greedy wolf, an enemy of God and man. By the persuasion of the devil he had reached the height of iniquity in the sale of ecclesiastical preferments; he paid no regard to either divine or human laws; a loose was given to perjury, adultery, sacrilege, and all manner of vices, and the king not only encouraged these but set the example of them. Nay, not content with this, he even robbed foreign merchants who visited his dominions—an outrage unheard of among the very pagans. The bishops were charged to remonstrate, and were assured that their obligations of fealty bound them not to overlook the sovereign's misdeeds, but to reprove them; the kingdom must not be ruined by "one most abandoned man". Gregory told Philip himself that France had sunk into degradation and contempt; he threatened to excommunicate and interdict him, to withdraw the obedience of his subjects, to leave nothing undone in order to wrest the kingdom from him, unless he repented.

Yet all this led to no result. Philip was too indolent to enter into a direct conflict with the pope; he allowed the Roman legates to hold synods and to exercise discipline in his dominions; but he grudged the diminution of his revenues by their proceedings, and, when he found that they especially interfered with his patronage or profit in the appointment or deposition of bishops and abbots, he opposed them with a sullen and dogged resistances. Gregory repeatedly wrote to him, admonished him, and expressed hopes of his amendment. No amendment followed; but the pope was too deeply engaged in other business, and too much dreaded the spirit of the French nation—in which the nobles were gradually rallying round the throne, while the church was more united than that of Germany—to take any steps for the correction of the king.

While Gregory spared Philip, and while (as we shall see hereafter) he dreaded William of England and Normandy, his most vigorous efforts were employed against the king of Germany, the heir of the imperial dignity. If he could humble the highest and proudest of crowns, the victory would tell on all other sovereigns; and the papacy, in such strength as it had never before possessed, was measured against the empire in its weakness.

Germany was now in a miserable state of distraction. The young king had given much just cause of discontent, while his subjects were not disposed to limit their demands within the bounds of reason. The garrisons of the Saxon and Thuringian fortresses excited by their outrages the violent indignation of the people, and the complaints which were addressed to Henry against them were received with scorn and mockery. Sometimes he refused to see the deputies who were sent to him; it is said that on one occasion, when some envoys waited on him at Goslar by his own appointment, they were detained in his ante-chamber all day, while he amused himself by playing at dice, and at length were told that he had retired by another way. It was believed that the king intended to reduce the Saxons to slavery, and to seize on their country for his own domain. The whole population rose in frenzy; a confederacy was formed which included the primate Siegfried, with the abbots of Fulda and Hersfeld; and a leader was found in Otho of Nordheim. Both among princes and among prelates many were ready to disguise their selfish ambition under the cloak of patriotism and religion; and loud cries were raised for a new king. The exasperation of the Saxons was yet further increased when Henry endeavoured to engage the barbarians of the north—Poles, Luticians, and Danes—to take up arms against them.

Gregory in the beginning of his pontificate wrote to Godfrey of Tuscany and to other relations of Henry, entreating them to use their influence for the king's amendment. Henry, feeling the difficulties of his position, and not suspecting the extent of the great scheme for the exaltation of the papacy at the cost of the empire, addressed the pope in a tone of deference; he regretted his own past misconduct—his encouragement of simony, his negligence in punishing offenders; he owned himself unworthy to be called the son of the church, and requested Gregory to aid him in appeasing the distractions of Milan, where a new claimant, Tedald, nominated by the king at the request of the citizens, who disowned both Godfrey and Atto, was now engaged in a contest for the archbishopric with Atto and the faction of Herlembald.

The troubles of Germany increased. In March 1074 an agreement was extorted from Henry that the hated fortresses should be destroyed. The great castle of the Harz was at once that in which the king took an especial pride, and which was most obnoxious to his people. It included a church, which, although built of wood, was splendidly adorned; a college of monks was attached to the church, and in its vaults reposed the bodies of the king's brother and infant son. Henry dismantled the fortifications, in the hope of saving the rest; but the infuriated peasantry destroyed the church, scattered the royal bones and the sacred relics, carried off the costly vessels, and proceeded to demolish other fortresses in the same riotous manner. The Saxon princes endeavoured to appease the king's indignation by representing to him that these outrages were committed without their sanction, and by promising to punish the ringleaders; but he refused to listen to their apologies, inveighed against the Saxons as traitors whom no treaties could bind, and complained to the pope of the sacrileges which had been committed at the Harzburg. About the same time the tumultuary spirit of the Germans showed itself in outbreaks in various quarters. The citizens of Cologne expelled their archbishop, Hanno, but he soon reduced them to submission, and punished them with characteristic severity.

In April 1074 Gregory sent the empress-mother Agnes, with four bishops, on an embassy into Germany. They were received at Nuremberg by Henry, but refused to hold any communication with him until he should have done penance for his offences against the church. Out of deference to his mother, the king submitted to this condition; in the rough garb of a penitent, and with his feet bare, he sued for and received absolution; and his excommunicated courtiers were also absolved, on swearing that they would restore the church property which they had taken. Henry was disposed to accede to the pope's intended measures against simoniacs, as he hoped by such means to get rid of some bishops who had opposed him in the Saxon troubles. It was proposed that a council should be held in Germany, under a legate, with a view to investigating the cases of bishops suspected of having obtained their

promotion by unlawful means. The primate Siegfried—a mean, selfish, and pusillanimous prelate—made no objection to the proposal. But Liemar, archbishop of Bremen, a man of very high character for piety, learning, and integrity, declared that it was an infringement on the rights of the national church; that, in the absence of the pope, the archbishop of Mayence alone was entitled to preside over German councils, as perpetual legate of the holy see. In consequence of his opposition, Liemar was suspended by the envoys, was cited to Rome, and, as he did not appear, was excommunicated by Gregory, who wrote to him a letter of severe rebuke; and other prelates who took part with him were suspended until they should clear themselves before the pope. Agnes and her companions were dismissed by the king with gifts, and were assured that he would aid the pope in his endeavours to suppress simony.

Gregory still had hopes of using Henry as an ally. In December 1074 he addressed to him two letters—the one, thanking him for his promise of cooperation; the other, remarkable as announcing the project of a crusade. The pope states that fifty thousand men, from both sides of the Alps, were ready to march against the infidels of the east, if he would be their leader; that he earnestly wishes to undertake the expedition, more especially as it holds out a hope of reconciliation with the Greek church; and that, if he should go, Henry must in his absence guard the church as a mother, and defend her honour. Even so late as July 1075, he commended the king for his cooperation in discountenancing simony, and for his desire to enforce chastity on the clergy, while he expressed a hope that this might be regarded as a pledge for yet more excellent things.

In the meantime the pope's measures of reform were producing a violent commotion. Gregory was resolved to proceed with vigour in the suppression of simony and of marriage among the clergy. Like Peter Damiani, he included under the name of simony all lay patronage of benefices; that which is given to God (it was said) is given for ever, so that the donor can thenceforth have no further share in the disposal of it. In enforcing celibacy on the clergy, he was probably influenced in part by his strict monastic ideas, and in part by considerations of policy. By binding the clergy to single life, he might hope to detach them from their kindred and from society, to destroy in them the feeling of nationality, to consolidate them into a body devoted to the papacy, and owing allegiance to it rather than to the temporal sovereigns under whom they enjoyed the benefits of law and government, to preserve in the hierarchy wealth which might have readily escaped from its hands through the channels of family and social connections.

At his first synod, in Lent 1074, canons were passed against simony and clerical marriage. The clergy who were guilty of such practices were to be debarred from all functions in the church; the laity were charged to refuse their ministrations; it was declared that their blessing was turned into a curse, and their prayer into sin—that disobedience to this mandate was idolatry and paganism. Even if such enactments did not directly contradict the long acknowledged principle of the church, that the validity of sacraments does not depend on the character of the minister, their effect was practically the same; for it mattered not whether the sacraments were annulled, or whether the laity were told that attendance on them was sinful. The charge to the laity had, indeed, already been given by Nicolas and by Alexander; but the decrees of those popes appear to have been little known or enforced beyond the bounds of Italy, and north of the Alps the canon against the marriage of the clergy was received as something wholly new. In Germany it aroused a general feeling of indignation among the clergy. They declared that it was unwarranted by Scripture or by the ancient church; that the pope was heretical and insane for issuing such an order, in contradiction to the Saviour and to St. Paul; that he required the clergy to live like angels rather than men, while at the same time he opened the door to all impurity; that they would rather renounce their priesthood than their wives. Some bishops openly defied the pope—not from any personal interest, but because they felt for the misery which his measures would inflict on the clergy, their wives, and their families. Otho of Constance, one of Henry's excommunicated counsellors, who had before

tolerated the marriage of his clergy, now put forth a formal sanction of it. Altmann of Passau, in publishing the decree, was nearly killed. The primate, Siegfried, on being required to promulgate it, desired his clergy to put away their wives within six months. As the order was ineffectual, he held a synod at Erfurt, in October 1074, where he required them to renounce either their wives or their ministry, and at the same time he revived his ancient claim to tithes, which the Thuringians supposed to have been relinquished. A band of armed Thuringians broke in, and the council was dissolved in confusion. Siegfried requested that the pope would modify his orders, but received in answer a rebuke for his want of courage, and a command to enforce them all. A second council was held at Mayence, in October 1075; but, notwithstanding the presence of a Roman legate, the clergy were so furious in their language, their looks, and their gestures, that Siegfried was glad to escape alive. Having no inclination to sacrifice himself for another man's views, he declared that the pope must carry out his schemes for himself and was content with ordering that in future no married man should be promoted to ecclesiastical office, and with exacting a promise of celibacy from those whom he ordained. In France, the excitement was no less than in Germany. A council at Paris, in 1074, cried out that the new decrees were intolerable and irrational; Walter, abbot of Pontoise, who attempted to defend them, was beaten, spitted on, and imprisoned; and John, archbishop of Rouen, while endeavouring to enforce them at a provincial synod, was attacked with stones and driven to flight. Gregory in one of his letters mentions a report (for which, however, there is no other authority) that a monk had even been burnt at Cambrai for publishing the prohibition of marriage.

Gregory was undaunted by the agitation which had arisen. Finding that little assistance could be expected from synods, he sent legates into all quarters with orders to enforce the decrees. To these legates he applied the text—"He that heareth you, heareth me"; wherever they appeared, they were for the time the highest ecclesiastical authorities; and bishops trembled before the deacons and subdeacons who were invested with the pope's commission to overrule, to judge, and to depose them. The monks, his sure allies in such a cause, were active in spreading the knowledge of the decrees among the people, and in stirring them up by their invectives against the clergy. If bishops opposed his measures, he absolved their flocks from the obligation of obedience; he avowed the intention of bringing public opinion to bear on such clergymen as should be impenetrable to his views of their duty to God and to religion; he charged his lay supporters to prevent their ministrations, "even by force, if necessary". The effects of thus setting the people against their pastors were fearful. In some cases the laity took part with the denounced clergy; but more commonly they rose against them, and with violence and insult drove them, with their wives and children, from their homes. A general confusion followed; the ordinances of religion were deserted, or were profaned and invaded by laymen and the contempt of the clergy thus generated was very effectual in contributing to the increase of anti-hierarchical and heretical sects.

The pope could the better afford to be calm, because the troubles excited by his decree as to celibacy distracted the general attention from a yet more important part of his designs, and weakened the influence of a large party among the clergy whose opposition he had reason to expect. At the outset of his pontificate he had not attacked the practice of investiture. When Anselm, the favourite chaplain and adviser of the countess Matilda, on being nominated to the see of Lucca, consulted him on the subject, Gregory advised him not to take investiture from Henry until the king should have dismissed his excommunicated counsellors and should have been reconciled to the Roman church; he did not, however, object to the ceremony of investiture in itself and, at Henry's request, he deferred the consecration of Anselm, and that of Hugh, who had been elected to the bishopric of Die, in Burgundy, until they should have been invested by the king. But at the Lent synod of 1075 (where the censures of the church were pronounced against many of Henry's partisans, who were charged with a breach of the conditions on which they had obtained absolution at Nuremberg), Gregory issued a decree that

no ecclesiastic should take investiture from lay hands, and that no lay potentate should confer investiture. Investiture, as we have seen, although it originated before the feudal system, had long been interpreted according to the principles of feudalism. By its defenders it was maintained on the ground that it related to the temporalities only; that, if bishops and abbots were to enjoy these, they ought, like other holders of property, to acknowledge the superiority of the liege-lord, and to be subject to the usual feudal obligations. The opposite party replied that the temporalities were annexed to the spiritual office, as the body to the soul; that, if laymen could not confer the spiritualities, they ought not to meddle with the disposal of their appendages, but that these also should be conferred by the pope or the metropolitan, as an assurance to the receivers that their temporalities were given by God. The abolition of investiture was a means to prevent effectually the sale of preferments by princes; but this was not all. On investiture depended the power of sovereigns over prelates, and the right to expect feudal service from them; if there were no fealty, there could be no treason. The patronage which was taken from sovereigns would pass into other hands; the prelates would transfer their allegiance from the crown to the pope; and if Gregory was sincere when, in September 1077, he told the people of Aquileia that he had no wish, to interfere with the duty of bishops towards sovereigns, he had at least discovered the real bearing of his pretensions when, in February 1079, he exacted from the new patriarch of Aquileia an oath of absolute fealty to himself including the obligation of military service.

Gregory knew that his decree was sure to be opposed by all the clergy who depended on the patronage of laymen—from the prelates of the imperial court to the chaplain of the most inconsiderable noble—and that, in addition to these, there were many who would oppose him, not from any selfish motive, but from the belief that the measure was an invasion of the lawful rights of princes. For a time he hardly mentioned the new canon in his letters; the publication of it was chiefly left to his legates; and sovereigns, as if in a contemptuous affectation of ignorance as to the new pretensions of Rome, continued to invest bishops and abbots as before.

At Christmas 1075 an extraordinary outrage was perpetrated by Cencius, who has been already mentioned. This man, after having been anathematized by Alexander II on account of his connection with Cadalous, effected a reconciliation with Alexander, and continued to reside at Rome. The city was scandalized and disquieted by his irregularities, which had often brought him into collision with the government; he had even been condemned to death, and had been pardoned only through the intercession of the countess Matilda; but he possessed great wealth and influence, and was master of several fortified houses, which were garrisoned by a force of desperate ruffians. On Christmas eve, Gregory proceeded to the church of St. Mary Major (where the holy cradle was then, as now, supposed to be preserved) for the midnight mass which ushers in the celebration of the Saviour's birth. In consequence of tempestuous weather, the congregation was small. The pope was in the act of administering the sacrament when the church was suddenly invaded by Cencius with a party of his retainers. The worshippers were borne down; some of them were stabbed with daggers. Gregory was rudely seized, was dragged by the hair, and beaten; a sword, aimed at him with the intention of despatching him, wounded him in the forehead; he was stripped of a part of his robes, and was carried off on the back of one of the villains to a tower belonging to Cencius. All this he bore with perfect composure, neither struggling to escape, nor asking for mercy. During the night he was exposed to the insults of the gang into whose hands he had fallen, among whom a sister of Cencius was conspicuous by the bitterness of her reproaches; and Cencius himself holding a drawn sword at his throat, endeavoured by the most savage demeanour and threats to extort the cession of papal treasures, or of castles belonging to the apostolic see, to be held as benefices under it. But even in this den of ruffians, Gregory found sympathy from a man who endeavoured to protect him with furs against the piercing cold, and from a woman who bathed his wound. It was intended to send him privately out of the city;

but in the course of the night the report of his captivity was spread by the clergy who had been with him at the time of the assault. The people of Rome were roused by the sound of bells and trumpets, the gates were watched so that no one could leave the city, and a vast multitude gathered around the tower of Cencius, demanding the release of their pastor. A breach was made in the wall, and the besiegers were preparing to set the place on fire, when Cencius, in abject terror, threw himself at the feet of his prisoner, and entreated forgiveness. "I pardon what thou hast done against myself", Gregory calmly replied; "as for thy offences against God, His Mother, and the church, I enjoin on thee a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and that, if thou return alive, thou be guided in future by my counsels". The pope, covered with blood, was received with exultation by the crowd, and was carried back to the church, to resume the interrupted rites, and to pour forth a thanksgiving for his deliverance. Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, formerly chancellor of Italy, and still Henry's ablest and most active partisan in that country, was suspected of having instigated the attempt of Cencius, and was ordered to leave Rome. Cencius, forgetting his promises of amendment, soon incurred a fresh excommunication, and fled to Henry, who was then in Italy. The king refused to admit him to his presence openly, as being excommunicate, although it is asserted by the opposite party that he held secret conferences with him by night; and Cencius died at Pavia, where he was buried by Guibert with a pomp which gave countenance to the suspicions against the archbishop.

The divisions of Germany had become more desperate. The king and the Saxons had each invoked the pope. Henry demanded the deposition of the prelates who had opposed him; the Saxons declared that such a king was unworthy to reign, and entreated Gregory to sanction the election of another in his room. Henry had been greatly strengthened and elated by a victory over the Saxons at Hohenberg, on the Unstrut, in June 1075. The pope, on that occasion, wrote to him, "As to the pride of the Saxons, who wrongfully opposed you, which, by God's judgment, has been crushed before your face, we must both rejoice for the peace of the church, and grieve because much Christian blood has been spilt". He expressed a willingness to receive him as his lord, brother, and son, and exhorted him to employ his success rather with a view to God's honour than to his own; but the advice was disregarded, and the king, by the abuse of his triumph, had added to the miseries and grievances of the conquered people.

A short time before the outrage of Cencius, ambassadors from Henry arrived at Rome; and on their return they were accompanied by envoys charged with a letter from Gregory to the king. The address was conditional: "Health and apostolical benediction—if, however, he obey the apostolic see as a Christian king ought". The letter explained that Henry's conduct had given cause for this doubtful form; he was censured for intercourse with excommunicate persons, for nominating and investing bishops to several sees—among them, Tedald to Milan. But as to investiture, the pope offers to meet the king's wishes if any tolerable way of accommodation can be pointed out. The bearers of the letter were instructed to proceed according as it should be received; if Henry were contumacious, they were to cite him, under pain of excommunication, to answer for his misdeeds at a synod which was to be held at Rome in the following Lent. He had already been warned by a private mission that, unless he should reform, he would be excommunicated. The reception of the pope's letter was such that the envoys felt themselves bound to deliver the citation. The king was in great indignation; he sent them away with contempt, and summoned the bishops and abbots of Germany to a council at Worms, where all but a few Saxon bishops attended, and the feeling of the assembly was highly excited. One course only appeared to be open to Henry, unless he were disposed to absolute submission; as obedience to the pope had from the days of St. Boniface been a part of German Christianity, the only means of setting aside the authority of Gregory was by repudiating his claim to the apostolic see. An ally was found in Cardinal Hugh the White—the same who had taken so conspicuous a part in the elevation of Hildebrand to the pontificate. Hugh, a man of great ability and skillful in business, but versatile and utterly

unprincipled, had lately been deprived by Gregory for conniving at simony, and for the third time laid under anathema. He now produced letters which are said to have been forged in the name of the Roman cardinals, charging the pope with a multitude of offences, and demanding his deposition; and to these Hugh added a virulent invective of his own. Gregory was reproached with the lowness of his birth; he was accused of having obtained the papacy by bribery and violence—of simony, magic, praying to the devil. Although the charges were for the most part so monstrous as to be utterly incredible, the German prelates were in no mood to criticize them, and, headed by Siegfried, they pronounced the deposition of Hildebrand. Two bishops only, Adalbero of Wurzburg and Herman of Metz, objected that, as no bishop could be condemned without a regular trial, much less could a pope, against whom not even a bishop or an archbishop could be admitted as accuser. But William of Utrecht, one of the ablest of Henry's party, told them that they must either subscribe the condemnation of Gregory or renounce their allegiance to the king; and they submitted.

On the breaking up of the council, Henry wrote to the Romans a letter in which was embodied the substance of one addressed to Gregory. He begs them to reckon his enemies as their own enemies, and especially the monk Hildebrand, whom he charges with attempting to rob him of his Italian kingdom, and of his hereditary rights in the appointment to the papacy—with having declared himself resolved either to die or to deprive Henry both of his crown and of his life. The Romans are desired not to kill the pope, since life after degradation would be the severest punishment for him; but if he should make any resistance to the decree of deposition, they are to thrust him out by force, and are to receive from the king a new pope, able and willing to heal the wounds which Hildebrand had caused. Henry's letter to the pope was addressed, "To Hildebrand, now not apostolic pontiff, but a false monk". It taxed him in violent terms with an accumulation of offences and enormities. "We bore with these things", said the king, "out of respect for the apostolic see. But you mistook our humility for fear, and rose against the royal power itself which God had granted to us—as if we had received the kingdom from you, and as if it were in your hand, not in God's". And he peremptorily charged Hildebrand to descend from the chair of which he was unworthy. The bishops also wrote a letter to "brother Hildebrand" in which they charged him with throwing the church into confusion. His beginning had been bad, his progress worse; he had been guilty of cruelty and pride; he had attempted to deprive bishops of the power committed to them by God, and had given up everything to the fury of the multitude. He had obtained the papacy by the breach of an oath to the late emperor; his intimacy with the countess Matilda is censured as improper; and the bishops conclude by solemnly renouncing him. The prelates of Lombardy, in a council at Piacenza, confirmed the proceedings of their brethren at Worms, and swore never to acknowledge Hildebrand as pope.

In February, the customary Lenten synod met at Rome. It is said that the members were pondering on the appearance of an extraordinary egg which had lately been produced—displaying on its shell the figures of a serpent and a shield—when Roland, a canon of Parma, who had been despatched from the council of Piacenza, entered the assembly, and delivered the king's letter to Gregory. "My lord the king", he said, "and all the bishops, both beyond the mountains and in Italy, charge thee forthwith to quit St. Peter's seat which thou hast invaded; for it is not fit that any one should ascend to such an honour unless by their command and by the imperial gift". Then, turning to the assembled prelates, he summoned them to appear before the king at Whitsuntide, that they might receive from his hands a new pope instead of the ravaging wolf who had usurped the apostolic chair. The synod was thrown into confusion. "Seize him!" cried the bishop of Porto; and Roland might have paid for his audacity with his life, had not the pope warded off the swords of his soldiery by interposing his own body. Gregory stilled the tempest, and calmly desired that the king's letter should be read. The bishops entreated him to pronounce the judgment which Henry had deserved, and on the following day the excommunication was uttered. The pope ordered that the canons against

despisers of the apostolic see should be recited; he alluded to the portentous egg, of which the late scene now suggested an explanation; he recounted Henry's misdeeds, and the failure of all attempts to reclaim him. Now that the king had attacked the foundations of the church, it was time to draw forth the sword of vengeance, and to strike down the enemy of God and of His church; and, in accordance with the desire of the assembled fathers, he pronounced sentence on Henry in the form of an address to St. Peter. The pope called the apostle to witness that he had not sought the papacy, or obtained it by any unlawful means; and, by the power of binding and loosing committed to him, he declared Henry to be deprived of the government of Germany and Italy, released all Christians from their oaths of fealty to him, and denounced him with the curse of the church. The rebellious bishops of Lombardy were suspended and excommunicated; those who had taken part in the proceedings at Worms were placed under a like sentence, unless within a certain time they should prove that their concurrence had been unwilling. The empress Agnes was present, and heard the condemnation of her son.

Gregory announced the excommunication and deposition of Henry in letters to the people of Germany and to all Christians. The report of the sentence reached the king at Utrecht, where he was keeping the season of Easter. At first he was greatly agitated; but the bishop, William, succeeded in persuading him to put on an appearance of indifference, and he resolved to meet his condemnation by a counter-anathema on the pope. Two bishops, Pibo of Toul and Dietrich of Verdun, although strong partisans of the king, were afraid to share in such a step, and left Utrecht by night. But on Easter-day, at high mass, William ascended the pulpit of his cathedral, and, after a fiery invective, pronounced a ban against Hildebrand. The Lombard bishops, on being informed of Gregory's sentence against them, held another synod, under the presidency of Guibert, and renewed their condemnation of the pope.

The unexampled measure on which Gregory had ventured rent all Germany into two hostile parties. No middle course was possible between holding with the pope against the king and holding with the king against the pope. Herman of Metz ventured to report to Gregory that his right to excommunicate a king was questioned; to which he replied that the charge given by our Lord to St. Peter—Feed my sheep—made no distinction between kings and other men. He cited examples from history—the behaviour of St. Ambrose to Theodosius, and the pretended deposition of Childeric by Zacharias in answer to the opinion that the royal power was superior to the episcopal, he alleged, as if from Ambrose, a saying that the difference between lead and shining gold is nothing in comparison of that between secular and episcopal dignity and he declared that royalty was invented by human pride, whereas priesthood was instituted by the Divine mercy.

Henry soon felt that his power was ebbing from him. Destitute as Gregory was of any material force, he had left his decree to find for itself the means of its execution; yet in this he did not rely wholly on the belief of his spiritual power. The sentence of deposition against Henry was addressed to subjects among whom a disloyal and rebellious spirit had long prevailed. The pope was sure to find an ally in every one who had been offended by the king himself by his guardians, or by his father; all were glad to welcome the religious sanction which was thus given to their patriotism, their vindictiveness, or their ambition. The wrath of heaven was believed to have been visibly declared against Henry's cause. Godfrey the Hunchbacked, duke of Lorraine, who had undertaken to seat an imperialist antipope in St. Peter's chair, had been assassinated at Antwerp in the beginning of the year. The bishop of Utrecht, soon after his display of vehemence against Gregory on Easter-day, fell sick; it was rumoured that he saw devils in his frenzy—that he died unhousesled and in raving despair. Others of the king's partisans were also carried off about the same time, and their deaths were interpreted as judgments. A spirit of disaffection became general. Henry summoned diets, but few appeared at them; some of the princes, whose policy had hitherto been doubtful, now openly declared themselves against him, and bishops in alarm retracted their adhesion to the

measures which had been taken at Worms. Among these prelates was Udo, archbishop of Treves, who went to Italy, made his peace with the pope, and on his return avoided all intercourse with the excommunicated bishops and counsellors; nor, although specially permitted by Gregory to confer with the king, in the hope of bringing him to submission, could he be persuaded to eat or to pray with him. The example was contagious; Henry found himself deserted and shunned, and his attempts to conciliate his opponents by lenient measures were ineffectual. The pope, in answer to a letter from the Saxons, told them that, if the king should refuse to amend, they ought to choose a successor, who should be confirmed in the kingdom by the apostolic authority.

In October a great assembly of German dignitaries met at Tribur. The leaders of the princes and nobles were Rudolf of Swabia, Welf of Bavaria, Berthold of Zahringen, and Otho of Nordheim; at the head of the prelates was the primate Siegfried. The patriarch of Aquileia and bishop Altmann of Passau appeared as legates from the pope, and made a strong impression by declaring that they must avoid all intercourse with such bishops as had not obtained formal absolution for their concurrence in the acts of the council of Worms. The sessions lasted seven days. All the errors, the misdeeds, the calamities of Henry's life were exposed and dwelt on; a determination to depose him was loudly avowed. The king, who was at Oppenheim, on the opposite side of the Rhine, sent messages to the assembly day after day. His tone became even abject; he entreated the members to spare him; he promised amendment; he offered to bind himself by the most solemn pledges, and to resign into their hands all the powers of government, if they would but suffer him to enjoy the name and the ensigns of royalty, which, as they had been conferred by all, could not (he said) be resigned without discredit to all. His promises were rejected with contemptuous references to his former breaches of faith, and the confederates declared an intention of immediately choosing another king. Each party entertained projects of crossing the river and attacking the other by force; but at length it was proposed that the matters in dispute should be referred to the pope, who was to be invited to attend a diet at Augsburg at the feast of Candlemas ensuing. If Henry could obtain absolution within a year from the time of his excommunication, he was to be acknowledged as king; the princes would accompany him to Italy, where he should be crowned as emperor, and would aid him in driving out the Normans; but if unabsolved, he was to forfeit his kingdom for ever. In the meantime he was to forego the symbols and the pomp of royalty, to refrain from entering a church until he should be absolved, to dismiss his excommunicated advisers, and to live as a private man at Spire, restricting himself to the company of Dietrich, bishop of Verdun, and a few other persons. If he should fail in the performance of any condition, the princes were to be free from their engagements to him. Hard as these terms were, Henry saw no alternative but the acceptance of them; he disbanded his troops, dismissed his counsellors, and, with his queen and her infant child Conrad, withdrew to the city which had been assigned for his residence.

The prospect of meeting the pope in Germany—of appearing before him as a deposed king, in the presence of the exasperated and triumphant princes—was alarming, and Henry, by an embassy to Rome, requested that he might be allowed to make his submission in Italy. But Gregory refused the request, and announced to the Germans his compliance with the invitation to Augsburg. The year within which it was necessary for the king to obtain absolution was already drawing towards an end, and in desperation he resolved to cross the Alps and to present himself before the pope. With much difficulty he raised the funds necessary for the journey; for those who had fed on him in his prosperity were now deaf to his applications. He left Spire with Bertha and her child; among their train was only one man of free birth, and he a person of humble station. As the passes of the Alps were in the hands of the opposite party, the king, instead of proceeding by the nearest road, took his way through Burgundy, where he spent Christmas at Besançon with his maternal great uncle Duke William. At the foot of Mont Cenis, he was honourably received by his mother-in-law Adelaide, and her son Amadeus,

marquis of Susa: but, says Lambert of Hersfeld, the anger of the Lord had turned from him not only those who were bound by fealty and gratitude, but even his friends and nearest kindred; and Adelaide refused him a passage, except on condition of his giving up to her the disposal of five bishoprics situated within her territory. With such a proposal, which seemed as if intended to embroil him further with the pope, it was impossible to comply; but Henry was fain to purchase the passage by ceding to her a valuable territory in Burgundy.

The winter was of extraordinary severity. The Rhine and the Po were thickly frozen over from Martinmas until the end of March; in many places the vines were killed by the frost; the snow which covered the Alps was as hard and as slippery as ice. By the help of guides, the royal party with difficulty reached the summit of the pass; but the descent was yet more hazardous. The men crept on their hands and knees, often slipping and rolling down the glassy declivities. The queen, her child, and her female attendants, were wrapped in cow-hides, and in this kind of sledge were dragged down by their guides. The horses were led, with their feet tied together; many dropped dead through exhaustion, some fell from precipices and perished, and almost all the rest were rendered unserviceable.

Having achieved this perilous passage, the king arrived at Turin, where he met with a reception which contrasted strongly with the behaviour of his northern subjects. The Italians remembered the effects produced by former visits of German emperors; they looked to Henry for a redress of their grievances, for a pacification of their discords; the Lombards were roused to enthusiasm by a belief that he was come to depose the detested Gregory. Bishops, nobles, and a host of inferior partisans flocked around him, and, as he moved onwards, the number of his followers continually increased.

The proceedings at Tribur had opened a magnificent prospect to Gregory; he might hope to extinguish the imperial power, and to create it anew in accordance with his own principles. Contrary to the advice and entreaties of his Roman counsellors, he set out for Germany under the guidance of the countess (or marchioness) Matilda, who, by the murder of her husband, the younger Godfrey of Lorraine, and by the death of her mother, had lately become sole mistress of her rich inheritance. The Great Countess was not more remarkable for power and influence than for character. Her talents and accomplishments were extraordinary; no sovereign of the age was more skillful in the art of government; and with a masculine resolution and energy she united the warmth of a woman's enthusiastic devotion. Her marriage with the imperialist Godfrey, the son of her stepfather, had been disturbed by differences of feeling and opinion, and after a short union the pair had lived apart in their respective hereditary dominions. The attachment with which she devoted herself to the pope was a mark for the slander of Gregory's enemies, but needs no other explanation than that acquaintance with her from her early years which had given him an opportunity of imbuing her mind with his lofty ecclesiastical principles, and of gaining over her the influence of a spiritual father. In company with Matilda the pope was advancing northwards, when, on hearing that Henry had reached Vercelli, and finding himself disappointed in his expectation of an escort from the princes of Germany, he was persuaded by her to withdraw to Canossa, a strong Apennine fortress belonging to the countess. There they were joined by the marchioness Adelaide of Susa and her son, who seem to have accompanied the king across the Alps, by Hugh abbot of Cluny, the godfather of Henry and the ancient superior of Gregory, and by other persons of eminent dignity.

The bishops and others of the king's party who desired reconciliation with the pope appeared gradually at Canossa. Some of them had eluded the sentinels who guarded the Alpine passes; some had fallen into the hands of Henry's enemies, and had been obliged to pay heavily for leave to pursue their journey. On their arrival Gregory ordered them to be confined in solitary cells, with scanty fare; but after a few days he summoned them into his presence, and absolved them on condition that, until the king should be reconciled, they

should hold no intercourse with him, except for the purpose of persuading him to submission. For Henry himself a severer treatment was reserved.

On arriving before Canossa, the king obtained an interview with Matilda, and prevailed on her, with Adelaide, Hugh of Cluny, and other influential persons, to entreat that the pope would not rashly believe the slanders of his enemies, and would grant him absolution. Gregory answered that, if the king believed himself innocent, he ought to wait for the council which had been appointed, and there to submit himself to the pope's impartial judgment. The mediators represented the urgency of the time—that the year of grace was nearly expired; that the hostile princes were eagerly waiting to catch at the expected forfeiture of the kingdom; that, if the king might for the present receive absolution, he was willing to consent to any terms or to any inquiry. At length the pope, as if relenting, proposed that Henry, in proof of his penitence, should surrender to him the ensigns of royalty, and should acknowledge that by his offences he had rendered himself unworthy of the kingdom. The envoys, shocked at the hardness of these conditions, entreated Gregory not to "break the bruised reed; and in condescension to their importunities he promised to grant the king an interview.

But before this interview a deeper humiliation was to be endured. Henry was admitted, alone and unattended, within the second of the three walls which surrounded the castle. He was dressed in the coarse woollen garb of a penitent; his feet were bare; and in this state, without food, he remained from morning till evening exposed to the piercing cold of that fearful winter. A second and a third day were spent in the same manner; Gregory himself tells us that all within the castle cried out against his harshness, as being not the severity of an apostle, but barbarous and tyrannical cruelty. At last Henry, almost beside himself with the intensity of bodily and mental suffering, sought a meeting with Matilda and the abbot of Cluny in a chapel of the castle, and persuaded them to become sureties for him to the pope; and on the fourth day he was admitted to Gregory's presence. Numb with cold, bareheaded and barefooted, the king, a man of tall and remarkably noble person, prostrated himself with a profusion of tears, and then stood submissive before the pope, whose small and slight form was now withered with austerities and bent with age. Even Gregory's sternness was moved, and he too shed tears. After many words, the terms of absolution were stated. Henry was to appear before a diet of the German princes, at which the pope intended to preside. He was to submit to an investigation of his conduct, and, if found guilty by the laws of the church, was to forfeit his kingdom. In the meantime, he was to refrain from all use of the royal insignia, and from all exercise of the royal authority; his subjects were to be free from their allegiance to him; he was to hold no intercourse with his excommunicated counsellors; he was to yield implicit obedience to the pope in future, and, if in any respect he should violate the prescribed conditions, he was to lose all further hope of grace. The king was brought so low that even these terms were thankfully accepted; but Gregory would not trust him unless the abbot of Cluny, with other persons of high ecclesiastical and secular dignity, undertook to be sureties for his observance of them.

The pope then proceeded to the celebration of mass, and, after the consecration, desired Henry to draw near. "I", he said, "have been charged by you and your adherents with simony in obtaining my office, and with offences which would render me unworthy of it. It would be easy to disprove these charges by the evidence of many who have known me throughout my life; but I prefer to rely on the witness of God. Here is the Lord's body; may this either clear me from all suspicion if I am innocent, or, if guilty, may God strike me with sudden death!". A thrill of anxiety ran throughout the spectators; the pope amidst their breathless silence underwent the awful ordeal, and they burst into loud applause. Then he again addressed the king—"Do, my son, as you have seen me do. The princes of Germany daily beset me with accusations against you, so many and so heinous that they would render you unfit not only for empire, but for the communion of the church, and even for the common

intercourse of life; and for these they pray that you may be brought to trial. But human judgment is fallible, and falsehood and truth are often confounded. If therefore, you know yourself to be guiltless, take this remaining portion of the Lord's body, that so God's judgment may approve your innocence”.

The ordeal was unequal. The charges from which the pope had purged himself were distinct and palpable; those against the king were unnamed, infinite in variety, extending over his whole life, many of them such as he would have met, not with a denial but with explanation and apology. He shuddered at the sudden proposal, and, after a brief consultation with his friends, told the pope that such a trial, in the absence of his accusers, would not be convincing; he therefore prayed that the matter might be deferred until a diet should meet for the consideration of his case. Gregory assented, and, on leaving the chapel, invited the king to his table, where he conversed with him in a friendly tone, and gave him advice as to his future conduct.

While the king remained in the castle, the bishop of Zeitz was sent out to absolve, in the pope's name, those who had held intercourse with Henry during his excommunication. His message was received with derision. The Italians cried out that they cared nothing for the excommunication of a man who had been justly excommunicated by all the bishops of Italy—a simoniac, a murderer, an adulterer. They charged Henry with having humbled them all by his abasement; he had thought only of himself, he had made peace with the public enemy, and had deserted those who, for his sake, had exposed themselves to hostility and danger. They spoke of setting up his son, the young Conrad, as king—of carrying the prince to Rome for coronation, and choosing another pope. Henry, on joining his partisans, found that a change had come over their dispositions towards him. The chiefs returned to their homes without asking his permission; and as he marched along, the general dissatisfaction was apparent. No cheers or marks of honour greeted him; the provisions which were supplied to him were scanty and coarse; and at night he was obliged to lodge in the suburbs of towns, as the inhabitants would not admit him within their walls. The bishops, who were especially indignant, held a meeting at Reggio, and combined to excite their flocks against him.

It is said that, when some Saxon envoys expressed their alarm in consequence of Henry's absolution, the pope endeavoured to reassure them in these words—“Be not uneasy, for I will send him back to you more culpable than ever”. The story is generally discredited, on the ground that, even if Gregory had been capable of the profound wickedness which it implies, he would not have been so indiscreet as to avow his crafts. Yet it is hardly conceivable that he should have expected the king to fulfill the engagements which had been so sternly exacted from him in his distress. While the abasement to which Henry had been forced to stoop greatly exceeded all that could have been anticipated, the grace which had been granted to him was far short of his expectations. He was still at the mercy of the offended princes of Germany; his royalty, instead of being restored, seemed to be placed hopelessly beyond his reach. And the temper of the Italians—the enthusiasm with which they had received him, their burning animosity against his great enemy—proved to him that his humiliation had been needless. Although for a time he behaved with an appearance of submission to the pope—partly out of deference to his mother, who visited him at Piacenza—he wished to find some pretext for breaking with Gregory, and assured the Italians that he had submitted to him only for reasons of temporary necessity, but that he was now resolved to take vengeance for the indignities to which he had been subjected. They flocked again to his standard; he resumed the insignia of royalty; Liemar of Bremen, with his excommunicated advisers, again appeared at his side, and with them were many who had avoided him during his excommunication. Large contributions of money poured in from his adherents, and he again felt himself strong. He asked the pope to allow him to be crowned at Monza, as if his absolution had restored him to the kingdom of Italy; but the request was refused. He then

invited Gregory to a conference at Mantua; but Matilda, acting either on information or on suspicion of some treacherous design, persuaded the pope to avoid the risk of danger.

Gregory remained at Canossa, or in its neighbourhood, until the month of August; and during his residence there, the countess bequeathed her inheritance to the Roman see—a donation which was afterwards renewed, and which, although it never fully took effect, contributed much in the sequel to the temporal power of the popes.

The princes of Germany considered that Henry, by going into Italy, had broken the engagements which he had made with them at Tribur, and they resolved to proceed to further measures. A diet was summoned to meet at Forchheim, in Franconia, in March 1077. The king excused himself from attending it, on the ground that, being on his first visit to Italy, he was occupied with the affairs of that country, and was unwilling to offend his Italian subjects by hastily leaving them. The pope declined the invitation, on the plea that Henry refused to grant him a safe-conduct; but he was represented at the meeting by legates. It was his wish to keep matters in suspense until the king, by some breach of the conditions on which he had been absolved, should give a clear pretext for deposing him; and the legates were instructed accordingly. They were to endeavour that, if the state of the country would permit, the election of a new king should be deferred until their master could himself go into Germany; but if the princes were bent on taking it in hand at once, they were not to oppose them. To the princes he wrote that they should carry on the government of the country, but should refrain from any more decided step until the case of Henry should be fully examined in his own presence.

But the Germans were furious against Henry, and would endure no delay. The legates, after expressing the pope's feeling, said that it was for the princes to decide what would be best for their country, and were silent; and Rudolf, duke of Swabia, formerly one of Henry's chief supporters, and connected both with him and with Bertha by having married a sister of each, was chosen as king. The first to vote for him was the primate Siegfried, whose eagerness to secure the tithes of Thuringia had contributed so largely to Henry's errors and unpopularity. The legates confirmed the choice, and proposed conditions for the new sovereign. He was to discourage simony and was to grant freedom of election to sees; and the kingdom was not to be hereditary, but elective—a provision intended to make its possessors feel the necessity of keeping well both with the pope and with the princes. Rudolf was crowned at Mayence on the 26th of March by Siegfried and the archbishop of Magdeburg. On the day of the coronation a bloody affray took place between the populace and Rudolf's soldiers; and this inauguration of the new reign was too truly ominous of its sequel. Siegfried was driven from his city, never to return to it.

By the violent measure of setting up a rival king the feeling of loyalty was reawakened in many who had long been discontented with Henry's government, and, when he returned into Germany, his force increased as he went on. He enriched himself, and found means of rewarding his adherents, by confiscating the estates of his chief opponents. With Rudolf were the mass of the Swabians, Saxons, and Thuringians; with Henry were Franconia and Bavaria. Yet in countries where the majority favoured one of the rivals, the other also had adherents, so that the division penetrated even into the bosom of families. The bishops were for the most part on Henry's side; many abbeys sent their contingents to swell his army, and the populations of the towns were generally with him, out of gratitude for the privileges which they had received from him, and for the protection which he had afforded them against the tyranny of princes and nobles. For three years the contest was carried on; the land was desolated by the ravages of war, especially by the outrages of the barbarous and half-heathen Bohemians, whom Henry had called to his aid, and who revelled in acts of profanity and sacrilege, of lust and cruelty. Three great battles were fought; at Melrichstadt, in August 1078, and at Fladenheim (or Flarchheim) in January 1080, Rudolf was declared the victor; but so slight was his superiority and so severe was his loss that the victories were little more than

nominal. In the meantime the anarchy of Germany was frightful. Neither Henry nor Rudolf dared to execute justice from fear of alienating their followers. Violence met with no check, nobles and knights built castles and lived by robbery, and the wretched people were ground to the dust by oppression of every kind.

The north of Italy too was in a state of continual agitation. Guibert of Ravenna and Tedald of Milan were indefatigable in their exertions against Gregory. Imperialist and papalist bishops fought for the possession of sees, and strove to outbid each other by grants of privileges to their people.

Gregory found that he had gone too far—that Henry possessed a strength which the pope had not suspected when at Canossa he subjected him to such humiliation as could never be forgiven; and he was displeased that the princes, by electing Rudolf, had taken into their own hands the determination which he had wished to reserve for himself. During the war he refrained from showing any decided favour to either party. It was in vain that Rudolf entreated his recognition, and that Henry urged him to excommunicate the rebel leader, although Gregory said that he would do so unless Rudolf should be able to justify his conduct. He gave to each of them alike the title of king; he assured the envoys of each that he was anxious to do justice—that he would go into Germany and decide between them; and he asked both to grant him a safe-conduct. His legates went from Henry to Rudolf and from Rudolf to Henry; they took money from each, and spoke to each in terms of encouragement, while they were instructed by their master, if either of the rivals should be contumacious, to anathematize him, and to adjudge the kingdom to his more submissive opponents.

The Saxons were indignant at this wavering conduct, so widely different from their expectations. In five letters, written in a plain and downright tone of remonstrance and with a scanty observance of the usual forms, they represent to Gregory the sufferings which they had brought on themselves by what they had supposed to be an obedience to his instructions. They tell him that they had relied on the firmness of Rome; that, after having urged them into danger, he had deserted them; that they are too simple to understand the subtle and equivocal policy by which he acknowledged two kings at once, and seemed to pay greater honour to him whom he had deposed than to the king whose election they had believed to be warranted by the papal sanction.

Gregory in reply endeavoured to justify himself by dwelling on the exigencies of the time, and on his wish to do impartial justice. He denied that he had instigated the election of Rudolf; he disowned the acts of his legates who had confirmed that election and had pronounced a fresh excommunication against Henry at Goslar in November 1077. But the Germans treated his excuses as subterfuges; they told him that he ought either to have refrained from proceeding against Henry or to follow up his acts by openly aiding them. They beseech him to have regard to his own reputation, and to the effusion of blood which must lie at his door if he should continue his course of indecision.

At length the tidings of the battle of Fladenheim (Jan. 27, 1080) roused the pope to a bolder proceeding. At the council which was held in the following Lent, and which was the most fully attended of all his councils, he refused to allow Henry's envoys a hearing in answer to the charges which Rudolf's envoys had advanced; he repeated his threats against all who should give or should receive investiture; and he renewed the excommunication and deposition of the king in very remarkable terms. The sentence, as before, is addressed to St. Peter and St. Paul. Gregory calls the apostles to witness as to the means by which he had attained his office, and as to his conduct in the administration of it. He recounts the course of his dealings with Henry—the king's offences, his excommunication, his absolution, his breach of the promises which he had made at Canossa; the election of Rudolf, which, the pope solemnly protests, was not undertaken by his advice; the calamities which had followed in Germany, and of which he charges the guilt on Henry. He then again declared the king to be deposed, forbade all Christians to obey him, and anathematized him with his abettors. He

prayed that Henry might never prosper in war; in the name and with the blessing of the apostles, he bestowed the kingdom of Germany on Rudolf, and promised to all who should faithfully adhere to the new king absolution for all their sins; and he prayed them that, as they had power to bind and to loose in heaven—as they judged angels—so they would now show to kings, princes, and all the world, that the dignities of this life also were in their disposal. “Do you”, the form concluded, “so exercise your judgment on the aforesaid Henry, as that all may know that he shall fall, not by chance, but by your power. May he be confounded unto repentance, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord!”. Gregory even ventured to assume the character of a prophet; he foretold (and he staked his credibility on the result) that within a year Henry would either be dead, or deposed and utterly powerless. And it is said that he sent into Germany a crown with an inscription signifying that it was the gift of the Saviour to St. Peter and of St. Peter to Rudolf.

On hearing of the pope’s proceedings, Henry resolved to meet them by a measure no less decided. At Whitsuntide he assembled a council of his bishops at Mayence for the choice of a new pope. With a view of obtaining the concurrence of the Lombards, the election was adjourned to a council which was to be held at Brixen, and the German prelates engaged themselves to accept the decision of their brethren. At Brixen, Gregory was condemned as a disturber of the church and of the empire—as a patron of murder, perjury, and sacrilege, a Berengarian heretic, a necromancer, and a demoniac; and Guibert of Ravenna was elected pope, under the name of Clement III.

The armies of Henry and his rival met once more, on the bank of the Elster. The contest was long and obstinate; each side prevailed by turns; and, although at last the victory was with the Saxons, the death of their leader converted it into a virtual defeat. The fatal wound is said to have been given by Godfrey of Bouillon—afterwards the hero of the first crusade. A stroke from the sword of another cut off Rudolf’s right hand, and it was reported that the dying man remorsefully acknowledged this as a just punishment, since with that hand he had sworn fealty to Henry. The pope’s prediction of Henry’s death was falsified; according to one version of the story, he had prophesied the death or ruin of the king, and Heaven had now declared that the king of Gregory’s own choice was the pretender.

Henry offered peace to the Saxons, but they answered that they could not act without the pope; and the king, in the belief that he might safely leave their intern discords to work in his interest, resolved to march on Rome.

The prospect which Gregory had before him might well have alarmed him. Henry was stronger than ever, and his alliance was sought by the emperor of the east, who wished to make common cause with him against the Normans. The pope could expect no aid from Philip of France. William of England and Normandy, although Gregory was assiduous in his civilities to him and to his queen, remained cool and uninterested. As he, alone among the sovereigns of his time, found Gregory tractable, he had no motive for taking part with the anti-pope; and he was not disposed to embroil himself in Gregory’s quarrels. The countess Matilda was the only ally who could be relied on. Her devotion to the papal cause was unbounded; she placed her forces at Gregory’s disposal, she sheltered his adherents in her Alpine fortresses, and by her heroic energy, aided by the counsels, the pen, and the active exertions of Anselm of Lucca, she kept up the spirit of his party. By the sale, not only of her own precious ornaments, but of those which belonged to her churches, she repeatedly raised large sums, with which she enabled him to purchase for a time the support of the venal and fickle Romans. But her forces were altogether unequal to cope with those of Henry; and the pope was urged by his friends to make peace with the king and to bestow on him the imperial crown.

Gregory was undaunted and immovable in his resolution; but a change had come over his object. It was no longer a question of things, but of persons. He had professed to break with Henry for the maintenance of certain abuses, and he was now willing to tolerate those very abuses in order to humble the king. All means were to be taken that men should not

be driven to Henry's side. The legates in Germany were instructed to permit the ministrations of concubinary priests, on account of the hardness of the times, and the fewness of clergy. If the bishop of Osnaburg should be disposed to abandon Henry, they were to deal easily with him in a suit as to tithes. The pope wrote to Robert, count of Flanders, in terms of great courtesy, professing, out of a wish to keep him in the unity of the church, to forgive the language which he had used against the apostolic see. The legate in France, Hugh, bishop of Die, was reproved for unseasonably enforcing the rigour of the canons. He was ordered to restore some Norman bishops whom he had deposed for refusing to attend a synod. He was to absolve certain knights who had impropriated tithes and had taken the part of simoniac and concubinary clergymen. The bishops of Paris and Chartres, against whom Hugh had proceeded in a summary manner, were treated by the pope with indulgence. Above all, the legate was to beware of irritating the king of England, whom Gregory, although he professed himself not blind to his faults, declared to be far more worthy of approbation than other kings. To every one but Henry the pope breathed conciliation; and in this spirit he sought an alliance with the Normans of the south—selfish, faithless, profane, and sacrilegious robbers as he well knew them to be.

The power and the ambition of the Normans had been continually on the increase. Robert Guiscard had been suspected as an accomplice in the plot of Cencius, and had for some years been under excommunication for his invasions of the patrimony of St. Peter; but Gregory, by the mediation of Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, now eagerly patched up a treaty with him. Guiscard swore to defend the pope; he was released from his excommunication without any profession of penitence; and, instead of exacting restitution from him, Gregory added to a renewal of the grants of Nicolas and Alexander the following remarkable words: —“But as for the territory which you unjustly hold, we now patiently bear with you, trusting in Almighty God and in your goodness, that hereafter your behaviour with respect to it will be such, to the honour of God and of St. Peter, as it becomes both you to show and me to accept, without peril either to your soul or to mine”. It is said that, in consideration of the expected aid, he even promised Guiscard the imperial crown.

In Germany, the partisans of Rudolf set up Count Herman of Salm or Luxemburg as his successor. Gregory instructed his legates to see that no one should be chosen who would not be obedient to the Roman see, and sent them a form of oath to be taken by the new king, which reduced the kingdom, and consequently the empire, to a fief of the church. But Herman was unable to gain any considerable strength, and Henry was safe in disregarding him.

Henry's successes revived the disposition to ask whether the pope were justified in deposing sovereigns; and, in answer to a renewed inquiry from Herman, bishop of Metz, Gregory laid down more fully than before his views of the papal authority. He cites the same passages of Scripture on which he had relied in his former letter. He magnifies the sacerdotal power above that of temporal sovereigns. The instances of Theodosius and Childeric are reinforced by a fabulous excommunication of Arcadius by pope Innocent, and by a forgery, apparently of recent date, in which Gregory the Great is represented as threatening to deprive of his dignity any king or other potentate who should invade the monastery of St. Medard at Autun. But the most remarkable words of the letter are those in which the pope contrasts the origin of secular with that of ecclesiastical power. “Shall not”, he asks, “the dignity invented by men of this world, who even knew not God, be subject to that dignity which the providence of Almighty God hath invented to His own honour, and hath in compassion bestowed on the world? Who can be ignorant that kings and dukes took their beginning from those who, not knowing God, by their pride, their rapine, perfidy, murders, in short by almost every sort of wickedness, under the instigation of the prince of this world, the devil, have in blind ambition and intolerable presumption aimed at domination over other men, their equals?”. The bold assertions of this letter called forth many replies from the controversialists of the opposite party, both during the lifetime of Gregory and after his death.

In the spring of 1081 Henry descended on Italy. Gregory, in a letter to Desiderius of Monte Cassino, speaks of him as being at Ravenna with a small force, and expresses a confident belief that he will not obtain either supplies or recruits in his further advance. "If we would comply with his impiety", says the pope, "never has any one of our predecessors received such ample and devoted service as he is ready to pay us. But we will rather die than yield". The king's army, however, (although he had been obliged to leave a large force behind him as a safeguard to the peace of Germany), was far stronger than Gregory represented it to be. He ravaged Matilda's territories, and laid siege to her capital, Florence; but, finding that the capture was likely to detain him too long, he relinquished the attempt, and on Whitsun eve appeared before the walls of Rome. As he had expected the city to open its gates, he was unprovided with the means of assaulting it, and the siege lasted nearly three years — the king withdrawing during the unhealthy seasons, while such of his troops as remained on duty suffered severely from the climate. Gregory, although shut up in his city, and even there regarded with dislike by the mass of the inhabitants, who were influenced by Henry's largesses, and ascribed to the pope all the sufferings which they endured on account of the siege, abated nothing either of his pretensions or of his activity; he held his synods as usual, he renewed his canons and his anathemas against the imperialists and their practices, he continued, by his legates and correspondence, to superintend the affairs of the church in foreign and distant countries. When Henry, in the summer of 1083, had gained possession of the Leonine city, the pope resisted all the importunities of the Roman nobles, clergy, and people, who endeavoured to persuade him to a reconciliation; he would consent to no other terms than that the king should resign his dignity and should submit to penance. All attempts at negotiation were fruitless. The pope held a last council, at which he is described as having spoken with the voice not of a man but of an angel; and, without naming Henry, he anathematized him among those who had intercepted bishops on their way to the assembly. The Romans, it is said, in order to obtain a cessation of hostilities, swore to Henry that either Gregory or another pope should crown him by a certain day. Gregory, on hearing of this, was indignant, but discovered an evasion : if Henry would submit, he would crown him as emperor; if not, he would let down a crown to him from the tower of St. Angelo, accompanied by his curse. At length the Romans, weary of the siege, made terms with the king, and ten days before Easter 1084 he became master of the greater part of the city. Guibert summoned Gregory to a council, but the invitation was disregarded. The antipope was formally enthroned in the Lateran church on Palm Sunday, and on Easter-day performed in St. Peter's the imperial coronation of Henry and Bertha.

Gregory took refuge in the castle of St. Angelo, and a few of his partisans, chiefly nobles, held out in their fortified houses. In his distress the pope had entreated the aid which Guiscard was bound by his feudal obligations to render; but the Norman was engaged in an expedition which his daring ambition had led him to undertake against the Greek empire, and during his absence Henry, who had entered into an alliance with Alexius Comnenus and had received a subsidy from him, exerted himself to create an interest in the south of Italy.

Guiscard, on returning from the east, was occupied for a time in quelling the opposition which had been thus excited; but in Gregory's extremity the long-desired aid arrived. Guiscard had sent before him a large sum of money, which the pope had employed in purchasing the favour of the Romans; and the Norman chief himself now appeared at the head of 6000 horse and 30,000 foot—a wild and motley host, in which were mingled adventurers of many nations, and even a large number of unbelieving Saracens. Henry, apprehending no danger, had sent away a great part of his troops, and, as the remainder were unequal to encounter these unexpected enemies, he retired at their approach, taking with him forty hostages, and assuring his Roman friends that he would soon return. The gates were closed against the Normans, but some of them found an entrance by an old aqueduct, close to the gate of St. Laurence, and admitted the rest into the city. For three days Rome was subjected to

the horrors of a sack. Butchery, plunder, lust, were uncontrolled. The inhabitants, driven to despair by these outrages, rose on their assailants, and Guiscard, to quell their resistance, ordered the city to be set on fire. The conflagration which followed raged far and wide, and has left its permanent effects in the desolation which reigns over a large portion of ancient Rome. The Romans were at length subdued; multitudes were carried off by the Normans as prisoners, and many thousands were sold for slaves.

Gregory was again master of his capital. Guiscard, immediately after having effected an entrance, had carried him in triumph from the fortress of St. Angelo to the Lateran palace, and, falling at his feet, had begged his blessing. But the pope was sick of the Romans, of whose baseness and corruption he had had so much experience; he was unwilling to look on the ruins of his city; he shrank from the reproaches which were likely to be directed against him as the author of the late calamities, and felt that he could not trust himself to his people if the protection of the Normans were withdrawn. He therefore left Rome in company with his allies, and, after a visit to Monte Cassino, retired to Salerno. There, in the month of July, he held a synod, at which he renewed the anathemas against Henry and the antipope, and addressed a letter to all faithful Christians, setting forth his sufferings for the freedom of the church, complaining of their supineness in the cause, and urging them, as they would wish for forgiveness, grace, and blessing, here and hereafter, to help and succour their spiritual father and mother—St. Peter and the Roman church. During the following winter he fell sick, and, as his illness increased, he became aware that his end was near. He entreated the friends who stood around his bed to tell him if they had observed in him anything which needed correction. He declared his faith as to the Eucharist—probably with a view of clearing himself May 25, from the suspicions of Berengarianism which his enemies had industriously cast on him. He forgave and absolved all whom he had anathematized, with exception of the emperor and the antipope; but with these he charged his adherents to make no peace unless on their entire submission. A fearful tempest was raging without as his friends hung over the dying pope. Gathering himself up for a final effort, he exclaimed, in words which have been interpreted as a reproach against Providence, but which may perhaps rather imply a claim to the beatitude of the persecuted — “I have loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile”.—“My lord”, a bishop is said to have replied, “in exile thou canst not die; for, as vicar of Christ and of His apostles, thou hast received from God the heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession!”

The strength and towering grandeur of Gregory’s character, the loftiness of his claims, the intrepid firmness with which he asserted them through all changes of fortune, the large measure of success which crowned his efforts, in his own time and afterwards, have won for him enthusiastic admirers, not only among persons who are attached to the church of Rome by profession or by sympathy, but among those modern idolaters of energy whose reverence is ready to wait on any man of extraordinary abilities and of unrelenting determination. But we may hesitate to adopt an estimate which scorns to inquire into the righteousness either of his objects or of the means which he employed.

Gregory found the papacy in miserable degradation; he left it far advanced towards dominion over the kingdoms of the world. The progress which it had made under his administration is significantly shown by the fact that the decree of Nicolas II as to the election of popes, which had at first been resented as an invasion of the imperial rights, was now the ground on which the imperialists were fain to take their stand, while the papalists had come to disavow it as unworthy of their pretensions. The old relations of the papacy and of the empire were to be reversed; the emperor was no longer to confirm the election of popes, or to decide between rival claimants of the see, but the pope was to hold the empire at his disposal. The successor of St. Peter was to give laws to mankind.

We may reasonably believe that Gregory was sincere; we may believe that, in forming and in carrying out his great design, he was not actuated by selfish personal ambition; that he

would have been content to go on to the end of his life directing the execution of his policy under the names of other men—anxious only that the policy should succeed, not that the author of it should be conspicuous, and willing that its triumph should be deferred until after he should himself have passed away from earth. But is this enough to entitle him to our approval? Are we to admire a wisdom so blind as that which would remedy the evils of secular misrule by setting up a universal spiritual despotism, and thus, by a certain consequence, plunging the spiritual power deeply into secularly? Or shall we sanction the idea of a conscientiousness so imperfect that, in pursuit of one engrossing purpose, it disregards all the ordinary laws of equity, truth, and mercy?

We read of Gregory with awe, mixed perhaps with admiration, perhaps with aversion; but in no human bosom can his character awaken a feeling of love. The ruthless sternness of his nature may be illustrated by an incident which occurred before his elevation to the papacy. Thrasimund, a monk of Monte Cassino, had been appointed by the abbot, Desiderius, to the abbacy of the dependent monastery of Tremiti. A rebellion broke out among his monks, and he suppressed it with great rigour, blinding three of them, and cutting out the tongue of a fourth. Desiderius, on hearing of this, was overwhelmed with grief; he displaced the abbot, and put him to penance for his cruelty. But Hildebrand justified the severity which had been used, and contrived that Thrasimund should be promoted to a higher dignity.

The exaltation of the papacy was Gregory's single object. For this he sacrificed Berengar; he acted doubly with the Germans; he excited the multitude against the clergy and the empire; he occasioned an endless amount of confusion, bloodshed, and misery. He took advantage of Henry's youth, of the weakness of his position, of the defects of his character; he used his triumph over him inhumanly, and when Henry had again become strong, Gregory, for the sake of gaining allies against this one enemy, was willing to connive at all which he had before denounced as abominable. Other popes had used the censures of the church as means of influencing princes through the discontent of their people; but Gregory was the first who assumed the power of releasing subjects from their obedience. He argued that Scripture made no difference between princes and other men as to the exercise of those powers of binding and loosing which the Saviour committed to His church. But it was forgotten that Scripture allows a discretion in the employment of ecclesiastical censures : that the greatest of the western fathers had strongly insisted on the inexpediency of rigidly enforcing discipline in cases where it would lead to a dangerous disturbance in the church; nor does Scripture give any countenance to the idea that the censures of the church deprive a sovereign of his right to civil obedience.

Gregory was not without enthusiasm. He instituted a new office in honour of the blessed Virgin, and relied much on her aid and on that of St. Peter he expected to obtain revelations from heaven by means of visions he even fancied himself an oracle of the Divine will, and dealt in predictions of temporal weal or woe, which, as we have seen, were in some cases signally unfortunate. Yet in many respects he rose above the superstitions and the narrow opinions of his age. He remonstrated humanely and wisely with the king of Denmark against the cruelties which in that country were practised on women accused of witchcraft. In the Eucharistic controversy raised by Berengar, while he appears himself to have held the opposite doctrine, he allowed that of Berengar to be sufficient for communion with the church.

In the controversy with the Greek church, he showed himself superior to the zealots of either side by regarding the use of leavened or of unleavened bread as indifferent. And, deeply monastic as was his own character, he was free from the indiscriminate rage for compelling all men to enter the cloister. He censures his old superior, Hugh, for having admitted a duke into the society of Cluny—thereby releasing him from the duties of his office, and leaving a hundred thousand Christians without a keeper. Such a man, he says, ought to have retained his

place in the world., where, although piety is not uncommon among priests, and monks, and the poor, the instances of it among princes are rare and precious.

The plea that Gregory lived in a dark age is therefore only available in a modified degree for his defence, since it appears that in many things he was more enlightened than his contemporaries. And in admitting this plea for him, or for any other man to whom Holy Scripture was open, we must be careful never to let it cover the violation of duties which Scripture unequivocally enjoins—of justice and mercy, of charity and simplicity; while, on the other hand, we must deny him the credit of any good which it may have pleased the Divine providence to bring out of his acts, if such good were beyond Gregory's own wish and intention.

No doubt that elevation of the papacy in which he was the most effective agent was in the middle ages a great and inestimable bulwark against secular tyranny. But why should one usurpation be necessary as a safeguard against another? Why, if the investiture of bishops by princes was worse in its practical consequences than in its theory, should we be required to sympathize with one who opposed it by a system of which the very theory is intolerable? Spiritual tyranny is worse than secular tyranny, because it comes to us with higher pretensions. Against the oppressions of worldly force religion may lift up her protest; to those who suffer from them she may administer her consolations; but when tyranny takes the guise of religion, there is no remedy on earth, except in that which is represented as rebellion against God's own authority. The power of the hierarchy, as established mainly through the labours of Gregory, served as a protection against the rude violence of princes and of nobles; but it claimed for itself an absolute dominion over the minds and souls of men, and it did not hesitate to enforce this by the most inhuman and atrocious measures. And how much of what was worst in the secular power may have arisen out of a reaction against the extravagant claims of the papacy!

While we freely and thankfully acknowledge the good which resulted from Gregory's exertions, we may yet ask—and we may refuse to accept a theoretical assertion as an answer to the question—whether it would not have been infinitely better for mankind, and even for the hierarchy itself, that the power of the gospel should have been enforced on the world by milder and truer means?

CHAPTER III.

BERENGAR.

A.D. 1045-1088.

IN the middle of the eleventh century a controversy arose as to the manner of the Saviour's presence in the eucharist. On this question the church had not as yet pronounced any formal decision, or proposed any test of orthodoxy. A real presence of Christ was generally held; but the meaning of this reality was very variously conceived. Thus, in England, Aelfric, who is supposed to have written at the beginning of the century, and whose homilies were read as authoritative in the Anglo-Saxon churches, had laid down in these homilies the very doctrine of Rattram—that the presence of Christ is not material but spiritual. But in countries nearer to the centre of the papal influence the opinions of Paschasius had by degrees won general acceptance, and any deviation from them was now regarded as an innovation on the faith.

In the beginning of the century, Leutheric, archbishop of Sens, who had been a pupil of Gerbert, was called in question for substituting for the usual form of address to communicants the words—"If thou art worthy, receive". The scanty notices of Leutheric leave it doubtful whether his offence consisted in holding that none but the worthy could really be partakers, or in giving the Eucharist the character of an ordeal; but, whatever it may have been, he was silenced by king Robert I, and quietly submitted to the sentenced Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, a friend of Leutheric, and one of the most eminent teachers of his age, while he maintained that the Eucharist was a pledge, would not, with Paschasius, affirm its identity with the body in which the Saviour was born and was crucified; and he speaks strongly against gross and material misconceptions on the subject. It is, however, doubtful in how far Fulbert would have agreed with the doctrines which were afterwards propounded by his pupil Berengar.

Berengar was born at Tours about the year 1000, and was educated under Fulbert, in the cathedral school of Chartres. His opponents afterwards described him as having in his early days exhibited a passion for novelty, as having despised books and criticized his teacher. William of Malmesbury adds that, as Fulbert was on his death-bed, he singled out Berengar from the crowd which filled the chamber, and, declaring that he saw beside him a devil enticing people to follow him, desired that he might be thrust out. But even the less improbable of these stories appears to be refuted by the tone in which an old fellow-pupil of Berengar reminded him of the days when they had studied together under the venerated bishop of Chartres. In 1031 Berengar returned to his native city, where he became schoolmaster and treasurer of the cathedral. The reputation of the school was greatly raised by him, and his authority as a theologian stood high. Eusebius Bruno, bishop of Angers, out of respect for his character and learning, bestowed on him the archdeaconry of that city, which Berengar held without relinquishing his preferments at Tours.

It appears to have been in 1045, or soon after, that Berengar began to make himself noted by advocating a doctrine which he professed to have derived from Scotus Erigena, under whose name Rattram's treatise appears to have been really intended. The earliest notices of the novelties imputed to Berengar are contained in letters of expostulation addressed to him by two other old pupils of Fulbert—Hugh, bishop of Langres, whose deposition at the council of Reims for gross offences has been already mentioned, and Adelman, schoolmaster of Liège, who afterwards became bishop of Brixen. These writers

entreat Berengar to abandon his dangerous speculations. Adelman tells him that in countries of the German as well as of the Latin tongue he was reported to have forsaken the unity of the church.

In 1049, Berengar addressed a letter to Lanfranc, master of the monastic school of Bee in Normandy. Lanfranc was born at Pavia about the year 1005. He received a legal education and, while yet a young man, became distinguished as an advocate. But the spirit of adventure led him to leave his country; he travelled through France, attended by a train of pupils, and, after having taught for a time at Avranches, was on his way to Rouen, when he was attacked by robbers, who plundered, stripped, and bound him. In his distress he made a vow to amend his life, and when, on the following day, he was set free by some travellers, he asked them to direct him to the humblest monastery with which they were acquainted. They answered that they knew of none poorer or less esteemed than the neighbouring house of Bee (or Le Bec), which Herluin, an old soldier who had turned monk, was then building. Lanfranc found the abbot labouring with his own hands at the work, and was admitted into his society in 1042. The poor and despised little monastery soon became famous as a seminary of learning, and it is not impossible that, among the motives by which Berengar was led to attack Lanfranc's doctrine, there may have mingled some feeling of jealousy at this unexpected and successful rivalry of his own fame as a teacher. In the letter which he now wrote, he expresses surprise that Lanfranc should (as he heard) have espoused the Eucharistic doctrine of Paschasius, and should have condemned that of Scotus as heretical; such a judgment, he says, is rash, and unworthy of the "not despicable wit" which God had bestowed on Lanfranc. He taxes him with insufficient study of the Scriptures, while, for himself he professes to be still but imperfectly acquainted with them. He proposes a conference on the point in question, and in the meantime tells Lanfranc that, if he considers Scotus heretical, Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome must be included in the same sentence.

When this letter reached Bec, Lanfranc was absent; and there is some uncertainty as to the next part of the story. Lanfranc states that he had gone to Italy— apparently after having attended the council of Reims, and in the train of Leo IX and that the letter, having been opened by some clerks, brought his own orthodoxy into suspicion. To this Berengar answers that it could not have had such an effect, inasmuch as it showed that the opinions of the person addressed were different from those of the writer, and agreeable to the doctrine which Lanfranc described as being generally held and on the strength, chiefly, of this reply some modern writers have charged Lanfranc with a complication of intrigue and falsehood, and have supposed that he went to Rome for the express purpose of denouncing Berengar. If; however, we look to probability only, without claiming any consideration for Lanfranc's character, we may fairly see reason to question these inferences. Lanfranc could not but have foreseen Berengar's obvious and plausible answer, and would hardly have provoked it, unless he were conscious that his own story was nevertheless true. The mere rumour that a reputed heretic had written to him would naturally raise suspicions; and it would circulate far more widely than the contents of the letter. Nor was it necessary that Lanfranc should act the part of an informer; for Leo had in all likelihood heard of Berengar while yet bishop of Toul— situated as that see is in a district where Berengar's opinions had early excited attention, and on the direct road between the cities from which Adelman and Hugh had sent forth their remonstrances; and it is now known that the pope had spoken of Berengar's alleged errors before leaving Rome for his late circuit beyond the Alps.

A synod was held at Rome, where, after his letter to Lanfranc had been read, Berengar was excommunicated—a suitable punishment, say his opponents, for one who wished to deprive the church itself of its communion in the Saviour's body and blood. Lanfranc was then required to give an account of his faith, which he did to the satisfaction of the assembly; and Berengar, in order that he might have an opportunity of defending himself was cited to a synod which was to meet at Vercelli in the following September. He was disposed to obey the

summons, although some friends urged on him that, according to the canons, the pope's jurisdiction was limited to the case of appeals, and that questions ought to be decided in the province where they arose. But the king, Henry I, to whom he applied as the head of St. Martin's monastery, instead of aiding him in his journey, committed him to prison, seized his property, and laid on him a fine which, according to Berengar, was greater in amount than all he had ever possessed. Being thus detained from attending the council, he was again condemned in his absence. A passage was read from the book ascribed to Scotus, in which the Eucharist was spoken of as a figure, a token, a pledge of the Saviour's body and blood. On this, Peter, a deacon of the Roman church (most probably Peter Damiani), exclaimed—"If we are still in the figure, when shall we get the reality?". Scotus was condemned, with his admirer, and the book was committed to the flames. One of Berengar's brother canons, who had been sent by the church of Tours to request the pope's intercession for his release, on hearing him styled a heretic, cried out to the speaker—"By the Almighty God, you lie!". Another clerk, indignant at the summary condemnation of Scotus, protested that by such inconsiderate haste St. Augustine himself might be condemned; and the pope ordered that these two should be imprisoned, in order to protect them from the fury of the multitude.

Through the influence of Bruno and other friends, Berengar recovered his liberty. He protested loudly against the injustice done him by the pope, who ought, he said, rather to have resented the imprisonment of one who was on his way to the papal judgment-seat than to have taken advantage of it in order to condemn him in his absence; and he desired an opportunity of maintaining his opinions before a council.

It would seem to have been in 1051 that Berengar appeared in Normandy, and was condemned by a council held at Brionne in the presence of duke William; and in the same year a council was summoned to meet at Paris for the consideration of his opinions. On this Theotwin, the successor of Wazo in the see of Liège, addressed a letter to king Henry. After stating that Berengar, in addition to his errors on the Eucharist, was accused of "destroying lawful marriage" and of denying infant-baptism—charges which seem to have been altogether groundless—he speaks of the difficulty arising from the circumstance that Bruno, one of Berengar's chief partisans, was a bishop, and therefore subject to the pope's judgment alone; and he suggests that, in order to overcome this difficulty, the king should not allow any discussion of the question, but should proceed against the Berengarians as heretics already condemned. The council was held in October; Berengar, deterred by rumours which reached him, did not appear, and it is said that the assembly, not content with condemning his doctrine and that of Scotus, decreed that he and his followers should be forcibly seized, and, in case of obstinacy, should be put to death.

In 1054 Berengar was cited to appear before a council which was to be held at Tours under Hildebrand, as papal legate. He looked forward to this as an opportunity of vindicating himself, and, before the meeting of the assembly, he showed the legate a collection of authorities for his doctrine. To the charge of asserting that the elements after consecration in no respect differed from what they were before it, he answered that such was not his opinion; that he believed them, when consecrated, to be the very body and blood of Christ. Hildebrand, satisfied with this statement, proposed that Berengar should accompany him to Rome, and should there clear himself before the pope; and that in the meantime he should give such explanations as might satisfy the assembled bishops. These explanations were received with some distrust; it was suggested that perhaps Berengar might say one thing with his mouth and hold another thing in his heart. He therefore confirmed the sincerity of his profession by an oath—that the bread and wine are, after consecration, the body and blood of Christ. But the serious illness of Leo obliged Hildebrand to return in haste to Rome, and the arrangement which had been made was not carried out. The enemies of Berengar state that, being unable to defend his heresy, he recanted it at Tours, and afterwards resumed the profession of it. But this is a misrepresentation founded on their misconception of the real nature of his doctrine.

The controversy rested throughout the pontificates of Victor and of Stephen, until 1059, when Berengar appeared at Rome before the synod held by Nicolas II. This appearance would seem to have been voluntary; he probably relied on the favour of Hildebrand, to whom he carried a letter from his only lay supporter whose name is known to us—Geoffrey, count of Anjou—requesting that the cardinal would not temporize, as at the council of Tours, but would openly befriend the accused. But the majority of the council proved to be strongly hostile, and Berengar's friends were afraid to speak, while Hildebrand was unwilling to imperil his own influence, and the cause which he had most at heart, by encumbering himself with the defense of the suspected heretic. Berengar complains that the council behaved to him not only without Christian kindness, but without reason. They stopped their ears when he spoke of a participation in the Eucharist; and, when he proceeded to argue in the dialectical form, they desired him to produce authority rather than arguments which they dreaded as sophisms. He reproached the pope for exposing him to beasts, instead of instituting a deliberate inquiry by competent persons; to which Nicolas only replied that he must blame Hildebrand. Finding his attempts at a defence hopeless, Berengar desisted. A confession drawn up by cardinal Humbert, and embodying a strong and unequivocal assertion of a *material* change in the sacrament, was produced; and Berengar, overpowered (as he tells us) by the fear of death and by the tumult of his opponents, took the document into his hands, prostrated himself in token of submission, and cast his own writings into the fire.

But on returning to his own country Berengar again openly taught his old opinions, and they were widely spread by the agency of poor students. He denounced the treatment which he had received from the late council, to which (he said) he had gone, not as a culprit, but of his own free will; he reflected severely on Leo, Nicolas, Humbert, and the Roman church; he maintained that his own doctrine was that of St. Augustine, while the doctrine of Lanfranc and Paschasius was no better than “a dotage of the vulgar”. Lanfranc wrote to reproach him, Berengar rejoined, and a controversy ensued in which the opinions of each party were brought out into greater distinctness than before.

Lanfranc's treatise *Of the Body and Blood of the Lord* was written between 1063 and 1070. The work opens by blaming Berengar for spreading his errors in an underhand manner, and for declining to argue before competent judges. Lanfranc then gives an account of the proceedings under Leo and Nicolas. He remarks on his opponent's dialectical subtleties. He asserts the doctrine of Paschasius, and supports it by quotations from ecclesiastical writers. That the elements after consecration are still styled bread and wine, he accounts for by saying that in Scripture things are often called by the name of that from which they are made; thus man is spoken of as earth, dust, ashes; or they are named after something which they resemble—as Christ is styled a lion and a lamb. He represents Berengar as holding the sacrament to be nothing more than a figure and a memorial.

Berengar replied in a treatise which, after having been long unknown, has in late times been partially recovered, and has thrown a new and important light on his opinions. He gives (as we have seen) a version of the previous history different in many respects from that which had been given by Lanfranc. His fault in the synod under Nicolas consisted (he says) not in having sworn—for that was not required of him—but in having been silent as to the truth. He had yielded to the fear of death and of the raging multitude, and in behalf of this weakness he cites the examples of Aaron and of St. Peter; to have adhered to the confession extorted from him would have been as if the apostle had persisted in the denial of his Lord. There is something like effrontery in the tone of contempt and defiance which Berengar assumes after having submitted to such humiliations; but, while we cannot give him credit for the spirit of a martyr, his words are a valuable evidence of the uselessness of force as a means of religious conviction. He strongly protests against the employment of swords and clubs and uproar by way of argument he declares against the principle of being guided by the voice of a majority, while he yet states that the supporters of his own views are very many, or almost innumerable,

of every rank and dignity. He defends his use of dialectics, and denies the charge of despising authority, although he holds reason to be "incomparably higher" as a means for the discovery of truth. He complains that he had been condemned, not only without a hearing, but even without a knowledge of his doctrines—especially at the council of Vercelli, when he had not set forth his opinions, nor had attained to such clearness in them as persecution and study had since brought to him. The doctrine which he lays down is very different from that which was imputed to him; he distinguishes between the visible sacrament and the inward part or thing signified it is to the outward part only that he would apply the terms for which he had been so much censured—sign, figure, pledge, or likeness. He repeatedly declares that the elements are "converted" by consecration into the very body and blood of the Saviour; that the bread, from having before been something common, becomes the beatific body of Christ—not, however, by the corruption of the bread, or as if the body which has so long existed in a blessed immortality could now again begin to be; that consecration operates, not by destroying the previous substance, but by exalting it. It is not a portion of Christ's body that is present in each fragment, but He is fully present throughout.

On the side of Rome, the pontificate of Alexander II was a season of peace for Berengar. The pope wrote to him in friendly terms, urging him to forsake his errors; but, although he replied by declaring himself resolved to adhere to his opinions, no measures were taken against him, and, when he was persecuted by the nephews and successors of his old patron, Geoffrey of Anjou, Alexander befriended him and interceded for him.

In 1075, under the pontificate of Gregory, Berengar was brought before a council held under the presidency of a legate at Poitiers; and such was the tumult that he hardly escaped with his life. About the same time, Guitmund, a pupil of Lanfranc, and only second to him in fame as a teacher, wrote against Berengar a dialogue *Of the Verity of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist*. The tone of this work is very bitter. Guitmund repeats, with additions, the charges of error which had been brought by Theotwin; he asserts that Berengar denied the possibility of our Lord's having entered through closed doors; it was, therefore, no wonder if he and his followers disbelieved the miracles of the church. The most remarkable passage of the book is one in which the writer draws a distinction between various kinds of Berengarians. All, he says, agree that there is no essential change in the elements; but some deny any presence, and allow only shadows and figures : some—which is said to be the "very subtle opinion" of Berengar himself—admit that the Saviour's body and blood are really and latently contained in the elements, and are, so to speak, *impanated*; others, who are strongly opposed to Berengar, maintain that the elements are changed in part, and in part remain; while others, again, admit the entire change, but think that, when unworthy communicants approach, the bread and wine resume their natural substance.

BERENGAR AT ROME.

Berengar was once more cited to Rome. The pope received him kindly, and, at a council in 1078, endeavoured to provide for his escape by a confession, which, while it avowed a change in the Eucharistic elements, would have permitted him to retain his own opinions and against the authority of Lanfranc he cited that of Peter Damiani. Berengar remained at Rome nearly a year; but the opposite party was vehement, and he was required to undergo the ordeal of hot iron. While, however, he was preparing for it by prayer and fasting, the pope intimated to him that the trial was not to take place; a monk, whom Gregory had desired to address himself by special devotion to the blessed Virgin for instruction on the subject, had received a revelation that nothing ought to be added to the declarations of Scripture, and that Berengar's doctrine was sufficient. But his opponents pressed for stronger measures, the imperialists broadly impeached the pope's orthodoxy, and Berengar was alarmed by a rumour that Gregory, to save his own reputation, was about to imprison him for life. At the Lent synod of 1079, which consisted of a hundred and fifty bishops and abbots, Berengar was required to sign a confession that the elements are "substantially" changed into

the real, proper, and life-giving body and blood of Christ. A bold evasion suggested itself to his mind—that *substancially* might be interpreted to mean *while retaining their substance!*—and he professed himself ready to subscribe. In answer to a question whether he understood the form in the same sense as the council, he said that he understood it agreeably to the doctrine which he had privately explained to the pope some days before. Such a speech was not likely to be acceptable to Gregory, who thereupon told him that he must prostrate himself in token of unreserved submission, and must own that he had hitherto sinned in denying a substantial change. Berengar, in fear of anathema and of violence, obeyed—as God (he says) did not give him constancy and, after having been charged to refrain from teaching, except for the purpose of recovering those whom he had misled, he was dismissed with a commendatory letter, addressed to all the faithful, in which the pope ordered that no one should injure him in person or in property, and that no one should reproach him as a heretic, forasmuch as he had been acknowledged as a son of the Roman church.

After returning to France, Berengar regretted his late compliance, and once more openly professed his real opinions. In 1080, he was summoned before a council at Bordeaux, where his statements seem to have been accepted; and in the same year Gregory wrote to desire that the archbishop of Tours and the bishop of Angers would protect him against the count of Anjou, who had been incited by his enemies to persecute him. Berengar was allowed to spend his last years unmolested in an island of the Loire near Tours, where he died in 1088. The latest of his known writings is a letter addressed to a friend on the occasion of Gregory's death, in which he speaks of the pope with regard, expresses a conviction of his salvation, and excuses his behaviour towards himself.

The memory of Berengar was revered in the district of Tours, and there was, down to late times, a yearly solemnity at his tomb. Hence it has been argued that he finally renounced his heresy, having, as was supposed, been converted by Lanfranc's book. But the groundlessness of that supposition has been abundantly shown by the discovery of his answer to Lanfranc; nor is there any reason to question the statement of his contemporary Bemold that he persevered in his opinions to the last.

The recovery of his treatise, and of other writings, has placed his doctrines in a clearer light, and it is now acknowledged, even by writers of the Roman church, that, instead of supposing the Eucharist to be merely figurative, he acknowledged in it a real spiritual change, while he denied that doctrine of a material change which has become distinctive of their own communion.

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE DEATH OF GREGORY VII TO THAT OF THE EMPEROR HENRY
IV.—THE FIRST CRUSADE.
A.D. 1085-1106.

GREGORY VII left behind him a powerful and resolute party. It could reckon on the alliance of the Normans, for whom it was important that the pope should be favourable to their own interest rather than to that of the emperor; and it was supported by the devoted attachment of the countess Matilda. On the other hand, the emperor's strength in Italy was greater in appearance than in reality; for, although many of the chief cities were with him, a strong desire of independence had arisen among them, and he could not safely rely on them unless in so far as his interest coincided with their private objects.

When asked on his death-bed to recommend a successor, Gregory had named Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, and first cardinal-presbyter of the Roman church, and had desired that, if the abbot should refuse the papacy, either Otho, bishop of Ostia, Hugh, archbishop of Lyons (the same who, as bishop of Die, had been legate in France), or Anselm, bishop of Lucca, the chaplain and chief counsellor of Matilda, should be chosen. The general wish was for Desiderius, but he obstinately refused—perhaps from unwillingness to exchange his peaceful dignity for one which, although loftier, must involve him in violent contentions with the emperor and the antipope. A year had elapsed, when at Whitsuntide 1086 he was persuaded to go to Rome, supposing that he was then no longer in danger of having the popedom forced on him. Preparations were made for an election, and, by the advice of Desiderius, Otho was about to be chosen, when an objection was raised that he was canonically disqualified, as being already a bishop. Although this impediment had in later times been often disregarded, the mention of it served to divert the multitude, who cried out for Desiderius. The abbot, struggling, and refusing to put on a part of the pontifical dress, was enthroned, and greeted as Victor III; but immediately afterwards he left the city, and, renouncing the dignity which had been thrust on him, withdrew to his monastery.

Ten months more passed away, and in March 1087 Desiderius summoned a council to meet at Capua, with a view to a new election. At this meeting Roger, son of Robert Guiscard, and Jordan, prince of Capua, with a number of bishops, threw themselves at his feet, and entreated him to retain the papacy; but Hugh of Lyons and Otho of Ostia objected to him, and required an examination into his conduct. By this opposition Desiderius was determined to accept the office which he had so long declined. He repaired to Rome under the protection of a Norman force, which wrested St. Peter's from the antipope; and on the 9th of May he was consecrated. The partisans of Guibert, however, soon after recovered possession of the church, and, after the fashion of the ancient Donatists, they washed the altars in order to cleanse them from the pollution of the Hildebrandine mass.

Although the new pope had been among the most devoted of Gregory's adherents, it would seem that he was now weary of conflict, and desirous to gratify his natural inclination for peace. Of his late opponents, Otho submitted to him : but Hugh, who himself aspired to the papacy, addressed to Matilda two letters, in which he charged him with apostasy from

Gregory's policy, and with a disposition to grant unworthy concessions to the emperor. By this letter Victor was greatly exasperated, and at a synod at Benevento, in the month of August, he excommunicated the archbishop. The synod renewed the anathema against the antipope and the decrees against investiture. After three sessions had been held, the pope was struck with palsy; and, having been removed to Monte Cassino, he died there on the 16th of September. Victor has left three books of Dialogues, which are valuable as throwing light on the history of his time, while, by the excessive credulity which he displays, as well as by their form, they remind us of his model, the Dialogues of Gregory the Great.

Another long vacancy in the popedom followed. The antipope had possession of Rome, and the emperor's power was formidable to the inheritors of Gregory's principles. But they were encouraged by the resolution of Matilda; and in March 1088 a council met at Terracina for the appointment of a successor to Victor. In consideration of the difficulties of the time, the form of election prescribed by Nicolas II was set aside. About forty bishops and abbots were present, together with envoys from the Great Countess, and from some prelates beyond the Alps. The clergy of Rome were represented by the cardinal of Porto; the people, by the prefect of the city; and Otho, bishop of Ostia, who had again been recommended by Victor on his death-bed, was unanimously chosen.

The new pope, who took the name of Urban II, was a Frenchman of noble family. He was educated at Reims, under Bruno, afterwards famous as the founder of the Carthusian order, and became a canon of that city; but he resigned his position to enter the monastery of Cluny. In consequence of a request which Gregory had made, that the abbot would send him some monks who might be fit for the episcopate, Otho left Cluny for Rome in 1076; he was employed by the pope in important business, and was advanced to the see of Ostia. Urban's principles were the same with those of Gregory, and, if he had not the originality of his master, he was not inferior to him in firmness, activity, or enterprise; while with these qualities he combined an artfulness and a caution which were more likely to be successful than Gregory's undisguised audacity and assumption.

At the time of the election, Rome was almost entirely in the hands of the antipope, so that Urban, on visiting it, was obliged to find shelter in the island of the Tiber; while such was his poverty that he was indebted to one of the Frangipani family, and even to some women of the humblest class, for the means of subsistence. The city was a scene of continual struggles between the opposite parties. Their mutual exasperation may be imagined from an instance on each side : that Bonizo, a vehement partisan of Urban, on being appointed to the see of Piacenza, after having been expelled from that of Sutri, was blinded and was put to death with horrible mutilation by the imperialists of his new city and that Urban declared it lawful to kill excommunicate persons, provided that it were done out of zeal for the church.

Henry, when compelled by Robert Guiscard to retire from Rome, had returned to Germany in 1084. He found the country in great disorder, and in August 1036 he was defeated by the Saxons and their allies, at the Bleichfeld, near Wurzburg. But by degrees he was able to conciliate many of his old opponents and his strength increased; in the following year he received the submission of his rival Herman, and in 1088 he reduced the Saxons to tranquillity. In consequence of these successes, the bishops of the opposite party were expelled from their sees, so that Urban had only four adherents among the prelates of Germany. While the warriors fought the battles of the papacy and the empire with the sword, the theologians of the parties carried on a fierce controversy with the pen—some of them with learning, decency, and Christian feeling; others with outrageous violence, reckless falsehood, and disgusting buffoonery. In 1089, Urban issued a decree by which the sentences of Gregory were somewhat modified. Anathema was denounced in the first degree against the emperor and the antipope; in the second degree, against such as should aid them, or should receive ecclesiastical dignities from them; while those who should merely communicate with them were not anathematized, but were not to be admitted to catholic fellowship except after

penance and absolutions. In the same year the antipope Clement was driven out of Rome by the citizens, who are said to have exacted from him an oath that he would not attempt to recover his dignity. A negotiation was soon after opened between the parties, on the condition that Henry should be acknowledged as emperor, and Urban as pope. But it was abandoned through the influence of the imperialist bishops, who naturally apprehended that they might be sacrificed to the proposed reconciliation.

Urban now persuaded Matilda, at the age of forty-three, to enter into a second marriage, with a youth of eighteen—the younger Welf, son of the duke of Bavaria. The union was one of policy; the pope hoped to secure by it a male head for his lay adherents, to fix the allegiance of Matilda, who had now lost the guidance not only of Gregory but of Anselm of Lucca, and to engage the elder Welf to exert all his influence in Germany against the emperor. On hearing of the event, which had for some time been kept secret from him, Henry crossed the Alps in the spring of 1090, and for three years ravaged Matilda's territories. Mantua, after a siege of six months, was surrendered to him by treachery. The countess, reduced to great distress, entered into negotiations at Carpineto, and was about to yield, even to the extent of acknowledging Clement as pope, when the abbot of Canossa, starting up with the air of a prophet, declared that to conclude peace on such terms would be a sin against every Person of the Divine Trinity, and the treaty was broken off! Henry attempted to take Canossa, the scene of his memorable humiliation; but he was foiled, partly through the dense gloom of the weather, and lost his standard, which was hung up as a trophy in the castle-chapel.

The antipope had found means of re-establishing himself at Rome, in 1091; but in 1094 Urban again got possession of the Lateran, through the treachery of the governor, who offered to surrender it for a certain sum. There were, however, no means of raising this until Godfrey, abbot of Vendome, who had arrived at Rome on a pilgrimage of devotion, by placing at the pope's disposal not only his ready money but the price of his horses and mules, enabled him to complete the bargain.

The empress Bertha had died in 1088, and in the following year Henry had married Adelaide or Praxedes, a Russian princess, and widow of Uto, marquis of Saxony. The marriage was unhappy, and Henry relapsed into the laxity of his early life. But worse infamies were now imputed to him; it was asserted that he had compelled Adelaide to prostitute herself to his courtiers, that he had required his son Conrad to commit incest with her, and that, when the prince recoiled with horror from the proposal, he had threatened to declare him a supposititious child. The empress was welcomed as an ally by Matilda, and her story was related before a synod at Constance, in 1094. What her motives may have been for publishing a tale so revolting, so improbable, and in parts so contradictory to itself—whether she were disordered in mind, or whether, in her ignorance of the language in which her depositions were drawn up, she subscribed them without knowing their contents—it is vain to conjecture. But the story furnished her husband's enemies with a weapon which they employed with terrible effect against him.

About the same time, Conrad appears to have been tampered with by some of the anti-imperialist clergy. This prince had grown up at a distance from Henry, and without experiencing his influence; for in early childhood he had been committed to the archbishop of Milan for education, and many years had passed before the troubles of Germany permitted the father and the son to meet again. To a character like Conrad's—gentle, studious, devout, and dreamy—the long and hopeless contentions of the time, its rude hostilities, the schism of western Christendom, could not but be deeply distasteful; it would seem that the work of alienating him from his father was easy, and that he was preparing to leave the court when Henry, suspecting the intention, committed him to custody. Conrad, however, found means to escape, and sought a refuge with Matilda, who had perhaps been concerned in the practices by which he had been incited to rebel, and now received him with honour, while Urban released him from his share in the emperor's excommunication. He was crowned at Monza as king of

Italy, by Anselm, archbishop of Milan; and many Lombard cities declared in his favour. How little the prince's own will concurred in the movements of which he was the nominal head, appears from the fact that he always continued to style Henry his lord and emperor, and would not allow him to be spoken of with disrespect. The rebellion of his son inflicted on Henry a blow in comparison of which all his earlier sufferings had been as nothing. He cast off his robes, secluded himself in moody silence, and, it is said, was with difficulty prevented from putting an end to his own life.

But a new movement, which now began, was to be far more valuable to Urban and to the papacy than any advantages which could have resulted from the contest with the emperor.

For many years the hardships inflicted on pilgrims by the Mahometan masters of the Holy Land had roused the pity and the indignation of Christendom. The stream of pilgrimage had continued to flow, and with increasing fulness. Sometimes the pilgrims went in large bodies, which at once raised the apprehensions of the Mussulmans that they might attempt to take possession of the country, and, by the wealth which was displayed, excited their desire of plunder. A company headed by Lietbert, bishop of Cambray, in 1054, was so numerous that it was styled "the host of the Lord"; but the bishop and his followers had the mortification of finding that Jerusalem was for the time closed against the entrance of Christians. Ten years later, on a revival of the belief that the day of judgment was at hand, a still greater expedition set out under Siegfried of Mayence, whose mean and tortuous career was varied from time to time by fits of penitence and devotion. The pilgrims were repeatedly attacked, and, out of 7000 who had left their homes, 5000 fell victims to the dangers, the fatigues, and the privations of the journey.

A fresh race of conquerors, the Seljookian Turks, had appeared in the east. They carried their arms into Asia Minor, wrested all but the western coast of it from the Greeks, and in 1071 humiliated the empire by taking prisoner its sovereign, Romanus Diogenes. Their conquests were formed into a kingdom to which they insolently gave the name of Roum (or Rome), with Nicaea, the city venerable for the definition of orthodox Christianity, for its capital and in 1076 they gained possession of Palestine. Under these new masters the condition of the Christian inhabitants and pilgrims was greatly altered for the worse. With the manners of barbarians the Turks combined the intolerant zeal of recent converts to Islam; and the feelings of European Christians were continually excited by reports of the exactions, the insults, and the outrages to which their brethren in the east were subjected.

The idea of a religious war for the recovery of the Holy Land was first proclaimed (as we have seen) by Sylvester II. Gregory VII, in the beginning of his pontificate, had projected a crusade, and had endeavoured to enlist the emperor and other princes in the cause; but as the object was only to succour the Byzantine empire, not to deliver the Holy Land, his proposal failed to excite any general enthusiasm, and led to no result. His successor, Victor, had published an invitation to a war against the Saracens of Africa, with a promise of remission of all sins to those who should engage in it; and a successful expedition had been the consequence. But now a greater impulse was to be given to such enterprises.

Peter, a native of Amiens, had been a soldier in his youth. He was married, but withdrew from the society of his wife into a monastery, and afterwards became a hermit. In 1093 he visited Jerusalem, where his spirit was greatly stirred by the sight of the indignities which the Christians had to endure. He suggested to the patriarch Symeon an application for aid to the Byzantine emperor; the patriarch replied that the empire was too weak to assist him, but that the Christians of the west could help effectually, by prayers if not by arms. On his return to Europe, Peter presented himself before the pope, related his interview with Symeon, and enforced the patriarch's request by a story of a vision in the church of the holy sepulchre, where the Saviour had appeared to him, and had charged him to rouse the western nations for the delivery of the Holy Land. Urban listened with approbation, but, instead of at once committing himself to the enterprise, he desired Peter to publish it by way of sounding the

general feeling. The hermit set forth, roughly dressed, girt around his waist with a thick cord, having his head and feet bare, and riding on a mule. Short of stature, lean, of dark complexion, with a head disproportionately large, but with an eye of fire, and a rude, glowing eloquence, he preached to high and to low, in churches and on highways, the sufferings of their brethren, and the foul desecrations of the land which had been hallowed by their Redeemer's birth and life. He read letters from the patriarch of Jerusalem and other Christians, with one which he professed to have received from heaven. When words and breath failed him, he wept, he groaned, he beat his breast, and pointed to a crucifix which he kissed with fervent devotion. Some, it is said, regarded him as a hypocrite; but the vast mass listened with rapture. The hairs which fell from his mule were treasured up as precious relics. Gifts were showered on him, and were distributed by him as alms. He reconciled enemies; he aroused many from lives of gross sin, and others from a decent apathy; he reclaimed women from a course of profligacy, portioned them, and provided them with husbands. In no long time he was able to return to the pope, with a report that everywhere his tale had been received with enthusiasm, so that he had even found it difficult to restrain his hearers from at once taking arms and compelling him to lead them to the Holy Land.

The pope appears to have been sincerely interested in the enterprise for its own sake; yet he can hardly have failed to apprehend something of the advantages which he was likely to reap from it. It opened to him the prospect of uniting all Christian Europe in one cause; of placing himself at the head of a movement which might lift him triumphantly above the antipope, and might secure for the church a victory over the temporal power; of putting an end to the schism which had so long divided the Greek from the Latin Christianity. And while the greater part of his own city was still in the hands of a rival—while he was embroiled in deadly hostility with the most powerful sovereign of the west—Urban boldly resolved to undertake the great work.

A council was assembled in March 1095 at Piacenza, where the pope appeared surrounded by two hundred bishops, four thousand clergy, and thirty thousand laity; and, as no building was large enough to contain this multitude, the greater sessions were held in a plain near the city. The project of a holy war was set forth; ambassadors from the Greek emperor, Alexius Comnenus, stated the distress of the eastern Christians, and the formidable advances of the Turks. The hearers were moved to tears by these details; the pope added his exhortations, and many bound themselves by oath to engage in the crusade. But the Italians of that day possessed neither the religious enthusiasm nor the valour which would have fitted them to sustain the brunt of such an enterprise; and Urban resolved that the grand inauguration of it should take place in his native country.

Other affairs were also transacted at Piacenza. Canons were passed against Simoniacs, Nicolaitans, and Berengarians; the antipope was solemnly anathematized; and the empress Adelaide was brought forward to excite indignation and revolt against her husband by the story of his alleged offences.

In his progress towards France, Urban was received at Cremona by Conrad, who obsequiously held his stirrup. The prince was rewarded by a promise of Germany and the imperial crown, and was yet further bound to the papal interest by a marriage which Urban and Matilda arranged for him with a wealthy bride, the daughter of Roger, grand count of Sicily. On entering France the pope was met by the gratifying information that Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, had at length succeeded in procuring for him the acknowledgment of his title in England.

The case of Philip, king of France, divided the pope's attention with the crusade. Philip, whose increasing sloth and sensuality had continued to lower him in the estimation of his feudatories and subjects, had in 1092 separated from his queen Bertha, and married Bertrada, wife of Fulk, count of Anjou. There was no formal divorce in either case; but the separation and the marriage were justified on the ground that both Bertha and Bertrada were

within the forbidden degrees of relationship to their first husbands—a pretext which, between the extension of the prohibitory canons and the complicated connexions of princely houses, would have been sufficient to warrant the dissolution of almost any marriage in the highest orders of society. No one of Philip's immediate subjects would venture to officiate at the nuptial ceremony, which was performed by a Norman bishop; but the union had been sanctioned by a council at Reims in 1094, when the death of Bertha appeared to have removed one important obstacle to it. Ivo, bishop of Chartres, a pious and honest prelate, who was distinguished above all his contemporaries for his knowledge of ecclesiastical law, alone openly protested against it; he disregarded a citation to the council, and was not to be moved either by the king's entreaties, or by imprisonment and the forfeiture of his property. Hugh, archbishop of Lyons, who had been reconciled with Urban and restored to his office of legate, excommunicated the king in a council at Autun, which was not then within the kingdom of France; but Philip obtained absolution from Rome by swearing that, since he had become aware of the pope's objections to his marriage, he had abstained from conjugal intercourse with Bertrada. Urban, however, now knew that this story was false, and was resolved to strike a decisive blow.

A council had been summoned to meet at Clermont in Auvergne. The citations to it were urgent, and charged the clergy to stir up the laity in the cause of the crusade. Among the vast assemblage which was drawn together were fourteen archbishops, two hundred and twenty-five bishops, and about a hundred abbots; the town and all the neighbouring villages were filled with strangers, while great numbers were obliged to lodge in tents. The sessions lasted ten days: the usual canons were passed in condemnation of simony, pluralities, and impropriations; the observation of the truce of God was enjoined and Urban ventured to advance a step beyond Gregory, by forbidding not only the practice of lay investiture, but that any ecclesiastic should swear fealty to a temporal lord—a prohibition which was intended entirely to do away with all dependence of the church on the secular power. Philip, the suzerain, although not the immediate ruler of the country in which the council was held, was excommunicated for his adultery with Bertrada; and, startling as such an act would have been at another time, it was not only allowed to pass, but even was unnoticed, amid the engrossing interest of the greater subject which filled the minds of all.

At the sixth session the crusade was proposed. Urban ascended a pulpit in the market-place and addressed the assembled multitude. He dwelt on the ancient glories of Palestine, where every foot of ground had been hallowed by the presence of the Saviour, of his virgin mother, of prophets and apostles. Even yet, he said, God vouchsafed to manifest his favour to it in the yearly miracle of the light from heaven, by which the lamps of the holy sepulchre were kindled at the season of the Saviour's passion—a miracle which ought to soften all but flinty hearts. He enlarged on the present condition of the sacred territory—possessed as it was by a godless people, the children of the Egyptian handmaid; on the indignities, the outrages, the tyranny, which they inflicted on Christians redeemed by Christ's blood. He appealed to many of those who were present as having themselves been eyewitnesses of these wrongs. Nor did he forget to speak of the progressive encroachments of the Turks on Christendom—of the danger which threatened Constantinople, the treasury of so many renowned and precious relics. "Cast out the bondwoman and her son!" he cried; "let all the faithful arm. Go forth, and God shall be with you. Turn against the enemies of the Christian name the weapons which you have stained with mutual slaughter. Redeem your sins by obedience—your rapine, your burnings, your bloodshed. Let the famous nation of the Franks display their valour in a cause where death is the assurance of blessedness. Count it joy to die for Christ where Christ died for you. Think not of kindred or home; you owe to God a higher love; for a Christian, every place is exile, every place is home and country". He insisted on the easiness of the remedy for sin which was now proposed—the relaxation of all penance in favour of those who should assume the cross. They were to be taken under the protection of the church; their persons and

their property were to be respected, under the penalty of excommunication. For himself he would, like Moses, hold up his hands in prayer for them, while they were engaged in fighting the Amalekites.

The pope's speech was interrupted by an enthusiastic cry from the whole assemblage—"God wills it!"—words which afterwards became the war-cry of the crusaders; and when he ceased, thousands enlisted for the enterprise by attaching the cross to their shoulders. The most important promise of service was that of Raymond of St. Gilles, the powerful count of Toulouse, who was represented at the council by envoys. Adhemar of Monteil, bishop of Le Puy, who had already been a pilgrim to Jerusalem, stepped forward with a joyous look, declared his intention of joining the crusade, and begged the papal benediction. A cardinal pronounced a confession of sins in the name of all who were to share in the expedition, and the pope bestowed his absolution on them. Adhemar was nominated as legate for the holy war; the pope, in answer to a request that he would head the Christian army, excused himself on the ground that the care of the church detained him; but he promised to follow as soon as circumstances should allow. It was believed that the resolution of the council was on the same day known throughout the world, among infidels as well as among Christians.

Urban remained in France until August of the year 1096, and held many councils at which he enforced the duty of joining the holy war. The bishops and clergy seconded his exhortations, and everywhere a ferment of preparation arose. Famines, pestilences, civil broils, portents in the heavens, had produced a general disposition to leave home and to engage in a career of adventure. Women urged their husbands, their brothers, and their sons to take the cross; and those who refused became marks for universal contempt. Men who on one day ridiculed the crusade as a chimera, were found on the next day disposing of their all in order to join it. Lands were sold or mortgaged, to raise the means of equipment for their owners; artisans and husbandmen sold their tools; the price of land and of all immoveable property fell, while horses, arms, and other requisites for the expedition became exorbitantly dear. A spirit of religious enthusiasm animated all ranks, and with it was combined a variety of other motives. The life of war and adventure in which the nations of the west found their delight was now consecrated as holy and religious; even the clergy might without scruple fight against the enemies of the faith. The fabulous splendours and wealth of the east were set before the imagination, already stimulated by the romantic legends of Charlemagne and his peers. There was full forgiveness of sins, commutation of all penances. God, according to the expression of a writer of the time, had instituted a new method for the cleansing of sins. Penitents, who had been shamed among their neighbours by being debarred from the use of arms, were now at liberty to resume them. For the peasant there was an opportunity to quit his depressed life, to bear arms, to forsake the service of his feudal lord, and to range himself under the banner of any leader whom he might choose. For the robber, the pirate, the outlaw, there was amnesty of his crimes, and restoration to society; for the debtor there was escape from his obligations; for the monk there was emancipation from the narrow bounds and from the monotonous duties of his cloister; for those who were unfit to share in the exploits of war, there was the assurance that death on this holy expedition would make them partakers in the glory and bliss of martyrs. The letter which Peter the Hermit professed to have received from heaven was not the only thing which claimed a supernatural character. Prophets were busy in preaching the crusade, and turned it to their own advantage. Many deceits were practised, nor did they always escape detection. It was common among the more zealous crusaders to impress the cross on their flesh; but some impostors professed to have received the mark by miracle. Among them was a monk who found himself unable to raise money for his outfit by other means, but who, by displaying the cross on his forehead and pretending that it had been stamped by an angel, succeeded in collecting large contributions. The fraud was detected in

the Holy Land; but his general conduct on the expedition had been so respectable that he afterwards obtained promotion, and eventually became archbishop of Caesarea.

The festival of the Assumption (August 15) had been fixed on for the commencement of the expedition; but long before that time the impatience of the multitude was unable to restrain itself Peter was urged to set out, and in the beginning of March he crossed the Rhine at Cologne, at the head of a motley host, of which the other leaders were a knight named Walter of Pacy, and his nephew Walter “the Pennyless”. A separation then took place; the military chiefs went on, with the more vigorous of their followers, and promised to wait for Peter and the rest at Constantinople. A second swarm followed under a priest named Gottschalk, and a third under another priest named Folkmar, with whom was joined count Emicho, a man notorious for his violent and lawless character. Each successive crowd was worse than that which had preceded it; among them were old and infirm men, children of both sexes, women of loose virtue—some of them in male attire; they were without order or discipline, most of them unprovided with armour or money, having no idea of the distance of Jerusalem, or of the difficulties to be encountered by the way. Emicho’s host was composed of the very refuse of the people, animated by the vilest fanaticism. It is said that their march was directed by the movements of a goose and a goat, which were supposed to be inspired. Their passage through the towns of the Moselle and the Rhine, the Maine and the Danube, was marked by the plunder and savage butchery of the Jewish inhabitants, who in other quarters also suffered from the fury excited among the multitude against all enemies of the Christian name. Bishops endeavoured to rescue the victims by admitting them to a temporary profession of Christianity; but some of the more zealous Jews shut themselves up in their houses, slew their children, and disappointed their persecutors by burning themselves with all their property.

No provision had been made for the subsistence of these vast hordes in the countries through which they were to pass. Their dissoluteness, disorder, and plundering habits raised the populations of Hungary and Bulgaria against them and the later swarms suffered for the misdeeds of those who had gone before. Gottschalk and his followers were destroyed in Hungary, after having been treacherously persuaded to lay down their arms. Others were turned back from the frontier of that country, or struggled home to tell the fate of their companions, who had perished in battles and sieges; while want and fatigue aided the sword of their enemies in its ravages. The elder Walter died at Philippopoli; but his nephew and Peter the Hermit struggled onwards, and reached Constantinople with numbers which, although greatly diminished, were still imposing and formidable.

The emperor Alexius was alarmed by the unexpected form in which the succour which he had requested presented itself; and the thefts and unruliness of the strangers disturbed the peace of his capital. It is said that he was impressed by the eloquence of Peter, and urged him to wait for the arrival of the other crusaders; but the hermit's followers were resolved to fight, and the emperor was glad to rid himself of them by conveying them across the Bosphorus. A great battle took place under the walls of Nicaea, the city which had been hallowed for Christians by the first general council, but which had become the capital of the Turkish kingdom. Walter the Pennyless, a brave soldier, who had energetically striven against the difficulties of his position, was slain, with most of his followers. Many were made prisoners, and some of them even submitted to apostatize. The Turks, after their victory, fell on the camp, where they slaughtered the unarmed and helpless multitude; and the bones of those who had fallen were gathered into a vast heap, which remained as a monument of their luckless enterprise. The scanty remains of the host were rescued by Alexius, at the request of Peter, who had returned to Constantinople in disgust at the disorderly character of his companions; they sold their arms to the emperor, and endeavoured to find their way back to their homes. It is reckoned that in these ill-conducted expeditions half a million of human beings had already

perished, without any other effect than that of adding to the confidence of the enemy, who dispersed the armour of the slain over the east in proof that the Franks were not to be dreaded.

In the meantime the more regular forces of the crusaders were preparing. Every country of the west, with the exception of Spain, where the Christians were engaged in their own continual holy war with the infidels, sent its contributions to swell the array. Germany, at enmity with the papacy, had not been visited by the preachers of the crusade, and, when the crowds of pilgrims began to stream through the country, the inhabitants mocked at them as crazy, in leaving certainties for wild adventure; but by degrees, and as the more disciplined troops appeared among them, the Germans too caught the contagion of enthusiasm. Visions in the sky—combats of airy warriors, and a beleaguered city—added to the excitement. It was said that Charlemagne had risen from his grave to be the leader, and preachers appeared who promised to conduct those who should follow them dry-shod through the sea.

Of the chiefs, the most eminent by character was Godfrey of Bouillon, son of Count Eustace of Boulogne, who had accompanied William of Normandy in the invasion of England, and descended from the Carolingian family through his mother, the saintly Ida, a sister of Godfrey the Hunchbacked. In his earlier years, Godfrey had been distinguished as a partisan of the emperor. It is said that at the Elster, where he carried the banner of the empire, he gave Rudolf of Swabia his death wound by driving the shaft into his breast, and that he was the first of Henry's army to mount the walls of Rome. His services had been rewarded by Henry with the marquisate of Antwerp after the death of his uncle Godfrey, and to this was added in 1089 the dukedom of Lower Lorraine, which had been forfeited by the emperor's rebel son Conrad. A fever which he had caught at Rome long disabled him for active exertion; but at the announcement of the crusade he revived, and—partly perhaps from a feeling of penitence for his former opposition to the pope—he vowed to join the enterprise, for which he raised the necessary funds by pledging his castle of Bouillon, in the Ardennes, to the bishop of Liège. Godfrey is described by the chroniclers as resembling a monk rather than a knight in the mildness of his ordinary demeanour, but as a lion in the battle-held—as wise in counsel, disinterested in purpose, generous, affable, and deeply religious. Among the other chiefs were his brothers Eustace and Baldwin; Hugh of Vermandois, brother of the king of France; the counts Raymond of Toulouse, Robert of Flanders, Stephen of Blois and Chartres; and Robert duke of Normandy, the brave, thoughtless, indolent son of William the Conqueror. Each leader was wholly independent of the others, and the want of an acknowledged head became the cause of many disasters.

In order that the passage of the army might not press too severely on any country, it was agreed that its several divisions should proceed to Constantinople by different routes. Godfrey, at the head of 10,000 horse and 80,000 foot, took the way through Hungary, where his prudence was successfully exerted in overcoming the exasperation raised by the irregular bands which had preceded him. The crusaders from Southern France in general went through Italy, and thence by sea either to the ports of Greece and Dalmatia, or direct to Constantinople. A large force of Normans, under Roger of Sicily and Bohemund, the son of Robert Guiscard by his first marriage, were engaged in the siege of Amalfi, when Hugh of Vermandois with his crusaders arrived in the neighbourhood. The enthusiasm of the strangers infected the besiegers, and Bohemund, who had been disinherited in favour of his half-brother, and had been obliged to content himself with the principality of Tarentum, resolved to turn the enterprise to his own advantage. He raised the cry of "God wills it!" and, sending for a mantle of great value, caused it to be cut up into crosses, which he distributed among the eager soldiers, by whose defection Roger found himself compelled to abandon the siege. The new leader was distinguished by deep subtlety and selfishness; but with him was a warrior of very opposite fame—his cousin or nephew Tancred, whose character has (perhaps not without some violence to facts) been idealized into the model of Christian chivalry.

The gradual appearance of the crusading forces at Constantinople renewed the uneasiness of Alexius, and the accession of Bohemund, who had been known to him of old in Guiscard's wars against the empire, was especially alarming. That the emperor treated his allies with a crafty, jealous, distrustful policy, is certain, even from the panegyric history of his daughter Anna Comnena; but the statements of the Latin chroniclers are greatly at variance with those of the Byzantine princess, and it would seem that there is no foundation for the darker charges of treachery which they advance against Alexius. Godfrey was obliged to resort to force in order to establish an understanding with him; and the emperor then took another method of proceeding. While obliged to entertain his unwelcome visitors during the remainder of the winter season, he plied the leaders with flattery and with gifts, and obtained from one after another of them to him such parts of their expected conquests as had formerly belonged to the empire; in return for which he promised to provide for their supply on the march, and to follow with an army for their support. He skilfully decoyed one party across the Bosphorus before the arrival of another; and by Whitsuntide 1097 the whole host had passed into Asia. They had been joined at Constantinople by Peter the Hermit, and were accompanied by an imperial commissioner, whose golden substitute for a nose excited the wonder and distrust of the Franks.

The Turks of Roum were now before them, and, on approaching the capital of the kingdom, their zeal and rage were excited by the sight of the hill of bones which marked the place where Walter and his companions had fallen. Nicaea was besieged from the 14th of May to the 20th of June, but on its capture the Latins were disappointed of their expected plunder by finding that the Turks, when it became untenable, had been induced by the imperial commissioner to make a secret agreement for surrendering it to Alexius. The discovery filled them with disgust and indignation, which were hardly mitigated by the presents which the emperor offered by way of compensation; and they eagerly looked for an opportunity of requiting their perfidious ally. A fortnight later was fought the battle of Dorylaeum, in which the fortune of the day is said to have been turned by heavenly champions, who descended to aid the Christians. The victory was so decisive that the sultan of Roum was driven to seek support among the brethren of his race and religion in the east.

The army had already suffered severely, and, as it advanced through Asia Minor, it was continually thinned by skirmishes and sieges, by the difficulties of the way, and by scarcity of food and water. The greater part of the horses perished, and their riders endeavoured to supply their place by cows and oxen—nay, it is said, by the large dogs and rams of the country. Godfrey was for a time disabled by wounds received in an encounter with a savage bear. Disunion appeared among the leaders, and some of them began to show a preference of their private interests to the great object of the expedition. Baldwin, disregarding the remonstrances of his companions, accepted an invitation to assist a Christian prince or tyrant of Edessa, who adopted him and promised to make him his heir. The prince's subjects rose against him, and, in endeavouring to escape by an outlet in the wall of the city, he was pierced with arrows before reaching the ground, whereupon Baldwin established himself in his stead. But the great mass of the crusaders held on their march for Jerusalem.

At length they arrived in Syria, and on the 18th of October laid siege to Antioch. The miseries endured during this siege, which lasted eight months, were frightful. The tents of the crusaders were demolished by the winds, or were rotted by the heavy rains, which converted their encampment into a swamp; their provisions had been thoughtlessly wasted in the beginning of the siege, and they were soon brought to the extremity of distress; the flesh of horses, camels, dogs, and mice, grass and thistles, leather and bark, were greedily devoured; and disease added its ravages to famine. Parties which were sent out to forage were unable to find any supplies, and returned with their numbers diminished by the attacks of the enemy. The horses were reduced from 70,000 to less than 1000, and even these were mostly unfit for service. Gallant knights lost their courage and deserted; among them was Stephen of Blois,

who, under pretence of sickness, withdrew to Alexandretta, with the intention of providing for his own safety if the enterprise of his comrades should miscarry. The golden-nosed Greek commissioner, looking on the ruin of the crusaders as certain, obtained leave to depart by promising to return with reinforcements and supplies, but was careful not to reappear. Peter the Hermit, unable to bear the privations of the siege, and perhaps the reproaches of the multitude, ran away, with William, count of Melun, who, from the heaviness of his blows, was styled "the Carpenter"; but the fugitives were brought back by order of Bohemund, who made them swear to remain with the army. Yet in the midst of these sufferings the camp of the crusaders was a scene of gross licentiousness, until the legate Adhemar compelled them to remove all women from it, to give up gaming, and to seek deliverance from their distress by penitential exercises. As the spring advanced, the condition of the army improved; supplies of provisions were obtained from Edessa, and from Genoese ships which had arrived in the harbour of St. Symeon; most of the deserters returned; and on the 2nd of June, through the treachery of one Firuz, who had opened a negotiation with Bohemund, and professed to embrace Christianity, the crusaders got possession of the city, although the fortress still remained in the hands of the enemy.

The capture of Antioch was marked by barbarous and shameful excesses. All who refused to become Christians were ruthlessly put to the sword. The crusaders, unwarned by their former distress, recklessly wasted their provisions, and when, soon after, an overwhelming force of Turks appeared, under Kerboga, prince of Mosul, who had been sent by the sultan of Bagdad to the relief of Antioch, they found themselves shut up between these new enemies and the garrison of the fortress. Their sufferings soon became more intense than ever. The most loathsome food was sold at exorbitant prices; old hides, thongs, and shoe-leather were steeped in water, and were greedily devoured; even human flesh was eaten. Warriors were reduced to creep feebly about the silent streets, supporting themselves on staves. The cravings of famine levelled all ranks; nobles sold their horses and arms to buy food, begged without shame, or intruded themselves unbidden at the meals of meaner men; while some, in despair and indifference to life, withdrew to hide themselves and to die. Many deserted,—William the Carpenter being especially noted among them for the violation of his late oath; and while some of these were cut off by the enemy, others surrendered themselves and apostatized. Rumours of the distress which prevailed, even exaggerated (if exaggeration were possible), reached Stephen of Blois in his retreat; regarding the condition of his brethren as hopeless, he set out on his return to the west, and, on meeting Alexius, who was advancing with reinforcements, he gave such a representation of the case as furnished the emperor with a pretext for turning back, and leaving his allies to a fate which seemed inevitable.

In the extremity of this misery, Peter Bartholomes, a disreputable priest of Marseilles, announced a revelation which he professed to have thrice received in visions from St. Andrew—that the lance which pierced the Redeemer's side was to be found in the church of St. Peter. The legate made light of the story; but Raymond of Toulouse, to whose force Peter was attached, insisted on a search, and, after thirteen men had dug a whole day, the head of a lance was found. The crusaders passed at once from despair to enthusiasm. Peter the Hermit was sent to Kerboga, with a message desiring him to withdraw; but the infidel scornfully replied by vowing that the invaders should be compelled to embrace the faith of Islam, and the Christians resolved to fight. After a solemn preparation by prayer, fasting, and administration of the holy Eucharist, all that could be mustered of effective soldiers made a sally from the city, with the sacred lance borne by the legate's chaplain, the chronicler Raymond of Agiles. The Saracens, divided among themselves by fierce dissensions, fled before the unexpected attack, leaving behind them an immense mass of spoil; and again the victory of the Christians was ascribed to the aid of celestial warriors, who are said to have issued from the neighbouring mountains in countless numbers, riding on white horses, and armed in dazzling white. The fortress was soon after surrendered into their hands; but the unburied corpses

which poisoned the air produced a violent pestilence, and among its earliest victims was the pious and martial legate Adhemar. Fatal as this visitation was to those who had been enfeebled by the labours and privations of the siege, it was yet more so to a force of 1500 Germans, who arrived by sea soon after its appearance, and were cut off almost to a man. Godfrey, fearing a return of the malady which he had caught at Rome, sought safety from the plague by withdrawing for a time into the territory of his brother, Baldwin of Edessa.

A report of the capture of Antioch and of the legate's death was sent off to Urban, with a request that he would come in person to take possession of St. Peter's eastern see, and would follow up the victory over the unbelievers by reducing the schismatical Christians of the east to the communion of the Roman church. In the meantime the Greek patriarch was reinstated, although he soon found himself compelled to give way to a Latin; and, after much discussion between the chiefs who asserted and those who denied that the conduct of Alexius had released them from their promise to him, Bohemund, in fulfilment of a promise which he had exacted as the condition of his obtaining the surrender of the city, was established as prince of Antioch.

Although the discovery of the holy lance had been the means of leading the crusaders to victory, the imposture was to cost its author dear. The Normans, when offended by his patron Raymond of Toulouse in the advance to Jerusalem, ridiculed the idea of St. Andrew's having chosen such a man for the medium of a revelation, and declared that the lance, which was clearly of Saracen manufacture, had been hidden by Peter himself. Peter offered, in proof of his veracity, to undergo the ordeal of passing between two burning piles, and the trial took place on Good Friday 1099. He was severely scorched; but the multitude, who supposed him to have come out unhurt, crowded round him, threw him down in their excitement, and, in tearing his clothes into relics, pulled off pieces of his flesh with them. In consequence of this treatment he died on the twelfth day; but to the last he maintained the credit of his story, and it continued to find many believers.

The ravages of the plague, and the necessity of recruiting their strength after the sufferings which they had undergone, detained the crusaders at Antioch until March of the following year. Three hundred thousand, it is said, had reached Antioch, but famine and disease, desertion and the sword, had reduced their force to little more than 40,000, of whom only 20,000 foot and 1500 horse were fit for service and on the march to Jerusalem their numbers were further thinned in sieges and in encounters with the enemy, so that at last there remained only 12,000 effective foot-soldiers, and from 1200 to 1300 horsed. Aided by the terror of the crusade, the Fatimite Arabs had succeeded in recovering Jerusalem from the Turks; and before Antioch the Christian leaders had received from the caliph an announcement of his conquest, with an offer to rebuild their churches and to protect their religion, if they would come to him as peaceful pilgrims. But they disdained to admit any distinction among the followers of the false prophet, and replied that, with God's help, they must win and hold the land which He had bestowed on their fathers. On the 6th of June, after a night during which their eagerness would hardly allow them to rest, they arrived in sight of the holy city. A cry of "Jerusalem! Jerusalem! It is the will of God!" burst forth, while with many the excess of joy could only find vent in tears and sighs. All threw themselves on their knees, and kissed the sacred ground. But for the necessity of guarding against attack, they would have continued their pilgrimage with bare feet; and they surveyed with eager credulity the traditional scenes of the Gospel story, which were pointed out by a hermit of Mount Olivet. The Christians who had been expelled from the city, and had since been miserably huddled together in the surrounding villages, crowded to them with tales of cruelty and profanation, which raised their excitement still higher. Trusting in their enthusiasm, and expecting miraculous aid, they at once assaulted the walls; but they were unprovided with the necessary engines, and met with a disastrous repulse.

During the siege of forty days which followed, although those who could afford to buy were well supplied with food and wine, the crusaders in general suffered severely from hunger, and yet more from the fierce thirst produced by the heats of midsummer, and from the burning south wind of that parched country. The brooks were dried; the cisterns had been destroyed or poisoned, and the wells had been choked up by the enemy; water was brought in skins from a distance by peasants, and was sold at extravagant prices, but such was its impurity that many died of drinking it; the horses and mules were led six miles to water, exposed to the assaults of the Arabs; many of them died, and the camp was infected by the stench of their unburied bodies. The want of wood was a serious difficulty for the besiegers. In order to remedy this, the buildings of the neighbourhood were pulled down, and their timber was employed in constructing engines of war; but the supply was insufficient, until Tancred (according to his biographer) accidentally found in a cave some long beams which had been used as scaling-ladders by the Arabs in the late siege, and two hundred men under his command brought trees from a forest in the hills near Nablous. All—nobles and common soldiers alike—now laboured at the construction of machines, while the defenders of the city were engaged in similar works, with better materials and implements. But the Christians received an unexpected aid by means of a Genoese fleet which opportunely arrived at Joppa. The sailors, finding themselves threatened by an overwhelming naval force from Egypt, forsook their ships and joined the besiegers of Jerusalem, bringing to them an ample supply of tools, and superior skill in the use of them. At length the works were completed, and the crusaders, in obedience, it is said, to a vision of the legate Adhemar, prepared by solemn religious exercises for the attack of the city. After having moved in slow procession around the walls, they ascended the Mount of Olives, where addresses were delivered by Peter the Hermit and Arnulf, a chaplain of Robert of Normandy. The princes composed their feuds, and all confessed their sins and implored a blessing on their enterprise, while the Saracens from the walls looked on with amazement, and endeavoured to provoke them by setting up crosses, which they treated with every sort of execration and contempt. On the 14th of July a second assault was made. The besiegers, old and young, able-bodied and infirm, women as well as men, rushed with enthusiasm to the work. The towering structures, which had been so laboriously built, on being advanced to the walls, were opposed by the machines of the enemy; beams and long grappling-hooks were thrust forth to overthrow them; showers of arrows, huge stones, burning pitch and oil, Greek fire, were poured on the besiegers; but their courage did not quail, their engines stood firm, and the hides with which these were covered resisted all attempts to ignite them. The fight was kept up for twelve hours, and at night the Christians retired. Next day the contest was renewed, with even increased fury. As a last means of disabling the great engine which was the chief object of their dread, the Saracens brought forward two sorceresses, who assailed it with spells and curses; but a stone from the machine crushed them, and their bodies fell down from the ramparts, amid the acclamations of the besiegers. In the end, however, the crusaders were repulsed, and were on the point of yielding to despair, when Godfrey saw on the Mount of Olives a warrior waving his resplendent shield as a signal for another effort. Adhemar and others of their dead companions are also said to have appeared in front of the assailants, and after a fierce struggle they became masters of the holy city—the form of the legate being the first to mount the breach. It was noted that the capture took place at the hour of three on the afternoon of a Friday—the day and the hour of the Saviour's passion.

The victory was followed by scenes of rapine, lust, and carnage, disgraceful to the Christian name. The crusaders, inflamed to madness by the thought of the wrongs inflicted on their brethren, by the remembrance of their own fearful sufferings, and by the obstinate resistance of the besieged, spared neither old man, woman, nor infant. They forced their way into houses, slew the inhabitants, and seized all the treasures that they could discover. Seventy thousand Mahometans were massacred; many who had received a promise of life from the

leaders were pitilessly slaughtered by the soldiery. The thoroughfares were choked up with corpses; the temple and Solomon's porch, where some of the Saracens had made a desperate defence, were filled with blood to the height of a horse's knee; and, in the general rage against the enemies of Christ, the Jews were burnt in their synagogue. Godfrey, who in the assault had distinguished himself by prodigious acts of valour, took no part in these atrocities, but, immediately after the victory, repaired in the dress of a pilgrim to the church of the Holy Sepulchre, to pour out his thanks for having been permitted to reach the sacred city. Many followed his example, relinquishing their savage work for tears of penitence and joy, and loading the altars with their spoil; but, by a revulsion of feeling natural to a state of high excitement, they soon returned to the work of butchery, and for three days Jerusalem ran with blood. When weary of slaying, the crusaders employed the surviving Saracens in clearing the city of the dead bodies and burning them without the walls; and, having spared them until this labour was performed, they either killed them or sold them as slaves.

Eight days after the taking of the city, the victors met for the election of a king. The names of various chiefs—among them, Robert of Normandy—were proposed, and, as the surest means of ascertaining their real characters, their attendants were questioned as to their private habits. Against Godfrey nothing was discovered, except that his devotion was such as sometimes to detain him at the accustomed hours of food—a charge which the electors regarded as implying not a fault but a virtue. The duke of Lorraine, therefore, was chosen king of Jerusalem; but he refused to wear a crown of gold where the King of kings had been crowned with thorns, and contented himself with the style of “Defender and Baron of the Holy Sepulchre”.

Godfrey had hardly been chosen when he was again summoned to arms by the appearance of a more numerous force of Saracens from Egypt, which had arrived too late to succour the garrison of Jerusalem.

The crusaders were victorious in the battle of Askelon; and, having thus secured the footing of their brethren in the Holy Land, the great body of them returned to Europe, after having bathed in the Jordan, carrying with them palm-branches from Jericho, and relics of holy personages who, for the most part, had before been unheard of in the west. Among those who returned was Peter the Hermit, who spent the remainder of his days in a monastery of his own foundation at Huy, near Liège, until his death in 1115. The new kingdom was at first confined to the cities of Jerusalem and Joppa, with a small surrounding territory, but was gradually extended to the ancient boundaries of Palestine. The French language was established; and, Godfrey, with the assistance of the most skilful advisers whom he could find, laid the foundation of a code of laws, derived from those of the west, and afterwards famous under the name of the “Assizes of Jerusalem”. After having held his dignity for little more than a year, Godfrey died amidst universal regret, and by his recommendation his brother, Baldwin of Edessa, was chosen to succeed him as king; for the scruple which the hero of the crusade had felt as to this title was now regarded as unnecessary. Crusaders and pilgrims continued to flock towards the Holy Land, excited less by the triumphs of their brethren than by sympathy for their sufferings; and in these expeditions many perished through the difficulties and dangers of the way.

The patriarch of Jerusalem, who had been sent out of the city by the Arabs before the siege, had since died in Cyprus. As at Antioch, a Latin patriarch was established; and the Greek Christians, who found themselves persecuted as schismatics, were reduced to regret the days when they had lived under the government of the infidels. Nor were the Latins free from serious dissensions among themselves. Arnulf, who has been already mentioned as having shared in animating the crusaders to the final assault, a man of ability, but turbulent, ambitious, and grossly immoral, had contrived to get himself hastily elected to the patriarchate on the taking of Jerusalem, and had endeavoured to prevent the appointment of any secular head for the community. He was set aside in favour of Daimbert, archbishop of Pisa, who

arrived from Rome with a commission as legate in succession to Adhemar, and is said to have obtained the support of the chiefs by means of wealth which he had acquired on a mission in Spain; but Daimbert was no less bent on establishing the supremacy of the hierarchy. Not content with persuading Godfrey and Bohemund to take investiture at his hands, he advanced claims of territory for the church which would have left the new royalty almost destitute; and Godfrey was glad, in the difficulties of his situation, to make a provisional compromise with the patriarch's demands. The troubles thus begun continued to divide the kings and the patriarchs of Jerusalem, while the patriarchate itself was the subject of intrigues which led more than once to the deposition of its possessors. The patriarch also had to contend with his brother of Antioch for precedence and jurisdiction; and his authority was boldly defied by the great military orders which soon after arose.

The diminished kingdom of Roum, of which Iconium became the capital, was now isolated between the Latins of Syria and the Byzantine empire. But although the crusaders had saved the empire of Alexius, his relations with them were of no friendly kind. They taxed him with perfidy, with deserting them in their troubles, with secretly stirring up the infidels against them. They held themselves released by his conduct from the feudal obligations which they had contracted to him; Bohemund, who, after a captivity in the east, had revisited Europe, and had married a daughter of Philip of France, even for a time alarmed the empire by a renewal of his father's projects against it. Instead of effecting, as had been expected, a reconciliation between the eastern and the western churches, the crusade had the effect of embittering their hostility beyond the hope of cure.

In endeavouring to estimate the crusades—the Trojan war of modern history (as they have been truly styled)—we must not limit our consideration to their immediate purpose, to the means by which this was sought, or to the degree in which it was attained. They have often been condemned as undertaken for a chimerical object; as an unjust aggression on the possessors of the Holy Land; as having occasioned a lavish waste of life and treasure; as having inflicted great hardships on society by the transference of property, the impoverishment of families, and the heavy exactions for which they became the pretext; as having produced grievous misrule and disorder by drawing away prelates, nobles, and at length even sovereigns, from their duties of government at home to engage in the war with the infidels. Much of this censure, however, seems to be unfounded. The charge of injustice is a refinement which it is even now difficult to understand, and which would not have occurred to either the assailants or the assailed in an age when the feeling of local religion (however little countenanced by the new Testament) was as strong in the Christian as in the Jew or the Moslem—when the Christians regarded the holy places of the east as an inheritance of which they had been wrongfully despoiled, and which they could not without disgrace, or even sin, leave in the hands of the unbelievers. But in truth the crusades were rather defensive than aggressive. They were occasioned by the advance of the new tribes which with the religion of Mahomet had taken up that spirit of conquest which had cooled and died away among the older Mahometan nations. They transferred to the east that war in defence of the faith which for ages had been carried on in Spain. And while this was enough to justify the undertaking of the crusades, they led to results which were altogether unforeseen, but which far more than outweighed the temporary evils produced by these expeditions.

The idea of a war for the recovery of the land endeared to Christians by the holiest associations was of itself a gain for the martial nations of the west—raising, as it did, their thoughts from the petty quarrels in which they had too generally wasted themselves, to unite their efforts in a hallowed and ennobling cause. It was by the crusades that the nations of Europe were first made known to each other as bound together by one common interest. Feudal relations were cast aside; every knight was at liberty to follow the banner of the leader whom he might prefer; instead of being confined to one small and narrow circle, the crusaders were brought into intercourse with men of various nations, and the consequences tended to

mutual refinement. And, while the intercourse of nations was important, the communication into which persons of different classes were brought by the crusades was no less so; the high and the low, the lord and the vassal or common soldier, the fighting man and the merchant, learned to understand and to value each other better. The chivalrous spirit, of which France had hitherto been the home, now spread among the warriors of other countries, and the object of the crusades infused into chivalry a new religious character. Nor was chivalry without its effect on religion, although this influence was of a more questionable kind. In the cause of the cross, the canons against clerical warriors were suspended and the devotion which knights owed to their ladies tended to exalt the devotion of the middle ages to her who was regarded as the highest type of glorified womanhood. The Christians of the west were brought by the crusades into contact with the civilization of the Arabs, new to them in its character, and on the whole higher than their own. After the first blind fury of their enmity had passed away, they learned to respect in their adversaries the likeness of the virtues which were regarded as adorning the character of a Christian knight; and they were ready to adopt from them whatever of knowledge or of refinement the Orientals might be able to impart. Literature and science benefited by the intercourse which was thus established. Navigation was improved; ships of increased size were built for the transport of the armaments destined for the holy wars. Venice, Genoa, Pisa, and Marseilles were enriched by the commerce of the east; the gems, the silks, the spices, and the medicines of Asia became familiarly known in Europe; new branches of industry were introduced; and the inland trading cities gained a new importance and prosperity by aiding to distribute the commodities and luxuries which they received through the agency of the great seaports.

The political effects of the crusades on the kingdoms of western Europe were very important. They tended to increase the power of sovereigns by lessening the number of fiefs. As many of the holders of these were obliged to sell them, in order to find the means of equipment for the holy war, the feudal power became lodged in a less number of hands than before, and kings were able to make themselves masters of much that had until then been independent of their authority. At the same time the class of citizens was rising in importance and dignity. As the wealth of towns was increased by commerce, they purchased or otherwise acquired privileges, and became emancipated from their lay or ecclesiastical lords. It was the interest of kings to favour them, as a counterpoise to the power of the nobles; and thus, more especially in France, the strength of the crown and the liberty of the trading class advanced in alliance with each other. And, although slowly and gradually, the crusades contributed towards the elevation of the peasantry, and the abolition of slavery in western Europe.

To the clergy the transfer of property occasioned by the crusades was very advantageous. Sees or monasteries could not permanently suffer by the zeal of crusading bishops or abbots, inasmuch as the incumbents could not dispose of more than a life-interest in their property. And, while they were thus secured against loss, the hierarchy had the opportunity of gaining immense profit by purchasing the lay estates which were thrown into the market at a depreciated value, while in such purchases they were almost without rivalry, as the Jews, the only other class which possessed the command of a large capital, were not buyers or cultivators of land.

But the popes were the chief gainers by the crusades. By means of these enterprises they acquired a control over western Christendom which they might otherwise have sought in vain. They held in their own hands the direction of movements which engaged all Europe; and their power was still further increased, when, in the second crusade, sovereign princes had shown the example of taking the cross. The spirit of the time then emboldened the popes to propose that emperors and kings should embark in a crusade; to refuse would have been disgraceful; and when the promise had been made, the pope was entitled to require the fulfilment of it whenever he might think fit. Nor would any plea of inconvenience serve as an excuse; for what was the interest of a prince or of his dominions to the general concern of

Christendom? In the east, the popes extended their sway by the establishment of the Latin church, while they claimed the suzerainty of the territories wrested from the infidels. And while in the west the holy war afforded them a continual pretext for sending legates to interfere in every country, they also gained by means of it a large addition to their wealth. The contributions which had at first been a free offering towards the cause became a permanent tribute, which was exacted especially from the monks and clergy; and when this took the form of a certain proportion of the revenues, the popes were thus authorized to investigate and to control the amount and the disposal of the whole property which belonged to ecclesiastical or monastic foundations.

Urban felt the addition of strength which he had gained by the crusade. He compelled Conrad to renounce the power of investiture, which the prince had ventured to exercise at Milan; and in a council held at Bari, in 1098, with a view to a reconciliation with the Greeks, he would have excommunicated the king of England for his behaviour to the primate Anselm, had not Anselm himself entreated him to refrain. But to his surest allies, the Normans of the south, the pope was careful to give no offence. Roger, grand count of Sicily, had now firmly established himself in that island, and, while he allowed toleration to the Mahometan inhabitants, had restored the profession of Christianity, founded bishoprics, and built many churches and monasteries. In 1098 the grand count was offended by finding that the pope, without consulting him, had appointed the bishop of Trani legate for Sicily; and, in consequence of his remonstrances at a council at Salerno, a remarkable arrangement was made, which, from the circumstance that it lodged the ecclesiastical power in the same hands with the civil, is known as the “Sicilian Monarchy”. By this the pope invests Roger and his successors with the character of perpetual legates of the apostolic see; all papal mandates are to be executed through their agency, and they are to have the right of selecting such bishops and abbots as they may think fit to attend the papal councils. In explanation of a grant so unlike the usual policy of Rome, it has been conjectured that the pope, being aware that the Normans would be guilty of many irregularities in the administration of the church, yet being resolved not to quarrel with such valuable auxiliaries, devolved his authority on the prince with a view to rid himself of personal responsibility for the toleration of these irregularities.

In 1099, the antipope and his adherents were finally driven out from Rome, where they had until then kept possession of some churches; and Urban became master of the whole city. But on the 29th of July in that year he died—a fortnight after the taking of Jerusalem, but before he could receive the tidings of the triumph which had crowned his enterprise. The cardinals, assembled in the church of St. Clement, chose as his successor the cardinal of that church, Rainier, a Tuscan by birth, who had been a monk at Cluny, and, having been sent to Rome at the age of twenty, on the business of his monastery, had obtained the patronage of Gregory, by whom he was employed in important affairs and promoted to the dignity of cardinal. Rainier on his election assumed the name of Paschal II.

In the following year, Guibert or Clement III, the rival of four successive popes, died at Castelli. That he was a man of great abilities and acquirements, and was possessed of many noble qualities, is admitted by such of his opponents as are not wholly blinded by the enmity of party and his power of securing a warm attachment to his person is proved by the fact that in the decline of his fortunes, and even to the last, he was not deserted. His grave at Ravenna was said to be distinguished by miracles, until Paschal ordered his remains to be dug up and cast into unconsecrated ground. Three antipopes—Theoderic, Albert, and Maginulf, the last of whom took the name of Sylvester IV—were set up in succession by Guibert’s party; but they failed to gain any considerable strength, and Paschal held undisturbed possession of his see. Philip of France, after having been excommunicated at Clermont, had succeeded, through the intercession of Ivo of Chartres, in obtaining absolution, which was pronounced by the pope in a council at Nimes, on condition of his forswearing further intercourse with Bertrada. This promise, however, was soon violated, and in 1097 the king was again excommunicated by the

legate, Hugh of Lyons. The pope, greatly to his legate's annoyance, was prevailed on to grant a second absolution in the following year; but in 1100 the adulterous pair incurred a fresh excommunication at Poitiers. Four years later, on the king's humble request, supported by the representations of Ivo and other bishops, who had met in a council at Beaugency, Paschal authorized his legate, Lambert bishop of Arras, to absolve them on condition that they should never thenceforth see each other except in the presence of unsuspected witnesses. At a synod at Paris in 1105, the king appeared as a barefooted penitent, and both he and Bertrada were absolved on swearing to the prescribed conditions yet it appears that they afterwards lived together without any further remonstrance on the part of the pope. Philip on his death-bed, in 1108, expressed a feeling that he was unworthy to share the royal sepulchre at St. Denys, and desired that he might be buried at Fleury, in the hope that St. Benedict, the patron of the monastery, would intercede for the pardon of his sins.

The marriage of Matilda with the younger Welf had been a matter of policy, not of affection. The countess, finding her political strength increase, treated her young husband with coldness and Welf was disgusted by discovering that the rich inheritance, which had been a chief inducement to the connexion, had already been made over in remainder to the church. A separation took place. Welf, as the only possible means of annulling the donation, invoked the emperor's aid, and his father, the duke of Bavaria, hitherto Henry's most formidable opponent in Germany, now joined him with all his influence. On returning to his native country, after a sojourn of nearly seven years in Italy, Henry met with a general welcome. He devoted himself to the government of Germany, and for some years the stormy agitation of his life was exchanged for tranquil prosperity. His conciliatory policy won over many of his old opponents, whose enmity died away as intercourse with him revealed to them his real character; and at a great diet at Cologne, in 1098, he obtained an acknowledgment of his second son, Henry, as his successor, in the room of the rebel Conrad, while, with a jealousy suggested by sad experience, he exacted from the prince an oath that he would not during his father's lifetime attempt to gain political power. The emperor's ecclesiastical prerogative was acknowledged; although his excommunication was unrepealed, even bishops of the papal party communicated with him and were fain to take investiture at his hands. The Jews, who had suffered from the fury of the crusading multitudes, were taken under his special protection, and from that time were regarded as immediately dependent on the crown.

The death of the antipope Clement, and the substitution of Paschal for Urban, appeared to open a prospect of reconciliation with Rome; and circumstances were rendered still more favourable by the removal of Conrad, who died in 1101, neglected by those who had made him their tool, but who no longer needed him. Henry announced an intention of crossing the Alps, and submitting his differences with Rome to the judgment of a council. But—whether from unwillingness to revisit a country which had been so disastrous to him, from a fear to leave Germany exposed, and in compliance with the dissuasions of his bishops, or from an apprehension that the pope, elated by the success of the crusade, would ask exorbitant terms of reconciliation—he failed to make his appearance; and Paschal, at a synod in March 1102, renewed his excommunication, adding an anathema against all heresies, and especially that which disturbs the present state of the church by despising ecclesiastical censures. Yet the emperor's clergy still adhered to him; among them, the pious Otho of Bamberg, afterwards famous as the apostle of Pomerania, who acted as his secretary and assisted him in his devotions.

Henry spent the Christmas of 1102 at Mayence, where he declared a resolution of abdicating in favour of his son, and setting out for the holy war, as soon as he should be reconciled with the pope. At the same time he proclaimed peace to the empire for four years,—that no one should during that time injure his neighbour, whether in person or in property; and he compelled the princes to swear to it. The decree was obeyed, and Germany by degrees recovered from the wounds inflicted by its long distractions. The peaceable

classes—the merchant and trader, the husbandman and the artisan—carried on their occupations unmolested; the highways were safe for travellers, and the traffic of the rivers was unimpeded by the little tyrants whose castles frowned along the banks. But the discords of Germany were only laid to sleep for a time. Intrigue was busy among the clergy, with whom the principles of Gregory had made way in proportion as their utility for the interests of the class became more apparent. Many bishops were won over from Henry's party, and were ready to countenance a new movement against him. And a renewal of civil war was sure to be welcome to the nobles and their armed retainers, who fretted against the forced inaction which was so opposite to the habits of their former lives, while many of them, being no longer at liberty to resort to violence and plunder, found themselves reduced from splendour to poverty.

The younger Henry was now tampered with. The young nobles, with whom the emperor had studiously encouraged him to associate, were prompted to insinuate to him that he was improperly kept under—that if he should wait until his father's death, the empire would probably then be seized by another; and that the oath exacted of him by his father was not binding. These suggestions were too successful. In December 1104, as the emperor was on an expedition against a refractory Saxon count, his son deserted him at Fritzlar, and to all his overtures and entreaties made no other answer than that he could hold no intercourse with an excommunicate person, and that his oath to such a person was null and void. There is no evidence to show that the pope had been concerned in suggesting this defection; but the prince immediately asked his counsel, and was absolved from his share in the emperor's excommunication by the legate, Gebhard of Zahringen, bishop of Constance. On declaring himself against his father, the young Henry at once found himself at the head of a powerful party, among the most conspicuous members of which was Ruthard, archbishop of Mayence, who had been charged with misdemeanours as to the property of the Jews slain by the crusaders, and had found it expedient to abscond when the emperor proposed an inquiry into his conducts. For a year Germany was disquieted by the muster, the movements, and the contests of hostile armies. The prince, however, professed that he had no wish to reign—that his only motive in rebelling was to bring about his father's conversion; and, with consistent hypocrisy, he refused to assume the ensigns of royalty.

On the 21st of December 1105, an interview between the father and the son took place at Coblenz. The emperor's fondness burst forth without restraint; he threw himself at the feet of his son, and confessed himself guilty of many offences against God, but adjured the prince not to stain his own name by taking it on himself to punish his father's misdeeds. The behaviour of the young Henry was marked throughout by the deepest perfidy. He professed to return his father's love, and proposed that they should dismiss their followers with the exception of a few knights on each side, and should spend the Christmas season together at Mayence. To this the emperor consented, and in his interviews with his son, as they proceeded up the bank of the Rhine, he poured forth all the warmth of his affection for him, while the prince professed to return his feelings, and repeatedly gave him the most solemn assurances of safety. But at Bingen Henry found himself made prisoner, and he was shut up in the castle of Bockelheim on the Nahe, under the custody of his enemy Gebhard of Urach, bishop of Spire, who had lately been promoted to that see by the rebel king. The emperor was rudely treated and ill fed; his beard was unshorn; he was denied the use of a bath; at Christmas the holy Eucharist was refused to him, nor was he allowed the ministrations of a confessor; and he was assailed with threats of personal violence, of death or lifelong captivity, until he was persuaded to surrender the ensigns of his power—the cross and the lance, the crown, the sceptre, and the globe—into the hands of the rebel's partisans. He entreated that an opportunity of defending his conduct before the princes of Germany might be granted him; but, although a great diet was about to meet at Mayence, he was not allowed to appear before it—under the pretext that his excommunication made him unfit, but in reality because it was feared that his appearance might move the members to compassion, while the citizens of

Mayence, like the inhabitants of most other German cities, were known to be still firmly attached to him. On the 31st of December he was removed to Ingelheim, where he was brought before an assembly composed exclusively of his enemies. Worn out by threats and ill usage, he professed himself desirous to resign his power, and to withdraw into the quiet which his age rendered suitable for him. The papal legate and the fallen emperor's own son alone remained unmoved by his humiliation. In answer to his passionate entreaties for absolution, the legate told him that he must acknowledge himself guilty of having unjustly persecuted Gregory. Henry earnestly desired that a day might be allowed him to justify his conduct before the princes of the empire, but it was answered that he must at once submit, under pain of imprisonment for life. He asked whether by unreserved submission he might hope to obtain absolution; but the legate replied that absolution could only be granted by the pope himself. The emperor, whose spirit was entirely broken, so that he was ready to catch at any hope, however vague, and to comply with any terms, promised to satisfy the church in all points; it is even said that he solicited, for the sake of a maintenance, to be admitted as a canon of Spire, a cathedral founded by his grandfather and finished by himself, and that the bishop harshly refused his request. On the festival of the Epiphany, the younger Henry was crowned at Mayence by archbishop Ruthard, who at the ceremony warned him that, if he should fail in his duties as a sovereign, his father's fate would overtake him. The violence of his ecclesiastical abettors was shown by disinterring the bones of deceased imperialist bishops.

But serious outbreaks in favour of the dethroned emperor took place in Alsatia and elsewhere; and after a time, alarmed by rumours that his death or perpetual captivity was intended, he contrived to make his escape by the river to Cologne. At Aix-la-Chapelle he was met by Otbert, bishop of Liège, to whose affectionate pen we are chiefly indebted for the knowledge of his latest fortunes, and under the bishop's escort he proceeded to Liège. The clergy of that city had steadily adhered to him, and when Paschal desired count Robert of Flanders to punish them for their fidelity, one of their number, the annalist Sigebert of Gemblours, sent forth a powerful letter in defence of their conduct, and in reproof of the papal assumptions. From his place of refuge Henry addressed letters to the kings of France, England, and Denmark, in which he denounced the new claims of Rome as an aggression on the common rights of all princes, and pathetically related the story of his sufferings from the enmity of the papal party and from the treachery of his own son whom they had misled. He again offered to abide an examination of his conduct by the princes of Germany, and he requested his godfather, the venerable abbot of Cluny, to mediate with the pope. Other cities joined with Liège in declaring for him; he was urged to retract his forced resignation, and he once more found himself in a condition to contest the possession of the kingdom. The younger Henry was repulsed from Cologne, and the hostile armies were advancing towards each other, when the emperor's faithful chamberlain appeared in the king's camp, and delivered to him his father's ring and sword. Henry IV had died at Liège, on the anniversary of his defeat at Melrichstadt, the 7th of August 1106, in the fifty-sixth year of his age, and the fiftieth of his reign—desiring on his death-bed that these relics might be carried to his successor, with a request (which proved fruitless) that his partisans might be forgiven for their adherence to him.

In surveying the long and troubled reign of this prince, it seems impossible to acquit the hierarchy of grievous wrongs towards him. His early impressions of the clergy were not likely to be favourable—derived as they must have been from the remembrance of his abduction by Hanno, and from the sight of that prelate's sternness, ambition, pride, and nepotism, of Adalbert's vanity and worldliness, and of the gross simony, misrule, rapacity, and corruption which disgraced the German church. Under his self-appointed ecclesiastical guardians, his education was neglected, and he was encouraged in licence and riot. The warnings of Gregory, however sound in their substance, were not conveyed in a manner which could be expected to influence him for good, since they were accompanied by new claims

against the royal and imperial power. Gregory took advantage of his weakness; he surrounded him with a net of intrigues; he used against him the disaffection of his subjects, which had been in great part provoked by the encroachments of some ecclesiastics and was swollen by the industrious enmity of others; he humbled him to the dust and trampled on him. The claims of the papacy, whether just or unjust, were novel; it was the pope that invaded the emperor's traditional power, while Henry asserted only the prerogatives which his predecessors had exercised without question. "It was his fate", says William of Malmesbury, "that whosoever took up arms against him regarded himself as a champion of religion". By the hierarchy his troubles were fomented, and atrocious calumnies were devised against him; it was under pretence of religion that his sons, one after the other, rebelled, and that that son on whom he had lavished his tenderness, to whom he was even willing to transfer all his power, forced from him a premature resignation by the most hateful treachery and violence. Yet Henry, among all the faults which are imputed to him, is not taxed by his very enemies with any profanity or irreligion; his contests were not even with the papacy itself but with its occupants, and with the new pretensions by which they assailed his crown.

The conduct of Henry as a ruler must be viewed with allowance for the unfortunate training and circumstances of his youth. The faults of other men were visited on him; the demands of his subjects were frequently unreasonable, and were urged in an offensive style; and if his breach of engagements was often and too justly charged against him, it may be palliated by the consideration that the opposition to him was animated by a power which claimed authority to release from all oaths and obligations. Adversity drew forth the display of talents and of virtues which had not before been suspected; from the time of his humiliation at Canossa, he appeared to have awakened to a new understanding of his difficulties and of his duties, and exhibited a vigour, a firmness of purpose, and a fertility of resource, of which his earlier life had given little indication. His clemency and placability were so remarkable as even to extort the acknowledgments of hostile writers. The troubles of his last days were excited, not by misgovernment, but by his having governed too well.

To the needy and to the oppressed classes Henry was endeared by his warm sympathy for them, by his support of them against the tyranny of the nobles, by the charity not only of bountiful almsgiving, but of personal kindness in administering to their reliefs. The poor, the widows, the orphans crowded around his bier, pouring forth their tears and prayers, kissing the hands which had distributed his gifts, and commemorating his kind and gentle deeds. The loyal Otbert buried his master with the rites of the church, but was soon after compelled, as a condition of receiving absolution, to disinter the body, which was then carried to Spires, where Henry himself had desired to be buried in the cathedral which owed its completion to his bounty. But this was not to be permitted; the cathedral, in consequence of having been polluted by the corpse, was interdicted by bishop Gebhard; and for five years the remains of the excommunicated emperor were kept in the unconsecrated chapel of St. Afra, where, like the relics of a saint, they were visited by multitudes who affectionately cherished his memory.

CHAPTER V.

ENGLAND FROM THE NORMAN CONQUEST TO THE DEATH OF ST.
ANSELM.
A.D. 1066-1108.

THE successful expedition of William of Normandy produced important changes in the English church. At his coronation, which was performed by Aldred, archbishop of York, William, as heir of Edward the confessor, swore to administer equal justice to all his subjects but the necessity of providing for his followers soon led him to disregard this pledge, while a pretext was afforded by the obstinate resistance which he met with in completing the subjugation of the country, and by the frequent insurrections of the Saxons. Much property of churches and monasteries was confiscated, together with the treasures which the wealthier English had deposited in the monasteries for security. During the reign of Edward, the Norman influence had for a time prevailed in England; many Normans had been advanced to high ecclesiastical stations, and the system of alien priories—*i.e.* of annexing priories and estates in England to foreign religious houses—had been largely practised. But under the ascendancy of Earl Godwin, Robert of Jumièges, the Norman archbishop of Canterbury, had been obliged to leave the kingdom, and the primacy had been conferred on Stigand, bishop of Winchester, who, after having unsuccessfully applied for the pall to Leo IX, received it from the antipope John of Velletri, and held his see in defiance of Alexander II. Stigand, according to some writers, refused to officiate at the coronation of the Conqueror, while others state that William refused his services; in any case, he was obnoxious as a Saxon. William for a time affected to treat him with great honour; but at a council held at Winchester under two papal legates in 1070, he was charged with having intruded into the seat of a living bishop; with having irregularly held at once the sees of Winchester and Canterbury; with the want of a properly-conferred pall, and with having used for a time that of his ejected predecessor. These pretexts served for the deprivation of the archbishop, which was followed by that of other native prelates, so that, with a jingle exception, the English sees were soon in the hands of Normans, who either had been appointed under Edward or were now promoted by the Conqueror. The system of preferring foreigners was gradually extended to the abbacies and lower dignities, and for a long series of years it was hopeless for any Englishman, whatever his merit might be, to aspire to any considerable station in the church of his own land. One Norman only, Guitmund, the opponent of Berengar, is recorded as having ventured to refuse an English bishopric, and to protest against a system so adverse to the interests of the church and of the people.

The later Anglo-Saxon clergy are very unfavourably represented to us by writers after the conquest. It is said that they were scarcely able to stammer out the forms of Divine service—that any one who knew “grammar” was regarded by his brethren as a prodigy; and religion as well as learning had fallen into decay. But, although the increase of intercourse with other countries eventually led to an improvement in the English church, it seems questionable whether the immediate effect of the change introduced by the conquest was beneficial. The new prelates were in general chosen for other than ecclesiastical merits; they could not edify their flocks, whose language they would have scorned to understand : the Anglo-Saxon literature, the richest by far that any Teutonic nation as yet possessed, fell into oblivion and contempt; the traditions of older English piety were lost; and there was no love

or mutual confidence to win for the new hierarchy the influence which the native pastors had been able to exert for the enforcement of religion on their people

But while the dignities of the church were commonly bestowed on illiterate warriors or on court-chaplains, the primacy was to be otherwise disposed of Lanfranc had been sentenced by William to banishment from Normandy for opposing his marriage with Matilda, as being within the forbidden degrees; but, as he was on his way to leave the country, an accidental meeting with the duke led to a friendly understanding, so that Lanfranc was employed to obtain the pope's sanction for the union, and a removal of the interdict under which William's territories had been laid. His success in this commission recommended him to the duke's favour; he was transferred from Bec to the headship of St. Stephen's at Caen, the noble abbey which William was required to found in penance for the irregularity of his marriage, and, after having already refused the archbishopric of Rouen, he was now urged to accept that of Canterbury. It was not without much reluctance that he resolved to undertake so onerous a dignity among a people of barbarous and unknown language; and the difficulties which he experienced and foresaw in the execution of his office speedily induced him to solicit permission from Alexander II to return to his monastery; but the pope refused to consent, and Lanfranc thereupon requested that the pall might be sent to him. The answer came from the archdeacon Hildebrand—that, if the pall could be granted to any one without his personal appearance at Rome, it would be granted to Lanfranc; but that the journey was indispensable. On his arrival at Rome, the archbishop was treated with extraordinary honour. The pope, who had formerly been his pupil at Bec, rose up to bestow on him two palls, as a mark of signal consideration—a compliment of which it is said that there has never been another instance—and invested him with the authority of legate. A question as to precedence was raised by Thomas, archbishop of York, who had accompanied Lanfranc to Rome and contended that, by the terms of Gregory's instructions to Augustine, the primacy of England ought to alternate between Canterbury and the northern see, for which he also claimed jurisdiction over Worcester, Lichfield, and Lincoln. The pope declined to give judgment, and remitted the questions to England, where, after discussions in the king's presence at Winchester and at Windsor, they were decided in favour of Lanfranc on the ground of ancient custom. The archbishop of York was required to promise submission to Canterbury, and, with his suffragans, to attend councils at such places as the archbishop of Canterbury should appoint.

Lanfranc exerted himself to reform the disorders of the English church (which it is very possible that, as a man trained in entirely different circumstances, he may have somewhat overrated), and in his labours for this purpose he was effectually supported by the king, who bestowed on him his full confidence, and usually entrusted him with the regency during his own absence on the continent. The primate used his influence to obtain the promotion of deserving men to bishoprics. Many churches which had fallen into ruin were rebuilt—among them the primate's own cathedral. Sees which had been established in villages or small towns were removed to places of greater importance; thus the bishopric of Selsey was transferred to Chichester, that of Sherborne to Sarum, Elmham to Thetford, Dorchester (in Oxfordshire) to Lincoln, Lichfield to Chester—a change agreeable to the ancient system of the church, but perhaps suggested by the policy of William, who, by thus placing the bishops in fortified cities, secured their assistance in preserving the subjection of the people. Lanfranc—"the venerable father and comfort of monks", as he is styled by the Anglo-Saxon chronicler—was zealous for celibacy and monasticism. The effects of Dunstan's labours had passed away, and the English clergy had again become accustomed to marry freely; but the Italian primate renewed the endeavour to substitute monks for secular canons in cathedrals, and serious struggles arose in consequence. Nor was the enforcement of celibacy on the clergy complete; for, although a council at Winchester in 1076 enacted that no canon should have a wife, and that for the future no married man should be ordained priest or deacon, the rural clergy were,

in contradiction to the regulations which Gregory VII was labouring to enforce elsewhere, allowed by the council to retain their wives. William was greatly indebted to Rome. His expedition had been sanctioned by a consecrated banner, the gift of Alexander II, and he had found the papal support valuable in carrying out his plans as to the English church. But he was determined to make use of Rome—not to acknowledge her as a mistress. He held firmly in his own grasp the government of the church. By retraining from the sale of preferment—however he may have been guilty of simony in that wider definition which includes the bestowal of benefices for service or by favour—he earned the commendation of Gregory but he promoted bishops and abbots by his own will, invested them by the feudal forms, and took it upon himself to exempt the abbey which was founded in memory of his victory near Hastings from all episcopal and monastic jurisdiction. No pope was to be acknowledged in England, except by the king's permission; nor, although William allowed legates to hold synods in furtherance of his own views, was anything to be treated or enacted at these meetings without his previous sanction. The bishops were forbidden to obey citations to Rome; they were forbidden to receive letters from the pope without showing them to the king; nor were any of his nobles or servants to be excommunicated without his licence. The bishop was no longer to sit in the same court with the sheriff but his jurisdiction was confined to spiritual matters. The tenure of frank-almoign (or free alms), under which the bishops had formerly held their lands, was exchanged for the feudal tenure by barony; and the estates of the clergy became subject to the same obligations as other lands.

In his ecclesiastical policy William was willingly seconded by the primate. Lanfranc was indeed no devoted adherent of Gregory, with whom he was probably dissatisfied on account of the indulgence which the pope had shown to his antagonist Berengar. In a letter to a partisan of the antipope, he professes neutrality as to the great contest of the time, and even shows an inclination towards the imperial side. After censuring the unseemly language which his correspondent had applied to Gregory, he adds—"Yet I believe that the emperor has not undertaken so great an enterprise without much reason, nor has he been able to achieve so great a victory without much aid from God". And, while he advises Guibert's agent not to come to England, it is on the ground that the king's leave ought first to be obtained—that England has not rejected Gregory, or given a public adhesion to either pope, and that there is room for hearing both parties before coming to a decision. If such was the archbishop's feeling as to the controversy between the pope and the emperor, he could hardly fail to be wholly with his own sovereign in any questions between England and Rome.

Gregory, in his letters to William and to Lanfranc, spoke of the king with profuse expressions of the deepest respect, as incomparably superior to all other princes of the age; and, when obliged to censure any of his acts, he was careful to season the censure with compliments to the king's character, with remembrances of their old mutual regard, and of the services which he had rendered to William in former days. But these blandishments were thrown away on a sovereign whose policy was as decided, and whose will was as strong, as those of Gregory himself. When, in 1079, the pope required William to see to the payment of Peter-pence from England, and to swear fealty to the apostolic see, the reply was cool and peremptory—"Your legate has admonished me in your name to do fealty to you and your successors, and to take better order as to the money which my predecessors have been accustomed to send to the Roman church; the one I have admitted; the other I have not admitted. I refused to do fealty, nor will I do it, because neither have I promised it, nor do I find that my predecessors have performed it to yours". The payment was to be made, not as a tribute, but as alms. On receiving this answer, the pope declared that money without obedience was worthless, and at the same time he complained of the king's conduct in other respects; that, by a presumption which no one even among heathen princes had ventured on, he prevented the prelates of his kingdom from visiting the apostle's city; that he had promoted to the see of Rouen the son of a priest—an appointment to which Gregory was resolved never

to consent. His legate was charged to threaten William with the wrath of St. Peter unless he should repent, and to cite certain representatives of the English and Norman bishops to a synod at Rome. No heed was paid to this citation; but the pope submitted to the slight; and it is certain that, but for the voluntary retirement of William's nominee, Guitmund, the ally of Lanfranc in the Eucharistic controversy, the objection in the case of Rouen would have been withdrawn. Equally unsuccessful were the pope's attempts on Lanfranc. Again and again invitations, becoming by degrees more urgent, required the archbishop to appear at Rome, where he had not been since Gregory's election. After a time the pope expresses a belief that he is influenced by fear of the king, but tells him that neither fear, nor love, nor the difficulties of the journey, ought to detain him. Lanfranc, in his answer, showed no disposition to comply; and he alluded, with an indifference which must have been very annoying, to the failure of the pope's claim to fealty. At length Gregory summoned the archbishop to set out for Rome within four months after receiving his citation, and to appear there on a certain day, under pain of deposition, but the citation was as vain as those before it, and the threat was never followed up.

Gregory again found himself obliged to remonstrate in the case of William's half-brother, Odo, bishop of Bayeux. Odo, deluded (it is said) by the arts of soothsayers, who assured him that a person of his name was to be pope, sent large sums of money to Rome for the purpose of securing himself an interest there, and enlisted a considerable force with which he intended to make his way to Italy. But William, on discovering the project, arrested and imprisoned him; and, in answer to an objection as to the bishop's spiritual character, declared that he had proceeded against him, not as bishop, but as earl of Kent. Gregory expostulated with the king, insisting on the immunities of the clergy, with the pretended saying of St. Ambrose, that royalty is less comparable to the episcopal dignity than lead to gold, and quoting the text—"He that toucheth you, toucheth the apple of Mine eye"; but Odo remained in prison until his brother, when dying, reluctantly ordered his release; and here, as in the other cases, conduct which would have drawn down the most awful thunders of Rome on the head of a weaker prince, was allowed to pass unpunished in the stern, able, powerful, and resolute master of England and Normandy.

In 1087 the Conqueror was succeeded by William Rufus. For a time the new king was kept within some degree of restraint by the influence of Lanfranc, who had been his tutor; but on the archbishop's death, in 1089, his evil dispositions were altogether uncontrolled. William, according to an ancient writer, "feared God but little, and men not at all". His character was utterly profane; his coarse and reckless wit was directed not only against the superstitions of the age, or against the clergy, whom he despised and hated, but against religion itself. The shameless debaucheries in which he indulged gave an example which his subjects were not slow to imitate. The rapacity by which he endeavoured to supply his profuse expenditure fell with especial weight on the property of the church. In former times the revenues of a vacant abbey had been committed to the bishop, and those of a vacant bishopric to the archbishop, under whose superintendence they were applied to religious or charitable uses; under the Conqueror, they were administered by a clerk, who was accountable for his stewardship to the next incumbent. But William's chosen adviser, a Norman ecclesiastic of low birth, named Ralph Passeflaber or Flambard, devised the idea that, as bishoprics and abbacies were fiefs of the crown, the profits of them during vacancy belonged to the sovereign. Under this pretext William kept bishoprics long vacant; while the diocese was left without a pastor, he extorted all that was possible from the tenants of the see, by means alike oppressive to them and injurious to the future bishop and the most unblushing simony was practised in the disposal of ecclesiastical preferments.

After the death of Lanfranc, the primacy remained vacant for nearly four years. In answer to entreaties that he would nominate a successor, William swore, as he was wont, "by the holy face of Lucca", that he would as yet have no archbishop but himself; and when public

prayers were offered up for the direction of his choice, he said that the church might ask what it pleased, but that he was resolved to take his own way. A severe illness, which followed soon after, was regarded as a judgment of heaven, and the king was earnestly urged to show his penitence by filling up the primacy, and by redressing the grievances of his government. He consented, promised amendment, and made choice of Anselm as archbishop.

Anselm was born of an honourable family at Aosta, in 1033 or the following year. His boyhood was devout, but was succeeded by a somewhat irregular youth, more especially after the death of his pious and gentle mother, to whom he had been deeply attached. The harshness with which his father treated him produced a resolution to leave his home; he crossed the Alps, and, after having, like Lanfranc, resided for some time at Avranches, he became, at the age of twenty-seven, a monk at Bec, where the founder, Herluin, was still abbot, while Lanfranc was prior and master of the school. On the removal of Lanfranc to Caen in 1063, Anselm succeeded him in his offices, and at the death of Herluin, in 1078, he was elected to the abbacy. With each dignity which he attained, his anxious feeling of responsibility increased, and he would have returned to the condition of a simple monk, but for the authority of Mauritius, archbishop of Rouen. His fame speedily even surpassed that of Lanfranc, and his name was widely spread by treatises on philosophical, theological, and grammatical subjects. Pupils flocked to his instructions; questions were addressed to him from all quarters, and his friend and biographer, Edmer, tells us that his answers were received as oracles from heaven. Since the time of St. Augustine, the church had produced no teacher of equal eminence with Anselm, or so powerful in his influence on later ages. He has been described as the founder of natural theology; but if this title is to be applied to him, the term must be understood as signifying a theology which aimed at bringing the aid of philosophical thought to the support of the most rigid orthodoxy of the church. Whereas John Scotus had made philosophy his foundation, and had endeavoured to reduce religion into accordance with it, the method of Anselm was exactly the opposite; its character is expressed in the title originally given to his 'Proslogion'—'Faith in search of Understanding'. The object of that work is to prove the existence and attributes of the Deity by a single argument. Edmer relates that, when the idea of such a proof had entered into Anselm's mind, he was unable to eat, drink, or sleep; it disturbed him at his devotions, and, although he endeavoured to resist it as a temptation of the devil, he could not rest until, in the watches of the night, a light broke in on him a—"God is that than which nothing greater can be conceived; and he who well understands this will understand that the Divine Being exists in such a manner that His non-existence cannot even be conceived". A monk named Gaunilo wrote a short tract in reply, objecting that the conception of a thing does not imply its existence, and exemplifying this by the fabulous island of Atlantis to which Anselm rejoined that the illustration was inapplicable to the question, since existence is a part of the perfections which are conceived of as belonging to the Deity.

The character of Anselm was amiable, gentle and modest. Simple and even severe, in his own habits, he was indulgent to others, and the confidence which he placed in those below him, with his indifference to the vulgar interests of the world, was often abused. Edmer draws a very pleasing picture of his familiar intercourse, and relates many stories which illustrate his wisdom, his kindly temper, his mild, yet keen and subtle humour, e In one of these stories, an abbot "who was accounted very religious" applies in despair for advice as to the treatment of the pupils in his monastery; he had flogged them indefatigably both by day and by night, but, instead of amending, they only grew worse. Anselm by degrees leads him to understand that so brutal a discipline could only be expected to brutalize its objects, and the abbot returns home to practise a gentler and a wiser system. But as the exercise of Anselm's philosophical genius was subordinated to the strictest orthodoxy, so with his calm and peaceful nature he combined the most unbending resolution in the cause of the hierarchical system. To this he seems to have adhered, not from any feeling of interest or passion, or even of strong personal

conviction, but because it was sanctioned by the church, while the scandalous abuses perpetrated by such sovereigns as William Rufus tended to blind him to the existence of dangers on the other side; and his assertion of it was marked by nothing of violence or assumption, but by an immoveable tenacity and perseverance.

Anselm was already known and honoured in England, which he had visited for the purpose of superintending the English estates of his abbey. He had been acquainted with the Conqueror, who, in conversing with him, laid aside his wonted sternness; and he had been the guest of Lanfranc, who had profited by his advice to deal tenderly with the peculiarities and prejudices of the people committed to his care. It was with great reluctance that, during the vacancy of the archbishopric, he yielded to the repeated invitations of Hugh Lupus, earl of Chester, who desired to see him in a sickness which was supposed to be mortal: for he knew that popular opinion had designated him as the successor of his old master; he was unwilling to exchange his monastery, with its quiet opportunities of study and thought, and his position of influence as a teacher, for the pomp and troubled dignity of the English primacy; and, honouring royalty, disliking contention, but firmly resolved to maintain the cause of the church, he shrank from the connexion with such a prince as William—a connexion which he compared to the yoking a young untamed bull with an old and feeble sheep. He therefore endeavoured, with a sincerity which cannot reasonably be questioned, to decline the offer; but he was carried into the sick king's chamber at Gloucester, the crosier was forced into his hands, and notwithstanding his struggles he was hurried away to a neighbouring church, where the people received him with acclamations as archbishop, and the clergy sang *Te Deum* for the election. He did not, however, consider himself at liberty to accept the primacy until he had been released from his obligations to his monks, to the archbishop of Rouen, and to his sovereign, duke Robert of Normandy.

The king recovered, and relapsed into courses even worse than before. The works of amendment which he had begun were undone, and when Gundulf, bishop of Rochester, ventured gently to remind him of his late promises, he disavowed the obligation in a speech of outrageous profanity. Anselm waited on him at Dover, and stated the terms on which only he would consent to be archbishop—that he should be allowed to enjoy all the rights of his see which Lanfranc had possessed, with such portions of its alienated property as he might be able to recover; that William should pay him the same regard in spiritual matters which the king claimed from the archbishop in temporal things; and that no offence should arise as to his acknowledgment of pope Urban, who had not yet been recognized in England. The answer was, that he should have all which Lanfranc had had, but that the other points must remain undecided for the present. The archbishop was invested in September 1093, but his consecration did not take place until the 4th of December. At this ceremony the archbishop of York, who took the chief part in it, objected to the title of "metropolitan of all England" on the ground that it implied a denial of the metropolitan dignity of his own Bec. The objection was allowed, and the title of primate was substituted.

The first entrance of Anselm into his city had been disturbed by the appearance of Flambard, who in the king's name instituted against him a suit of which the subject is not recorded and other events soon occurred to justify the apprehensions with which he had undertaken his office. William was busy in raising subsidies for an intended expedition into Normandy, and the archbishop, after his consecration, was advised by his friends to send him a contribution of five hundred pounds, in the hope that it might render the king favourable to the church. William was at first pleased with the gift, but some of his advisers persuaded him that it was too little—that the archbishop, in consideration of his promotion, ought to have given twice or four times as much. Anselm replied that he could not raise more without distressing his tenants; that it should not be his last gift; that a little freely given was better than a larger sum extorted: and, as William persevered in refusing the money, he bestowed it on the poor for the benefit of the king's soul, comforting himself with the thought that he

could not be charged with even the appearance of simony. The king was deeply offended. He evaded the fulfilment of his promise as to the restoration of the archbishop's estates. He refused him leave to hold a council for the suppression of disorders among the clergy and monks, and for the general reformation of morals; and when Anselm urged the necessity of filling up the vacant abbacies, he asked, "What is that to you?—are not the abbeys mine?". "They are yours" replied the primate, "to defend and protect as advocate, but they are not yours to invade and to devastate". The knowledge of the royal disfavour naturally raised up or encouraged a host of lesser enemies, who industriously persecuted Anselm by their encroachments on his property and by other annoyances. The bishops advised him to propitiate William by a new offering of five hundred pounds; but he declared that he would not oppress his exhausted tenants, and that such a proceeding would be alike unworthy of the king and of himself.

Notwithstanding all discouragements, the archbishop set vigorously about the work of reform. In the beginning of Lent, when the court was at Hastings, he refused to give the customary ashes and benediction to the young nobles who affected an effeminate style of dress and manners—wearing long hair, which they curled and adorned like women. It is not to be supposed that he regarded for their own sake these follies, or the fashionable shoes in which the invention of Fulk of Anjou had been developed by one of William's courtiers, who twisted their long points into the likeness of a ram's horn. But he dreaded the tendency of such fashions to extinguish a high and active spirit, and he denounced them from a knowledge that they were connected with habits of luxury and gaming, and with the unnatural vices which had become rife in England since the conquest.

Since the death of Gregory VII neither of the rival popes had been acknowledged in England. The king had come to regard it as a special prerogative of his crown, distinguishing him from other sovereigns, that within his dominions no pope should be recognized except by his permission; and this opinion had been encouraged by courtly prelates. The right of Urban had, however, been admitted in Normandy, and Anselm, as we have seen, had stipulated that he should be allowed to adhere to the profession which, as abbot of Bec, he had made to that pontiff. He now, on William's return from the Norman expedition, requested leave to go to Rome, and to receive his pall from the pope. "From which pope?" asked the king; and, on Anselm's replying "From Urban", he angrily declared that neither his father nor himself had ever allowed any one to be styled pope in England without their special warrant; as well might the archbishop attempt to deprive him of his crown. .

Anselm on this desired that the question whether his duty to the pope were inconsistent with his duty to the king might be discussed at a council; and an assembly of bishops and nobles met for the purpose at Rockingham, in March 1095.

The archbishop took his stand on the principle that God ought to be obeyed rather than man. Two only of his own order, the bishops of Rochester and Chichester, supported him. William of St. Calais, bishop of Durham, and Herbert of Norwich, who from his character was styled the Flatterer, were vehement in their opposition; while the rest, accustomed as they had been to the Conqueror's ecclesiastical supremacy, and perplexed by the discord between powers which had until then acted in concert, behaved with timidity and indecision. The king maintained that it was an invasion of his rights for a subject to look to any other authority, even in spiritual things. The bishops advised the archbishop to make full submission; but, when William asked them to disown him, they answered that they could not venture on such a step against the primate, not only of England, but of Scotland, Ireland, and the adjacent islands. Anselm, who throughout retained his composure, and at one time even fell asleep while the bishops had withdrawn for a consultation, professed his readiness to answer for his conduct in the proper place; and his enemies were alarmed at the words, which they rightly understood to imply that, as metropolitan, he was amenable to the pope's jurisdiction only. The bishop of Durham, after having in vain attempted to influence Anselm, told the king that,

as the archbishop had Scripture and the canons in his favour, the only way to deal with him was by force—that he should be stripped of the ensigns of his dignity, and should be banished from the realm. On being again asked by William whether they renounced the archbishop, some of the prelates replied that they did so absolutely; others, that they renounced him in so far as he pretended to act by Urban's authority. The king was indignant at the qualified answer, and those who had made it were afterwards obliged to pay heavily for the recovery of his favour. The nobles behaved with greater spirit than the bishops, declaring that, although they had not taken any oath to the primate, they could not disown him, especially as he had committed no offence; while the people, who surrounded the place of meeting, were zealous in his cause, and loudly exclaimed against his cowardly brethren as Judases, Pilates, and Herods. At length it was resolved that there should be a truce until the octave of Whitsunday. Anselm was ordered in the meantime to confine himself to his diocese; but the truce was broken on the king's side by the pillage of the archbishop's estates, by attacks on his train, and by the banishment of some of his confidential friends.

William took advantage of the interval to send two ecclesiastics to Rome, with instructions to inquire into the claims of the rival popes, to make terms with the claimant whom they should find to be legitimate, and to obtain from him a pall for the archbishop of Canterbury, without naming Anselm, for whom the king hoped by this means to substitute another. The decision of the envoys was in favour of Urban, from whom a pall was brought to England by Walter, bishop of Albano. The king agreed to acknowledge Urban; but when he asked the legate to depose Anselm, he was told that it was impossible. The archbishop was summoned to court, and was desired to receive the pall from William's own hands. He replied that it was not for any secular person to give the pall; and, as he persevered in his refusal, it was agreed that the pall should be laid by the legate on the high altar at Canterbury, and that the archbishop should take it thence, as from the hand of St. Peter.

Robert of Normandy was now about to set out for the crusade, and had agreed to pledge the duchy to his brother in consideration of a sum of money for the expenses of his expedition. In order to make up this payment, William had recourse to severe exactions. He seized the plate of monasteries; and when the monks remonstrated, he met them in his usual style by asking—“Have ye not shrines of gold and silver for dead men's bones?”. Anselm contributed liberally; but he was soon after required to answer in the king's court for having failed in the proper equipment of some soldiers whom he had supplied for an expedition against the Welsh. In this summons the archbishop saw a design to bring him under feudal subjection, and he knew that he could not look for justice, while the hopelessness of any satisfactory relations with such a prince as William became continually more and more evident. He therefore resolved to lay his case before the pope, and requested leave to go to Rome that he might represent the state of the English church. William met the application by telling him that he had no need to make such a journey, since he had done nothing to require absolution, and, as for advice, he was fitter to give it to the pope than the pope to him. The suit was thrice urged in vain. Anselm declared that he must obey God rather than man; and that, even if leave were refused, he must go to Rome. The bishops whom he requested to support him, told him that they revered his piety and heavenly conversation, but that it was too far above them; that, if he would descend to their level, they would gladly give him their assistance; but that otherwise they must decline to do anything inconsistent with their duty to the king. William required him either to renounce his design, and swear that he would never apply to St. Peter, or to quit the kingdom for ever, but Oct. 15, finally, at Winchester, yielded an ungracious consent. The archbishop offered to give him his blessing unless it were refused; and, on William's replying that he did not refuse it, they parted with a solemn benediction.

At Canterbury the archbishop took from the altar the staff and the dress of a pilgrim. When about to embark at Dover, he was subjected to the indignity of having his baggage publicly searched by William of Warelwast, one of the king's chaplains, in the vain hope of

finding treasures; and after his departure his archiepiscopal acts were annulled, the property of his see was confiscated, and his tenants were oppressed by the king's officers more mercilessly than ever.

Anselm had been forbidden to take his way through Normandy. The earlier part of his journey was a triumphant progress; the latter part was, from the fear of antipapalists and of robbers, performed in the garb of a simple monk, undistinguished by appearance from his companions, Baldwin and the biographer Edmer, precentor of Canterbury, whom in one of his epistles he describes as "the staff of his old age". On arriving at Rome, he was received with extraordinary distinction by Urban, who declared that he ought to be treated as an equal—as "pope and patriarch of another world"—and wrote to the king of England, desiring that the archiepiscopal property should be released from confiscation. After a stay of ten days in the city, Anselm withdrew to a monastery near Telese, in compliance with an invitation from the abbot, who was a Norman and had formerly been his pupil. In order that he might escape the extreme heat of summer, his host conveyed him to a retreat among the neighbouring hills; and here he finished a treatise which he had begun in England, on the purpose of the Saviour's incarnation—a treatise of which the doctrine has become a standard of orthodoxy even in communions where the obligation to Anselm is little suspected. In the opening of it, he states that the subject was engaging the attention not only of the learned, but of many uneducated Christians. He shows the necessity of a satisfaction for sin in order that man might become capable of that blessedness for which he was originally created; the impossibility that this satisfaction should be rendered except by God, while yet it must be made by man, from whom it was due; and the consequent necessity that the Mediator, who was to effect the reconciliation by his voluntary death, should at once be perfect God and perfect man.

Anselm in his retreat was regarded with veneration by all who saw him—even by the Saracens of the Apulian army. He thought of resigning his dignities, and of devoting himself to labour in this new sphere; but the pope rejected the proposal, and required him to attend a council which was to be held at Bari, before the body of St. Nicolas, with a view to the reconciliation of the Greek and Latin churches. At this assembly, when the question of procession of the Holy Ghost was proposed, Urban, after arguing from one of Anselm's treatises, desired the archbishop himself to stand forward, and pronounced a high eulogium on his character and sufferings. Anselm was ready to discuss the subject, but was requested to defer his argument until the following day, when he spoke with a clearness and an eloquence which won universal admiration. The pope then entered on the grievances of the English church; the council was unanimous for the excommunication of William; and, Urban, inspired by his success in the great movement of the crusade, was about to pronounce the sentence, when Anselm, throwing himself at his feet, entreated him to forbear, and gained fresh admiration by this display of mildness towards his oppressor.

The archbishop accompanied Urban to Rome, where he was treated with a reverence second only to the pope, while the people, impressed by his demeanour, spoke of him not as "the man" or "the archbishop", but as "the man". About Christmas envoys from England appeared—William of Warelwast being one. The pope told them that their master must restore everything to the archbishop on pain of excommunication; but in private interviews they were able, by means of large presents, to obtain a truce until Michaelmas. At the synod of the following Lent, the decrees against investitures and homage were renewed, and were received with general acclamation. Reginer, bishop of Lucca, introduced the subject of Anselm's wrongs in an indignant speech, to which he added emphasis by striking the floor with his pastoral staff; and it was with difficulty that the pope prevailed on him to desist, while Anselm, to whom the mention of his case was unexpected, took no part in the scene. It was, however, now evident to him that he could not expect any strenuous assistance from Urban, and he withdrew to Lyons, where for a year and a half he was entertained with the greatest

honour by archbishop Hugh. During this residence at Lyons he was informed of the pope's death, in July 1099, and of William's mysterious and awful end, in August 1100.

Henry I, at his coronation, promised to redress the grievances in the church and in the civil administration from which his subjects had suffered during the late reign. Flambard, who had succeeded William of St. Calais as bishop of Durham, was committed to the Tower. The king resolved to fill up the vacant bishoprics and abbeys; he urgently invited Anselm to return, and, on his arrival, apologized for having been crowned in the primate's absence. But a subject of difference soon arose.

The custom of investiture and homage, which were regarded as inseparable, was so firmly settled in England, that Anselm, notwithstanding his lofty ecclesiastical principles, had without scruple submitted to it at his elevation to the primacy. But when he was now required to repeat his engagements, in acknowledgment of the new sovereign, he answered that it was forbidden by the Roman council which he had lately attended. He declared that, although the objection to the ceremony was not his own, he held himself bound to maintain the council's decrees, and that, if the king would not admit them, he could not communicate with him or remain in England. He suggested, however, that Henry might ask the pope to dispense with the enforcement of them in his dominions. A truce until Easter was agreed on, and, soon after it had expired, the king received an answer to a letter which he had written to the pope. In this answer Paschal dwelt on the distinction between ecclesiastical and secular power, but without touching the question whether investiture and homage were really an invasion of the church's spiritual rights.

The king found it necessary to temporise. He feared the influence of his brother Robert, who had returned from the east, adding to the charm of his popular manners the fame of a brave warrior who had borne a conspicuous share in the delivery of the holy sepulchre from the infidels. Henry, therefore, could not afford to alienate the clergy, while he was unwilling to give up so important a part of his prerogative as that which was now assailed. The nobles in general were opposed to the ecclesiastical claim, and the bishops joined them in declaring that, rather than yield the national rights, they would expel the primate from the realm, and renounce their connexion with Rome. Gerard, archbishop of York, Herbert of Norwich, and Robert of Coventry, were sent to Rome on the part of the king; Baldwin and another monk on that of Anselm. The bishops were charged with a letter, in which Henry, while professing his desire to respect the pope as his predecessors had done, declared himself resolved to uphold the rights of his crown; if, he said, he were to abase himself by suffering them to be diminished, neither his nobles nor his people would endure it; and he desired Paschal to choose between a relaxation of the decrees and a loss of England from his obedience.

In answer to the solicitations of the bishops, the pope declared that, even to save his life, he would not recede from the decrees; he wrote to the king that his treatment of the church was as if an unnatural son should reduce his mother to bondage; and he addressed to Anselm a letter of commendation and encouragements. The bishops, however, who brought back the letter for Henry, professed to have been verbally assured by the pope that, if the king would in other respects discharge his duties well, he should not be troubled on the subject of investiture. The archbishop's envoys said that they had received no such communication: but the bishops rejoined that it had been made in secret; that the pope would not commit it to writing, lest it should come to the knowledge of other princes, who might thereupon claim a like allowance. A vehement dispute followed. Baldwin indignantly insisted that he and his companion ought to be believed, supported as they were by the pope's letters. It was replied that the word of an archbishop and two bishops ought to outweigh that of two monkings, who by their very profession were disqualified for bearing witness in secular courts; that it was far superior to sheepskins bescribbled with ink, and with a lump of lead appended to them: to which Baldwin rejoined that the question was not secular but spiritual. A fresh reference was

made to Rome, for the purpose of ascertaining the pope's real sentiments, and in the meantime Anselm agreed that he would not suspend communion with the king, or with those who were invested by him. But he refused to consecrate some clergy of the court who were nominated to bishoprics; and, although the archbishop of York was willing to take the chief part in the rite, two of the nominees declined to receive consecration on such terms

At Michaelmas 1102, a council was held at London, and, by Anselm's desire, it was attended by the nobles of the realm, in order to add force to its decisions. A number of abbots were deprived for simony or other irregularities; the obligation of celibacy was now for the first time extended to the parochial clergy of England; and the other canons bear sad evidence to the condition into which religion, discipline, and morality had sunk under the misgovernment of William Rufus. The enforcement of celibacy met with strong opposition, especially in the province of York, where many of the priests preferred the alternative of shutting their church-doors, and giving up the performance of all Divine service. The king and the archbishop received answers from the pope; but Henry refused to make known the contents of that which was addressed to him, and Anselm refrained for a time from opening the other, lest it should involve him in fresh difficulties. The king made an opportunity of visiting him at Canterbury, and proposed that the archbishop should himself go to Rome with a view of obtaining a relaxation of the decrees. Anselm replied that, although old and infirm, he was willing to undertake the journey, but that he would not do anything to the injury of the church, or to his own discredit; whereupon he was assured that he would only be expected to confirm the evidence of the king's own envoys as to the state of English affairs.

The archbishop set out, and, on arriving at Bec, opened the pope's letter, by which he found that Paschal solemnly disavowed the words imputed to him by Henry's late envoys, and placed the three prelates under censure until they should make satisfaction. After a journey in which honours everywhere waited on him, he reached Rome, where about the same time William of Warelwast arrived as representative of the king. At an audience of the pope, the envoy declared that his master would rather lose his crown than abandon the right of investiture. Paschal replied that he himself would die rather than yield up his claim; but, by way of conciliation, he confirmed in some other points the usages which had been introduced by William the Conqueror. Anselm soon discovered that his opponents were employing the pecuniary arguments which were generally successful at Rome; and, after having received the papal blessing, with a vague confirmation of the privileges of his see, he again withdrew to the hospitality of Hugh of Lyons, who, since his former visit, had performed the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. On the way he was overtaken by William of Warelwast, who travelled for some time in his company, and at parting told him that the king would gladly see him back, if the archbishop would do as his predecessors had done to the crown. Anselm considered this as forbidding his return, unless he would agree to terms which the late Roman canons had rendered impossible; and he wrote from Lyons to warn the king that on him must be the guilt of any mischiefs which might follow. Henry committed the property of the archbishopric to the care of two of Anselm's retainers, who, as would appear from a hint of Edmer, did not exercise their stewardship very faithfully. He repeatedly desired the primate to return, but without offering any mitigation of his conditions; while Anselm, in answer to letters from some of the clergy, who urged him to redress the disorders of the church, steadily declared that he could not return unless the king would make concessions. The archbishop attempted by frequent messages to urge the pope to a more decided course; but although he prevailed on Paschal to excommunicate the Norman counsellors who had maintained the principle of investiture, and the ecclesiastics who accepted it, no sentence was uttered against the king himself. At length Anselm resolved to take further steps on his own responsibility. In the spring of 1105, he visited Henry's sister, the countess of Blois, and told her that he was about to excommunicate the king. The countess was greatly alarmed by this information, as such a sentence might have dangerous effects at a time when Henry was at war with his brother

Robert, and when his subjects were discontented on account of its cost. She therefore earnestly endeavoured to mediate between the king and the archbishop, and succeeded in bringing them to a conference at the castle of L'Aigle in Normandy, on the eve of St. Mary Magdalen (July 21). But although at this meeting Henry professed himself willing to give up the revenues of Canterbury, the question of homage and investiture was still a bar to reconciliation; and again a reference to Rome was necessary.

Many of the English clergy had taken advantage of the primate's absence to defy the late canons as to celibacy, and Henry conceived the idea of turning their irregularities to profit by imposing a fine on them. As, however, the produce of this measure fell short of his expectations and of his necessities, he proceeded to levy a fine on every parish-church, holding the incumbents answerable for the payment. It was in vain that two hundred of the clergy, arrayed in their robes of ministration, waited on him with a petition for relief; and Anselm found himself obliged to address to the king a remonstrance against his usurpation of ecclesiastical discipline. The primate received fresh letters, detailing the increased confusion which prevailed among his flock, and earnestly entreating him to return. Gerard of York, and other prelates who had formerly been his opponents, now wrote to acknowledge their error, and declared themselves ready not only to follow but to go before him in the endeavour to heal the wounds of the church.

At length William of Warelwast and Baldwin, who had been sent to Rome as representatives of the king and of the archbishop respectively, returned with the proposal of a compromise—that the king should forego investiture, but that, until he should come to a better mind, bishops and abbots should be permitted to do homage, while those who had been invested by him were to be admitted to communion on such terms as the two envoys should agree on. These conditions were ratified at Bec on the 25th of August 1106, when the king promised to restore to Anselm the profits of the see during his absence, to abstain from the revenues of vacant bishoprics and abbeys, and to remit all fines to the clergy. The victory over Robert at Tenchebray, on the 28th of September, was regarded by many as a blessing on the peace which had been concluded with the church.

Anselm was received in England with enthusiasm. The queen, “Maud the Good”, who had always regarded him with the highest reverence and had corresponded with him in his exile, went before him from stage to stage, to direct the preparations for his entertainment. He soon after joined with the archbishop of York in consecrating five bishops, among whom were his old antagonist William of Warelwast and the two who had refused to be consecrated in the primate's absence.

A council was held at Westminster in 1107, when the king formally relinquished the privilege of investiture, and the archbishop promised to tolerate the ceremony of homage, notwithstanding the condemnation which Urban had pronounced against it. The king had conceded, and Anselm was congratulated by his correspondents as victorious; yet in truth Henry, by giving up an indifferent formality, was able to retain the old relations of the crown with the hierarchy, and even the nomination of bishops. At this council, and at one held in the following year, the canons against the marriage of ecclesiastics were renewed with great strictness; but the pope consented for a time that the sons of clergymen might be admitted to orders, on the remarkable ground that “almost the greater and the better part of the English clergy” were derived from this class.

During the short remainder of his life, Anselm enjoyed the friendship and respect of Henry. Notwithstanding his growing infirmity, he continued to write on theological and philosophical subjects; on his death-bed he expressed a wish that he might be permitted to live until he had solved a question as to the origin of the soul—because he feared that no other person would be able to give a right solution. After his death, which took place in April 1109, the primacy was allowed to remain vacant until 1114, when it was conferred on Ralph, bishop of Rochester, who had administered its affairs during the interval.

CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE DEATH OF THE EMPEROR HENRY IV TO THE CONCORDAT OF
WORMS.

A.D. 1106-1122.

So long as his father lived, Henry V had been unmeasured in his professions of obedience to the Roman see; and, now that the elder emperor was removed, the pope supposed that he might make sure of compliance with the claims which from the time of Gregory had been advanced on behalf of the church. In October 1106, Paschal held a council at Guastalla, which renewed the decrees against lay investiture; while, with a view to the restoration of peace, it was provided that such bishops and clergy of the imperialist party as had received ordination from schismatics, should, unless guilty of simony or usurpation, be suffered to retain their preferments. Before the opening of the council, envoys had arrived from Henry, requesting the papal confirmation of his title, and inviting the pope to spend the Christmas season with him at Augsburg. The message appeared to promise the fulfillment of all Paschal's wishes; but, as he proceeded towards Germany, some expressions reached him which suggested a suspicion as to Henry's designs, and induced him to turn aside into France, in the hope of engaging Philip and his son Lewis, who for some years had been associated in the kingdom, to take part with him against the German sovereign. He was, however, unable to obtain from the French princes anything beyond vague promises, and was to pay severely for the encouragement which he had given to Henry's rebellion against his father. The new king was bent on recovering all the authority which his crown had lost or risked in the contests of the preceding years, and for this purpose he was ready to employ all the resources of a character bold, crafty, persevering, and utterly unprincipled.

In April 1107, a conference was held at Châlons on the Marne between the pope and some ambassadors of Henry, headed by Bruno, archbishop of Treves, and Welf, duke of Bavaria. The king had now thrown off all disguise, investing bishops and compelling the prelates of Germany to consecrate them. The envoys, emboldened by Paschal's late concessions to Henry of England, demanded, with a confident air, that the right of investiture should be acknowledged, and, with the exception of the archbishop of Treves, are said to have behaved as if they intended rather to frighten the pope by clamour than to discuss the question—especially Welf, the nominal husband of Matilda, a large, burly, noisy man, who always appeared with a sword carried before him. The argument on the imperial side was left to archbishop Bruno, who eloquently and skillfully contended that from the time of Gregory the Great it had been customary that the vacancy of a bishopric should be notified to the sovereign, and that his leave to elect a successor should be obtained; after which the new bishop was to be chosen by the clergy and people, and invested by the sovereign with ring and staff. The bishop of Piacenza replied, on the part of the pope, that this reduced the church to the condition of a handmaid, and annulled the effect of the Redeemer's blood. At this speech the envoys gnashed their teeth and declared that they would waste no more words; that the question must be determined at Rome and with the sword. A few weeks later a council was held at Troyes, where the pope condemned simony and investitures, but Henry's representatives declared that their master would not be bound by the judgment of a synod assembled in a foreign kingdom.

It was not until 1110 that the internal troubles of Germany, and the wars in which he was engaged with his neighbours of Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary, allowed Henry to attempt the fulfillment of his threat. He then, after having concluded a treaty of marriage with the princess Matilda of England, crossed the Alps at the head of 30,000 cavalry, with a great number of infantry and other followers; and for the purposes of controversial warfare he was attended by a body of learned men, while a chaplain named David, a Scotsman by birth and afterwards bishop of Bangor, was charged with the task of writing the history of the expedition. The cities of Italy, which had shown an insubordinate spirit, submitted, with the exception of Novara and Arezzo, which paid dearly for their resistance. Even the countess Matilda did homage by proxy for the fiefs which she held under the crown, and promised to support the king against all men except the pope. Paschal, who in the two preceding years had sent forth fresh denunciations of investiture as a sacrilege, had engaged the Normans by a special promise to assist him; but, dispirited as they now were by the recent deaths of their leaders Roger of Apulia and Bohemund, they were altogether unable to cope with so overwhelming a force. They answered the pope's supplications with excuses, and were even afraid lest they should be driven out of their Italian conquests. From Arezzo Henry sent envoys to the pope, requiring him to bestow on him the imperial crown and to allow the right of investiture. In reply he received a startling proposal of a compromise— that, in consideration of his relinquishing investiture, the bishops and abbots should resign all the endowments and secular privileges which they had received from his predecessors since Charlemagne, and on which the royal claim was founded. The pope expressed an opinion that, as the corruptions of the clergy had chiefly arisen from the secular business in which these privileges had involved them, they would, if relieved of them, be able to perform their spiritual duties better; while he trusted for their maintenance to the tithes, with the oblations of the faithful, and such possessions as they had acquired from private bounty or by purchase. The sincerity of this offer, so prodigiously favourable to the king, has been questioned, but apparently without reason, although it is difficult to imagine how the pope could have expected to obtain the consent of those whose interests were chiefly concerned. Henry foresaw their opposition—more especially as the pope, instead of employing clerical commissioners, had entrusted the proposal to a layman, Peter, the son of a convert from Judaism named Leo; and at Sutri he accepted the terms on condition that the cession of the "royalties" should be ratified by the bishops and the church. The engagements were to be exchanged at the imperial coronation, which the pope was to perform at Rome.

Henry reached the city on the 12th of February 1111, and was received with great magnificence. In St. Peter's, as if to throw all the odium of the proposed arrangement on the pope, he declared that it was not his wish to deprive the clergy of anything which his predecessors had given them. On this the German and Lombard prelates broke out violently against Paschal, whom they charged with sacrificing their rights, while he had taken care to secure his own lordship not only over the patrimony of St. Peter, but over Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily. The nobles, alarmed at the prospect of losing the fiefs which they held under the church, were furious. Long conferences and delays took place. The king said that, as the pope could not fulfill his part of the compact, it must be given up, and required to be crowned at once. A German started forth and roughly told the pope that there was no need of further words; that the Germans would have their master crowned, like Pipin, Charlemagne, and Lewis. The day had worn away, and, as night was coming on, Henry, by advice of his chaplain Adalbert, arrested the pope and cardinals, with a number of clergy and others, and the palaces of the high ecclesiastics were plundered by the soldiery. Immediately Rome was in an uproar; the people murdered such of the Germans as were found straggling about the streets; and on the next day bloody fights took place. The king himself, after having slain five Romans with his lance, was unhorsed and wounded in the face; a Milanese noble, who gave up his horse to him, was torn in pieces, and his flesh was cast to dogs. Exasperated by these

scenes, Henry carried off the pope and cardinals, and for sixty-one days kept them prisoners in the castles of the neighbourhood, while the country was fearfully devastated by the German troops. Henry was master only of the quarter beyond the Tiber; the rest of Rome was held out by the inhabitants, whom John, cardinal bishop of Tusculum, animated to resistance by the offer of forgiveness for all their sins. By some it is said that the pope was treated with personal respect; by others, that he was stripped of his robes, chained, and threatened with death unless he would comply with Henry's desires. It was in vain that the king endeavored to bend him by representing that, in granting the right of investiture, he would not bestow offices or churches, but only royal privileges. But the cardinals who were with Paschal urged also that investiture was a mere external ceremony; the Romans, distressed by the ravages of the troops, and dreading the capture of their city, earnestly entreated him to make peace; and at last he yielded, declaring that for the deliverance of the church and of his people he made a sacrifice which he would not have made to save his own life. He swore, with thirteen cardinals, to allow investiture by ring and staff, after a free election and as a necessary preliminary to consecration; never to trouble the king either on this subject or as to his late treatment of him; and never to excommunicate him. Henry then released his prisoners, and on the 13th of Aprils was crowned emperor in St. Peter's—the gates of the Leonine city being shut from an apprehension of tumults. The pope was reluctantly obliged during the ceremony to deliver to the emperor with his own hand a copy of his engagement, as evidence that he adhered to it after the recovery of his liberty. At the celebration of the Eucharist he divided the host into two parts, of which he himself took one, and administered the other to Henry, with a prayer that, as that portion of the life-giving body was divided, so whosoever should attempt to break the compact might be divided from the kingdom of Christ and of God. The courtly historiographer David found a precedent for his master's treatment of the pope in Jacob's struggle with the angel, and in the speech, "I will not let thee go except thou bless me".

The emperor returned to Germany in triumph, and on the way spent three days with the Countess Matilda, whom he treated with high respect and appointed governor of Lombardy. He signaled his victory by nominating and investing his chaplain Adalbert to the archbishopric of Mayence; and he proceeded to celebrate the funeral of his father. Urged by the general feeling of the Germans, he had endeavored at Sutri to obtain the pope's consent to the interment; but Paschal refused on the ground that it was contrary to Scripture, and that the martyrs had cast out the bodies of the wicked from their churches. The pope, however, afterwards found it convenient to believe an assertion of the late emperor's repentance : and the body, which for five years had been excluded from Christian burial, was now laid in the cathedral of Spire with a magnificence unexampled in the funeral of any former emperor.

No sooner had the terror of Henry's presence been removed from Italy than voices were loudly raised against the pope's late compliances. The Hildebrandine party, headed by Bruno, bishop of Segni and abbot of Monte Cassino, reproached him with a betrayal of the church, and urged him to recall his unworthy act; at an assembly held in his absence they renewed the decrees of his predecessors against investiture, and declared the compact with the emperor to be void. The feeble pleas which Paschal advanced, in conjunction with the cardinals who had been his fellow-prisoners, were disallowed, and in a letter to the cardinal bishops of Tusculum and Velletri, who, as they had themselves escaped captivity, were conspicuous in the agitation against him, he promised to amend what he had done. An envoy whom he sent into Germany, to request that Henry would give up investitures, returned, as might have been expected, without success; and at the Lenten synod of 1112, which was held in the Lateran, the pope found himself obliged to condemn his own engagement, to which he said that he had consented under constraint, and solely for the peace of the church. He asked the advice of the prelates as to the means of retrieving his error. They loudly declared the compact to be condemned and annulled, as contrary to the Holy Ghost and to the laws of the church; but even this was not enough for the more zealous members of the assembly, who

urged Paschal to annul it by his own authority. It seemed as if the papacy were to be set up against the pope. Paschal, in the hope of weakening Bruno's influence, obliged him to resign the great abbacy which he held in conjunction with his see; but such were the strength and the clamour of the party that the pope thought of hiding his shame in a hermitage, and withdrew for a time to the island of the Tiber, from which he only returned to resume his office at the urgent entreaty of the cardinals. While thus pressed on one side by the high ecclesiastical party, he had to resist, on the other side, the desire which the king of England and other princes manifested, that the same privileges which he had granted to the emperor might be extended to themselves.

Paschal was determined to observe his engagement not to excommunicate Henry, although he complained that the emperor had not been equally scrupulous; and on this head he withstood all importunities. But Guy, archbishop of Vienne, who in the end of 1111 had obtained from him a letter annulling the compact, and had since attended the Lateran synod, drew him into an extraordinary proceeding. In a council held at Vienne, within Henry's own kingdom of Burgundy, in September 1112, the archbishop declared investiture to be a heresy, renewed the Lateran condemnation of the compact, and anathematized the emperor for extorting it and for his other outrages against the pope. He then wrote to Paschal, asking him to confirm the decrees, and announcing that, in case of his refusal, the members of the synod must withdraw their obedience from him. Thus threatened, the unfortunate pope answered by granting the required confirmation; yet while by this sanction he made the excommunication his own, he considered that, so long as he did not directly pronounce it, he was not guilty of violating his oath.

In the meantime Germany was a scene of great agitation. Henry, as if the cession proposed at Sutri had taken effect, seized on the revenues of many churches and monasteries, assumed an entire control over ecclesiastical affairs, and excited the general detestation of the clergy. Conon, bishop of Palestrina, a cardinal and legate, who was at Jerusalem when he heard of the pope's captivity, immediately pronounced an anathema against the emperor, which he repeated in many cities of Greece, Hungary, Germany, and France. The new primate, Adalbert, the creature of Henry and the adviser of his outrage against the pope, turned against his master under pretence of his being excommunicate, and craftily endeavored to undermine him. For this Adalbert was imprisoned on a charge of treason, but, after he had been kept in confinement nearly three years, the emperor was obliged to give him up to the citizens of Mayence, when his miserable appearance bore witness to the sufferings and privations which he had endured, and excited general indignation. The archbishop was bent on vengeance; although he had sworn and had given hostages to answer to a charge of treason, he cast off the obligation, and became the soul of the anti-imperialist party. Germany was distracted by a civil war, and such was the exasperation of feeling that when, in 1115, the emperor was defeated at Welfesholz, the bishop of Halberstadt refused to allow the burial of his fallen soldiers, under the pretext that they had fought in the cause of an excommunicate person.

In 1116 Henry again crossed the Alps, in order to take possession of the inheritance of Matilda, who had died in the preceding summer, and to counteract some negotiations which aimed at the acknowledgment of Alexius Comnenus, or of some prince of the Byzantine family, as emperor of Rome. His appearance put an end to this scheme, and he seized on all that had belonged to the great countess—on the fiefs in his character of suzerain, and on the allodial territories as heir,—while the pope did not venture even to raise a protest in behalf of the donations by which her possessions had been twice bestowed on the Roman see.

While the emperor was at Venice, in March 1116, Paschal held a council in the Lateran, at which he desired the bishops to join with him in condemning the compact which he had executed while Henry's prisoner. On this Bruno of Segni burst forth into triumph at the pope's having with his own mouth condemned his heretical act. "If it contained heresy"

exclaimed a member of the council, “then the author of it is a heretic”. But cardinal John of Gaeta and others of the more moderate party reproved Bruno for the indecency of his speech, and declared that the writing, although blamable, was not heretical. Conon of Palestrina detailed the anathemas which he had pronounced against the emperor from Jerusalem to France, and asked the approbation of the pope and of the council, which was granted.

On his way to Rome Henry made overtures to the pope—partly in consequence of the impression produced by a dreadful earthquake which took place at the time. Paschal replied that he would himself observe his oath not to excommunicate the emperor; that he had not authorized the excommunications which Conon and another legate had pronounced in Germany; but that decrees passed by the most important members of the church could not be annulled without their consent, and that the only means of remedy was a general council. At the emperor’s approach he fled from Rome, and took refuge at Monte Cassino.

Henry arrived at Rome in March 1117. The people received him with acclamations, but the cardinals and clergy stood aloof, and the attempts to negotiate with them were unsuccessful. At the great ceremonies of Easter, the only dignified ecclesiastic connected with the pope who could be found to place the crown on the emperor’s head was Maurice Burdinus or Bourdin, a Limousin by birth, and archbishop of Braga in Portugal, who had formerly been employed by Paschal on a mission to the German court. For this act Burdinus was deposed and excommunicated by the pope in a synod at Benevento. But although the clergy in general remained faithful to Paschal, the Romans were discontented with him on account of an appointment to the prefecture of the city, and on his return, after Henry’s departure, they refused to admit him. He was only able to get possession of the castle of St. Angelo, where he died on the 21st of January 1118.

The cardinals chose as his successor one of their own number, the deacon John of Gaeta, who had been a monk of Monte Cassino, and had held the chancellorship of the Roman church since the pontificate of Urban. But as the new pope, who took the name of Gelasius II, was receiving homage in the church of a monastery on the Palatine, Cencius Frangipani, one of the most powerful among the Roman nobles, broke in with a troop of armed followers, seized him by the throat, struck and kicked him, wounding him severely with his spurs, dragged him away to his own house, and loaded him with chains. By this outrage the Romans of every party were roused to indignation. Frangipani, like the Cencius of Gregory VII’s time, was compelled to release his prisoner, and to cast himself at his knees with an entreaty for pardon; and Gelasius, mounted on a horse, was escorted in triumph to the Lateran. Some weeks later, however, in the dead of night, the rites of his ordination to the priesthood were interrupted by tidings that the emperor was in Rome, and had possession of St. Peter’s. The news of pope Paschal’s death had recalled Henry in haste from the north of Italy, with a view to the exertion of the prerogative which he claimed in appointments to the apostolic chair. Gelasius fled, and, after serious dangers both by land and by sea, reached his native city of Gaeta, where the ordination and consecration were completed. The emperor endeavored to draw him to a conference; but Gelasius, who had been a companion of Paschal’s imprisonment, regarded the proposal as a snare, and suggested that their differences should be discussed in a council at Milan or Cremona, where he had reason to hope that he might be safe. The proposal to transfer the important business to these northern cities excited the jealousy of the Romans, to whom Henry caused the pope’s letter to be read in St. Peter’s; and their spirit was fostered by the celebrated jurist Irnerius, the founder of the law-school of Bologna, who urged them to exert their rights in the election of a pope, agreeably to the ancient canons, which were publicly recited from the pulpit. Under the advice of Irnerius and other lawyers, Burdinus was chosen by the people, and was confirmed by the emperor, on whose head he again placed the crown at Whitsuntide.

Gelasius, at a synod at Capua, anathematized the emperor and the antipope, who had assumed the name of Gregory VIII. On returning to Rome he found the people turbulent, and,

while celebrating mass in the church of St. Praxedes, was again attacked by the Frangipanis. He declared that he would leave the bloody city—the new Babylon and Sodom; that he would rather have one emperor than many; and his words were hailed with applause by the cardinals. The pope made his way into France, where he was received with honour; and, after having visited several of the principal cities, he was about to hold a council at Reims, when he died at the abbey of Cluny on the 29th of January 1119.

Conon of Palestrina had been selected by Gelasius as his successor, but had suggested to him that Guy, archbishop of Vienne and cardinal of St. Balbina, should be preferred, as more likely, from his character and position, to serve the church effectually. Guy was son of a duke or count of Burgundy, and was related to the sovereigns of Germany, France, and England. The zeal which he had displayed in excommunicating the emperor, and the skill for which he was noted in the conduct of affairs, marked him out as a champion to whom the Hildebrandine party might look with hope and confidence. In consequence of Conon's suggestion, the archbishop was summoned to Cluny; but he did not arrive until after the death of Gelasius. The cardinals, five in number, who had accompanied the late pope from Italy, were unanimous in choosing Guy for his successor; but it was with the greatest unwillingness, and only under condition that his election should be ratified by the Romans, that he was persuaded to accept the office; and when the result of the election became known, the conclave was invaded by a body of his kinsmen, retainers, and soldiery, who tore off his pontifical robes, and dragged him away, crying out that they would not part with their archbishop—the Romans might find a pontiff for themselves. The violence of these adherents, however, was, with some difficulty, appeased; the consent of the Romans was readily obtained, and Guy was inaugurated as pope Calixtus II in his own cathedral at Vienne.

Calixtus spent the spring and the summer of 1119 in France, and on the 20th of October he opened at Reims the synod which his predecessor had projected. Fifteen archbishops and more than two hundred bishops were present; among them was the German primate Adalbert, with his seven suffragans and a brilliant train of three hundred knights. There were four bishops from England, whom the king, in giving them permission to attend, had charged not to complain against each other, because he was resolved to do full justice to every complaint within his own kingdom, and had warned not to bring back any “superfluous inventions”. The pope, although elected by a handful of exiles, appeared in splendid state, and in all the fullness of his pretensions. Lewis the Fat, who since 1008 had been sole king of France, brought charges before the council against Henry of England for violations of his feudal duty as duke of Normandy, and for his treatment of his brother Robert; and these charges, relating purely to matters of secular policy, he referred to the pope as arbiter. The Norman primate, Godfrey of Rouen, attempted to justify his sovereign, but was put down by the general disapprobation of the assembly.

During the emperor's absence in Italy, Germany had been a prey to anarchy and confusion, and since his return it had been immersed in the horrors of civil war. Conon, after having passed in disguise through the territories occupied by the imperialists, had again appeared, denouncing excommunications against Henry and deposition against all prelates who refused to obey his citations; while Adalbert of Mayence stirred up the Saxons, and consecrated bishops in contempt of the imperial claims. Henry had made overtures for a reconciliation with the pope, and William of Champeaux, bishop of Châlons on the Marne, with Pontius, abbot of Cluny, had been sent by Calixtus to confer with him at Strasburg. The bishop assured the emperor that he need not so strongly insist on the privilege of investiture, since in France no such ceremony was then used, and yet he himself performed the duties of feudal service as faithfully as any of his German brethren. The cases were not indeed parallel; for the French sovereigns had always retained a control over the church, which rendered the position of their bishops very unlike that of the great German prelates since the minority of Henry IV. But the emperor professed himself satisfied, and a second commission arranged

with him the terms of an accommodation—that he should give up investitures, that bishops should do homage for their royalties, and that he should be released from his excommunication.

The pope left Reims with the intention of meeting the emperor, and sent commissioners before him for the conclusion of the treaty. But the report that Henry had with him a force of 30,000 men raised a feeling of distrust, and Calixtus halted at the castle of Mousson to await the result of the negotiations. A dispute arose between Henry and the commissioners as to the sense of certain articles. The emperor, finding himself strong, was disposed to evade his engagements; he pretended a wish to consult the princes of Germany, and declared that he would not stand barefooted to receive absolution. The commissioners promised to do their utmost that this point might be waived, and that the ceremony should be as private as possible. But on their reporting the negotiations to the pope, he left Mousson in indignation at Henry's conduct, and returned to Reims, where he signaled his arrival by consecrating a popularly-elected bishop for Liège, in opposition to one who had been invested by the emperor. The council passed the usual canons against investiture, simony, and clerical marriage; and on the sixth and last day the church's curse was denounced in the most solemn manner against the emperor and the antipope—each of the bishops and abbots, 427 in number, standing up, with his pastoral staff in one hand, and with a lighted taper in the other. Henry's subjects were declared to be absolved from their allegiance until he should be reconciled to the church.

In fulfillment of an intention which he had announced at the council, the pope proceeded into Normandy, and held an interview with Henry of England at Gisors. One subject of discussion between them related to the employment of legates. Calixtus himself, while archbishop of Vienne, had been sent by Paschal with the character of legate for all England in 1100, within a few months after Anselm's return from his first exile. His visit caused a great excitement; for, although legates had before appeared in this country, their visits had been very rare, and their authority had been limited to special business, so that an outcry was raised against the new commission as a thing without example, and it was declared that no one but the archbishop of Canterbury could be acknowledged as a representative of the pope. Anselm asserted the privilege of Canterbury; the legate returned without obtaining a recognition of his power; and the primate procured from the pope, although for his own person only, a promise that no legate should be sent to supersede him. At a later time, the independent character of the English church, and its disposition to settle its own affairs without reference to Rome, were complained of by Paschal II on the translation of Ralph from Rochester to Canterbury; while the king was offended at Conon's having ventured, as papal legate, to excommunicate the Norman bishops for refusing to attend a council. William of Warelwast, now bishop of Exeter, was once more sent to Rome to remonstrate against Conon's proceedings; and the pope despatched a new legate into England—the abbot Anselm, who was chosen as being nephew of the late archbishop, and as being himself known and popular among the English. But although Henry ordered that the legate should be treated with honour in Normandy, he would not permit him to cross the sea, and sent Ralph himself to Rome, to assert the rights of his primacy. The archbishop was prevented by illness from following the pope, who had withdrawn to Benevento; but he returned with a general and vague confirmation of the privileges of Canterbury.

Another question related to the pretensions of the see of York. Anselm, in the beginning of the reign, had exacted from Gerard, on his translation to the northern archbishopric, a promise of the same subjection to Canterbury which he had sworn when consecrated as bishop of Hereford. The next archbishop of York, Thomas, renewed the pretensions which his predecessor of the same name had raised in opposition to Lanfranc; but the measures which Anselm took to defeat him were successful, although Anselm did not himself live to witness their success. Thurstan, who was nominated to York in 1114, declined

to receive consecration at Canterbury, from an unwillingness to swear subjection to the archbishop; and, in violation both of his own solemn promise and of assurances which the pope had given to Henry, he contrived to get himself consecrated by Calixtus at Reims, before the arrival of a bishop who was specially charged to prevent his consecration, although the English bishops who were present protested against it.

The pope was easily satisfied with the explanations which Henry gave of his behaviour towards Robert and the king of France. He promised that no legate should be sent into England except at the king's request, and for the settlement of such things as could not be settled by the English bishops; and he requested that Thurstan might be allowed to return to England. The king replied that he had sworn to the contrary. "I am apostolic pontiff", said Calixtus, and offered to release him from the oath; but Henry, after consideration, declined to avail himself of the absolution, as being unworthy of a king, and an example which would tend to produce universal distrust between men; and he refused to readmit Thurstan, except on condition that he should make the same submission to Canterbury which had been made by his predecessors.

Having established his authority to the north of the Alps, the pope proceeded into Italy. His rival Burdinus, abandoned by the emperor, fled from Rome at the approach of Calixtus and took refuge within the walls of Sutri. St. Peter's, which had been strongly fortified, was given up to the friends of Calixtus in consideration of a sum of money. Burdinus himself was betrayed into the hands of the pope, and, after having been paraded about Rome, mounted on a camel, arrayed in bloody sheepskins by way of a pontifical robe, and holding the camel's tail in his hands, he was thrust into a monastic prison. He lived to an advanced age, but his remaining years were varied only by removals from one place of confinement to another.

In the meantime the discords of Germany were unabated. Hostile armies moved about the country—the one commanded by the emperor, the other by the primate Adalbert, to whom the pope had given a commission as legate : and it seemed as if their differences must be decided by bloodshed. But circumstances had arisen which tended to suggest a compromise. The contest of fifty years had exhausted all parties, and a general desire for peace began to be felt. The princes of Germany had come to see how their own interest was affected by the rival pretensions of the papacy and the crown. While desirous to maintain themselves against the emperor, and to secure what they had won for their order, they had no wish to subject him, and consequently themselves, to the pope—to degrade their nationality, to lose all hold on the offices and endowments of the church. Thus patriotic and selfish motives concurred in rendering the leaders of the laity desirous to find some means of accommodation. And from France, where the difficulty as to investiture had not been felt, persuasives to moderation were heard. There the learned canonist Ivo, bishop of Chartres, had throughout maintained the lawfulness of investiture by laymen, provided that it were preceded by a canonical election. He held that the form of the ceremony was indifferent, inasmuch as the lay lord did not pretend to confer any gift of a spiritual kind; that, although it was schismatical and heretical to maintain the necessity of lay investiture, yet such investiture was in itself no heresy. Ivo strongly reprobated the agitation excited by the Hildebrandine party against Paschal, and he was able to persuade the archbishop of Sens, with other prelates, to join him in a formal protest against the councils which took it on themselves to censure the pope. Hildebert, bishop of Le Mans, Hugh, a monk of Fleury, and other eminent ecclesiastics gave utterance to somewhat similar views; and at length abbot Godfrey of Vendome—who had been long known as one of the most uncompromising asserters of the ecclesiastical claims, and had published two tracts in which he declared lay investiture to be heresy—sent forth a third tract, composed in an unexpected spirit of conciliation. Laymen, he said, may not confer the staff and the ring, since these are for the church to give; but there are two kinds of investiture—the one, which makes a bishop, the other, which maintains him; and princes may without offence

give investiture to the temporalities by some symbol, after canonical election and consecration. Godfrey speaks strongly against the mischief of contentiousness on either side, and (in direct contradiction to the Hildebrandine principle that kings ought to be treated by the church as freely as other men) he quotes St. Augustine's opinion that one ought seldom or never to be excommunicated who is backed by an obstinate multitude, "lest, while we strive to correct one, it become the ruin of many".

The effect of such writings was widely felt, and contributed to swell the general eagerness for peace. As the hostile armies of the Germans were encamped in the neighbourhood of Wurzburg, negotiations were opened between them. The preliminaries were settled in October 1121; a formal compact was then drawn up by commissioners at Mayence; and on the 23rd of September 1122, the terms of the agreement between the empire and the hierarchy were read before a vast multitude assembled in a meadow near Worms. On the pope's part, it was stipulated that in Germany the elections of bishops and abbots should take place in the presence of the king, without simony or violence; if any discord should arise, the king, by the advice of the metropolitan and his suffragans, was to support the party who should be in the right. The *bishop elect* was to receive the temporalities of his see by the sceptre, and was bound to perform all the duties attached to them. In other parts of the emperor's dominions, the bishop was, *within six months after consecration*, to receive the temporalities from the sovereign by the sceptre, without any payment, and was to perform the duties which pertained to them. The emperor, on his part, gave up all investiture by ring and staff, and engaged to allow free election and consecration throughout his dominions; he restored to the Roman church all possessions and royalties which had been taken from it since the beginning of his father's reign, and undertook to assist towards the recovery of such as were not in his own hands. These conditions were solemnly exchanged at Worms; the legate, Lambert, cardinal of Ostia, celebrated mass, and gave the kiss of peace to the emperor; and in the following year, 1123, the concordat of Worms was ratified by the first council of the Lateran, which in the Roman church is reckoned as the Ninth General Council. The contest, which for half a century had agitated Italy and Germany, was ended for a time.

The apparent simplicity of the solution—although, indeed, its terms contained the seeds of future differences as to their interpretation—strikes us with surprise, as contrasted with the length and the bitterness of the struggle. But in truth circumstances had disposed both parties to welcome a solution which at an earlier time would have been rejected. The question of investitures had on Gregory's part been a disguise for the desire to establish a domination over temporal sovereigns; on the part of the emperors, it had meant the right to dispose of ecclesiastical dignities and to exercise a control over the hierarchy. Each party had now learnt that its object was not to be attained; but it was not until this experience had reduced the real question within the bounds of its nominal dimensions that any accommodation was possible.

The emperor ceded the power of nomination to bishoprics, and, as to those which were beyond the limits of Germany, he appears to have given up all control over the appointments. But in Germany it was otherwise. The imperial claim to nominate was, indeed, acknowledged to be unlawful; but as this had never been defended on grounds of law, and as the provision that bishops should be chosen in the presence of the emperor or of his commissioners allowed the exercise of an important influence in the choice, the emperor's legal prerogative was really rather increased than lessened. And as, in the case of German bishops, the investiture was to precede consecration, there was thus an opportunity of interposing a bar to the promotion of any person unacceptable to the sovereign. The right of exacting homage was unquestioned, and, by a mere change in the outward symbol, the emperor secured the substance of the investiture that the bishops should be vassals of the crown, not of the papacy; that they should be subject to the feudal obligations, and that the connection of the church with the state should be maintained.

On the part of the pope, the concordat appears to be a serious sacrifice. Urged by the representations of the German estates, both lay and ecclesiastical, who told him that, if peace were not made, the responsibility would rest on him, he had ceded the pretensions of Gregory and Urban as to investitures and homage; the condition on which Godfrey of Vendome had insisted in his conciliatory proposals—that consecration should precede investiture—was relinquished as to German bishoprics; and the party of which Calixtus had hitherto been the foremost representative was deeply dissatisfied with the terms of the compromise. But his consent to these terms is to be explained by the change which had taken place in the position of the papacy since Hildebrand entered on his career. The imperial claim to control elections to St. Peter's chair was abandoned, and whereas Henry III had aimed at making himself master of the hierarchy, his son and his grandson had found it a sufficient labour to defend themselves against its encroachments. The bold assertions of Gregory, continued by his successors, and, above all, the great movement of the crusades, had raised the pope to a height before unknown; and, when on the whole his substantial gain had been so great, he could afford to purchase the credit of moderation by yielding in appearance and in matters of detail.

CHAPTER VII

MONASTICISM—NEW ORDERS—THE TEMPLARS AND HOSPITALLERS.

IN the history of Monasticism, decay and reformation are continually alternating. This alternation is a natural result of laying down as a permanent rule for a numerous succession of men the system which has been found to meet the particular circumstances of a few. When the rule has been some time in operation, no test that can be established by requiring a profession of vocation will be found effectual for the exclusion of unqualified persons; and, even where there are the same dispositions which originally gave birth to the rule and won popularity for it, the difference of times or circumstances may render it no longer suitable as a discipline for them. Hence, as a great monk of the twelfth century remarked, it was easier to found new religious societies than to reform the old. Moreover, as the poverty and devotion of monks never failed to bring them wealth and honour, the effect of these was too commonly a temptation to abandon the virtues by which they had been procured.

The spirit which produced the endeavour to reform the church led at the same time to a reform of monachism; and the anarchy, the insecurity, the manifold miseries of the age tended to excite an enthusiasm for the life which promised tranquillity and the opportunities of conversing with a better world. Bernold of Constance tells us that, in the great distractions between the papacy and the empire, multitudes rushed into the monasteries of Germany; that some who had been counts and marquises chose to be employed in the lowest offices, such as baking and cooking; that many, without putting on the monastic habit, devoted themselves to the service of certain monasteries; that many young women renounced marriage, and that the whole population of some towns adopted a monastic system of life.

Among the reformers of German monachism, the most eminent was William, who in 1071 was promoted from the priory of St. Emmeran's, at Ratisbon, to the abbacy of Hirschau, in the Black Forest. He raised the number of inmates from fifteen to a hundred and fifty, founded some new monasteries, reformed more than a hundred, and united his monks into a congregation after the pattern of Cluny, adopting the system of lay-brethren from Vallombrosa. The virtues of William were not limited to devotion, purity of life, and rigour of discipline; he is celebrated for his gentleness to all men, for his charity to the poor, for the largeness of his hospitality, for his cheerful and kindly manners, for his encouragement of arts and learning. He provided carefully for the transcription of the holy scriptures and of other useful books, and instead of locking them up in the library of his abbey, he endeavoured to spread the knowledge of their contents by presenting copies to members of other religious houses. The sciences included in the *quadrivium*, especially music and mathematics, were sedulously cultivated at Hirschau, and under William the monks were distinguished for their skill in all that relates to the ornament of churches—in building, sculpture, painting, carving of wood, and working in metals. In the general affairs of the church, the abbot of Hirschau was, by his exertions and by his influence, one of the most active and powerful supporters of the hierarchical or Hildebrandine party in Germany. He died in 1091, at the age (as is supposed) of sixty-five.

The congregation of Cluny, which had led the way in the reformation of an earlier period, maintained its preeminence under the sixty years' abbacy of Hugh, whose influence in the affairs of the church has often been mentioned in the preceding chapters. The Cluniacs received additions to their privileges : Paschal exempted them from the operation of such interdicts as might be pronounced against any province in which they should be; Calixtus, on

a visit to the great monastery in 1120, conferred on its abbots the dignity of the Roman cardinalate. But under Hugh's successor, Pontius, to whom this honour was granted, dissensions and scandals arose in the order. The abbot, on finding that he was charged at Rome with dissipating the property of his monastery, hurried to the pope, resigned his office, and went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem, with the intention, as he professed, of spending the remainder of his days there; but he afterwards returned to disturb the peace of the monastery. Another Hugh was appointed in his room, but died within three months: and on the renewed vacancy the order again chose a head who sustained the greatness of its reputation—Peter Maurice, "the Venerable". The Vallombrosan, Camaldolite, and other communities were also still in vigour; but the piety of the age was not content with adding to the numbers enrolled under the rules which already existed, and during the fifty years which followed the election of Gregory VII several orders took their beginning. Although the founders of these were not all of French birth, it was in France, which had become the centre of religious and intellectual movement, that the new institutions arose.

I.
ORDER OF GRAMMONT.

The earliest of them was the order of Grammont. The founder, Stephen, son of a count of Thiers in Auvergne, was born about 1045. His parents, who believed him to have been granted to them in return for many prayers and other exercises of devotion, were careful to train him religiously from his infancy, and at the age of twelve he accompanied his father on a pilgrimage to the relics of St. Nicolas, which had lately been translated from Myra, in Lycia, to Bari, in the south of Italy. Stephen fell ill at Benevento, and was left there in the care of the archbishop, Milo, who was his countryman, and perhaps a kinsman. The praises which the archbishop bestowed on an ascetic society of monks in Calabria excited the boy to resolve on embracing the monastic life, and he steadily adhered to his resolution. After having spent four years at Rome, he obtained, in the first year of Gregory's pontificate, the papal sanction for the formation of a new order—a document in which Gregory bestows on him his blessing, and expresses a wish that he may find companions innumerable as the stars of heaven.

Before proceeding to act on this privilege, Stephen paid a farewell visit to his parents, but ended it by secretly leaving his home, with a determination never to return, and took up his abode at Muret, near Limoges, where he built himself a hut of branches of trees in a rocky and wooded solitude. Here, putting on a ring, the only article which he had reserved out of his property, he solemnly devoted himself to the holy Trinity and to the virgin Mother. The rigour of his diet was extreme; he wore an iron cuirass, like Dominic of Fonte Avellano, and over it a thin dress, which was alike throughout all the changes of the season; his bed was formed of boards sunk in the earth, so that it resembled a grave, nor did he allow himself even straw to soften it; his devotional exercises were frequent, and such was his fervour that, while engaged in them, he sometimes forgot food and sleep for days together. He always prayed kneeling, and his prayers were accompanied by frequent obeisances and kissing of the earth, so that not only did his hands and knees become callous like those of a camel, but his nose was bent by the effect of his prostrations.

After a year, during which he was known only to the neighbouring shepherds, Stephen was joined by two companions; and the number was soon increased. His disciples were treated with an indulgence which he denied to himself and he desired them to call him not abbot or master, but corrector. It was believed that he had the power of reading their hearts; tales are related of miracles which he did, and of the wonderful efficacy of his prayers; and a sweet odour was perceived to proceed from his person by those who conversed with him. After having spent fifty years in his retirement, Stephen died in 1124.

At his death, the place where he had so long lived unmolested was claimed by a neighbouring monastery. His disciples, unwilling to engage in any contention, prayed for direction in the choice of another habitation; and as they were at mass, the answer was given by a heavenly voice, which thrice pronounced the words—"To Grammont!". The new home thus pointed out was but a league distant, and the monks removed to it, carrying with them the relics of their founder. They studiously concealed the spot where the body was deposited; but its presence was betrayed by a great number of miracles. On this the prior addressed the spirit of his former master in a tone of complaint and reproach, threatening that, if Stephen continued to regard his own fame for sanctity so as to turn the solitude of his disciples into a fair, his relics should be thrown into the river; and from that time the saint was content to exert his miraculous power in such a manner as not to expose his followers to the distractions which had before endangered their quiet and their humility. Sixty-five years after his death, he was canonized by Clement III.

Although, in the privilege which Gregory had granted to Stephen, it was supposed that the Benedictine rule would be observed by the new order, the discipline of the Grandimontans was more severe than that of St. Benedict. Stephen professed that his only rule was that of Christian religion, and the code of his order was unwritten until the time of his third successor, Stephen of Lisiac (A.D. 1141). Obedience and poverty are laid down as the foundations. The monks were to accept no payment for Divine offices : they were to possess no churches, and no lands beyond the precincts of their monasteries, nor were they allowed to keep any cattle—"for", it is said, "if ye were to possess beasts, ye would love them, and for the love which ye would bestow on beasts, so much of Divine love would be withdrawn from you". They were never to go to law for such property as might be bestowed on them. The founder assured them on his death-bed that, if they kept themselves from the love of earthly things, God would not fail to provide for them; when reduced to such necessity as to have had no food for two days, they might send out brethren to beg, but these were bound to return as soon as they had secured one day's provisions. They were to go out in parties of two or more; they were not to fall into company with travellers, and were to avoid castles. They must not leave the wilderness to preach; their life there was to be their true sermon. Their monasteries were to be strictly shut against all but persons of great authority; they were charged altogether to shun intercourse with women. Even the sick were forbidden to taste flesh; but they were to be carefully tended, and, rather than that they should lack what they needed, even the ornaments of the church were to be sold. The members of the order were bound to silence at times, and were to communicate by signs, of which a detailed system is laid down; and it was directed that when they spoke, their discourse must be of an edifying kind. The monks were to devote themselves entirely to spiritual things, while their temporal affairs were to be managed by "bearded" or lay brethren.

Under Stephen of Lisiac the order of Grandimontans, or "Good men", as they were popularly called, became numerous; and eventually it had about 140 "cells", subject to the "prior" of the mother community. So long as the austerity of its discipline remained, it enjoyed a high reputation, but the relaxations of its rules, although sanctioned by popes, and internal quarrels between the monks and the lay brethren led to its decline.

II.

BRUNO, CARTHUSIAN ORDER.

Ten years later than the order of Grammont, that of the Carthusians was founded by Bruno, a native of Cologne, who had been distinguished as master of the cathedral school at Reims. The popular legend ascribes his retirement from the world to a scene which he is supposed to have witnessed at Paris, on the death of a doctor who had been greatly esteemed for piety as well as for learning. As the funeral procession was on its way to the grave, the

corpse (it is said) raised itself from the bier, and uttered the words, “By God’s righteous judgment I am accused!”. The rites were suspended for a day; and when they were resumed, the dead man again exclaimed, “By God’s righteous judgment I am judged!”. A second time the completion of the ceremony was deferred; but on the third day the horror of the spectators was raised to a height by his once more lifting up his ghastly head, and moaning forth, in a tone of the deepest misery, “By God’s righteous judgment I am condemned!”. Bruno, struck with terror, and filled with a sense of the nothingness of human reputation by this awful revelation as to one who had been so highly venerated, resolved, as the only means of safety, to hide himself in the desert.

Such was the tale which was adopted by the Carthusian order; but the real motives of Bruno’s withdrawal appear to have been partly a conviction of the unsatisfying nature of worldly things, and partly a wish to escape from the tyranny of Manasses, archbishop of Reims, a violent, grasping, and ambitious prelate, whose character may be inferred from a saying recorded of him—that “The archbishopric of Reims would be a fine thing, if one had not to sing masses for it”. By the advice of Hugh, bishop of Grenoble, Bruno with six companions took up his abode among the wild and solemn rocky solitudes of the Chartreuse, from which his order derived its name; and so much was the bishop pleased with the system, that he often withdrew for a time from the world, to live with the Carthusians in the strict observance of their usages. The community, to which no one was admitted under the age of twenty, consisted of monks and lay brethren; the number of the former being limited to thirteen (or at the utmost, to fourteen), and that of the lay brethren to sixteen, on the ground that the wilderness could not support a larger company without the necessity of their being entangled in the affairs of this world. They were forbidden to possess any land, except in the neighbourhood of their monastery, and the number of beasts which they were allowed to keep was limited. The object of their retreat was declared to be the salvation of their own souls,—the part of Mary, not that of Martha; hence the intrusion of poor strangers into their wilderness was discouraged, and, although the monks were not absolutely forbidden to relieve such strangers, they were charged rather to spend any superfluities which they might have on the poor of their own neighbourhood. Their manner of life was extremely rigid. They wore goatskins next to the flesh, and their dress was altogether of the coarsest kind. For three days in the week their food was bread and water; on the other days they added pulse; the highest luxuries of festivals were cheese and fish; and the small quantity of wine allowed by the Benedictine rule was never to be drunk undiluted. The only greater relaxation as to diet was at the periodical bleedings, which took place five times in the year. They confessed every week, and underwent a weekly flagellation; but it was a part of their obedience that no one should impose any extraordinary austerity on himself without the leave of the prior. They ordinarily spoke on Sundays and festivals only; the lay brethren alone were allowed to relieve their silence by signs : and it was required that these signs should be of a “rustic” character, without any “facetiousness or wantonness”; that they should not be taught to strangers, and that no other code of signals should be learnt. When, however, any monks were employed together in copying or binding books, or in any other common labour, they were at liberty to converse among themselves, although not with others. Each monk was to cook for himself in his cell, which he was very rarely to leave; and in the cells most of the offices of religion were to be performed, except on Sundays, when the brethren met in the church and in the refectory. If any present were sent to a member of the society, the prior was not only authorized (as in the Benedictine rule) to give it to another, but, in order to eradicate the idea of individual property, it was even ordered that the present should not be given to the person for whom it had been intended. In the service of their churches everything was to be plain and severe; no processions were allowed, and all ornament was forbidden, with the exception of one silver chalice, and a silver tube for drinking the eucharistic wine. Notwithstanding their poverty, Guibert of Nogent found the Carthusians possessed of a valuable library; and much of their

time was devoted to transcription and other literary labours. After having spent six years at the Chartreuse, Bruno reluctantly complied with an invitation to Rome from Urban II, who had formerly been his pupil at Reims but he soon became weary of the city, and, after having refused the bishopric of Reggio, he founded, under the patronage of the grand count Roger, a second Chartreuse (Sto. Stefano del Bosco) in the diocese of Squillace, where he died in 1101. In the meantime the original foundation had been carried on by his disciples, who, after having accompanied him into Italy, had returned at his desire, and re-established themselves under Landuin as prior. The “customs” of the order were digested into a written code by the fifth prior, Guigo I, in 1128; the founder was canonized by Leo X in 1513.

The rigour of the Carthusian institutions rendered the progress of the order slow; yet it gradually made its way. There were also Carthusian nuns; but the discipline was too severe for the female sex, and in the eighteenth century only five convents of women professed the rule. Although the Carthusians became wealthy, and built magnificent houses (the Certosa near Pavia being perhaps the most splendid monastery in the world), they preserved themselves from personal luxury more strictly than any other order; thus they escaped the satire which was profusely lavished on monks in general, and they never needed a reformation.

III.

ORDER OF FONTEVRAUD.

The next in time of the new orders was founded by Robert, a native of Arbrissel or Albresec, near Rennes. Robert was born about 1047, and, after having studied at Paris, where he became a teacher of theology, he accepted in 1086 an invitation to act as vicar to Sylvester, bishop of Rennes, a man of high birth, who, although himself illiterate, respected learning in others. Here he for four years exerted himself to enforce the Hildebrandine principles as to celibacy, simony, and emancipation of the church from lay control; but after his patron’s death he found it expedient to withdraw from the enmity of the canons, whom he had provoked by his endeavours to reform them. For a time he taught theology at Angers, and in 1091 he withdrew to the forest of Craon, on the confines of Anjou and Brittany, where he entered on a course of extraordinary austerity. Disciples and imitators soon gathered around him, and for these, whom he styled “the poor of Christ”, he founded in 1094 a society on the principles of the canonical life.

Pope Urban, on his visit to France, in 1096, sent for Robert, and, being struck with his eloquence, bestowed on him the title of “apostolical preacher”, with a charge to publish the crusade. The zeal with which Robert executed this commission, in cities, villages, and hamlets, was the means of sending many to fight the battles of Christendom in the east; while others were persuaded by his discourse to forsake their homes and attach themselves to him as their master. In 1100 he laid the foundation of a great establishment at Fontevraud, in the diocese of Poitiers—then a rough tract, overgrown with thorns and brushwood. His followers were of both sexes; the men were committed to two of his chief disciples, while he himself especially took care of the women. From time to time he left Fontevraud for the labours of his office as apostolical preacher, which gave him opportunities of making his institutions known, and of founding similar communities in various parts of France. His preaching was addressed with great effect to unhappy women who had fallen from virtue; among his converts was the notorious queen Bertrada, whom he persuaded, after the death of Philip, to live for a time at Fontevraud under the severe discipline of his community. He had three nunneries—one for virgins and widows, one for the sick and lepers, and the third for women whom he had reclaimed from a life of sin. The rule was very strict; the female recluses were not allowed to speak except in the chapter-house, because, it is said, Robert knew that they could not be restrained from idle talk except by an entire prohibition of speech. But it was rumoured that Robert laid himself open to scandal by reviving a kind of fanaticism which had been practised

in the early African church. Godfrey of Vendome remonstrates with him on this subject, and mentions that he was charged also with partiality in his behaviour towards his female disciples—treating some with indulgence, while to others he was harsh in language, and mercilessly subjected them to cold, hunger, and nakedness. Marbod, bishop of Rennes, likewise addressed to him a letter of admonition—censuring him for the affectations which he practised for the sake of influence over the simple, but which, in the bishop's opinion, were more likely to make his sanity suspected—the long beard, the naked feet, the old and tattered garments; and telling him that, by attacking the clergy in his sermons, he excited the people to the sin of despising their pastors. It appears also that Roscellin (whose peculiar opinions will hereafter engage our attention) attacked Robert for receiving into his society women who had fled from their husbands, and for detaining them in defiance of the bishop of Angers.

The institute of Fontevraud was confirmed by Paschal II in 1106, and again in 1113. Robert, finding his strength decay, in 1115 committed the superintendence of his whole order—men as well as women—to a female superior—an extraordinary arrangement, for which he alleged the precedent that the Saviour on the cross commended St. John to the care of the blessed Virgin as his mother. At the founder's death, in 1117, the number of nuns at Fontevraud already amounted to 3,000; and soon after it was between 4,000 and 5,000. The order spread, so that it had establishments in Spain and in England, as well as in France, and some smaller orders, as those of Tiron and Savigny, branched off from it.

IV.

ROBERT OF MOLESME, CISTERCIAN ORDER.

Of the orders which had their origin about this time the most widely extended and most powerful was the Cistercian. The founder, Robert, was son of a nobleman in Champagne, and entered a monastery at fifteen. After having lived in several religious houses without finding any one sufficiently strict for his idea of the monastic profession, he became the head of a society at Molesme, in the diocese of Langres. They were at first excessively poor, and underwent great privations; but the sight of their rigid life soon drew to them a profusion of gifts, which led to a relaxation of their discipline, and Robert, after having in vain remonstrated, left them in indignation. In compliance with their urgent requests he consented to return; but he soon had the mortification of discovering that their invitation had been prompted by no better motive than a wish to recover the popular esteem and bounty which had been withdrawn from them in consequence of his departure. Discords arose on the subject of dispensations from the Benedictine rule; and in 1098, Robert, with the sanction of the legate Hugh of Lyons, withdrew with twenty companions to Cistercium or Citeaux, a lonely and uncultivated place in the neighbourhood of Dijon. The duke of Burgundy bestowed on the infant community a site for buildings, with land for tillage, and contributed to its support. In the following year, Robert was once more desired to return to Molesme by the authority of Urban II, on the representation of the monks that their society had fallen into disorder and that they were persecuted by their neighbours, and he continued to govern his earlier foundation until his death, in 1110.

His successor at Citeaux, Alberic, laid down the rule for the new order, and it was afterwards carried out with greater rigour by the third abbot, Stephen Harding, an Englishman and one of Robert's original companions, whose code, entitled the "Charter of Love", was sanctioned by pope Calixtus in 1119. The Cistercians were to observe the rule of St. Benedict, without any glosses or relaxations. Their dress was to be white, agreeably to a pattern which the blessed Virgin had shown to Alberic in a vision. They were to accept no gifts of churches, altars, or tithes, and were to refrain, from intermeddling with the pastoral office. From the ides of September to Easter, they were to eat but one meal daily. Their monasteries, which were all to be dedicated to the blessed Virgin, were to be planted in lonely places they were to eschew

all pomp, pride, and superfluity; their services were to be simple and plain, and all vocal artifices were forbidden in their chanting; some of the ecclesiastical vestments were discarded, and those which were retained were to be of fustian or linen, without any golden ornaments. They were to have only one iron chandelier; their censers were to be of brass or iron; no plate was allowed, except one chalice and a tube for the eucharistic wine, and these were, if possible, to be of silver gilt, but not of gold. Paintings, sculpture, and stained glass were prohibited, as being likely to distract the mind from spiritual meditation; the only exception as to such things was in favour of painted wooden crosses. The monks were to give themselves wholly to spiritual employments, while the secular affairs of the community were to be managed by the “bearded” or lay brethren. No serfs were allowed, but hired servants were employed to assist in labour. In the simplicity of their church-services and furniture the Cistercians differed from the Cluniacs, whose ritual was distinguished for its splendour; the elder order regarded the principle of the younger as a reproach against itself and a rivalry soon sprang up between them. The white dress, which, although already adopted at Camaldoli, was a novelty in France, gave offence to the other monastic societies, which had worn black habits as a symbol of humility and regarded the new colour as a pretension to superior righteousness; but the Cistercians defended it as expressive of the joy which became the angelic life of the cloister.

In 1113 the order of Citeaux received the member from whose reputation it was to derive its greatest lustre and popularity—St. Bernard. The same year saw the foundation of La Ferté, the eldest daughter society; Pontigny followed in 1114, Clairvaux (of which the young Bernard was the first abbot) and Morimond in 1115. The rule of the Cistercians was approved by the bishops in whose dioceses these monasteries were situated; and Stephen Harding required that, before the foundation of any monastery, the bishop of the place should signify his assent to the rule, so that no difficulty might afterwards arise from a conflict between the duties of the monks towards their order and that obedience to episcopal authority which was an essential part of the system. While the government of the Cluniacs was monarchical, that of the Cistercians was aristocratic; the four chief “daughters”—those which have just been named—were allowed a large influence in the affairs of the order; their abbots took the lead in electing the abbot of Citeaux, who was subject to their visitation and correction. But the most remarkable feature in the system was that of the annual general chapters, the first of which was held in 1116. For these meetings every abbot of the order was required to appear at Citeaux, unless prevented by illness, in which case he was represented by a deputy. From the nearer countries, the attendance was to be every year; from the more remote, it was, according to their distance, to be once in three, four, five, or seven years. Such meetings had been held occasionally in other orders, as in that of Grammont; but it was among the Cistercians that they were for the first time organized as a part of the regular government, and from them they were copied by the Carthusians and others. The effect of this arrangement was found to be beneficial, not only in securing a general superintendence of the community, but as a means of preventing jealousies by allowing the affiliated societies a share in the administration of the whole.

After having thrown out its first swarms, the Cistercian order rapidly increased. At the general chapter in 1151 it numbered upwards of 500 monasteries, and it was resolved that no further additions should be admitted. But in the following century the number had advanced to 1800, and eventually it was much greater. The Cistercians grew rich, and reforms became necessary among them; but until the rise of the mendicant orders, they were the most popular of all the monastic societies.

V.
NORBERT.

The canonical life had fallen into great decay. Nicolas II, in the council of 1059, attempted a reformation, by which canons were to have a common table and a common dormitory, and, although they were not required to sacrifice their private property, were enjoined to hold their official revenues in common. But a new system, which resembled that of monasticism in the renunciation of all individual property, was also introduced during the eleventh century, the first example of it having apparently been given by some clergy of Avignon, who in 1038 established themselves at the church of St. Rufus. The canons of this system were styled regular, and took their name from St. Augustine, who had instituted a similar mode of life among his clergy, and from whose writings their rule was compiled.

In the twelfth century a new order of canons was founded by Norbert, who was born of a noble family at Xanten, on the lower Rhine, about 1080. In early life he obtained canonries both at his native place and at Cologne. He attached himself to the court of Henry V, with whom he enjoyed great favour, and his life was that of a courtly ecclesiastic, devoted to the enjoyments of the world, and altogether careless of his spiritual duties. In 1111 he accompanied the emperor to Italy, where the first impulse to a change was given by his horror at the outrages and imprisonment to which the pope was subjected. A scruple as to investiture led him soon after to refuse the see of Cambray; and his conversion was completed by a thunder-storm, in which he appears to have been thrown from his horse, which was startled by a flash of lightning, and to have been rendered for a time insensible; while the voice which he is said to have heard from heaven, and other circumstances more closely assimilating his case to that of St. Paul, may be ascribed either to his imagination or to inventions

After this Norbert withdrew for a time to a monastery; and, as he was yet only a subdeacon, he presented himself before the archbishop of Cologne, with a request that the orders of deacon and priest might be conferred on him in one day. The archbishop, finding that this request proceeded from an excess of zeal, consented to dispense with the canons which forbade such ordinations; and Norbert, exchanging his gay dress for a rough sheepskin, girt around him with a cord, set out on the career of a preacher and a reformer. His appearance in this character displeased his brethren, and, at a council held by the legate Conon at Fritziar in 1118, some of them charged him with turbulence, assumption, and eccentricities unbecoming both his birth and his ecclesiastical station. As the attempt to do good in his own country seemed hopeless, he resigned his benefices, sold all that he possessed, gave away the price, and went forth with two brethren to preach the gospel in apostolical poverty. At St. Giles, in Provence, he became known to pope Gelasius, who wished to retain him in his company; but Norbert was bent on continuing his labours, and obtained from the pope a licence to preach wheresoever he would. He made his way through France, barefooted and thinly clad, disregarding the roughness of the ways, the rain, the ice and the snow. At Valenciennes, finding that his knowledge of French was insufficient for preaching, while the people could not understand his German, he prayed for the gift of tongues, and we are told that his prayer was heard. At Cambray, the city of which he had refused to be bishop, he fell dangerously ill, and his two original companions, with a third who had joined him at Orleans, died; but he found a new associate in the bishop's chaplain, Hugh. The effect of his preaching was heightened by miracles, and wherever he appeared he was received with veneration.

In company with Hugh, Norbert repaired to the council of Reims, with a view of soliciting from Calixtus a renewal of the general licence to preach which had been bestowed on him by Gelasius. On account of their mean appearance, they were unable to obtain an audience of the pope; and they left the city in despair. But on the road they met with Bartholomew, bishop of Laon, who persuaded them to return with him to Reims, and not only obtained for them the licence which they sought, but, by the pope's permission, carried them with him to Laon, with a view of employing them in a reform of his canons. Norbert, however, found the task of reform beyond his power; he refused an abbacy in the city of Laon, but, at Bartholomew's entreaty, he consented to remain within the diocese; and, after having

been conducted by the bishop from one spot to another, with a view of fixing on a site, he at length chose Prémontré, a secluded and marshy valley in the forest of Coucy, from which his order took the name of *Premonstratensian*.

A little chapel was already built there, and Norbert, on passing a night in it, had a vision of the blessed Virgin, who showed him a white woollen garment, as a pattern of the dress which his order was to assume.

Having chosen a situation, Norbert went forth in the beginning of Lent to gather companions, and by Easter he returned to Prémontré with thirteen, whose number was speedily increased. For a time, like Anthony and Benedict, he was much vexed by the devices of the devil; but he was victorious in the contest. Thus we are told that once, when the enemy was rushing on him in the shape of a bear, he compelled him to vanish; and that by a like power he obliged the wolves of the neighbourhood to perform the duty of sheepdogs. In the rule of the Premonstratensians the rigid life of monks was combined with the practical duties of the clerical office. The Cistercian system of annual chapters was adopted, and the three houses of the order which ranked next in dignity after Prémontré were invested with privileges resembling those enjoyed by the four “chief daughters” of Citeaux. The order was not allowed to possess tolls, taxes, or serfs; and the members were specially forbidden to keep any animals of the more curious kinds—such as deers, bears, monkeys, peacocks, swans, or hawks. The new establishment met with favour and liberal patronage, and Norbert founded other monasteries on the same model in various parts of France and Germany. Theobald, count of Champagne, was desirous to enter into the society of Prémontré; but the founder told him that it was God’s will that he should continue in his life of piety and beneficence as a layman, and that he should marry in the hope of raising offspring to inherit his territories. The fame of Norbert was increased by the victory which he gained in 1124 over the followers of a fanatic of Antwerp named Tanchelm, whose system appears to have been a mixture of impiety and immorality; and in 1126 the discipline and the possessions of the Premonstratensians were confirmed by Honorius II.

In the same year, Count Theobald married a German princess. Norbert was invited to the nuptials, and had proceeded as far as Spire, where the emperor Lothair III and two papal legates happened to be. The clergy of Magdeburg, being unable to agree in the choice of an archbishop, had resolved to be guided by the advice of these legates; and on Norbert’s entering a church where their deputies were in conference with the representatives of Rome, his appearance was hailed as providential, and the legates recommended him for the vacant dignity. The emperor, who had been struck by his preaching, conformed to the choice, and it was in vain that Norbert endeavoured to escape by pleading that he was unfit for the office, and that he was involved in other engagements. At Magdeburg he was received with great pomp; but he had altered nothing in his habits, and when he appeared last in the procession, barefooted and meanly dressed, the porter of the archiepiscopal palace was about to shut him out as a beggar. On discovering the mistake, the man was filled with dismay; but Norbert told him that he had understood his unfitness better than those who had forced him to accept the see. As archbishop, Norbert took an active part in the affairs of the church. Notwithstanding much opposition, he established a college of Premonstratensians instead of the dissolute canons of St. Mary at Magdeburg. In 1129 he resigned the headship of his order to his old companion Hugh; and, on revisiting Prémontré two years later, in company with pope Innocent II, he had the satisfaction of finding that his rule was faithfully observed by a brotherhood of about 500.

Norbert died in 1134. The Premonstratensians spread widely; even in the founder’s lifetime they had houses in Syria and Palestine; and the order was divided into thirty provinces, each of which was under a superintendent, styled *circator*. They long kept up their severity; but in the course of years their discipline was impaired by wealth, and the order has

become extinct even in some countries of the Roman communion where it was once established. The founder was canonized by Gregory XIII in 1582.

VI.
CANONS OF ST. ANTONY.

Some orders were established for the performance of special acts of charity, as the canons of St. Antony, founded in the end of the eleventh century by Gaston, a nobleman of Dauphiny, in thankfulness for his recovery from the pestilence called St. Antony's fire. And to such an institution is to be traced the origin of one of the great military orders which are a remarkable feature of this time.

A monastery for the benefit of Latin pilgrims had been founded at Jerusalem about the middle of the eleventh century, chiefly through the bounty of merchants of Amalfi. To this was attached a hospital for each sex—that for men having a chapel dedicated to St. John the Almsgiver, who was afterwards superseded as patron by the more venerable name of St. John the Baptist; and relief was given to pilgrims who were sick, or who had been reduced to destitution, whether by the expenses of their journey or by the robbers who infested the roads. From the time of the conquest by the crusaders, the brethren of the hospital became independent of the monastery, and formed themselves into a separate order, distinguished by a black dress, with a white cross on the breast, and living monastically under a rule which was confirmed by Paschal II in 1113. The piety and charity of these brethren attracted general reverence; they were enriched by gifts and endowments, both in Asia and in Europe, from kings and other benefactors; and many knights who had gone to the Holy Land as crusaders or as pilgrims enrolled themselves among them. Among these was Raymond du Puy, who in 1118 became master of the hospital, and soon after drew up a rule which was sanctioned by pope Calixtus in 1120. The Hospitallers were to profess poverty, obedience, and strict chastity; they were to beg for the poor, and, whenever they went abroad for this or any other purpose, they were not to go singly, but with companions assigned by the master. No one was to possess any money without the master's leave, and, when travelling, they were to carry a light with them, which was to be kept burning throughout the night.

About the same time arose the military order of the Temple. In 1118, Hugh des Payens and seven other French knights, impressed by the dangers to which Christianity was exposed in the east, and by the attacks to which pilgrims were subject from infidels and robbers, vowed before the patriarch of Jerusalem to fight for the faith against the unbelievers, to defend the highways, to observe the three monastic obligations, and to live under a discipline adopted from the canons of St. Augustine.

By the formation of this society the Hospitallers were roused to emulation. The martial spirit revived in some of the brethren, who had formerly been knights; and as the wealth of the body was far more than sufficient for their original objects, Raymond du Puy offered their gratuitous services against the infidels to king Baldwin. The Hospitallers were now divided into three classes—knights, clergy, and serving brethren—the last consisting of persons who were not of noble birth. Both the knights and the servitors were bound, when not engaged in war, to devote themselves to the original purposes of the order. They soon distinguished themselves by signal acts of valour, and in 1130 their institution was confirmed by Innocent II. But by degrees they cast off the modesty and humility by which they had been at first distinguished; they defied and insulted the patriarchs of Jerusalem, and claimed immunity from the payment of ecclesiastical dues. When expelled from the Holy Land, they settled successively in Cyprus, Rhodes, and Malta; and in the last of these seats they continued almost to our own time.

The career of the Templars was shorter, but yet more brilliant. At first they were excessively poor, although the seal of the order, which displays two knights seated on one

horse, may perhaps be better interpreted as a symbol of their brotherly union than as signifying that the first grand master and Godfrey of St. Omer possessed but a single charger between them. In 1127, Hugh des Payens and some of his brethren returned to Europe. St. Bernard, who was nephew to one of the members, warmly took up their cause, and addressed a letter to Hugh, in which he enthusiastically commended the institution, exhorted the Templars to the fulfillment of their duties, and dilated on the holy memories connected with Jerusalem and Palestine. At the council of Troyes, held by a papal legate in 1128, Hugh appeared and gave an account of the origin of his order and he received for it a code of statutes, drawn up under the direction of Bernard. These no longer exist in their original form, but their substance is preserved in the extant rule, which is divided into 72 heads. The Templars were charged to be regular in devotion, self-denying, and modest. Each knight was restricted to three horses—the poverty of God’s house for the time not allowing of a greater number. No gold or silver was to be used in the trappings of their horses; and if such ornaments should be given to them, they were ordered to disguise the precious metals with colour, in order to avoid the appearance of pride. They were to have no locked trunks; they were not to receive letters, even from their nearest relations, without the master's knowledge, and were to read all letters in his presence. They were to receive no presents except by leave of the master, who was entitled to transfer presents from the knight for whom they were intended to another. They were forbidden to hawk and to hunt, nor might they accompany a person engaged in such amusements, except for the purpose of defending him from infidel treachery. They were charged “always to strike the lion”—a charge which seems to mean that they were bound to unceasing hostility against the enemies of the faith. Individual property in lands and men was allowed. Married brethren might be associated into the order; but they were not to wear its white dress, and they were bound to make it their heir. The Templars were forbidden to kiss even their mothers or sisters, and were never to walk alone. The habit of the order was white, to which Eugenius III added a red cross on the breast the banner, the *Beauseant*, was of black and white, inscribed with the motto, “Non nobis, Domine, non nobis, sed nomini tuo da gloriam”.

Although at the time of the council of Troyes the order had already been nine years in existence, the number of its members was only nine; but when thus solemnly inaugurated, and aided by the zealous recommendations of the great saint of Clairvaux, it rapidly increased. There were soon three hundred knights, of the noblest families, a large body of chaplains, and a countless train of servitors and artificers. Emperors, kings, and other potentates enriched the order with lands and endowments, so that, within fifty years after its foundation, it already enjoyed a royal revenue, derived from possessions in all parts of Europe. But, according to the writer who states this, it had even then begun to display the pride, insolence, and defiance of ecclesiastical authority which, afterwards rendered it unpopular, and prepared the way for its falling undefended and unlamented, although probably guiltless of the charges on which it was condemned.

By the rise of the new orders the influence of monachism in the church was greatly increased. They were strictly bound to the papacy by ties of mutual interest, and could always reckon on the pope as their patron in disputes with bishops or other ecclesiastical authorities. A large proportion of the papal rescripts during this time consists of privileges granted to monasteries. Many were absolutely exempted from the jurisdiction of bishops; yet such exemptions were less frequently bestowed, as the monastic communities became better able to defend themselves against oppression, and as, consequently, the original pretext for exemptions no longer existed. If bishops had formerly found it difficult to contend with the abbots of powerful individual monasteries, it was now a far more serious matter to deal with a member of a great order, connected with brethren everywhere, closely allied with the pope, and having in the abbot of Cluny or of Citeaux a chief totally independent of the bishop, and able to support his brethren against all opposition. The grievance of which bishops had

formerly complained, therefore, was now more rarely inflicted by the privileges bestowed on monasteries; yet the monks were, although without it, in a higher position than ever.

The monastic communities not only intercepted the bounty which would otherwise have been bestowed on the secular clergy, but preyed very seriously on the settled revenues of the church. Laymen, who were moved by conscience or by compulsion to resign tithes which they had held, were inclined to bestow them on monasteries rather than on the parish churches to which they rightfully belonged. And as, by an abuse already described, it had often happened that a layman possessed himself of the oblations belonging to a church, assigning only a miserable stipend to the incumbent, these dues, as well as the tithes, were, in case of a restitution, transferred to the monks. Although some abbots refused to enrich their monasteries by accepting tithes or ecclesiastical dues, and although some of the new monastic rules contained express prohibitions on the subject, it was with little effect that synods attempted to check such impropriations; nor did they perfectly succeed in forbidding monks to interfere with the secular clergy by undertaking pastoral and priestly functions.

The monks of Monte Cassino, the “head and mother of all monasteries”, claimed liberties even against the papacy itself. An abbot named Seniorectus (Signoretto), elected during the pontificate of Honorius II, refused to make a profession of fidelity to the pope, and, on being asked why he should scruple to comply with a form to which all archbishops and bishops submitted, the monks replied that it had never been required of their abbots—that bishops had often fallen into heresy or schism, but Monte Cassino had always been pure. Honorius gave way; but when Reginald, the successor of Seniorectus, had received benediction from the antipope Anacletus, the plea for exemption could no longer be plausibly pretended, and, notwithstanding the vehement opposition of the monks, Innocent II insisted on an oath of obedience as a condition of their reconciliation to the Roman church.

New privileges were conferred on orders or on particular monasteries. According to the chroniclers of St. Augustine’s, at Canterbury, the use of the mitre was granted to Egilsin, abbot of that house, by Alexander II in 1063, although they admit that, through the “simplicity” of the abbots and the enmity of the archbishops, the privilege lay dormant for more than a century. The earliest undoubted grant of the mitre, however, is one which was made to the abbot of St. Maximin’s, at Treves, by Gregory VII. Among other privileges granted to monasteries were exemption from the payment of tithes and from the jurisdiction of legates; exemption from excommunication except by the pope alone, and from any interdict which might be laid on the country in which the monastery was situated; permission that the abbots should wear the episcopal ring, gloves, and sandals, and should not be bound to attend any councils except those summoned by the pope himself. The abbots of Cluny and Vendome were, by virtue of their office, cardinals of the Roman church.

In addition to the genuine grants, forgery was now very largely used to advance the pretensions of monastic bodies. Thus we are told that Leo IX, on visiting Subiaco in 1051, found many spurious documents and committed them to the flames. Even Monte Cassino did not disdain to make use of the forger’s arts. The monks of St. Medard’s at Soissons were notorious for impostures of this kind; one of them, named Guerno, confessed on his death-bed that he had travelled widely, supplying monasteries with pretended “apostolic” privileges, and that among those who had employed him in such fabrications was the proud society of St. Augustine’s, at Canterbury.

CHAPTER VIII.

FROM THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS TO THE DEATH OF POPE ADRIAN IV.
A.D. 1122-1159

1

BERNARD DE CLAIRVAUX

ALTHOUGH the concordat of Worms had been welcome both to the papal and to the imperialist parties as putting an end to the contest which had long raged between them, the terms of the compromise embodied in it did not remain in force beyond the death of Henry V, which took place at Utrecht in May 1125. Henry had not taken the precaution of providing himself with a successor to the empire or to the German kingdom, nor was there any one who could pretend to election as being his natural heir; and the princes of Germany saw in the circumstances of the vacancy an opportunity for gaining advantages at the expense of the crown. A letter is extant, addressed by such of them as had assembled for the emperor's funeral at Spire to their absent brethren, whom they exhort to remember the oppressions under which both the church and the kingdom had suffered, and to take care that the future sovereign should be one under whom both church and kingdom might be free from "so heavy a yoke of slavery". It is supposed that this letter was drawn up by Archbishop Adalbert of Mayence, the bitter and vindictive enemy of the late emperor, and in the election of a new king this prelate's influence was exerted in the spirit which the document had indicated. For this election sixty thousand men of the four chief nations of Germany—the Franconians, the Saxons, the Swabians, and the Bavarians—gathered near Mayence, in the month of August, encamping on both sides of the Rhine, while the conferences of their leaders were held within the city. The attendance of prelates and nobles was such as had not been seen within the memory of living men; and under the direction of a papal legate, who was present, it was settled that the election should be conducted in a form analogous to that of a pope—that, as the pope was chosen by the cardinals, and the choice was ratified by the inferior clergy, so the king should be elected by ten representatives from each of the four chief nations, and their choice should be confirmed by the rest. Three candidates were proposed— Frederick, duke of Swabia, Lothair, duke of Saxony, and Leopold, marquis of Austria; to whom some authorities add the name of a fourth—Charles "the Good", count of Flanders. Both Lothair and Leopold, however, professed, with strong protestations, a wish to decline the honour; and it appeared as if the election were about to fall on Frederick, the son of Frederick of Hohenstaufen, who in the reign of Henry IV had suddenly emerged from the undistinguished crowd of German nobles, and had been rewarded for his services with the dukedom of Swabia and the hand of the emperor's daughter. But the younger Frederick was obnoxious to the hierarchical party on account of his connection with the Franconian emperors, whose family estates he had inherited; while many of the lay princes, as well as the clergy, were unwilling to give themselves a king who was likely to assert too much of independence. Through Adalbert's artful policy it was contrived that the election should fall on Lothair, who, while he still protested, struggled, and threatened, was raised on the shoulders of his partisans and proclaimed as king.

Lothair, who was already advanced in life, had been conspicuous for the steadiness of his opposition to the late dynasty, and on that account was popular with its enemies; he was respected for his courage and honesty; and, after a slight display of opposition in some

quarters, his election was received with general acquiescence. But, although he had always professed himself a champion of the church, the clerical party, which had borne so large a part in his advancement, held it necessary to bind him by new conditions. It was stipulated that the church should have full liberty of election to bishoprics, without being controlled, “as formerly”, by the presence of the sovereign, or restrained by any recommendation; and that the emperor, after the consecration of a prelate so elected, should, without any payment, invest him with the regalia by the sceptre, and should receive of him an oath of fidelity “saving his order”—a phrase which was interpreted as excluding the ancient feudal form of homage. No mention was made of the concordat of Worms, by which the presence of the prince at elections had been allowed, and, while the formality of homage had been left untouched, it had been provided that, in the case of German bishops, investiture should precede consecration; and this disregard of the reservations made at Worms in behalf of the crown was justified by the hierarchical party under the pretence that they had been granted to Henry V alone, and not to his successors. A further proof of the change which had taken place in the relations of the papal and the imperial powers is furnished by the circumstance that two bishops were sent to Rome, with a prayer that the pope would confirm the election of the king.

The pontificate of Calixtus II was distinguished by the vigour of his home administration. At the Lateran Council of 1123, he enacted canons against the invasion of ecclesiastical property and the conversion of churches into fortresses. He suppressed the practice of carrying arms within the city, which had grown up during the long contest with the empire, and had become the provocation to continual and bloody affrays; and in other ways he exerted himself successfully against the lawlessness and disorder which had prevailed among the Romans. On the death of Calixtus, in December 1124, a cardinal named Theobald Buccapecus (or Boccadipecora) was chosen as his successor, and assumed the name of Celestine; but, after he had been invested with the papal robe, and while the cardinals were engaged in singing the *Te Deum* for the election, Robert Frangipani, the most powerful of the Roman nobles, burst with a band of armed men into the church where they were assembled, and insisted that Lambert, cardinal bishop of Ostia (a prudent and learned man, who had acted as the late pope’s legate at Worms), should be chosen. Theobald, although his election was unimpeachable, and although he had received the vote of Lambert himself, thought it well to prevent a schism by voluntarily withdrawing from the contest; and Lambert, having some days later been elected in a more regular manner, held the papacy, under the name of Honorius II, until 1130. But on his death a serious schism arose, through the rival elections of Gregory, cardinal of St. Angelo, and Peter Leonis, cardinal of St. Mary in the Trastevere, the grandson of a wealthy Jew, who had been baptized under the pontificate of Leo IX, and had taken at his baptism the name of that pope. The “Leonine family”, or Pierleoni (as they were called), had since risen to great power in Rome; their wealth had been increased by the continued practice of those national arts which they had not renounced with the faith of their forefathers; while their political ability had been displayed in high offices, and in the conduct of important negotiations. For a time the Jewish pedigree seems to have been almost forgotten, and their genealogy (like that of other great medieval families, and probably with equal truth) was afterwards deduced from the illustrious Anicii and the imperial Julii of ancient Rome. The future antipope himself had studied at Paris, had been a monk of Cluny, had been raised to the dignity of cardinal by Paschal II, and had been employed as a legate in England and in France—on one occasion as the colleague of his future rival, Gregory. The circumstances of the election are variously reported; but from a comparison of the reports it would appear that Gregory (who styled himself Innocent II) was chosen in the church of St. Gregory on the Caelian, immediately after the death of Honorius, with such haste that the proper formalities were neglected; whereas the election of Peter, which took place in St. Mark’s at a later hour of the same day, was more regular, and was supported by a majority of the cardinals. And the inference in favour of Peter (or Anacletus II) is strengthened by the

circumstance that his opponent's partisans, while they continually insist on the question of personal merit, are studious to avoid that of legality as to the circumstances of the election.

The rival popes were not, as in former cases, representatives of opposite principles, but merely of the rival interests of the Frangipani and the Leonine factions. Each of them, at his election, had gone through the pretence of professing unwillingness to accept the papacy; and each of them now endeavoured to strengthen himself for the assertion of his title to it. In Rome itself Anacletus prevailed. His enemies tell us that not only was he supported by the power and wealth of his family, but that he had formerly swelled his treasures by all the corrupt means which were open to him as a cardinal or a legate; that he plundered the treasury, that he compelled pilgrims by imprisonment and hunger to submit to merciless exactions, that he melted down the plate of churches, even employing Jews to break up chalices and crucifixes when Christian tradesmen shrank from such impiety. His connection with the hated and unbelieving race is eagerly caught up as matter of reproach; and he is charged with scandalous and even revolting dissoluteness. That Innocent is not assailed by similar reproaches may have been the effect either of superior character in himself or of greater forbearance in the party which opposed him. The wealth of Anacletus was employed in raising soldiers and in corrupting the venal Romans; he got possession of St. Peter's by force; and in no long time the nobles who had adhered to Innocent, and had sheltered his partisans in their fortified houses—even the Frangipani themselves—were gained over by the rival pope or were terrified into submission. Finding himself without support in his own city, Innocent resolved to throw himself on that kingdom which had lately afforded a refuge to his predecessor Gelasius; he therefore left Conrad, cardinal-bishop of Sabina, as his representative at Rome, sailed down the Tiber in the end of May, and after having spent some time at Pisa and at Genoa, he landed in September at St. Gilles in Provence. The course which the king and the church of France were to take in the dispute as to the papacy was mainly determined by two abbots, who stood in the highest repute for sanctity, Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter of Cluny.

Bernard, the third son of a knight named Tesselin, was born at Fontaines, near Dijon, in 1091. His mother, Aletha, or Alice, was a woman of devout character, and dedicated her children—six sons and one daughter—in their infancy to God; but Bernard—a gentle, thoughtful, studious, and silent boy—was the one in whom she placed the strongest hope of seeing her desire fulfilled. As he was entering on youth, Aletha died, taking part to the last moment of her life in the devotions of the clergy who were gathered around her bed; but her influence remained with him. The earnestness of his resistance to the temptations of youth was shown by standing for hours up to the neck in chilling water; and other stories to the same purpose are related of him. He believed that his mother often appeared to him in visions, for the purpose of warning him lest his studies (like those of many others in that time) should degenerate into a mere pursuit of literature, apart from the cultivation of religion; and, after much mental distress, the crisis of his life took place as he was on his way to visit his brothers, who were engaged in a military expedition under the duke of Burgundy. Entering a church by the wayside, he “poured out his heart like water before the sight of God”; he resolved to devote himself to the monastic state, and forthwith endeavoured to bring his nearest relations to join in the resolution. The first of his converts was his uncle Waldric, a distinguished and powerful warrior; and one by one his five brothers also yielded. The eldest, Guy, who was married and had children, was restrained for a time by his wife's unwillingness; but a sudden illness convinced her that it “was hard for her to kick against the pricks”. To another brother, Gerard, who was strenuous in his refusal, Bernard declared that nothing but affliction would bring him to a right mind, and, laying his finger on a certain place in his side, he told him that even there a lance should penetrate. The prophecy was fulfilled by Gerard's being wounded and made prisoner; and, on recovering his liberty (not without the assistance of a miracle) he joined the company which Bernard was forming. As Bernard at the head of his converts was

leaving the family mansion in order to fulfill their resolution, the eldest brother observed the youngest, Nivard, at play, and told him that the inheritance would now all fall to him;—"Is it, then, heaven for you and earth for me?" said the boy, "that is no fair division"; and he too, after a time, broke away from his father to join the rest. The old man himself followed, and at length the devotion of the family to the monastic life was completed by the adhesion of the sister, who renounced the married state, with the wealth and the vanities in which she had delighted. For six months the brothers resided in a house at Chatillon, for the purpose of settling their worldly affairs before entering the cloister. Others in the meantime were induced to join them, and in 1113 Bernard, with more than thirty companions, presented himself for admission at Citeaux—a monastery which he chose for the sake of its rigour, and as offering the best hope of escaping the notice of men. The progress of the Cistercian order had been slow, on account of the severity of its discipline, so that Stephen Harding, the third abbot, had almost despaired of spiritual offspring to carry on his system. But the vision by which he had been consoled, of a multitude washing their white garments in a fountain was now to be rapidly fulfilled.

By the accession of Bernard and his company, the original monastery became too narrow to contain its inmates, and in the same year the "eldest daughter", the monastery of La Ferté, was founded. This was followed in 1114 by the foundation of Pontigny; and in 1115 Bernard himself was chosen to lead forth a fresh colony to a place which had been the haunt of a band of robbers, and known as "The Valley of Wormwood", but which now exchanged its name for that of Clairvaux—The Bright Valley. For a time, the hardships which the little community had to bear were excessive. They suffered from cold and from want of clothing; they were obliged to live on porridge made of beech-leaves; and when the season of necessity was past, their voluntary mortifications were such as to strike all who saw them with astonishment. Their bread, wrung by their labour from an ungracious soil, was "not so much branny as earthy"; their food (it is said) had no savour but what was given to it by hunger or by the love of God; everything that could afford pleasure to the appetite was regarded as poison. A monk of another order, who visited Clairvaux, carried off a piece of the bread as a curiosity, and used to show it with expressions of wonder that men, and yet more, that such men, could live on such provisions. But we are told that miracles came to the aid of the monks. When they were in the extremity of need, opportune supplies of money unexpectedly arrived; in a famine, when they undertook to feed the poor of the neighborhood, their corn was miraculously multiplied; and from these assistances they drew a confidence in the Divine protection, so that they ceased to disturb their abbot with anxieties about worldly things.

Bernard himself carried his mortifications to an extreme of rigour. He prayed standing, until his knees and his feet failed him through weariness; he fasted until his digestion was so deranged that to eat was a torture to him; he grudged the scanty time which he allowed himself for sleep, as being wasted in a state of death. He shared beyond his strength in the ruder labours of the monks, such as the work of the fields and the carrying of wood. "It was", says one of his biographers, "as if a lamb were yoked to the plough and compelled to drag it". Much of his time was spent in study; but, although he read the orthodox expositors, he declared that he preferred to learn the sense of Scripture from itself, that his best teachers were the oaks and beeches among which he meditated in solitude. By the severity of his exercises, it is said that he had extinguished his bodily senses; for many days together he ate blood, supposing it to be butter; he drank oil without knowing it from water; after having spent a year at Citeaux, he could not tell whether the roof of the novices chamber was vaulted or not, nor whether the east end of the church had two windows or three; and for a whole day he walked along the shore of the Leman lake without being aware that any water was near. Hearing that his life was in danger from his excessive mortifications, William of Champeaux, bishop of Châlons on the Marne, by whom he had been ordained, repaired to Citeaux, and, prostrating himself before the abbots of the order, who were assembled in a general chapter, requested

that Bernard might be committed to his care for a year. The request was granted, and the bishop placed the abbot in a small hut outside his monastery, “like those usually made for lepers at the crossings of the highways”, with orders that he should not be disquieted with business or allowed to indulge in his usual austerities. By this (although the bishop’s orders were but imperfectly obeyed) Bernard’s life was probably saved; but, when the year was at an end, he plunged into ascetic exercises more violently than before, as if to compensate for his forced relaxations. In later years, Bernard expressed disapprobation of such excess in mortification as that by which he had weakened his own body and impaired his vigour yet the appearance of his pale face and macerated form, the contrast of bodily weakness with inward strength, contributed greatly to enhance the effect of his powerful voice and his gushing flow of language, his strong conviction, and the burning fervour with which he spoke. To persons of every class he knew how to address himself in the style most suitable to their understanding and feelings and over all kinds of men, from the sovereign to the serf, he exercised an irresistible power. Whenever he went forth from his solitude, says a biographer, he carried with him, like Moses, from his intercourse with heaven, a glory of more than mortal purity, so that men looked on him with awe, and his words sounded to them as the voice of an angel. To his other means of influence was added the reputation of prophetic visions and of miraculous gifts. Not only is it said that he healed by his touch, but there are many such stories as that bread which he had blessed produced supernatural effects both on the bodies and on the minds of those who ate it; that water in which he had washed his hands cured the ailment of a man who had been charged in a vision to drink it; that his stole cast out a devil; and that a blind man recovered his sight by placing himself on a spot where the saintly abbot had stood. Of the reality of his miracles Bernard himself appears to have been convinced, and we are told that they were a matter of perplexity to him; but that, after much consideration, he concluded that they were granted for the good of others, and were no ground for supposing himself to be holier or more favoured than other men. When recommended by such a man, the rigour which at first had deterred from the Cistercian order became a powerful attraction; Clairvaux was beset by candidates for admission; the number of its inmates rose to seven hundred, among whom the king’s brother Henry, afterward archbishop of Reims, was to be seen submitting to the same severe discipline as the rest; and the number of monasteries founded by Bernard, in person or through his disciples, amounted to a hundred and sixty, scattered over every country of the west, but subject, as was believed, to a preternatural knowledge of their affairs which enabled him to watch over all. Wives were afraid for their husbands, and mothers hid their sons, lest they should fall under the fascination of Bernard’s eloquence, and desert the world for the cloister. As the chief representative of the age’s feelings, the chief model of the character which it most revered, he found himself, apparently without design, and even unconsciously, elevated to a position of such influence as no ecclesiastic, either before or since his time, has attained. Declining the dignities to which he saw a multitude of his followers promoted, the abbot of Clairvaux was for a quarter of a century the real soul and director of the papacy; he guided the policy of emperors and kings, and swayed the deliberations of councils; nay, however little his character and the training of his own mind might have fitted him for such a work, the authority of his sanctity was such as even to control the intellectual development of the age which owned him as its master.

In the schism which had now arisen, Bernard zealously espoused the interest of Innocent. At a council which king Lewis summoned at Étampes for the consideration of the question, the abbot of Clairvaux is said to have spoken as if by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost; and the assembly, in accordance with his opinion, pronounced in favour of Innocent—not, apparently, as having been the most regularly elected (for it is said that the notorious disorderliness of Roman elections led them to pay little regard to this point), but mainly on the ground of his superior personal merit.

Unequaled as Bernard's influence became, however, perhaps that of Peter "the Venerable" was at this time yet more important to Innocent. For Anacletus had himself been a monk of Cluny, and had reckoned on the support of his order; so that the ready and spontaneous declaration of the abbot in behalf of Innocent inflicted the severest blow on the rival claimant of the papacy. And the character of Peter was such as to give all weight to his decision. Elected to the headship of his order at the age of thirty, he had recovered Cluny from the effects of the disorders caused by his predecessor, Pontius, and had once more established its reputation as a seat of piety, learning, and arts. In him the monastic spirit had not extinguished the human affections, but was combined with a mildness, a tolerance, and a charity which he was able to reconcile with the strictest orthodoxy. The reputation of the "venerable" abbot was such that emperors, kings, and high ecclesiastical personages revered his judgment; and when it became known that Innocent had reached Cluny with a train of sixty horses, provided by the abbot for his conveyance, the effect of this signal declaration against the Cluniac antipope was widely and strongly felt. At Cluny Innocent spent eleven days, and on the 25th of October, the anniversary of the dedication of the high altar by Urban II, he consecrated the new church of the monastery. There he was welcomed in the name of the French king by Suger, abbot of St. Denys; and in the beginning of 1131 he was received by Lewis himself at Fleury, with the deepest demonstrations of respect. With a view of enlisting Henry of England in the same cause, Bernard had undertaken a journey into his continental territory; and, notwithstanding the opposition of many prelates, who are said to have represented that Innocent, as a fugitive, would be a burden to the king and to his people, the abbot had met with his wonted success. On Henry's hesitating,—“Are you afraid”, asked Bernard, “that you may sin by giving your obedience to Innocent? Think how you may answer for your other sins, and let this rest on me!”. The king's reluctance was overcome, and he accompanied Bernard to Chartres, where Innocent received his assurances of support, with the magnificent presents which accompanied them.

Anacletus had proposed that the question between himself and his rival should be decided by an ecclesiastical council or by the emperor; but the proposal was declined by Innocent, on the ground that he was already rightful pope. Each party continued, by strenuous exertions, to endeavour to enlist adherents. The cardinals who supported Innocent wrote to Lothair, that, after their election had been made at the third hour, the Jewish antipope was chosen at the sixth—the hour when the Redeemer was crucified by the Jews, and when a thick darkness overspread the world. They dwell on his alleged impieties and other misdeeds; they assure Lothair that the whole East joins in anathematizing the pretender, and they entreat the king of the Romans himself to support their cause.

With no less eagerness and confidence, Anacletus endeavored to make interest in all quarters. He insisted on the validity of his election, which he described as unanimous, although he admitted that he was opposed by a few sons of Belial, on whom he lavishes all the treasures of ecclesiastical abuse. He reminds some to whom he writes of their ancient friendship with his father; to others he recalls his own friendly relations with them; to the Cluniacs, his connection with their order and its chief monastery. He, too, boasts of his powerful supporters—that he is acknowledged throughout the whole of Rome, and that the East is with him and it would seem that he endeavoured to verify this boast by a letter to the king of Jerusalem, in which he vaguely promises to do great things for the holy city. But the success of these endeavours was very small. For a time bishops of the opposite parties contended in dioceses, and rival abbots disputed the headship of monasteries but the great orders all declared in favour of Innocent. The letters which Anacletus addressed to princes and prelates remained without acknowledgment, and the only secular power which he was able to secure to his side was that of the southern Normans. The position of the rivals was expressed by a verse which spoke of Peter as having Rome, while Gregory had the whole world.

Although Anacletus had declared himself in favour of Lothair, instead of throwing himself into the interest of the Hohenstaufen family, and although Lothair had been importuned in his behalf by a letter written in the name of the Romans, Germany was won to the side of Innocent by legates who appeared before a diet at Wurzburg, and it was arranged that the king should meet the pope at Liège. The assemblage collected in that city for the occasion was imposing from the number of prelates and nobles who attended. Lothair received the pope with the greatest reverence, held the rein of his horse while he rode through the streets, and, with his wife Richenza, was crowned by his hands in the cathedral. The king promised to go into Italy, and to seat Innocent in St. Peter's chair; but when, in consideration of this aid, he desired that the privilege of investiture should be restored to him,—representing, it is said, that the weakening of the imperial power by the cession of this was a weakening of the papacy itself—a serious difference arose. To the Romans who were present, the proposal appeared to involve evils even worse than the ascendancy of the antipope in Rome; but their repugnance might have been unavailing if it had not been reinforced by the authority of Bernard, to whose firm opposition Lothair found himself obliged to yield. But in questions which soon after arose as to various sees—especially those of Treves and Verdun—he showed that he was no longer disposed, as at the time of his election, to give up the privileges which had been reserved to the crown by the concordat of Worms, but, agreeably to the terms of that treaty, he insisted that the bishops should receive investiture before consecration.

Returning into France, Innocent spent the Easter season at Paris and St. Denys, where he was received with splendid hospitality, and in October he held a council at Reims, which was attended by thirteen archbishops and two hundred and sixty-three bishops. Norbert, the founder of the Premonstratensians, and now archbishop of Magdeburg, appeared on the part of the German king, to renew his promises of assistance, and to efface the remembrance of the late disputes. The kings of England, of Aragon, and of Castile were also represented by prelates who tendered in their names assurances of obedience and support. Lewis of France was present in person; and, as his son and colleague, Philip, had lately been killed by a fall from his horse in a street of Paris a younger son, Lewis, at that time ten years old, was crowned in his stead. Bernard had by his personal intercourse acquired an unbounded influence over Innocent, so that although the pope still appeared to consult in public with his cardinals, it was known that he was really under the guidance of the abbot of Clairvaux, to whom all who desired any favour from the pope addressed themselves. From Reims Innocent proceeded to visit Clairvaux, where he was the more deeply impressed by the austerity of the Cistercian system from its contrast with the magnificence of Cluny. The “poor of Christ”, according to Bernard's biographer, received him, not in purple and fine linen, not with the display of gilded books and splendid furniture, not with the loud blare of trumpets; but their coarsely-attired procession carried a cross of stone, and greeted him with a low chant of psalms. The pope and his attendant bishops were moved to tears at the sight, while the monks, with their eyes fixed on the ground, would not allow themselves to look at their visitors. It was with awe that these beheld the simple oratory with its naked walls, the refectory with its bare earthen floor, the rude and scanty provisions of the brotherhood—even fish being served up for the pope's table only. The solemnities of the choir were painfully disturbed by a monk who suddenly exclaimed, “I am the Christ!”, but we are told that the demon who had prompted this outbreak was immediately quelled by the prayers of Bernard and his brethren.

In April 1132, Innocent crossed the Alps on his return to Italy, having addressed from Lyons a letter to Bernard, by which, in acknowledgment of his services, the pope bestowed exemptions and other privileges on Clairvaux and on the whole Cistercian order. After having spent the summer in Lombardy, he met Lothair in the plains of Roncaglia in November. Since the election of the German king, the interest of the Hohenstaufen had been strengthened by the return of Frederick's brother Conrad from the Holy Land; and as Conrad had taken no oath of

fealty to Lothair, he was now set up as the head of the party. In 1128 he was crowned as king of Italy at Monza by Anselm, archbishop of Milan, who, on the ground of his church's independence, had refused the pall from pope Honorius. In consequence of having officiated at the coronation, Anselm had been declared by Honorius to be deposed, and, having afterwards accepted the pall from Anacletus, he was excommunicated by Innocent and driven from his city, while Conrad was excommunicated by both the claimants of the papacy. Yet the opposition of the Hohenstaufen was still so formidable in Germany that Lothair, when he proceeded into Italy, in fulfillment of the promise which he had made at Liège, could only take with him a body of 1,500 or 2,000 horse, which excited the mockery of the Italians. With this small force, however, he conducted the pope to Rome, where they arrived on the 30th of April 1133.

Attempts were made by Anacletus (who still held possession of a great part of the city) to obtain an inquiry into his pretensions; but Lothair, under the influence of the opposite party, rejected his overtures, and issued an edict in condemnation of him. On the 4th of June, Lothair and Richenza were crowned in the Lateran by Innocent; for St. Peter's, the usual scene of the imperial coronations, was in the hands of the antipope. Before entering the church, the emperor swore, in the presence of the Roman nobles, to defend the pope's person and dignity, to maintain those royalties of St. Peter which innocent already possessed, and to aid him with all his power towards the recovery of the rest. A compromise was arranged as to the inheritance of the countess Matilda, which, in consequence of Henry V's refusal to admit her donation, had become a subject of dispute between the papacy and the empire. Lothair was invested with the lands by the ceremony of the ring, and was to hold them under the Roman see on payment of a hundred pounds of silver yearly; and after him they were to be held on like terms by his son-in-law Henry, duke of Bavaria, at whose death they were to revert to the papacy. In this arrangement it is evident that Lothair was more eager to secure the interest of his own family than that of the elective imperial crown. But beyond the temporary settlement of this question and his formal acknowledgment as emperor, Lothair's expedition to Italy had no results. His declaration in favour of Innocent was not supported either by the force which would have suppressed opposition, or by the wealth which would have bought over the Romans; and he found himself obliged to retire before the dangers of the climate, leaving Rome a prey to its exasperated factions. Innocent was speedily again driven out, and withdrew to Pisa, where he remained until the beginning of 1137.

At Pisa a great council was held in May 1136, when Anacletus was excommunicated, and the sentence of deposition, without hope of restoration, was pronounced against his partisans. At this assembly Bernard was the person most remarkable for the influence which he exerted, and for the reverence which was paid to him : but we are assured by his biographer that he remained unmoved by all the honours which were pressed on him. From Pisa he proceeded to Milan, in order to complete the work of reclaiming the citizens from their adhesion to the antipope and Conrad. When his approach was known, almost the whole population poured forth to meet him at a distance of some miles. They thronged to touch him; they pulled out threads from his clothes, to be treasured as relics or employed for the cure of the sick. Bread and water were brought from a distance for his blessing, from which they were believed to derive a sacramental virtue; and a vast number of miracles was wrought, which were ascribed by the Milanese to his sanctity, and by himself to the willing and eager faith of the people. The turbulent city submitted implicitly to his words; the ornaments of the churches were put away, sackcloth and coarse woollen garments were generally worn, and women as well as men manifested their repentance by submitting to be shorn of their hair. Bernard was entreated to accept the archbishopric, which he did not absolutely refuse; but he declared that he would leave the matter to be decided by the course which his palfrey should take on the morrow, and in obedience to this sign he rode away from Milan. A new archbishop, Robald, was soon afterwards elected, and, at Bernard's persuasion, the Milanese consented to his

accepting the pall from Innocent, and taking an oath to the pope by which, in the words of the chronicler Landulf, “he turned the liberty of the church of Milan into the contrary”. The jurisdiction of the see had lately been diminished by the erection of an archbishopric of Genoa, with metropolitan authority over some dioceses which were withdrawn from the province of Milan.

On Bernard’s return to France, his influence was again remarkably manifested. Gerard, bishop of Angouleme, who had taken a prominent part in forcing Pope Paschal to recall his compact with Henry V, had been employed by successive popes as legate for Aquitaine and the adjoining provinces of Spain. He had written to the council of Étampes a letter in favour of Innocent, but, having been unable to obtain from that pope a renewal of his legation, he had espoused the party of Anacletus, and had received from him a fresh commission. It was in vain that he attempted to draw Henry of England and some princes of Spain and Brittany into the antipope’s interest; but he was able to secure the adherence of William IX, count of Aquitaine, and, relying on the count’s support, he seized on the see of Bourges, and ejected several bishops and abbots, filling their places with men whose birth is said to have been their only qualification for such office. Peter of Cluny had endeavored to reclaim the count of Aquitaine, but without success; but at the request of Innocent’s legate, Geoffrey, bishop of Chartres, Bernard undertook the task. After having listened to his arguments, the count, who was really indifferent as to the claims of the rival popes, professed himself willing to join the party of Innocent. But as to the deprived bishops, he declared that he would not and could not restore them, because they had offended him beyond forgiveness, and he had bound himself by an oath to the contrary; nor could he be persuaded by Bernard’s assurances that such oaths were not to be regarded as valid. The abbot proceeded to the celebration of mass, while William, as an excommunicate person, remained without the church-door, until Bernard again came forth, with a sternness of countenance, a fire in his eyes, and an awful solemnity in his whole demeanour, which appeared more than human, and bearing the consecrated host in his hands. “Often”, he said, “have we entreated you, and you have despised us, the servants of God. Lo, here comes to you the Son of the Virgin, the Lord and Head of the church which you persecute. Here is your Judge, at whose name every knee shall bow of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth—your Judge, into whose hands your soul will fall. Will you despise Him too, as you have despised His servants?”. At these words, while all around were in trembling expectation of the event, the count fell on the earth, foaming at the mouth, and apparently senseless. He was raised up by some soldiers of his guard, but his limbs refused to support him, until Bernard, touching him with his foot, desired him to stand up, and hear God’s sentence. The demand that he should restore the ejected prelates was immediately obeyed, and his reconciliation with the church was signed with the kiss of peace. Gerard of Angouleme still resisted all attempts to gain him; but it is said that he was soon after found lifeless in his bed, having died excommunicate and without the last sacraments. His body was torn from the grave by order of the legate Geoffrey of Chartres, the altars which he had consecrated were thrown down, all who had been promoted by him to ecclesiastical offices were ejected, and the schism was suppressed in France.

In 1137, Bernard, in compliance with a request from Innocent and his cardinals, undertook another journey into Italy, for the purpose of labouring against the antipope. The interest of Anacletus had by this time greatly declined; his money was exhausted, his state was diminished, even the service of his table had fallen into a condition of meanness and neglect; and Bernard, on arriving at Rome, discovered that most of the antipope’s adherents were inclined to a reconciliation with Innocent, although many of them were withheld by oaths, by family ties, or by other private considerations. The whole strength of the party now rested on Roger II of Sicily. Roger, an able, stern, and ambitious prince, had undertaken, on the extinction of Robert Guiscard’s line by the death of William of Apulia in 1127, to unite under

his own power the whole of the Norman acquisitions in Italy, and, in addition to the possessions both of the Hauteville family and of the earlier settlers in Campania, he had seized on the duchy of Naples, which until then had been connected with the Greek empire. Pope Honorius, after having thrice denounced him excommunicate, and after having vainly endeavoured to resist his progress by an armed alliance, was compelled in 1228 to invest him in his new conquests with the title of duke; and two years later, Roger, having assumed the title of king, received a confirmation of it from Anacletus, by whom he was crowned at Palermo.

The pope had joined with the dispossessed princes of the south in entreating the emperor's intervention; and Lothair, after having established peace in Germany by a reconciliation with Frederick and Conrad of Hohenstaufen (in which Bernard's mediation was added to that of the empress Richenza), again crossed the Alps at the head of a powerful force. In a single campaign, with the aid of the fleets of Genoa and Pisa, he deprived Roger of all his late acquisitions on the mainland. But dissensions arose between the allies. In a question as to the reconciliation of the abbey of Monte Cassino, which had been drawn by the Sicilian power into the antipope's interest, the emperor bitterly reproached the pope's representatives for their master's ingratitude to him, and even threatened to forsake his party; and when a new prince, Rainulf, was to be invested at Salerno, after a month's discussion whether the suzerainty belonged to the pope or to the emperor, the difficulty was for the time overcome by an arrangement that both should at the ceremony hold the banner by means of which the investiture was performed. Having restored Innocent to Rome, and apparently pacified Italy, Lothair set out homewards; but at Trent he fell sick, and on the 3rd of December he died at Breitenwang, an obscure place between the rivers Inn and Lech. A diet was summoned to meet at Whitsuntide 1138 for the election of a successor, and it was expected that the choice of the Germans would fall on Henry, duke of Bavaria, the son-in-law and representative of the late emperor. But Henry, by conduct which had gained for him the epithet of "The Proud", had offended many of the electors, and the influence of the pope, who dreaded a too powerful emperor, was exerted in opposition to the family which had restored him to the possession of his capital. Without waiting, therefore, for the appointed diet, a small party of the electors, headed by the archbishops of Treves and Cologne (Mayence being vacant in consequence of the death of Adalbert), chose Conrad of Hohenstaufen—once an excommunicated pretender to the Italian kingdom—as king of Germany, and he was crowned by the papal legate, cardinal Theotwin, at Aix-la-Chapelle. For some years which followed, Germany was again a prey to the contests of parties struggling for supremacy, and it is said that in the course of these contests—at the battle of Weinsberg, in 1140—the names of Welf and Waiblingen (Guelf and Ghibelline), "those hellish names", as a Genoese chronicler calls them, which afterwards became so notorious in the feuds of Italy, were first heard as the rallying cries of the opposite parties.

While Lothair was yet on his way towards the Alps, Roger again appeared in Italy, and speedily recovered a large portion of his conquests. In answer to overtures from Innocent, which were made through Bernard, he proposed a conference between representatives of the rival popes,—in the hope, it is said, that Peter of Pisa, one of the ablest partisans of Anacletus, would by his learning and rhetorical skill prove superior to the abbot of Clairvaux. After Peter had stated the claims of Anacletus, Bernard began his reply by insisting on the unity of the church, and then proceeded to apply the doctrine by asking whether it could be thought that Roger alone was in the one ark of salvation, while all other Christian nations, and all the holy orders of monks, were to perish? Then, seeing the impression which his words had made on his hearers, "Let us", he said to Peter, taking him by the hand, "enter into a safer ark". The antipapal champion, whether really convinced, or gained by a promise that his dignities should be secured to him, yielded to the appeal and returned with Bernard to Rome, where he

professed his submission to Innocent; but Roger still held out with a view of making conditions as to some property of the Roman see which he had seized.

The death of Lothair was followed within a few weeks by that of Anacletus, who, notwithstanding, the decay of his power, had to the last kept possession of the Vatican. His body was secretly buried, lest it should be treated like that of Pope Formosus; and, although a successor was set up, under the name of Victor the Fourth, this was rather with a view to making favourable terms of reconciliation than with any serious hope of prolonging the schism. Innocent spent large sums in buying over the adherents of Anacletus,—among them the members of the late antipope's own family, who humbled themselves at his feet, and took the oath of fealty to him; and such was Bernard's influence that the new antipope went to his lodging, by night, renounced his claims, stripped off his insignia, and was led by the abbot in triumph to prostrate himself at the feet of Innocent. The joy of the Romans at the restoration of peace was unbounded; but Bernard, to whom they ascribed the merit of it, escaped with all speed from their demonstrations of gratitude, and returned to resume in the quiet seclusion of Clairvaux his mystical exposition of the Canticles.

In April 1139, Innocent, now undisputed master of Rome, assembled at the Lateran a general council, which was attended by a thousand archbishops and bishops. The pope in his opening speech asserted the feudal authority of St. Peter's successor over all other members of the hierarchy, as the superior under whom all ecclesiastical power is held. The ordinations and other acts of Anacletus and his partisans, such as Gerard of Angouleme, were annulled, and some bishops who had received schismatic consecration were severely rebuked by the pope, who forcibly snatched their pastoral staves from their hands, plucked off their robes, and took from them their episcopal rings. Roger of Sicily, although he had given in his adhesion to Innocent, was denounced excommunicate, with all his followers canons relating to discipline were passed; and the Truce of God, in its fullest extent, was re-enacted. Yet the remainder of the pope's own life was almost entirely spent in war—partly against his immediate neighbours, and partly against the Sicilian king. Roger was carrying on the war in the south with great barbarity—slaughtering defenseless people, plundering, destroying trees and crops, tearing from the grave and treating with the basest indignities the body of Bruno, archbishop of Cologne, who had accompanied Lothair on his last expedition, and that of duke Rainulf of Salerno, who had died at Troja about the time of the Lateran council. In June 1139 Innocent set out against the invader, at the head of an armed force, accompanied by Robert, prince of Capua, who had been again dispossessed of his territories. But, like Leo IX, the pope fell into the hands of the Normans, and, as in Leo's case, the victors contented themselves with exacting the papal sanction for their conquests, with the confirmation of Roger's kingly title.

The contest for the papacy had long diverted Bernard's attention from the studies in which he most delighted. We shall next find him engaged in a conflict of a different kind; but before proceeding to this, it is necessary to trace in some degree the intellectual movements of the age, and the history of the celebrated man to whom Bernard was now to be opposed.

During the latter part of the eleventh century, a fresh impulse had been given to intellectual activity by the labours of Lanfranc, Berengar, Anselm, and other eminent teachers. The old cathedral schools were developing into seminaries of general learning, frequented by numbers beyond the example of former times, and exercising an important influence. And the monastic discipline, which for some was merely a mechanical rule, while for spirits of a mystical tendency it offered the attractions of contemplation and devotion, stimulated minds of a different character to exercise themselves in speculations which often passed the boundaries of orthodoxy.

The question as to the existence of universals—such as *genus*, *species*, *differentia*, *proprium*, *accidens*,—which had divided the schools of ancient philosophy, had been generally ruled in the church by the authority of St. Augustine, who held with Plato the real existence of universals; yet there had been some who, with Aristotle, asserted that they were

mere names or ideas. This nominalism (as it was styled) was now taken up by Roscellin, a canon of Compiègne, and perhaps a Breton by birth, who is said to have taught that universals were nothing more than words, and to have denied the existence of anything but individuals—of collective wholes, because they are made up of individuals; of parts, because they are not entire individuals. It was, however, by the application of his system to the doctrine of the Trinity that Roscellin became most famous. If, he said, we would avoid the error of supposing the Father and the Holy Ghost to have been incarnate with the Son, we must believe the divine Persons to be three real beings, as distinct from each other as three angels or three souls, although the same in power and in will. This proposition, although advanced not in opposition to the doctrine of the church, but with a view to explain and support it, naturally gave rise to a charge of tritheism, for which Roscellin was cited to answer before a council at Soissons, in 1092. Anselm, then abbot of Le Bec, on being informed by a monk named John that Roscellin claimed for his opinion the authority of Lanfranc and his own, strongly denied the imputation, declaring that Roscellin either was a tritheist, or did not understand his own words; and he requested Fulk, bishop of Beauvais, who was about to attend the council, to clear both himself and Lanfranc from the charge. He also began a treatise on the subject, but broke it off on hearing that Roscellin had retracted at Soissons; although he afterwards completed it on being told that Roscellin, like Berengar, had only yielded for a time out of fear, and had since resumed the profession of his old opinions. Finding himself unsafe in France, Roscellin withdrew into England; but his opposition to Anselm, who was now archbishop of Canterbury, and his maintenance of the strict Hildebrandine view as to the unfitness of the sons of clergy for ordination, combined to render him unpopular, so that in 1097 he was compelled to leave the country. He was, however, kindly received by Ivo of Chartres, who appears to have reconciled him with the church, and, probably through his interest, he became a canon of St. Martin's at Tours but his unfortunate application of nominalism to theology had excited such a prejudice against the theory altogether, that John of Salisbury speaks of it as having almost disappeared with Roscellin.

Among Roscellin's pupils was Peter Abelard, born in 1079 at Palais or Le Pallet, near Nantes. In the "History of his Misfortunes" (an autobiographical epistle which abundantly displays his vanity and indiscretion), he tells us that, although the eldest son of Berengar, who was lord of the place, he very early preferred "the conflicts of disputation to the trophies of arms", and, resigning the family inheritance to his brothers, he betook himself to the life of a scholar. He had already travelled over many provinces of France, displaying his dialectical skill in disputes with all who chose to encounter him, when, at the age of twenty-one, he became a pupil of William of Champeaux, archdeacon of Paris and master of the cathedral school, who was in enjoyment of the highest reputation as a teacher. William was at first charmed with the pupil's abilities; but when Abelard began to question his doctrines, to argue with him, and sometimes to triumph over him, both the master and the other scholars were not unnaturally disgusted. Notwithstanding the endeavours of William to prevent him, Abelard opened a school of his own at Melun, then a royal residence, and, after a time, removed to Corbeil, with a view of being nearer to the capital. The fame and the popularity of William began to wane before the new teacher, whose eloquence, boldness, clearness of expression, and wit drew crowds of admiring hearers. An illness brought on by study compelled Abelard to withdraw to his native province; and, on returning to Paris, after an absence of some years, he found that William of Champeaux had resigned his archdeaconry and school, and had become a canon regular at the abbey of St. Victor, without the city walls, where, however, he had resumed his occupation as a teacher. Notwithstanding their former rivalry, Abelard became a pupil of William in rhetoric; but the old scenes were renewed; for Abelard not only controverted an opinion of his master on the subject of universals, but obliged him to renounce it, or, at least, the form in which it was expressed. By this defeat William's credit was greatly impaired; many of his pupils deserted to Abelard, who now gained a more regular

position, being invited by William's successor to teach in the cathedral school; but through the envy of William (as the case is represented to us), this master was ejected, and Abelard was again driven to teach independently at Melun. After a time, William retired to the country, and Abelard thereupon returned to Paris, where (in his own language) he "pitched his camp on the Mount of St. Genevieve, without the city, as if to besiege the teacher who had taken possession of his place". On hearing of this, William again began to lecture at Paris; the cathedral school was deserted; and the students were divided between William and Abelard, while both the masters and the pupils of the rival schools engaged in frequent conflicts. Abelard, however, was again obliged to go into Brittany, in order to take leave of his mother, who was about to enter a cloister, as her husband had done before; and on his return to Paris, as the old rivalry had been ended by the promotion of William to the bishopric of Châlons on the Marne, he resolved to turn from the study of philosophy to that of theology.

For this purpose he repaired to the school of Laon, which had long flourished under Anselm, a pupil of Anselm of Canterbury. It was said of Anselm of Laon that he had argued a greater number of men into the catholic faith than any heresiarch of his time had been able to seduce from it; pupils flocked to him, not only from all parts of France but from foreign countries; and among them were many who, like Abelard, had themselves been teachers of philosophy before placing themselves at the feet of the theologian of Laon. But to Abelard the plain, solid, and traditional method of Anselm appeared tame and empty. It seemed to him that the old man's fame was founded rather on his long practice than on ability or knowledge; that he had more of smoke than of light; that if any one came to him in uncertainty as to any question, the uncertainty was only increased by Anselm's answer; that he was like the barren fig-tree which the Saviour cursed. "Having made this discovery", he adds, "I did not idle away many days in lying under his shadow"; and the rareness of his attendance at Anselm's lectures began to be noted as disrespectful towards the teacher. In consequence of having expressed contempt for the traditional glosses on Scripture, he was challenged by some of his fellow-students to attempt a better style of exposition; whereupon he undertook the book of Ezekiel, as being especially obscure, and, declining the offer of time for preparation, began his course of lectures next day. The first lecture found but few hearers; but the report which these spread as to its brilliancy drew a greater audience to the second, and the few soon became an eager multitude. Anselm, on receiving reports as to the lectures from two of his chief pupils, Alberic and Letulf, was alarmed lest he should be held accountable for any errors which might be vented in them, and made use of a privilege which belonged to his office by forbidding Abelard to teach at Laon; whereupon Abelard once more returned to Paris. He now got uncontrolled possession of the principal school, from which he had formerly been ejected, and his theological lectures became no less popular than those which he had before delivered in philosophy. Even Rome, it is said, sent him pupils. Wealth as well as fame flowed in on him; his personal graces, his brilliant conversation, his poetical and musical talents, enhanced the admiration which was excited by his public teaching; but now, when all went prosperously with him, the passions which he represents himself as having before kept under strict control, began to awake. He tells us that he might have won the favour of any lady whom he might have chosen; but he coolly resolved on the seduction of Heloisa, a beautiful maiden of eighteen, whose extraordinary learning and accomplishments were already famous. With a view to this, he insinuated himself into the confidence of her uncle, with whom she lived,—a canon named Fulbert; and, by lamenting to Fulbert the troubles of housekeeping, he drew him into an arrangement agreeable both to the canon's love of money and to his affection for his niece—that Abelard should board in Fulbert's house, and should devote his spare hours to the culture of Heloisa's mind, for which purpose he was authorized to use even bodily chastisement. "I was no less astonished at his simplicity", says Abelard, "than if he were to entrust a tender lamb to a famished wolf"; and the result was such as might have been expected.

In the meantime, Abelard's scholars could not but remark a change in their master. The freshness and life of his teaching were gone; he contented himself with listlessly repeating old lectures; and his mental activity was shown only in the production of amatory verses, which, as he complacently tells us, were long afterwards popular. At length the rumours which had been generally current reached Fulbert himself. The lovers were separated; but on Heloisa's announcing to Abelard, "with the greatest exultation", that she was pregnant, he contrived to steal her from her uncle's house, and sent her to his sister in Brittany, where she gave birth to a son, Astrolabius. Fulbert furiously insisted on a marriage, to which Abelard consented, on the condition that, for the sake of his reputation and of his prospects, it should be kept secret. But against this Heloisa remonstrated vehemently and in an unexpected strain. She assured Abelard that her uncle would never be really appeased. She entreated her lover not to sacrifice his fame, in which she considered herself to have an interest. She strongly put before him the troubles of married life—the inconveniences which children must cause in the modest dwelling of a philosopher—fortifying her argument with a host of quotations from writers both sacred and profane. For herself, she said, she would rather be his friend, having no hold on him except by favour, than connected with him by the bonds of wedlock. She was, however, brought back to Paris, and the marriage was secretly performed. But no sooner was the ceremony over than Fulbert broke his promise of silence, while Heloisa with oaths and even with curses denied the marriage; and Abelard, in order to withdraw his wife from her uncle's cruelty, placed her in the convent of Argenteuil, where she had been brought up. Here he continued to carry on his intercourse with her; but as she wore the monastic dress, Fulbert began to fear that Abelard might rid himself of her by persuading her to take the vows, and resolved on a barbarous revenge. Abelard's servant was bribed to admit into his lodging some ruffians whom the canon had hired; and entering his chamber at night, they inflicted on him a cruel and disgraceful mutilation

The report of this atrocity excited a general feeling of indignation. Two of the agents in it, who were caught, were subjected to a like penalty, with the addition of the loss of their eyes; and Fulbert was deprived of his preferments, although sheltered by his clerical character from further punishment. Abelard, overwhelmed with shame and grief, retired to St. Denys, where—more, as he confesses, from such feelings than from devotion—he took the monastic vows; Heloisa having at his command already put on the veil at Argenteuil.

But although Abelard profited by the opportunities of study which his monastic retirement afforded, it was not to give him peace. He soon made himself unpopular by censuring the laxity of the abbot and his brethren, and by their contrivance he was removed to a dependent cell, where he resumed his occupation of teaching both in philosophy and in theology, with such success that, as he tells us, "neither the place sufficed for their lodging, nor the land for their support". The audiences of other professors were thinned; their envy was aroused, and they beset bishops, abbots, and other important persons with complaints against their successful rival—that the cultivation of secular learning was inconsistent with his duty as a monk, and that, by teaching theology without the sanction of some accredited master, he was likely to lead his pupils into error. And in no long time an opportunity for attacking him was given by an "Introduction to Theology", drawn up at the desire of his pupils, who had requested him to illustrate the mystery of the Trinity in words which might be not only pronounced, but understood. Roscellin, who had made his own peace with the church, denounced Abelard as a Sabellian, and in the grossest terms reflected on him for the errors and misfortunes of his life, while Abelard in his turn reproached his former master as alike infamous for his opinions and for his character. At the instance of his old opponents, Alberic and Letulf, who were now established as teachers, at Reims, he was cited by the archbishop of that city before a council at Soissons. At this assembly he delivered his book to the legate Conon of Palestrina, who presided, and professed himself willing to retract anything in it which might be regarded as contrary to the catholic faith. The book was handed to his

accusers for examination, and in the meantime Abelard daily expounded his opinions in public, with such effect that, although he and his disciples, on their arrival, had been in danger of being stoned as tritheists, a great reaction took place in his favour.

On the last day of the council, to which the further consideration of the case had been deferred, Geoffrey of Chartres, the most eminent of the bishops present, after having reminded the assembly of Abelard's fame, and of the necessity of dealing cautiously, proposed that the charge against him should be clearly stated, and that he should be allowed to reply. On this an outcry was raised that no one could withstand such a sophist; that his book deserved condemnation, if it were only because he had allowed it to be copied without the sanction of Rome. He was condemned, not for tritheism, but for the opposite error of Sabellianism; he was required to read aloud the Athanasian creed, which he did with a profusion of tears, and to throw his book into the fire. The bishop of Chartres in vain endeavoured to obtain that he might be sent back to St. Denys; the accusers insisted that he should be detained within the jurisdiction of Reims, and he was committed to the custody of Goswin, abbot of St. Medard's, at Soissons. But the severity of this judgment excited such general reprobation, that those who had shared in it endeavoured to excuse themselves by throwing the blame on each other, and after a time Abelard was allowed to return to St. Denys.

It was not long, however, before he again brought himself into trouble by denying, on the authority of a passage in Bede's works, the identity of Dionysius the Areopagite with the patron saint of the monastery. Such an opinion, after the labours of abbot Hilduin, who was supposed to have settled the matter by long inquiries in Greece, was regarded as not only profane but treasonable; for St. Denys was the patron of the whole kingdom, and Abelard was even denounced to the king. It was in vain that he addressed to the abbot a letter intended to reconcile the different accounts: he was placed under guard, and, "almost in desperation, as if the whole world had conspired against him", he escaped from the abbey by night, and found refuge with a friend, who was prior of a cell near Provins. Abbot Adam of St. Denys refused to release him from his monastic obedience; but as the old man died soon after, a release was obtained from his successor, Suger, on condition that Abelard should not attach himself to any other monastery; for St. Denys was proud of so famous a member, and wished to retain the credit of reckoning him as its own.

He now fixed himself in company with a single clerk, in the neighbourhood of Nogenton the Seine, where, on a site granted to him by Theobald, count of Champagne, he built himself an oratory of reeds and straw. But even in this retreat he soon found himself surrounded by disciples, who, for the sake of his instructions, were willing to endure all manner of hardships. By their labour the little oratory was enlarged into a monastery, with its church, to which he gave the name of the Divine Comforter or Paraclete—a novelty which, in addition to his popularity as a teacher, excited his enemies afresh, as it had not been usual to dedicate churches to any other Person of the Trinity than the Second. Among those enemies he mentions two "new apostles, in whom the world very greatly trusted"—Bernard and Norbert. These, he says, talked and preached against him everywhere, and such was the obloquy raised that, whenever he heard of a synod, he apprehended that it might be summoned for his own condemnation. He declared that he often thought even of withdrawing into some country of unbelievers, in the hope of finding that toleration which was denied him by his fellow Christians.

At this time he was chosen abbot of the ancient monastery of St. Gildas, at Ruys, on the coast of Morbihan, and, with the consent of Suger of St. Denys, he accepted the office as promising him a quiet refuge. But his hopes were bitterly disappointed. The country was wild and desolate, and, with the ocean filling the whole view beyond it, appeared to be the extremity of the world. The very language of the people was unintelligible; the monks were utterly disobedient and unruly, and met his attempts at reform by mixing poison for him, even in the eucharistic cup, and by setting ruffians in ambush to murder him. There were quarrels,

too, with a rude and powerful neighbour, who had invaded the property of the monastery; and such was the lawlessness of the country that no redress of wrongs was to be had. In such circumstances, moreover, Abelard could not but feel that his intellectual gifts were altogether useless and wasted.

Abbot Suger, of St. Denys, on the authority of old documents, brought forward a claim to the nunnery of Argenteuil, which was also denounced as a place of gross licentiousness; and his claim was admitted by a council held at Paris under a legate, whose decision was confirmed by Honorius II, and also by his successor Innocent. The charges against the nuns, however, do not appear to have extended to Heloisa, who had become prioress and was held in general veneration; and Abelard, on hearing that she was about to lose her home, offered the deserted Paraclete to her and such of her sisters as she might choose for companions. The gift was confirmed by Innocent II, and the Paraclete received privileges from other popes, and became the mother of a small orders. Abelard had drawn up the *History of his Calamities*, in the form of a letter to a (perhaps imaginary) friend; and it fell into the hands of Heloisa, who was thus induced to write to him. Her letters are full of the most intense and undisguised passion; the worship of genius mingles in them with the glow of carnal love. In the freest language she reminds her husband of their former intercourse; she declares that by him she and all her family had been raised to eminence; she charges herself with having caused his ruin, and declares that she would rather be his friend than his wife—rather his concubine, his harlot, than an empress. She avows that, however those who know her not may think of her, she is at heart a hypocrite; that she still cares more for her lover than for God; that beneath the monastic dress there burns in her an unabated and unquenchable passion which disturbs her in her dreams, at her prayers, even at the most solemn devotion of the mass. Abelard's replies are in a very different strain; he coldly points out to her the sinfulness of her former life, and urges her to seek for pardon and peace in the duties of the cloister. He furnished her and her sisterhood with prayers and hymns, with a rule which as to externals was conceived in a spirit of Cistercian severity, and with directions for their studies borrowed in a great part from St. Jerome. From time to time he visited the Paraclete; but as even these visits excited scandal, they became infrequent. In 1134, apparently, he finally quitted Ruys, although he still retained the abbacy; and once more he taught on the Mount of St. Genevieve, where John of Salisbury afterwards famous for his achievements in literature and for his connexion with Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, was one of his pupils.

On many important subjects—the mutual relations of the Divine Persons and other points connected with the doctrine of the Trinity; the Divine attributes; the work and merits of the Saviour; the operations of the Holy Ghost; the sinfulness of man; the gift of prophecy; the inspiration and the integrity of the Scriptures; the eucharistic presence; the character of miracles altogether, and the reality of those which were reported as of his own time; the relations of faith, reason, and church authority; the penitential system, and the absolving powers of the priesthood—Abelard had vented opinions which were likely to draw suspicion on him. To this was added the irritation produced by his unsparing remarks on the faults of bishops and clergy, of monks and canons; and, in addition to the books which he had himself published, the circulation of imperfect reports of his lectures tended to increase the distrust of him which was felt. Yet while he bitterly complained of this distrust, it seems as if he even took a pride in exciting it. Without apparently intending to stray from the path of orthodoxy, he delighted to display his originality in peculiarities of thought and expression; and hence, instead of a harmonious system, there resulted a collection of isolated opinions, which, stated as they were without their proper balances and complements, were certain to raise misunderstanding and obloquy. Ignorant as he was of Greek (for he owns that on this account he was unacquainted with Plato's writings), and having little knowledge of antiquity even at second hand, he idealized the sages of heathenism—not only the Greek philosophers, but the Brahmans of India—whom he invidiously contrasted with the monks and clergy of his own

day. While he regarded the knowledge of the Saviour as necessary for all men, he held that the ancient sages had received this knowledge through the Sibyls; and he supposed them to have attained to the doctrine of the Trinity, partly by the exercise of their reason, and partly as the reward of their pure and self-denying lives. He supposed them to have had saving faith, and all but a historical knowledge of Christianity; he supposed their philosophy to have been nearer akin than Judaism to the gospel; and he supposed the rites of the old law to have been needless for them, because these were not, like the gospel, intended for all mankind. In a book which bore the title of "Yes and No", he had arranged under 158 heads the opinions of earlier Christian writers on a like number of subjects; not (as had been usual) for the purpose of exhibiting their agreement, or of harmonizing their differences, but in order that, by displaying these differences, he might claim for himself a like latitude to that which the teachers of older times had enjoyed without question. It was not to be wondered at that such a claim, with the novelty and strangeness of the opinions which he had advanced, should excite a general alarm. This feeling found expression through William, formerly abbot of St. Thierry, and now a Cistercian monk in the diocese of Reims, who addressed a letter to Bernard, and to Abelard's old patron, Geoffrey of Chartres, who was now papal legate for France. William professes much affection for Abelard, but desires to draw attention to his errors—errors (he says) the more dangerous on account of his vast reputation, which is described as such that his works were carried across the Alps and the seas, and even in the Roman court were regarded as authoritative. He also mentions the "Yes and No", and a work entitled "Know Thyself"; but, as he had not seen these, he could only conjecture that their contents were probably as monstrous as their names.

Bernard and Abelard were not unacquainted with each other. They had met in 1131, at the consecration of an altar for the abbey of Maurigny by Pope Innocent, and somewhat later, in consequence of a visit which Bernard had paid to the Paraclete, and of some remarks which he was reported to have made on usages which struck him as novel in that place, Abelard had addressed to him a letter, which by its want of deference to the popular saint, and by its somewhat satirical tone, was not likely to be acceptable. The old enmities between Abelard and some of Bernard's friends—William of Champeaux, Anselm of Laon, Alberic—and the fact that Arnold of Brescia, who had become notorious as the agitator of Rome, had once been Abelard's pupil—may have contributed to increase the abbot's dislike of him. The two men were, indeed, representatives of opposite tendencies. Bernard felt none of Abelard's intellectual cravings. Although not an enemy of learning, he valued knowledge only with a view to practical good; he distrusted and dreaded speculation; and, while Abelard taught that "by doubt we come to inquiry, and by inquiry we ascertain the truth",—thus making doubt his starting-point,—it was Bernard's maxim that "The faith of the godly believes instead of discussing". We may, therefore, easily understand that he was ready to listen to charges against a man so different from himself as Abelard; he felt instinctively that there was danger, not so much in this or that individual point of his teaching, as in the general character of a method which seemed likely to imperil the orthodoxy of the church.

On receiving William of St. Thierry's letter, Bernard sought an interview with Abelard, and endeavoured to persuade him to a retraction. Abelard, according to Bernard's biographer, consented to retract, but was afterwards induced by his disciples to depart from his promise; in any case, he requested that the matter might be brought before a council which was to meet at Sens in the Whitsun-week of 1140. The king of France was present, with a great number of bishops and other ecclesiastics; and the chief occasion of the meeting—the translation of the patron saint's relics—was of a nature to produce an excitement against anyone who was supposed to impugn the popular religion, so that Abelard's life seems to have been in danger from the multitude. Bernard had at first declined a summons to attend, on the ground that the question did not especially concern him, and also that he was but as a youth in comparison with such a controversial Goliath as Abelard. He wrote, however, to the pope and

to the Roman court, in strong denunciation of Abelard, both for his particular errors and for his general enmity to the established faith of the Church and at length the urgency of his friends prevailed on him to appear at the council. The representatives of intellect and of religious feeling, of speculative inquiry and of traditional faith, were now face to face. Seventeen articles were brought forward against Abelard, and Bernard, as the promoter of the charge, desired that they might be read aloud. But scarcely was the reading begun when Abelard,—losing courage, it would seem, at the thought of the influence and the prejudices arrayed against him,—surprised and disappointed the spectators by appealing to the pope. Such an appeal, from judges of his own choosing, and before sentence, was a novelty unsanctioned by the laws of the church; but the bishops admitted it, lest, by contesting the papal privileges, they should create a prejudice in favour of the appellant. While, however, they refrained from condemning Abelard's person, they proceeded to examine the propositions imputed to him, and pronounced fourteen out of the seventeen to be false and heretical.

A ludicrous account of the scene is given by one of Abelard's disciples named Berengar, in a letter addressed to Bernard himself and marked throughout by the ostentatious contempt with which Abelard and his followers appear to have regarded the most admired saint and leader of the age. Berengar treats Bernard as a mere idol of the multitude—as a man gifted with a plentiful flow of words, but destitute of liberal culture and of solid abilities; as one who by the solemnity of his manner imposed the tritest truisms on his votaries as if they were profound oracles. He ridicules his reputation for miraculous power; he tells him that his proceedings against Abelard were prompted by a spirit of bigotry, jealousy, and vindictiveness, rendered more odious by his professions of sanctity and charity. Of the opinions imputed to his master, he maintains that some were never held by Abelard, and that the rest, if rightly interpreted, are true and catholic. The book, he says, was brought under consideration at Sens when the bishops had dined, and was read amidst their jests and laughter, while the wine was doing its work on them. Any expression which was above their understanding excited their rage and curses against Abelard. As the reading went on, one after another became drowsy; and when they were asked whether they condemned his doctrines, they answered in their sleep without being able fully to pronounce their words. The council reported the condemnation to the pope, with a request that he would confirm it, and would prohibit Abelard from teaching; and a like request was urged by Bernard in letters addressed to Innocent and to some of the most important cardinals.

Abelard's hopes of finding favour at Rome were disappointed. His interest in the papal court was far inferior to Bernard's, and his connection with the revolutionary Arnold of Brescia, who had attended him at the council—a connexion which Bernard had carefully put forward—could not but weigh heavily against him. On reaching Lyons, on the way to prosecute his appeal, he was astounded to find that the pope, without waiting for his appearance, without any inquiry whether Abelard had used the language imputed to him, or whether it had been rightly understood, had condemned him, with all his errors (which, however, were not specified), and had sentenced him and Arnold to be shut up in separate monasteries. But in this distress, the “venerable” Peter, a man of wider charity than Bernard, not out of indifference to orthodoxy, but from respect for Abelard's genius and from pity for his misfortunes, offered him an asylum at Cluny, where, with the pope's sanction, Abelard lived in devotion, study, and in the exercise of his abilities as a teacher. Here he drew up two confessions (one of them addressed to Heloisa), in which he disowned some of the things imputed to him, “the words in part, and the meaning altogether”, and strongly declared his desire to adhere to the catholic faith in all points. Yet there is reason to suppose that he would not have admitted himself to have erred, except to the extent of having used words open to misconstruction; and, although he had been reconciled with Bernard through the good offices of the abbots of Cluny and Citeaux, he still blamed him for interfering in matters which he had

not been trained to understand, and declared that the charges against himself had been brought forward out of malice and ignorance.

Finding that his guest's health was failing, Peter removed him, in the hope of recovery, from Cluny to the dependent monastery of St. Marcel, near Châlons on the Saone; and there Abelard ended his agitated life in 1142. His body, in compliance with the desire which he had expressed, was sent to the Paraclete for burial. At Heloisa's request, the abbot of Cluny pronounced him absolved from all his sins, and the absolution was hung on his tomb; and Peter, who, in announcing his death to Heloisa, had highly praised his piety, humility, and resignation, composed an epitaph in which he was celebrated at once for his intellectual gifts and for that better philosophy to which his last days had been devoted. Heloisa survived her husband until the year 1163.

2

THE SECOND CRUSADE

A.D. 1122-1159, STATE OF ITALY. ARNOLD OF BRESCIA

Ever since the beginning of the contest between the papacy and the empire a spirit of independence had been growing among the Italian cities. The emperors were rarely seen on the southern side of the Alps, and although their sovereignty was admitted, it was practically little felt. Most of the Lombard cities set up governments of their own, under a republican form; and, with that love of domination which generally accompanies the republican love of liberty, the stronger endeavoured to reduce the weaker to subjection. In this movement towards independence, the claims of the bishops were found to stand in the way of the inhabitants of the cities; and this, with other circumstances, had prepared the people to listen to any teachers who might arise to denounce the hierarchy. Such a teacher, named Arnulf, had appeared at Rome in 1128, professing a divine commission to preach against the pride and luxury, the immorality and greediness, of the cardinals and of other ecclesiastics. Arnulf, after having disregarded warnings, met with the death which he had expected and courted—being seized and thrown into the Tiber by night; but in no long time a more formidable successor arose in Arnold of Brescia.

Arnold was born at Brescia, probably about the year 1105, and grew up amid the agitations and struggles which marked the rise of Lombard independence, and in which his native city largely shared. That he was a pupil of Abelard appears certain, although the time and the place are matters for conjecture. But although the master and the scholar were both animated by a spirit of independence, it would seem that Arnold had nothing of Abelard's speculative character (for he is not even distinctly charged with any heresy), but was bent entirely on practical measures of reform. After having officiated for a time as a reader in the church of Brescia, Arnold separated himself from the secular clergy, embraced a strict monastic life, and began to inveigh unsparingly against the corruptions of both clergy and monks in a strain which resembled at once the extreme Hildebrandine party and their extreme opponents. There had been much in the late history of Brescia to produce disgust at the assumption of temporal power by ecclesiastics; and Arnold, filled with visions of apostolical poverty and purity,—of a purely spiritual church working by spiritual means alone,—imagined that the true remedy for the evils which had been felt would be to strip the hierarchy of their privileges, to confiscate their wealth, and to reduce them for their support to the tithes, with the freewill offerings of the laity. These doctrines were set forth with copious eloquence, in words which, as Bernard says, were “smoother than oil, and yet were they very swords”. Nor can we wonder that they were heard with eagerness by the multitude, who, according to the preacher's scheme, were both to be enriched with the spoils of the church and for the future were to hold the clergy in dependence. The bishop of Brescia complained to the pope; and the Lateran council of 1139, without having called Arnold before it, condemned him to

silence and to banishment beyond the Alps. On this he withdrew into France, and in the following year he appeared at Sens as Abelard's chief supporter—"the shield-bearer of that Goliath", as Bernard styles him. Although, however, he was sentenced by the pope in consequence to imprisonment in a monastery, it would seem that the French bishops did not feel themselves concerned to carry out the sentence; and for some years Arnold lived and taught at Zurich unmolested, being tolerated by Herman, bishop of Constance, and even admitted as an inmate into the house of the papal legate, Guy of Castello, although Bernard, by applications both to the legate and to the bishop, endeavoured to dislodge him.

In the meantime his principles had made way at Rome—although rather in their political than in their religious character—and the more, perhaps, on account of the attention which had been drawn to him by the Lateran condemnation. Provoked by the pope's having concluded peace with Tivoli in his own name alone, and having granted too favourable terms, the Romans in 1143 burst into insurrection, displaced the government, and established in the Capitol a senate on the ancient Roman models. They resolved that their city should resume its ancient greatness—that it should be the capital of the world, as well in a secular as in a religious sense; but that the secular administration should be in different hands from the spiritual. As the popes were connected with the southern Normans, the revolutionary party felt themselves obliged to look for an alliance in some other direction. They therefore turned towards Conrad, king of the Romans; and perhaps it was at this time that they addressed to him a letter in which they profess themselves devoted to his interest, represent their services in opposition to his and their common enemies,—the clergy and the Sicilians,—and entreat him to receive the imperial crown at Rome, and to revive the glories of the empire by ruling as a new Constantine or Justinian, with the assistance of the senate, in "the city which is the capital of the world". Conrad, however, would seem to have suspected that these proposals were not so much intended for his interest as for that of the party from which they came; and he preferred an alliance with the pope, whose envoys waited on him at the same time.

The revolt of the Romans was fatal to Innocent II, who died in September 1143, and was succeeded by Celestine the Second, the same who, as Cardinal Guy of Castello, had been the pupil of Abelard and the protector of Arnold. Celestine was a man of high character, both for learning and for moderation; but his pontificate of less than six months was marked by no other considerable act than the removal of an interdict under which Lewis "the Young" of France had lain for some years on account of some differences as to the archbishopric of Bourges. The royal power had been rapidly growing in France. The number of the great fiefs had been diminished through the failure of male heirs, in consequence of which many of them had passed into new families by the marriage of the heiresses; the kings had made it their policy to raise the commons, and had strengthened themselves by allying themselves with them against the nobles; agriculture was greatly extended; population, industry, and wealth were increased. Lewis VII, who had become sole king by the death of his father in 1137, had very greatly extended the royal territory by his marriage with Eleanor, heiress of Aquitaine, and the successful outset of his reign had gained for him a reputation which was ill maintained by his conduct in later years. For a time he showed himself indifferent to the ecclesiastical sentence which had been pronounced against him; but in 1143 a change was produced in him by a terrible incident which took place in the course of a war between him and Theobald, count of Champagne—the burning of 1300 men, women, and children, who had taken refuge in a church at Vitry. Deeply struck with horror and remorse on account of the share which he considered himself to have had in their death, he solicited absolution, which Celestine readily bestowed—the questions in dispute between the crown and the church being settled by a compromise.

Under Celestine's successor, a Bolognese who exchanged his name of Gerard de' Caccianemici for that of Lucius II, the republicans of Rome ventured further than before. Arnold himself appears to have been now among them, having perhaps repaired to Rome in

reliance on Celestine's kindness, although the time of his arrival is uncertain. The constitution was developed by the creation of an equestrian order, and by the election of tribunes. A patrician named Jordan, who appears to have been a brother of the late antipope Anacletus, was substituted for the papal prefect of the city, and, as a matter of policy, this patrician was theoretically regarded as a representative of the emperor, whose lordship the revolutionary government affected to acknowledge. The palaces and houses of cardinals and nobles were destroyed; some of the cardinals were personally assaulted; and the pope was required to surrender his royalties, and to content himself and his clergy with tithes and voluntary offerings. Lucius, who was supported by a powerful party of nobles (among whom were the patrician's own brothers), resolved to put down the republic, and, at the head of a strong force, proceeded to the Capitol with the intention of dispersing the senators; but the senate and the mob combined to resist, and in the tumult which ensued the pope was wounded by a stone, which caused his death.

The vacant throne was filled by the election of Peter Bernard, a Pisan by birth, who had been a pupil of Bernard of Clairvaux, and had been appointed by Innocent II to the abbacy of St. Anastasius at the Three Fountains, near Rome—a monastery which that pope rebuilt, and, in gratitude for Bernard's services, bestowed on the Cistercian order. The character of the new pope, who styled himself Eugenius III, had been chiefly noted for an extreme simplicity, so that his old superior, while he congratulated him on his election and expressed the fullest confidence in his intentions, thought it necessary almost to blame the cardinals for the choice which they had made, and to bespeak their forbearance and assistance for him; but Eugenius, to the surprise of all who had known him, now displayed an eloquence and a general ability which were referred to miraculous illumination. The rites of his consecration were disturbed by an irruption of the citizens, demanding that he should acknowledge their republican government; and he withdrew to the monastery of Farfa, where the ceremony was completed. The anathemas which he pronounced against his contumacious people were unheeded; but after residing for some time at Viterbo, he was enabled to effect a re-entrance into Rome, where he agreed to acknowledge the senate on condition that its members should be chosen with his approval, and that he should be allowed to nominate a prefect instead of the patrician. But the Romans, finding that he refused to gratify their enmity against the inhabitants of Tivoli, to whom he had been chiefly indebted for his restoration, drove him again from the city, and the people, excited by the harangues of Arnold, who had brought with him a body of two thousand Swiss, continued their attacks upon the nobles and the clergy; they fortified St. Peter's and plundered the pilgrims, killing some of them in the church itself. Bernard strongly remonstrated with the Romans on the expulsion of Eugenius, and urged the emperor elect to interfere for his restoration. But during the pope's residence at Viterbo tidings had been received from the East which for the time superseded all other interests.

The Latins had kept their footing in the East chiefly in consequence of the dissensions of their enemies, but had failed to learn from them the necessity of union among themselves. The great feudatory princes of Antioch, Edessa, and Tripoli quarrelled with the kings of Jerusalem and with each other. The barons were defiant and unruly, and their oppressive treatment of their inferiors rendered them more hateful to the Christians than they were to the infidels. The patriarchs quarrelled with the kings and with the popes; the patriarchs of Jerusalem quarrelled with those of Antioch; while the archiepiscopal province of Tyre, which, on the acquisition of that city in 1127, had been assigned by Pope Honorius to Jerusalem, but was claimed by Antioch, suffered under the tyranny of both. The military orders already began to display an intolerable pride and a contempt of all external authority. The relations of the Latins with the Greek empire, although improved since the days of Alexius Comnenus, were still uneasy. The religious motive which had given birth to the Latin kingdom was forgotten, so that pilgrims were objects of mockery in the Holy Land, and were disliked as intruders. The successors of the crusaders had in general settled down into a life of ease and

luxury, in which the worst features of oriental life were imitated; and a mongrel race, the offspring of European fathers and of eastern mothers, had grown up, who were known by the name of *Poulains*, and are described as utterly effeminate and depraved—“more timid than women, and more perfidious than slaves”.

In December 1144, Zenghis, prince of Mosul and Aleppo, taking advantage of the enmity between the Frank rulers of Edessa and Antioch, made himself master of Edessa, chiefly through the assistance of an Armenian whose daughter had been debauched by the count, Jocelin. The archbishop, who is said to have allowed the capture to take place rather than expend his treasures in the payment of soldiers, was crushed to death. A frightful slaughter of the Christian inhabitants was carried on, until it was stopped by the command of Zenghis, and a multitude of captives were sold as slaves. Zenghis himself was soon after assassinated, and during the absence of his son Noureddin the Christians regained possession of the place through an agreement with the Armenian inhabitants; but when they had held it a few days, Noureddin recovered it with great slaughter, punished the inhabitants with terrible severity, and, after having enriched himself by the plunder of the city, utterly destroyed it.

The exultation of the Mussulmans at this great success was boundless; and not less intense were the feelings of grief and indignation with which the tidings of their triumph were received among the Christians of the west. The city of King Abgarus, who had been honoured by a letter from the Saviour himself; the city where the miraculously-impressed image of the Saviour's countenance, his gift to Abgarus, had been preserved for centuries, and had served as a protection against the attacks of infidel besiegers; the city where the apostle St. Thaddeus had preached, which still possessed his body, and that of St. Thomas, the apostle of the Indies; the city which had maintained its Christianity while all around it fell under the Mussulman yoke, was now in the hands of the unbelievers; thousands of Christians had been slain, and the enemy of the cross was pressing on, so that, unless speedy aid were given, the Latins would soon be altogether driven from the Holy Land. Eugenius resolved to stir up a new crusade; and on the 1st of December 1145 he addressed to the king, the princes, and the people of France, a letter summoning them to the holy war. The privileges formerly offered by Urban II were renewed—remission of sins for all who should engage in the expedition; the protection of the church for their families and property; no suits were to be brought against them until their return; those who were in debt were discharged from payment of interest, and it was allowed that the possessors of fiefs should pledge them in order to raise the expenses of the war.

It was natural that such a call should be first addressed to France, the chosen refuge of expelled popes, the country which had given princes, and laws, and language to the crusading colonies of the East. And Lewis VII, then about twenty-six years of age, was ready to take the cross—from feelings of devotion, from remorse for the conduct which had drawn on him the censures of the church and for his guilt in the calamity of Vitry, from a belief that he was bound by a promise which his brother Philip had been prevented by death from fulfilling; perhaps, too, by the hope of sharing in the saintly glory which crowned the names of Godfrey and Tancred. At a parliament which was held at Bourges, at Christmas 1145, he proposed the subject to his nobles, and the bishop of Langres excited them by a description of the scenes which had taken place in the East; but as the number of those who were present was not great, the business of a crusade was adjourned to a larger meeting, which was to be held at Vezelay at the following Easter. To this Lewis summoned all the princes of Gaul, and, as neither the abbey church nor the marketplace of Vezelay could hold the assembled multitude, they were ranged along the declivity of the hill on which the little town is built, and in the valley of the Cure below. The pope had been requested to attend, but had been compelled by the renewed troubles of Rome to excuse himself and had delegated the preaching of the crusade to Bernard, who, although for some years he had been suffering from sickness, enthusiastically took up the cause. At Vezelay, Bernard set forth with glowing eloquence the sufferings of the

eastern Christians, and the profanation of the holy places by the infidels. His speech was interrupted by loud and eager cries of "The cross! The cross!". Lewis and his queen were the first to take the sign of enrolment in the sacred cause; princes, nobles, and a multitude of others pressed forward, until the crosses which had been provided were exhausted, when the abbot, the king, and others gave up part of their own dresses in order to furnish a fresh supply. It was agreed that the expedition should be ready to set out within a year, and the great assembly of Vezelay was followed by meetings in other towns of France, at which Bernard's eloquence and the prophet-like authority which he had gained, were everywhere triumphant, and enlisted crowds of zealous followers. At Chartres he was urged to become the leader of the crusade; but, warned by the failure of Peter the Hermit, he felt his unfitness for such a post, and told the assembly that his strength would not suffice to reach the distant scene of action; that they should choose a leader of a different kind. "There is more need there", he told the abbot of Morimond, "of fighting soldiers than of chanting monks".

The scenes of the first crusade were renewed. Miracles, prophecies, promises of success drawn out of the Sibylline oracles, contributed to stir up the general enthusiasm. Bernard tells us that cities and castles were emptied; that the prophecy of "seven women taking hold of one man" was almost fulfilled among those who remained behind. Many robbers and other outcasts of society embraced the new way of salvation which was opened to them; hymns took the place of profane songs; violence ceased, so that it was considered wrong even to carry arms for the sake of safety. Yet amid the general excitement and zeal, many bitter complaints were raised (especially from the monastic societies) against the heavy taxation by which the king found it necessary to raise money for his expedition.

From France Bernard proceeded into Germany, where an ignorant and fanatical monk, named Rudolf had been preaching the crusade with much success, but had combined with it a denunciation of the Jews, of whom great numbers had been slaughtered in consequence. At such times of excitement against the enemies of Christ the Jews were generally sufferers. Even Peter of Cluny on this occasion wrote to the French king, denouncing them as more distant from Christianity and more bitter against it than the Saracens, and advising that, although they ought not to be slain, their wealth should be confiscated for the holy enterprise. But Bernard was against all measures of violence towards them, and wished only that they should be forbidden, as the pope had forbidden all Christians, to exact usury from the crusaders. He therefore reprobated Rudolf's preaching in the strongest terms, and, as the monk disowned submission to any ecclesiastical authority, Bernard, at the request of the archbishop of Mayence, undertook a journey into Germany for the purpose of counteracting his influence. In an interview at Mayence, Rudolf was convinced of his error; filled with shame and sorrow for the effects of his preaching, he withdrew into a cloister; and although such was the exasperation which he had produced among the people that Bernard was almost stoned on attempting to dissuade those of Frankfort from violence and plunder against the Jews, the abbot's humane exertions were successful in arresting the persecution.

At Frankfort Bernard had interviews with Conrad, whom he endeavored to draw into the crusade. In Germany, where there was not that special connection with the eastern Latins which had contributed to rouse the French to their assistance, less of sympathy was to be expected than in France; and the king's age, his knowledge of the difficulties, acquired in an earlier pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and most especially the political state of Germany, of Italy, and of Rome, combined to dissuade him from the expedition. Although, therefore, Bernard was able to remove some of the obstacles by reconciling him with princes who might have been likely to take advantage of his absence, Conrad steadily resisted his solicitations, and Bernard was about to return to Clairvaux, when he was invited by Herman, bishop of Constance, to wait for a diet which was to be held at Spire, and in the meanwhile to preach the crusade in the diocese of Constance.

The fame of Bernard and his reputation for miracles were already well known in Germany, and, as he journeyed up the Rhine, crowds everywhere flocked to him, entreating his pity for the cure of the sick, the blind, the lame, and the possessed. His own enthusiasm (for, although he disavowed all credit on account of his miracles, he believed them to be real, and to be attestations of his cause) and the enthusiasm of the people were raised to the highest degree; every day, says a biographer who had accompanied him on his mission, he did some miracles, and on some days as many as twenty. As he was unacquainted with the language of the country, his discourses were explained by an interpreter; but his looks and tones and gestures penetrated to the hearts of the Germans far more than the chilled words of the translator; they wept and beat their breasts, and even tore the saint's clothes in order that they might take the cross. Returning to Spire, Bernard there again urged his cause on Conrad with such force that the king promised to consult his advisers, and to answer on the morrow. But at the mass which followed immediately after this interview, Bernard, contrary to custom and without notice, introduced a sermon, which he wound up by a strong personal appeal to Conrad—representing him as standing before the judgment-seat, and as called by the Saviour to give an account for all the benefits which had been heaped on him. The “miracle of miracles”, as Bernard styled it, was wrought. Conrad burst into tears, and declared himself ready to obey the call to God's service; and, amid the loud shouts of all who were present, Bernard, taking the banner of the cross from the altar, delivered it to the king as the token of his engagement. Among the chiefs who followed Conrad's example in taking the cross were his nephew Frederick of Hohenstaufen, Welf of Bavaria, Henry, marquis of Austria, and the chronicler Otho, bishop of Freising, uterine brother of Conrad, and formerly a pupil of Abelard. The Saxons declined the expedition, on the ground that their duty called them rather to attack their own idolatrous neighbours, and for this purpose they engaged in a home crusade against the pagans on their northern border. But from all other parts of Germany recruits poured in; and Bernard left the abbot of Eberach to take his place in organizing the expedition.

Returning home by way of Cologne, Aix-la-Chapelle, and Cambrai, Bernard everywhere produced the greatest effect by his eloquence and his miracles; and he reappeared at Clairvaux with thirty followers, whom, with an equal number of others, he had persuaded to embrace the monastic life. In February 1147 a great meeting was held at Étampes, and Bernard was eagerly listened to as he reported the success of his late journey. On the second day of the meeting, the question of the route which should be taken by the French crusaders was discussed. Letters or envoys had been received by the king from various sovereigns to whom he had announced his expedition. Roger of Sicily advised him to proceed by sea, and offered him a resting-place by the way. Conrad of Germany and Geisa of Hungary, wishing to divert the stream from their own territories, advised that the French should take ship; but Manuel of Constantinople made flattering promises of aid and furtherance, and Lewis, disdaining the doubts which were raised as to the Greek's sincerity, and the representations which were offered as to the difficulties of the way, decided on making the journey by land.

On the following day the question of a regency was proposed. The king left the choice to his nobles and prelates, and Bernard announced that it had fallen on the count of Nevers, and Suger, abbot of St. Denys. “Behold”, he said, “here are two swords; it is enough”. The count, however, declined the office on the ground that he was about to become a Carthusian; and the regency was committed to Suger, with two colleagues whose share in it was little more than nominal.

Eugenius now appeared in France, and was met at Dijon by Lewis, who displayed the greatest reverence towards him. The two celebrated Easter at St. Denys, where the pope overruled Suger's reluctance to undertake the regency. The king took from the altar the —the banner of the county of the Vexin, which he held under the great abbey—and, as a feudal

vassal, received Suger's permission to engage in the crusade, with the pope's blessing on his enterprise.

It had been agreed that the forces of France and of Germany should proceed separately, as well for the sake of avoiding quarrels among the soldiers as for greater ease in obtaining provisions. In the spring of 1147, Conrad set out from Ratisbon, after having endeavored to secure the peace of Germany by the election and coronation of his son Henry as king of the Romans. His force consisted of 70,000 heavy-armed cavalry, with a huge train of lighter horsemen, footmen, women and children; and Lewis was to follow with an equal number. The Germans embarked on rafts and in boats which conveyed them safely down the Danube; but in Hungary they were met by envoys from the Greek emperor, who required them to swear that they had no designs against him; and on entering the imperial territory they found difficulties on every side. Manuel is accused by the Latins of treachery, and the Greek Nicetas joins in the charge, while other Greeks charge the crusaders with the blame of the differences which arose. There was plundering by the strangers, and attacks were often made on them by the Greek soldiery. Although markets for provisions had been promised, the Greeks shut themselves up in their towers, and let down their supplies over the walls in buckets; they insisted on being paid beforehand, and it is complained that their provisions were shamefully adulterated, that sometimes they gave nothing in return for the payment, and that in exchanges they cheated the Latins by means of false money which Manuel had coined for the purpose. By a sudden rising of the river Melas in the night, a considerable part of Conrad's force was swept away, with his tents and camp equipage. On reaching Constantinople, the scenes of the first crusade were renewed. The Byzantines were shocked by the rudeness of the Germans, and especially by the sight of women armed and riding in male fashion, "more masculine than Amazons". There were quarrels about markets; the Germans, in indignation at the treatment which they met with, plundered and destroyed many splendid villas near the city; there were irreconcilable and interminable disputes as to matters of precedence and ceremony. Although the two emperors were brothers-in-law, Conrad left Constantinople without having seen Manuel, and crossed the Bosphorus with a host which, after all the reduction that it had suffered, was still reckoned to exceed 90,000 men.

In the meantime a force composed of men from Flanders, England, and other northern countries, assembled in the harbour of Dartmouth, and sailed for Portugal, where they wrested Lisbon from the Saracens in October 1147. But it would seem that they were content with their successes in the Spanish peninsula, and did not proceed onwards to join in the attempts to deliver the Holy Land.

The French crusaders assembled at Metz, where a code of laws was drawn up for their conduct in the expedition; but a chronicler declines to record these laws, inasmuch as they were not observed by the nobles who had sworn to them. The host passed through Germany and Hungary without any considerable misfortune, although even from the Hungarian frontier the king found it necessary to write to Suger for a fresh supply of money; and at Constantinople their superior refinement at once made them more acceptable than the Germans, and enabled them better to conceal their dislike and distrust of the Greeks. But the hollowness of the oppressive civilities with which Manuel received Lewis was deeply felt; the Greeks were found to be false and fraudulent in all their dealings; and the exasperation of the crusaders was increased by religious differences, so bitter that the Greek clergy thought it necessary to purify the altars on which the Latins had celebrated, and even to rebaptize a Latin before allowing him to marry a wife of the Greek communion. The bishop of Langres proposed to seize the city, by way of punishing them for their schism and their perfidy; and but for the eagerness of the crusaders to go onwards, his counsels would probably have been acted on. After reaching the Asiatic shore, Lewis did homage to the eastern emperor; but an eclipse of the sun, which took place on the same day, was interpreted as portending some diminution of the king's splendour.

Lewis had reached Nicaea in safety when he was met by Frederick of Hohenstaufen with tidings of disasters which had befallen the Germans. The main body of these, under Conrad, had intended to march by Iconium, while the rest, under the bishop of Freising, were to take the less direct way by the coast; but, before Conrad and his division had advanced far, it was found that they had miscalculated, and had been deceived by the Greeks, both as to the distance and as to the difficulties of the way. Encumbered as they were by helpless women and children, they advanced but slowly. Their provisions were nearly exhausted, and no more were to be procured; the Greek guides who had led them into the desert country, after having deluded them with falsehoods of every kind, deserted them during the night, and returned to deceive the French with romantic fables as to the triumphs of the crusading arms. Squadrons of Turks, lightly armed and mounted on nimble horses, hovered about them, uttering wild cries, and discharging deadly flights of javelins and arrows, while the Europeans, worn out with hunger and toil, loaded with heavy armour, and having lost their horses, were unable to bring them to close combat: and, as they were still within the imperial territory, there was reason to believe that the enemies of the cross had been incited to attack them by the treachery of Manuel. At Nicaea Conrad himself appeared in retreat, with less than a tenth of the force which he had led onwards from that city. The Greeks refused to supply his hungry followers with food, except in exchange for their arms : and most of them returned in miserable condition towards Constantinople, whence a scanty remnant found its way back to Germany. In order that Conrad might not appear without a respectable force, Lewis ordered the Lorrainers, Burgundians, and Italians, who were feudally subject to the empire, to attach themselves to him; and, having resolved to proceed by the longer but less hazardous road, the army reached Ephesus. But quarrels had arisen between the nations of which it was composed a coolness took place between the two leaders; and Conrad, under pretext of illness, gladly accepted an invitation from his imperial brother-in-law, and returned to winter at Constantinople.

After having spent Christmas at Ephesus, Lewis directed his march towards Attalia (Satalia). The crusaders crossed the Maeander, after a victory over a Turkish force which opposed their passage. But as they advanced they found themselves unable to obtain food, and the treachery of the Greeks became continually more manifest. In a narrow defile, where the van and the rear had been accidentally separated, the army was attacked, and suffered heavy loss both in slain and in prisoners; the king's own life was in great danger. The survivors continued their march in gloomy apprehension, and dangers seemed to thicken around them. In their extremity, it was proposed by Lewis that a brotherhood of five hundred horsemen should be formed for the protection of the rest. A knight named Gilbert, of whom nothing is known except the skill and valour which he displayed on this occasion, was chosen as its head, and even the king himself served as a member of the band. By Gilbert's generalship, two rivers were successfully crossed in the face of the enemy, who were afterwards attacked and routed with great slaughter; and, although the crusaders were in such distress for provisions that they were obliged to eat most of their horses, they reached Attalia on the fifteenth day of their march from Ephesus.

From Attalia Lewis embarked for Syria, by advice of his counsellors, taking with him part of the force, and having, as he thought, secured a safe advance for the rest under the protection of an escort. But the Greeks who had been hired for this purpose abandoned them; and the crusaders, after having fought bravely against an assailing force of Turks, were driven to fall back on Attalia. There, however, the inhabitants who, during the king's stay in the city, had used every kind of extortion against the Franks, shut the gates on them, and they found themselves obliged to crouch under the walls, hungry and almost naked, while violent storms of wind and rain increased their misery. At length, in utter desperation, they attempted again to march onward. But the Turks surrounded them in overpowering numbers, and the whole remnant of the unhappy force was cut off with the exception of three thousand, who

surrendered themselves into slavery. Some of them apostatized, although their masters did not put any force on them as to religion.

Lewis landed at the mouth of the Orontes, and proceeded to Antioch, where he was received by his wife's uncle, prince Raymond; but he declined the prince's invitation to join in an expedition against Nouredin, and continued his way to Jerusalem, where he arrived towards the end of June, in a guise befitting a penitential pilgrim rather than a warrior who had set out at the head of a powerful army, and with an assured hope of victory and conquest. In July, a meeting of the Frank chiefs, both lay and ecclesiastical, was held at Acre, and among those present was Conrad, who, after having been hospitably entertained at Constantinople through the winter, had reached Jerusalem at Easter, with a very few soldiers in his train. An expedition against Damascus was resolved on, and the siege of that city was begun with good hope of success. But jealousies arose among the Franks, and some of them—it is said the Templars—were bribed by the enemy's gold, so that the expedition was defeated. Sick in body, depressed in mind, and utterly disgusted with the Christians of the Holy Land, Conrad embarked for Constantinople in September, and thence, by way of Greece and Istria, made his way to Ratisbon, where he arrived in Whitsun week 1149. Lewis, ashamed and penitent, lingered in the Holy Land until July of that year, when, yielding at length to Suger's earnest solicitations, he took ship for Sicily—his queen following separately. In passing through Italy he had an interview with the pope, and he soon after reached his own dominions. But of the vast numbers which had accompanied him towards the East, it is said that not so many as three hundred returned.

The miserable and shameful result of this expedition, which, while it had drained Europe of men and treasure, had only rendered the condition of the Christians in the Holy Land worse than before, excited loud murmurs against Bernard, as the man by whose preaching, prophecies, and miracles, it had been chiefly promoted; and all his authority was needed in order to justify himself. We are told that, when the dismal tidings from the East were filling all France with sorrow and anger, a blind boy was brought to him for cure. The abbot prayed that, if his preaching had been right, he might be enabled to work the miracle; and this attestation of his truth was granted. He referred to his earlier miracles as certain signs that his preaching of the crusade had been sanctioned by Heaven; he declared himself willing to bear any blame rather than that it should be cast on God. He regarded the failure of the expedition as a fit chastisement for the sins of the crusaders; and an Italian abbot assured him that St. John and St. Paul had appeared in a vision, declaring that the number of the fallen angels had been restored from the souls of those who had died in the crusade.

During the absence of Lewis in the East, his kingdom had been successfully administered by Suger. Suger was born of humble parents in 1081, and at an early age entered the monastery of St. Denys, where he became the companion of Lewis VI in his education, and so laid the foundation of his political eminence. His election as abbot in 1122 was at first opposed by Lewis, because the royal permission had not been previously asked; but this difficulty was overcome, and Suger became the king's confidential adviser. In the midst of the political employments which continually increased on him, notwithstanding his endeavours to withdraw from them, he performed his monastic duties with the most scrupulous attention. He reformed the disorders which Abelard had censured among the monks of the abbey; he skillfully improved its finances, and extended its property; he rebuilt the church and furnished it magnificently. In his own person he had always been rigidly monastic; and although it is supposed that he was the abbot whom Bernard censures for going about with upwards of sixty horses, and a train more than sufficient for two bishops, he afterwards reformed his pomp, and received Bernard's warm congratulations on the change. Under Lewis VII Suger's influence became greater than ever. While left as regent of the kingdom, he employed not only his secular authority, but the censures of the church, which the pope authorized him to wield, in checking the violent and lawless tendencies of such nobles as had remained in France. He

defeated the attempts of Robert of Dreux, who had returned from the crusade before his brother Lewis, to supplant the absent king, and he exerted himself diligently to raise and transmit the supplies of money for which Lewis was continually importuning him by letters. When the unhappy expedition was projected, Suger had opposed the general enthusiasm for it. But after its failure, the tidings which arrived from the East stirred him with new feelings. Raymond of Antioch had been slain, and other chiefs were taken prisoners. Jerusalem itself was threatened by the infidels, while within its walls a bitter contest for power was raging between the young king Baldwin III and his mother Melisenda. It seemed as if the Latins were about to be swept from the Holy Land. Suger was excited to attempt to raise a fresh crusade, which Bernard advocated with his old enthusiasm. Meetings for the purpose were held at Laon and at Chartres; but both nobles and bishops received the project with coldness, and when it was proposed that Bernard himself should go to Jerusalem, in order to provoke others to emulation, the Cistercians refused to allow him. Suger, however, resolved to devote to this purpose the treasures with which St. Denys had been enriched by his administration. He sent large sums of money to the East, and intended to follow with a force of his own raising. But his death in 1151 put an end to the projected expedition.

It has been mentioned that the queen of the French accompanied her husband to the crusade, and that she returned in a separate vessel. Eleanor's haughty and unbending character was ill suited to that of Lewis, and she scornfully declared that she had married, not a king, but a monk. Differences had broken out between them at Antioch, and had been fomented by her uncle Raymond, who was provoked by the king's refusal to assist him in his designs against Aleppo. She is charged with infidelity to her husband, whom it is even said that she had intended to desert for the embraces of an infidel chief. The marriage was open to a canonical objection, of which Bernard had spoken strongly during the quarrel between the king and the church; and although the pope had overruled this objection, it was now brought before a council at Beaugency, which pronounced for a separation on the ground of consanguinity. Immediately after, Eleanor entered into a second marriage with Henry, duke of Normandy, count of Anjou, and afterwards king of England, who thus became master of her extensive territories; and, by this marriage, the foundation was laid for a life-long jealousy and rivalry between Lewis and the great vassal whose territory in France exceeded the king's own.

The presence of the pope, and the good understanding between him and Suger, had contributed greatly to the preservation of peace in France during the crusade; and by corresponding with the archbishop of Mayence, and Wibald, abbot of Stablo, whom Conrad had left as guardians of his son, Eugenius conferred a like benefit on Germany. In November 1147 he was induced by an invitation from Albero, archbishop of Treves, to visit that city, where he remained nearly three months. Among the matters there brought before him were the prophecies of Hildegard, head of a monastic sisterhood at St. Disibod's, in the diocese of Mayence. Hildegard, born in 1098, had from her childhood been subject to fits of ecstasy, in which it is said that, although ignorant of Latin, she uttered her oracles in that language; and these oracles were eagerly heard, recorded, and preserved. With the power of prophecy she was believed to possess that of miracles; she was consulted on all manner of subjects, and among her correspondents were emperors, kings, and popes. Her tone in addressing the highest ecclesiastical personages is that of a prophetess far superior to them, and she denounces the corruptions of the monks and clergy in a strain, which has made her a favourite with the fiercest opponents of the papal church. Bernard, when in Germany, had been interested by Hildegard's character, and at his instance the pope now examined her prophecies, bestowed on her his approval, and sanctioned her design of building a convent in a spot which had been marked out by a vision, on St. Rupert's Hill, near Bingen.

From Treves Eugenius proceeded to Reims, where, on the 21st of March 1148, a great council met under his presidency. This council is connected with English history, not only by the circumstance that Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury, attended it in defiance of a

prohibition from king Stephen (for whom, however, he charitably obtained a respite when the pope was about to pronounce a sentence of excommunication), but because among the matters which came before it was a contest for the see of York between William, a nephew of the king, and Henry Murdac, abbot of Fountains. In this question, Bernard, influenced by partiality for Henry, as a member of his order and formerly his pupil, took a part which is universally acknowledged to have been wrong; for William had been elected by a majority of votes, and had been consecrated by his uncle, Henry, bishop of Winchester. The affair had already been discussed at Paris in 1147, and was now, through Bernard's influence, decided by the pope against William, who was excommunicated; but he found a refuge with the bishop of Winchester, until, after the death of his rival, he was again elected to York, and, with the sanction of Anastasius IV, resumed possession of the see in 1154. His return was, however, opposed by some of his clergy, and his death, which took place in the same year, is said to have been caused by poison administered in the eucharistic chalice. William's sanctity was attested by miracles at his tomb, and in the next century the archbishop whom Bernard had branded as a simoniac, and whom Eugenius, at Bernard's dictation, had deposed, was canonized by Nicholas III.

Another question which came before the council at Reims related to the opinions of Gilbert de la Porrée, who, after having been long famous as a teacher, had been raised in 1141 to the bishopric of Poitiers. Gilbert was, like Abelard, one of those theologians who paid less than the usual reverence to the traditions of former times. Otho of Freising, his pupil and admirer, tells us that his subtlety and acuteness led him to depart in many things from the customary way of speaking, although his respect for authority was greater than Abelard's, and his character was free from the vanity and the levity which had contributed so largely to Abelard's misfortunes.

Gilbert had been present at the council of Sens in 1140, and it is said that Abelard, after having heard himself condemned, turned to the theologian of Poitiers, and warned him in a well-known verse of Horace that his turn of persecution would come next. The pope, when on his way to France, was met at Siena by two archdeacons of Gilbert's diocese, who presented a complaint against their bishop; but when he attempted to investigate the charge at the council of Paris in 1147, Gilbert was saved from condemnation by the obscurity of the subject to which his alleged errors related, and by his own dialectical acuteness. The inquiry was adjourned to a greater assembly, but the difficulties which had baffled the council of Paris were equally felt at Reims. The chief errors imputed to Gilbert related to the doctrine of the Godhead. He was charged with denying that the Divine essence is God, and consequently with denying that it could have been incarnate; with holding that God is pure Being, without any attributes, although including in his perfect Being all that we conceive of as His attributes and to this it was added that he denied the efficacy of the Sacraments—maintaining that none were really baptized but such as should eventually be saved. Gilbert defended himself at great length, and cited many passages from the fathers in behalf of his opinions. “Brother”, said the pope at last, “you say and read a great many things which perhaps we do not understand; but tell us plainly whether you own that supreme essence by which the three Persons are God to be itself God”. Gilbert, wearied with the disputation, hastily answered “No”, and his answer was recorded, after which the council adjourned. On the following day, Gilbert, who in the meantime had held much earnest conference with such of the cardinals as favoured him, endeavored by distinctions and explanations to do away with the effect of his hasty reply. Bernard, in speaking against him, made use of some words which gave offence to the cardinals—“Let that, too, be written down”, said Gilbert. “Yes”, cried the abbot, “let it be written down with an iron pen, and with a nail of adamant!”. As Gilbert's party among the cardinals was strong, Bernard endeavoured to counteract their influence by assembling a number of French prelates and other ecclesiastics, and producing at the council a set of propositions on which these had agreed in opposition to the errors imputed to the bishop of

Poitiers. On this, the jealousy of the cardinals, who had long been impatient of his ascendancy over Eugenius, burst forth. They denounced the French clergy as attempting to impose a new creed—a thing, they said, which all the patriarchs of Christendom could not presume to do without the authority of Rome; they loudly blamed the pope for preferring the French church to the Roman—for preferring his private friendships before the advice of those legitimate counsellors to whom he owed his elevation. Eugenius, unwilling to offend either party, desired Bernard to make peace; whereupon Bernard declared that he and his friends had not intended to claim any undue authority for their paper; but that, as Gilbert had demanded a written statement of his belief, he had desired to fortify himself by the consent of the French bishops. Gilbert was at length allowed to depart unharmed, on professing his agreement with the faith of the council and of the Roman church; he was reconciled with his archdeacons, by whom the charges had been brought against him; and his friends represented the result of the inquiry as a triumph.

Eugenius was now able, by the assistance of the Sicilian king, to return to Rome, where he arrived in November 1149, and he requested Bernard, as their personal intercourse could no longer be continued, to draw up some admonitions for his benefit. The result was a remarkable treatise “On Consideration”, which shows how far Bernard’s reverence for the papacy was from implying an admiration of the actual system of Rome, and how nearly in some respects the views of the highest hierarchical churchmen agreed with those of such reformers as Arnold of Brescia. With professions of deep humility and deference, the abbot writes as if the pope were still a monk of Clairvaux. The great object of the book is to exhort Eugenius to the spiritual duties of his office, and to warn him against the dangers of secularity. Bernard complains of the manifold business in which popes were engaged; of their employment in hearing of suits which were rather secular than ecclesiastical, and fell rather under the laws of Justinian than under those of the Saviour. These engagements, he says, were so engrossing as to allow no time for consideration; and the pope is advised to extricate himself from them as far as possible by devolving some part of his jurisdiction on others, by cutting short the speeches and the artifices of lawyers, and by discouraging the practice of too readily appealing to Rome. There is much of earnest warning against pride and love of rule; Bernard declares that the pomp of the papacy is copied, not from St. Peter, but from Constantine; that the Roman church ought not to be the mistress of other churches, but their mother; that the pope is not the lord, but the brother, of other bishops. He denounces the frequent exemption of abbots from the authority of bishops, and of bishops from the authority of their archbishops, the greed, the venality, the assumption of the papal court; he desires Eugenius to be careful in the choice of his officials and confidants, to avoid all acceptance of persons—as to money, he acknowledges the pope’s utter indifference—and to advance resolutely, although gradually, towards a reformation of the prevailing abuses. There is no reason to doubt that this treatise was received by Eugenius with the respect which he always paid to Bernard; but the abuses which it denounced were too strong and too inveterate to be cured by the good intentions of any pope. In it, however, the great saint of Clairvaux, by the unreserved plainness of his language and by the weight of his authority, had supplied a weapon which, from age to age, was continually employed by those who desired to reform the church and the court of Rome.

Although Eugenius was received by the Romans with submission to his spiritual authority, his temporal claims were not admitted, and after a few months he was again compelled to leave the city. In the hope of aid against the rebels, he entreated Conrad to come to Italy and receive the imperial crown, while the Romans requested the king to take part with them against the clergy, and Manuel of Constantinople urged the fulfillment of an agreement which had been made as Conrad was returning from the East, for a joint expedition against the pope’s Sicilian allies. To each party Conrad replied that he was preparing for an Italian expedition, and he assured the pope that no evil was intended against the Roman church. But

in the midst of his preparations he was seized by an illness, which carried him off in February 1152. In the end of that year, Eugenius, whose bounty and mildness had done much to conciliate the Romans, was allowed to return to his capital; but he survived little more than six months, dying on the 8th of July 1153. And on the 20th of August in that year Bernard died at Clairvaux— “ascending”, says a chronicler of the time, “from the Bright Valley to the mountain of eternal brightness”.

3

ADRIAN IV AND FREDERICK BARBAROSSA.

Henry, king of the Romans, had died about a year and a half before his father; and, although Conrad still had a son surviving, his feeling for the public good induced him to choose an heir of maturer age, his nephew Frederick, son of that Frederick of Hohenstaufen who had been Lothair's competitor for the empire. A week after his uncle's death, Frederick was elected at Frankfort, and five days later he received the German crown at Aix-la-Chapelle from Arnold, archbishop of Cologne. On the very day of his coronation the stern determination of his character was remarkably displayed. In the minster, where the ceremony took place, one of his officers, who had been dismissed for misconduct, threw himself at his feet, in the hope that the circumstances of the day might secure his pardon. But Frederick declared that, as he had disgraced the man not out of hatred but for justice sake, neither the festive occasion nor the intercessions of the princes who were present could be allowed to reverse the sentence. Frederick, who was now thirty-one years of age, had distinguished himself in the late crusade; he was a prince of extraordinary ability and indomitable perseverance, filled with a high sense of the dignity to which he had been elevated, and with a firm resolution to maintain its rights according to the model of Charlemagne. Yet, although his struggle for the assertion of the imperial privileges was to be chiefly against the hierarchy, he appears to have been sincere in his profession of reverence for the church, and not immoderate in his conception of the relations between the secular and the ecclesiastical powers. Descended as he was from the houses of both Welf and Waiblingen, the feud of those houses was dormant throughout his reign, although it afterwards revived, when the names became significant of the papal and the imperial parties respectively.

In the very beginning of his reign, Frederick was drawn into a collision with the papacy with regard to the see of Magdeburg. Some of the clergy had wished to elect the dean as archbishop, while others were for the provost; but Frederick persuaded the dean and his partisans to accept Wichmann, bishop of Zeitz, as their candidate, and, by the power which the Worms concordat had allowed to the sovereign in cases of disputed elections, he decided for Wichmann, and invested him with the regalia. The provost on this carried a complaint to Eugenius, who, in letters to the chapter of Magdeburg and to the German bishops, ordered that Wichmann should not be acknowledged as archbishop; it is, however, remarkable that he rested his prohibition on the canons which forbade translation except for great causes (such as, he said, did not exist in this case), but did not hint as yet that the translation of bishops was a matter reserved to the Roman see. Frederick continued firm in the assertion of his pretensions, against both Eugenius and his successor, Anastasius IV. A legate whom Anastasius sent into Germany for the settlement of the question found himself resisted in his assumptions, and was obliged to return without having effected anything; and Wichmann, whom Frederick soon after sent to Rome, received from Anastasius the confirmation of his election, with the archiepiscopal pall. By the result of this affair Frederick's authority was strengthened in proportion to the loudness with which the Roman court had before declared itself resolved to abate nothing of its pretensions.

The long absence of the emperors from Italy had encouraged the people of that country, which was continually advancing in commerce, manufactures, and agriculture, in wealth and in population, to forget their allegiance to the imperial crown. The feudatories came to regard themselves as independent; the cities set up republican governments of their own, under consuls who were annually elected, and the right of investing these magistrates was the only shadow which the bishops were allowed to retain of their ancient secular power. The cities were engaged in constant feuds with each other, and each subdued the nobles of its neighbourhood, whom the citizens in some cases even compelled to reside within the city walls for a certain portion of the year.

Frederick was resolved to reassert the imperial rights, and applications from various quarters concurred with his own inclination in urging on him an expedition into Italy. With the Greek emperor he formed a scheme of combination against the Sicilian Normans and while Eugenius entreated his aid against the republican and Arnoldist faction, which the pope represented as intending to set up an emperor of its own, another writer addressed him on the part of the Romans, assuring him that the story of Constantine's donation had now lost all credit even among the meanest of the people, and that the pope with his cardinals did not venture to appear in public. At his first German diet, in 1152, Frederick proposed an expedition into Italy, for which he required the princes to be ready within two years; and in October 1154 he entered Lombardy by way of Trent, at the head of the most splendid army that had ever crossed the Alps. A great assembly was summoned to the plains of Roncaglia, the place in which the German kings, on their way to receive the imperial crown, had been accustomed to meet their Italian subjects. The vassals who failed to appear—among them, some ecclesiastics—were declared to have forfeited their fiefs. The mutual complaints of the Italian cities were heard, and severe sentences were pronounced against those who were found guilty, especially against the powerful and turbulent Milanese, who had treated Frederick's admonitions with contempt, and had now added to their offences by offering to bribe him into sanctioning their tyranny over their neighbours. Tortona, which had shown itself contumacious, was taken after a siege of two months, and destroyed; and at Pavia the king was received with a magnificence which expressed the joy of the citizens in the humiliation of their Milanese enemies.

In March 1153 Frederick had entered into a compact with Eugenius, binding himself to make no alliance with the Romans or with Roger of Sicily unless with the pope's consent, and to maintain the privileges of the papacy; while the pope promised to support the power of Frederick, and to bestow on him the imperial crown, and both parties pledged themselves to make no grant of Italian territory to "the king of the Greeks". Since the date of that compact, Eugenius had been succeeded by Anastasius IV, and Anastasius, in December 1154, by Nicholas Breakspear, an Englishman, who took the name of Adrian IV. Breakspear, the son of a poor clerk, who had afterwards become a monk of St. Albans, is said to have been refused admission into that house on account of his insufficiency in knowledge, and was driven to seek his fortune in France, where he distinguished himself by his diligence in study at Paris, and rose to be abbot of the regular canons of St. Rufus, near Avignon. In this office he became unpopular with his canons, who carried their complaints against him to Eugenius III; and the pope at once put an end to the strife and marked his high sense of the abbot's merit by appointing him cardinal-bishop of Albano. As cardinal, he was sent on an important legation into the Scandinavian kingdoms, from which he returned during the pontificate of Anastasius and now the poor English scholar, whose Saxon descent would probably have debarred him from any considerable preferment in his native land, was elected to the chair of St. Peter. "He was", says a biographer, "a man of great kindness, meekness, and patience, skilled in the English and in the Latin tongues, eloquent in speech, polished in his utterance, distinguished in singing and an eminent preacher, slow to anger, quick to forgive, a cheerful giver, bountiful in alms and excellent in his whole character". If, however, we may judge by his acts, it would

seem that Adrian's temper was less placid than it is here represented; and his ideas as to the papal dignity were of the loftiest Hildebrandine kind. Immediately after his election, he refused to acknowledge the republican government, and issued an order that Arnold of Brescia should be banished from Rome. To this it was answered that the pope ought to confine himself to spiritual affairs; and the insolence of Arnold's partisans increased until it reached a height which gave the pope an advantage against them. A cardinal was attacked and mortally wounded in the street; Adrian placed the city under an interdict; and the severity of this sentence, which had never before been known at Rome, was the more strongly felt from its being issued in Lent, a time when the Romans had been accustomed to the pomp and the religious consolations of especially solemn services. By the absence of these the people were so intensely distressed that, in the holy week, they compelled the senators to submit to the pope, who consented to take off his censure on condition that Arnold should be driven out. On this Arnold fled from the city, and, after having wandered for a time, he found a refuge among the nobles of the Campagna, by whom he was regarded as a prophet. But Frederick, as he advanced towards Rome with a rapidity which excited Adrian's suspicions, was met by three cardinals, who in the pope's name requested that he would take measures against an incendiary so dangerous to the crown as well as to the church; and in consequence of the king's demand Arnold was surrendered by those who sheltered him. Frederick delivered him over to the pope, and, under the authority of the prefect of Rome, the popular leader was hanged, after which his body was burnt, and his ashes were thrown into the Tiber, lest they should be venerated as relics by the multitudes who had followed him. "Bad as his doctrine was", says Gerhoh of Reichersperg, "I wish that he had been punished with imprisonment, or exile, or with some other penalty short of death, or at least that he had been put to death in such a manner as might have saved the Roman church from question".

The negotiations which Adrian had opened through his cardinals were satisfactorily settled by Frederick's swearing that his intentions were friendly to the pope, and receiving in turn a promise of the imperial crown. Having thus assured himself Adrian ventured into the camp at Nepi, where he was received with great honour; but, although Frederick threw himself at his feet, the pope took offence at the king's omitting to hold his stirrup—an act of homage which, although the first example of it had been given little more than half a century before, by Conrad, the rebellious son of Henry IV, was already deduced by the papal party from Constantine the Great, who was said to have performed it to Pope Sylvester. Adrian declared that he would not give the kiss of peace unless he received the same honour which his predecessors had always received, while Frederick declared that the omission was purely the effect of ignorance, but that he must consult his nobles on the subject. The cardinals in alarm withdrew to Civita Castellana, and a long discussion was carried on, which was at length settled by the evidence of some Germans who had accompanied the emperor Lothair to Rome; and, as this evidence was in the pope's favour, Frederick next day submitted to do the service which was required, although it would seem that in the performance he intentionally gave it the character of a jest. Having overcome this difficulty, the king proceeded onwards in company with the pope, who strongly represented to him the disorders of Rome, and endeavored to draw him into an expedition against the Sicilians, with a view to recovering Apulia for the apostolic see. Frederick contrived to defer the consideration of this proposal; but it may be supposed that the pope's representations had some share in producing the reception which the king gave to a deputation from the citizens, which waited on him near Sutri. After listening for a time to the bombastic oration which one of the envoys addressed to him in the name of Rome, dwelling on her glories, and endeavouring to make terms for the Romans in exchange for their consent to the imperial coronation, the king indignantly cut him short—"These", he said, pointing to his German nobles and soldiers, "are the true Latins—the consuls, the senators, the knights. The glory of Rome and the Romans has been transferred to the Franks. Our power has not been conferred by you, as you pretend, but has been won by

victory. Your native tyrants, such as Desiderius and Berengar, have been overcome by my predecessors, and died as captives and slaves in foreign lands. It is not for subjects to prescribe laws to their sovereign. It is not for a prince at the head of a powerful army, but for captives, to pay money; I will submit to no conditions of your making”.

On reaching Rome, Frederick took possession of the Leonine suburb, while the bridge of St. Angelo, the only means of communication with the opposite bank, was guarded by his soldiery; and on the 18th of June he was crowned by Adrian in St. Peter's amid the loud acclamations of the Germans. But after the ceremony, while the troops had withdrawn from the oppressive heat of the day, and were refreshing themselves in their tents, a body of Romans sallied across the bridge, attacking such of the Germans as they found in the streets or in the churches, and appeared to have a design of seizing the pope. The noise of this irruption penetrated to the emperor's camp, and Frederick immediately ordered his troops to arms. A fierce conflict raged from four in the afternoon till nightfall; the assailants were driven back as far as the Forum; the Tiber ran with blood, and it is said that a thousand of the Romans were slain, and two hundred taken prisoners, while only one of the imperialists was killed and one captured. At the pope's intercession the Roman captives were given up to the prefect of the city, and on St. Peter's day Adrian pronounced the absolution of all who had taken part in the late slaughter. Frederick was soon after compelled by the pestilential air of the Roman summer to withdraw from the neighbourhood of the city, and, as the time for which his troops were bound to serve was drawing towards an end, he retired beyond the Alps—on the way taking and destroying Spoleto, the inhabitants of which had provoked him by their insolence. At Christmas 1155-6 a diet was held at Worms, where Arnold, archbishop of Mayence, Hermann, count palatine, and others were brought to trial for disturbing the peace of Germany during the emperor's absence. The archbishop was spared in consideration of his age and profession; but the count palatine and ten of his partisans were sentenced to the ignominious punishment of “carrying the dog”.

Frederick's attention was soon again demanded by the affairs of Italy. William “the Bad”, the son and successor of Roger of Sicily, had in 1155 refused to enter into a treaty with the pope, or to admit his ambassadors to an interview, because Adrian, by way of claiming him as a vassal, had styled him not *king*, but *lord*. He besieged the pope in Benevento, laid waste the surrounding territory, and was denounced excommunicate. This sentence was not without its effect on the minds of William's allies, and, in addition to the fear that these might desert him, the dread of a combination between the Greek emperor and the pope inclined him further to peace. His first overtures were refused, but Adrian, after having seen his own troops and allies defeated, was fain to sue in his turn, and received the most favourable terms. The king fell at his feet, and, on swearing fealty to the Roman see, was invested by Adrian with the kingdom of Sicily and the Italian territories of the Normans (including some which the popes had never before affected to dispose of); while, in consideration of this, he promised to aid the pope against all enemies, and to pay a yearly tribute for Apulia, Calabria, and his other continental dominions. Frederick, who had been exerting himself with energy and success to reduce Germany to tranquillity, was greatly displeased that the pope had without his concurrence entered into an alliance with the Sicilians—an alliance, moreover, which involved the disallowance of the imperial claims to suzerainty over Apulia. He signified his displeasure to Adrian, who on his side was dissatisfied on account of the emperor's having divorced his wife under pretext of consanguinity, and having entered into another marriage, which was recommended to him by political considerations. At a diet at Wurzburg, in 1157, a fresh expedition into Italy was resolved on; but it was delayed by the necessity of attending to the affairs of Poland, and in the meantime an incident took place which led to a violent collision between the pope and the emperor.

Eskil, archbishop of Lund, in that part of modern Sweden which was then subject to Denmark, in returning from a visit to Rome, had been attacked, plundered, and imprisoned

with a view to the exaction of ransom, by some robber knights in the neighbourhood of Thionville. No notice had been taken of this by Frederick, to whom Eskil had probably given offence by his exertions to render the Danish church independent of the metropolitans of Bremen and Hamburg. But Adrian, on hearing of it, addressed to the emperor a letter of indignant remonstrance against the apathy with which he had regarded an outrage injurious to the empire as well as to the church—reminding Frederick of his having conferred the imperial crown on him, and adding that, if it had been in his power, he would have bestowed on him yet greater favours. The letter was presented to the emperor by two cardinals at a great assembly at Besançon, where it was read aloud, and was interpreted by the chancellor Reginald of Dassel (who soon after became archbishop of Cologne). But the word *beneficia* which the pope had used to signify favours or benefits, was unluckily misunderstood by the Germans as if it had the feudal sense of benefices or fiefs. The pope was supposed to have represented the empire as a fief of the papacy; and it was remembered that Frederick, at his first visit to Rome, had been offended by a picture which, with its inscription, represented Lothair as receiving his crown from the pope's gift, and as performing homage for it. A loud uproar arose at the supposed insolence of the pontiff, and the general feeling was still further exasperated when Cardinal Roland dared to ask "From whom, then, does the emperor hold his crown, if not from the pope?". The palsgrave Otho of Wittelsbach, who carried the naked sword of state, was with difficulty prevented by the emperor from cleaving the audacious ecclesiastic's head with it. "If we were not in a church", said Frederick himself, "they should know how the swords of the Germans cut". He burst forth into violent reproaches against the legates and their master; they were abruptly and ignominiously dismissed, and were charged to return home at once, without staying more than one night in any place of the imperial dominions, or burdening bishops or monasteries by their exactions. Frederick, whose exasperation was increased by some strong rebukes which Adrian had addressed to him on account of his divorce and second marriage, forthwith sent forth a letter to his subjects, in which he protested that he would rather hazard his life than admit the pope's insolent assumptions; that he held his kingdom and the empire by the choice of the princes and under God alone, agreeably to our Lord's saying, that two swords are necessary for the government of the world. Orders were issued that no German ecclesiastic should go to Rome without the imperial license, and the passes into Italy were guarded in order to prevent all communication.

On hearing from his legates of the indignities to which they had been subjected, the pope wrote to the German bishops, urging them to bring the emperor to a better mind, and to persuade him to exact from archbishop Reginald and the palsgrave signal and public atonement for their "blasphemies" against the Roman church. But on this occasion the German prelates preferred their national to their hierarchical allegiance. They told the pope that they had admonished the emperor, and had received from him "such an answer as became a catholic prince" declaring his firm resolution, while paying all due reverence to the pope, to admit no encroachment of the church on the empire; and they entreated Adrian to soothe the high spirit of their sovereign. The pope began to be alarmed, and, at the instance of Henry, duke of Bavaria, he dispatched two envoys of a more politic character than the last, with a letter of explanation composed in a moderate and conciliatory style. The word *beneficium* he said, meant, not a fief, but simply a good deed (*bonum factum*) and surely the emperor would admit that to crown him was such a deed; and by the crown nothing more had been meant than the act of placing it on Frederick's head. The letter was delivered at Augsburg, and was well received; and the picture which had given offence at Rome was removed, if not destroyed.

At length the projected expedition was ready, and Frederick, having settled the affairs of Germany, Hungary, and Poland, crossed the Alps in July 1158, at the head of a force composed of many nations, and which is reckoned at 100,000 infantry and 15,000 horsed Milan and other insubordinate cities were compelled to surrender, and felt his severity, while

the enmity of the Italian towns against each other was shown in acts of cruelty committed by those in the imperial interest, to the astonishment and disgust of the Germans. Milan was deprived of the privileges which were known under the name of *royalties* and was required to submit the choice of its consuls to the emperor for confirmation. At Martinmas, a great assembly was held in the Roncaglian plains, where a city of tents was erected, the Germans and Italians encamping on the opposite banks of the Po. As the extent of the imperial powers in Italy had been hitherto undefined, Frederick, in an address to his assembled subjects, declared himself resolved that it should now be duly ascertained and determined, professing that he would rather govern by law than by his own caprice; and the matter was committed to four eminent professors of Bologna, together with twenty-eight judges of the Lombard cities. Filled with the lofty notions of the imperial dignity which had lately been produced by the revived study of ancient Roman law, these authorities declared that the emperor possessed autocratic power, and was entitled to exact a capitation from all his subjects. The rights of the Italian cities, to the possession of royalties were investigated, and those for which no authority could be shown were confiscated; a general tribute was imposed; and by these measures a revenue of 30,000 pounds of silver was added to the imperial treasury. A few cities were allowed by special favour to retain their consuls, who were to be appointed with the emperor's consent; but the ordinary system of government was to be by officers bearing the title of *podestà*, who were to be nominated by the emperor, and were also to be chosen from among strangers to the place over which they were appointed. Measures were also taken to bind the cities to mutual peace, to prevent them from combining into parties, and to suppress the private wars of the nobles.

On hearing of these proceedings, Adrian was greatly excited. The idea of the imperial prerogative which had been sanctioned at Roncaglia conflicted with the Hildebrandine pretensions of the papacy. The resumption of royalties which had been held not only by cities and by nobles, but by bishops and abbots—the imposition of a tribute from which ecclesiastics were not exempted—the investiture of Frederick's uncle, Welf VI of Bavaria, in the inheritance of the countess Matilda—were circumstances which might well produce alarm and irritation in the pope's mind; "it seemed to him", says a writer of later date, "as if all that the emperor gained were taken from himself". While engaged in settling the quarrels of the Lombard cities, Frederick received from the pope a letter peremptorily forbidding him to arbitrate in a difference between Bergamo and Brescia; and instead of being committed, as was usual, to an envoy of honourable station, this letter was delivered by a man of mean and ragged appearance, who immediately disappeared. About the same time Adrian gave additional provocation to the emperor by refusing to allow the promotion of Guy of Blandrata to the see of Ravenna, on the evidently trilling ground that he could not be spared from Rome, where he was a subdeacon of the church. Indignant at these slights, the emperor ordered his secretaries, in addressing the pope, to use the singular instead of the plural number, and to reverse the custom, which had prevailed since the time of Leo IV, of placing the pope's name before that of the sovereign in the heading of letters. These changes drew forth a strong remonstrance from Adrian, who declared them to be a breach of the commandment that we should honour our parents, and of the fealty which Frederick had sworn to the see of St. Peter; and he further complained that the emperor exacted homage as well as fealty from bishops, that he took their consecrated hands between his own hands, that he closed not only the churches but the cities of his dominions against the legates of the apostolic see. An embassy was also commissioned to demand redress of alleged encroachments on the papacy—that the emperor sent messengers to Rome without the knowledge of the pope, to whom all power in the city belonged; that his envoys claimed entertainment in the palaces of bishops; that he exacted the allowance known by the name of the pope's subjects on other occasions besides that on which it was admitted to be lawful—the expedition to receive the imperial crown; that he detained Matilda's inheritance, and other territories which rightfully belonged to the

apostolic see. To these complaints Frederick replied that he had been driven by the pope's new assumptions to fall back on the older forms in writing to him; that he had no wish for the homage of bishops, unless they cared to retain the royalties which they had received from the crown; that the palaces of bishops stood on imperial ground, and therefore his ambassadors were entitled to enter them; that if he shut out cardinals from churches and from cities, it was because they were false to their profession, and were intent only on plunder; that if the pope were sovereign of Rome, the imperial title was a mockery: and he inveighed in strong terms against the pride and rapacity of the Roman court.

The exasperation of both parties rose higher and higher. A proposal of Frederick, that the matters in dispute should be left to the decision of six cardinals to be named by the pope, and six German bishops to be chosen by himself, was rejected by Adrian, on the ground that the pope could be judged by no man. The emperor, indignant at the discovery of letters exhorting the Lombard cities to revolt, received favourably a fresh embassy from the Roman senate and people, and entered into negotiations with them.

A rupture of the most violent kind between the papacy and the empire appeared to be inevitable, when, on the 1st of September 1159, Adrian died at Anagni.

CHAPTER IX.

ALEXANDER III.

A.D. 1159-1181.

THE higher clergy of Rome had during the late pontificate been divided into two parties, of which one adhered to the imperial, and the other to the Sicilian interest; and at the death of Adrian a collision took between these parties. The cardinals of the Sicilian faction elected Roland Bandinelli or Paparo, cardinal of St. Mark and chancellor of the Roman see, the same who had defied Frederick at Besançon; while the imperialists set up cardinal Octavian, of St. Cecilia, who is said to have been at one time excommunicated by the late pope, but had since rendered important services to the emperor. That Roland, although unsupported by the lower clergy, by the nobles, or by the people, had the majority of the cardinals with him, is allowed by the opposite party; but while these represent their own strength to have been nine against fourteen, the adherents of Roland claim for him all but three. The partisans of Octavian (who styled himself Victor IV) assert that, after the death of Adrian, the cardinals agreed at Anagni that no one should be declared pope except with the unanimous consent of the whole college; but that, on removing to Rome for the late pope's funeral, the Sicilian party, trusting in their superior numbers, resolved to set this compact aside, and to elect from among themselves a pope hostile to the emperor; that they themselves proposed Octavian, as a man of religious character, who would study to promote the good of the church, and its agreement with the empire; that the Sicilian faction cried out for Roland, and were about to invest him with the papal mantle, but that, while he strove to avoid it, the act was prevented, and Octavian was solemnly invested and enthroned in St. Peter's chair; whereupon Roland and his partisans withdrew without making any protest, and shut themselves up in the fortress of St. Peter. According to the other party, Roland (who assumed the name of Alexander III) had been duly invested with the mantle, when Octavian plucked it from his shoulders, and, after a struggle, huddled it on himself with the assistance of two clerks, but so awkwardly that the back part appeared in front; and that thereupon his partisans, rushing in with swords in their hands, drove out Alexander and his supporters. It is remarkable how much the formality as to the mantle is insisted on by the same party which, in the earlier schism between Innocent and Anacletus, had been careful to avoid all questions of form, and to rest its candidate's claims on his character alone; and in the present case the representations which are given by friends and by enemies as to the character of the rivals are utterly irreconcilable.

After having been kept as a prisoner beyond the Tiber for eleven days by some senators in Victor's interest, Alexander and his cardinals were delivered by the Frangipani faction, and passed through the city—in triumphant procession, as they assert, while they tell us that the antipope, on appearing in the streets of Rome, was jeered and hooted by women and boys.

On the 18th of September Alexander was invested with the mantle at Cisterna—a name from which his opponents took occasion for sneers as to “cisterns that could hold no water”; and on the following Sunday he was consecrated by the cardinal of Ostia, at Ninfa. The rival pope had also been compelled to leave Rome, and his consecration was performed at Farfa on the 4th of October by the cardinal of Tusculum, with two other bishops, whom Alexander's friends describe as banished from their sees. Victor was supported in his pretensions by the imperial commissioners Otho of Wittelsbach and Guy of Blandrata, and,

while Alexander's partisans complained of this, his rival appealed to the emperor for a decision.

Frederick, on attempting to carry out the decrees of the Roncaglian assembly, had met with an obstinate resistance. In many cities the podestàs appointed by him had been turned out by the people; at Milan admittance was denied to them, although the Milanese had advised at Roncaglia that such magistrates should be appointed for the Italian cities; and the imperial chancellor, Reginald, archbishop elect of Cologne, was grossly insulted and driven from the city. Sieges and other military operations were carried on with fierce exasperation on both sides, and the imperialists reduced the country around Milan to a desert. It was while engaged in the siege of Crema that Frederick received the letter by which Alexander announced his election; and such was his indignation at the contents that he tossed it from him, refused to make any answer, and was with difficulty restrained from hanging the bearers of it. After advising with his bishops and his lawyers, he resolved to submit the question of the papacy to a council; and the rival claimants were summoned to appear before it. By writers of Alexander's party it is asserted that, while Frederick continued to address him as chancellor Roland, Octavian was already acknowledged in the imperial letters as pope; but this seems very questionable.

The council, which had been originally summoned to meet in October, but had been delayed until after the fall of Crema, assembled at Pavia in February 1160. The emperor had invited the kings of France, England, Hungary, Spain, and other countries to send bishops as representatives of their churches; but the prelates who appeared, about fifty in number, were almost all from his own German and Lombard dominions. Alexander, although a homeless fugitive from his city, had refused in the loftiest style of papal dignity to attend, asserting that, as lawful pope, he could be judged by no man; that Frederick, by calling a council without his sanction, and by citing him to it as a subject, had violated the rights of the holy see. A second and a third summons were addressed to him, but met with the same disregard as the first.

At the opening of the council the emperor appeared, and, after a speech in which he asserted his right to convoke such assemblies, agreeably to the examples of Constantine, Theodosius, Justinian, and Charlemagne, declared that he left the decision of the disputed election to the bishops, as being the persons to whom God had given authority in such matters. An objection was raised by the Lombard prelates against proceeding in the absence of Alexander; but this was overruled by their German brethren, who pleaded the length and the cost of their own journeys to attend the council, and said that, as Roland's absence was willful, he must bear the consequences of it. The question was therefore debated, and at the end of seven days the council pronounced in favour of Victor, who thereupon received the homage of all who were present, the emperor holding his stirrup, leading his horse by the rein, and showing him all other usual marks of reverence. Victor renewed an excommunication which he had pronounced against Alexander, to which Alexander replied by a counter excommunication; and while the emperor declared that the meeting at Pavia had been a full and legitimate council of the church, Alexander and his party spoke of it as a mere secular court. They dwelt on the small number of the bishops who had attended; on the intimidation which was said to have been practised, but which had been unable to prevent some show of dissent from the decrees; on the refusal of the English and French envoys to commit themselves to the decision; and they asserted that the antipope had abased himself by the unexampled humiliation of stripping off his insignia in the emperor's presence, and receiving investiture by the ring.

Although the partisans of Victor professed at the council of Pavia to have the support of England, Spain, Hungary, Denmark, Bohemia, and other countries, Alexander was soon acknowledged almost everywhere except in the empire. The kings of France and of England, with their bishops, after a separate recognition of his title in each country, combined to acknowledge him at a council at Toulouse, to which Alexander, being assured of his ground,

had condescended to send representatives to confront those of his rival. The Lombard cities, engaged in a deadly struggle with the emperor, were Alexander's natural allies. The strength of the great monastic orders was with him, although for a time the Cluniacs held with his opponents. By means of envoys he was able to win the favour of the Byzantine court; the Latins of the East, in a council at Nazareth, agreed to acknowledge him, and to anathematize the antipope; and Spain, Denmark, and others of the less important kingdoms gradually adhered to the prevailing side. Each party employed against the other all the weapons which it could command; the rival popes issued mutual anathemas; Alexander released the emperor's subjects from their allegiance, while Frederick ejected bishops of Alexander's party, and banished the Cistercians from the empire for their adhesion to him. In Alexander the hierarchical party had found a chief thoroughly fitted to advance its interests. While holding the highest views of the Hildebrandine school, the means which he employed in their service were very different from those of Hildebrand. He was especially skillful in dealing with men, and in shaping his course according to circumstances; and above all things he was remarkable for the calm and steady patience with which he was content to await the development of affairs, and for the address with which he contrived to turn every occurrence to the interest of his cause.

In consequence of its renewed offences, Milan had been laid under the ban of the empire, and Frederick had sworn never to wear his crown until the rebellious city should be reduced. The siege had lasted three years, when, in the end of February 1162, the Milanese found themselves brought to extremity by the exhaustion of their provisions, while the emperor's strength had been lately increased by powerful reinforcements from Germany. The besieged attempted to make conditions, but Frederick would admit nothing less than an absolute surrender; and in his camp at Lodi he gratified himself by beholding the abject humiliation of their representatives, who appeared before him in miserable guise, barefooted, with ropes around their necks, and holding naked swords to their throats, in acknowledgment that their lives were forfeit. Four days later a more numerous deputation appeared, having with them the *carroccio*, or waggon on which the standard of Milanese independence had been displayed in battle. The great brazen war-trumpets were laid at the emperor's feet; and at his command the mast, to which the flag was attached, was lowered, and the *carroccio* was broken up in his presence. Frederick told the deputies that their lives should be spared, but declared himself resolved to root out their city from the earth. The inhabitants were marched out at the gates, and, after having endured much misery from the want of shelter, were distributed into four open villages, which they were compelled to build, each two leagues apart from the rest; and in these villages they lived under the inspection of imperial officers. The houses of the city were doomed to destruction, which was zealously and effectually executed by the men of Lodi and other hostile towns, to whom the work was entrusted. Churches and monasteries alone remained standing, amid masses of rubbish surrounded by shattered fragments of the walls which had so long defied the imperial power. Immense plunder was carried off; and among the losses which were most deplored by the Milanese was that of some relics of especial sanctity—the bodies of St. Felix and St. Nabor (famous in the history of the great archbishop Ambrose), and above all those of the Three Kings of the East, which were believed to have been presented by St. Helena to archbishop Eustorgius, and were now transferred by the imperial chancellor, Reginald of Cologne, to be the chief treasure of his own cathedral.

All Lombardy was subdued; the fortifications of some cities were destroyed, and all were put under the administration of podestàs, who, except in cases of special favour, as at Lodi, were always chosen from families unconnected with the places which they were to govern. Alexander in the meantime, after a residence of sixteen months at Anagni, had returned to Rome in April 1161; but, finding his residence there unsafe, he soon withdrew to Terracina; and at length he resolved, like so many of his predecessors, to seek a refuge in

France. In April 1162 he landed at Montpellier, where he was received with great enthusiasm; and there he held a council, at which he renewed his excommunication of the antipope and the emperor, with their adherents. The conquest of Milan now enabled Frederick to return to Italy, and he invited the French king—whose adhesion to Alexander was still believed to be wavering—to a conference at St. Jean de Losne, in Burgundy, with a view to the settlement of the question as to the papacy. It was proposed that each sovereign should be accompanied to the place of meeting by the pope whose cause he espoused, and that the decision should be committed to an equal number of laymen and ecclesiastics. Alexander, however, as before, refused to submit to any judgment, and he endeavoured to prevent the meeting. In this, indeed, he was unsuccessful; but through his influence Lewis went into the negotiations with a disposition to catch at any occasion for withdrawing. On one occasion, after having waited for some hours on the bridge of St. Jean de Losne, while Frederick was accidentally delayed, the king washed his hands in the Saone, and rode off, declaring that his engagement was at an end; and, although he was persuaded by the emperor's representations to resume the negotiations, they ended in mutual dissatisfaction.

The pope was visited at the monastery of Dole in Aquitaine by Henry of England, who kissed his feet, refused to be seated in his presence, except on the ground, and presented him with rich gifts; and soon after he had an interview with Lewis and Henry at Toucy, on the Loire, where both kings received him with the greatest reverence, and each held a rein of his horse as they led him to his tent. It was agreed that a council should be held at Tours in the following year; and at Whitsuntide this assembly met. Seventeen cardinals, a hundred and twenty-four bishops, and upwards of four hundred abbots were present; among the most conspicuous of whom was Thomas Becket, lately promoted by Henry to the archbishopric of Canterbury. Alexander was solemnly acknowledged by this great assembly, and among its canons was one which annulled the ordinations of Octavian. Both by Henry and Lewis the pope was requested to choose for himself a residence within their dominions; and having fixed on the city of Sens, he settled there in October 1163.

The antipope Octavian or Victor died at Lucca, in 1164. It is supposed that Frederick was inclined to take advantage of this event in order to a reconciliation with Alexander, but that a fresh election was urged on by the chancellor, Reginald of Cologne, whom Alexander describes as “the author and head of the church’s troubles”. Two only of the cardinals who had sided with Octavian survived; and one of them, Guy of Crema, was chosen by the single vote of the other, and was consecrated by Henry, bishop of Liege. It was noted by the opposite party, as a token of Divine judgment, that the bishop who had ventured to perform this unexampled consecration, although he himself, as well as Hillin, archbishop of Treves, had refused to be set up as antipope, died within the year. Whatever the emperor’s earlier feelings may have been, he now resolved to give a strenuous support to the antipope, who styled himself Paschal III. It seemed likely that Henry of England, the most powerful sovereign in Europe, whose territories in France exceeded those of Lewis, might be won to the imperialist side; for archbishop Becket, in consequence of having set up in behalf of the clergy pretensions to immunity from all secular jurisdiction, had found himself obliged to flee from England, and had been received with open arms by Lewis and Alexander. In the hope, therefore, of profiting by the English king's resentment at the favour displayed towards one whom he regarded as the enemy of his royal rights, Frederick despatched Reginald of Cologne into England, with proposals for a matrimonial alliance between the families of the two sovereigns, and also with a charge to negotiate in order to detach Henry from Alexander’s party. But although Henry was willing to consider such proposals, the envoys found the English in general zealous for the cause of Becket and of the pope to such a degree that, in token of abhorrence of the schism, the altars on which the imperialist clergy had celebrated mass were thrown down, or were solemnly purified from the contamination of their rites. The king, however, agreed to send representatives to a great diet which was to meet at Wurzburg,

under the emperor's presidency, at Whitsuntide 1165. At the second session of this diet Reginald appeared, with the English envoys, and his counsels swayed the judgment of the assembly. An oath of adhesion to Paschal was exacted; and not only were those present required to swear that they would never acknowledge Alexander or any of his line, and would never accept any absolution from their oaths, but it was provided that, at the emperor's death, his successor should be obliged to swear in like terms before receiving the crown. This oath, however, was not taken so completely as Frederick had designed. A few only of the laity swore; of the prelates, some were absent, some refused it, some took it with qualifications which destroyed its force. And although the English envoys bound themselves by it, their act was afterwards disavowed by their master, as having been done in excess of his instructions.

Reginald of Cologne, who had hitherto remained in the order of deacon—apparently lest, by accepting consecration from schismatics, he should put a hindrance in the way of reconciliation with Alexander—was now compelled to pledge himself to the schism by receiving ordination to the priesthood at Wurzburg, and to the episcopate a few months later, in his own city; and other elect dignitaries were required to commit themselves in like manner. But Conrad, archbishop elect of Mayence, while passing through France on a pilgrimage to Compostella, was reconciled to Alexander and from that time steadily adhered to him. Eberhard, archbishop of Salzburg, had throughout been the chief supporter of Alexander's interest in Germany, and had received from him at once a reward for his fidelity and an increase of influence, in being invested with the office of legate. His successor, the emperor's uncle Conrad, after having for some time appeared doubtful, now declared openly in favour of Alexander, and was in consequence denounced as an enemy of the empire; his territory was laid waste, his city reduced to ashes, and the property of the see was distributed among Frederick's followers.

The bishop of Palestrina, whom Alexander had left as his vicar in Rome, was dead, and his successor, cardinal John, by a skillful application of money, which had been raised by long and urgent begging in France, England, and Sicily, had succeeded in persuading the Romans to invite his master back. Alexander sailed from Maguelone in September 1165, and, after having visited the Sicilian king at Messina, landed at Ostia. His reception at Rome was a scene of extraordinary enthusiasm. The senate, the nobles, the clergy, and a vast multitude of people bearing olive-branches in their hands, pressed forth to meet him, and conducted him to the city with the liveliest demonstrations of joy; and at the Lateran Gate he was met by almost the whole of the remaining population, among whom the Jews, carrying the book of their law "according to custom" are especially mentioned as conspicuous. The antipope, Paschal, in the meantime resided at Viterbo, where he is described as making use of the emperor's soldiers to levy exactions from passing merchants and pilgrims.

The measures which the emperor had taken on his last visit to Italy had produced great dissatisfaction. The severities exercised against the Milanese excited general pity, so that even cities which had before been hostile to them received and harboured their fugitives. The podestàs harassed the people by a system of vexations alike cruel and petty, and are said, even by an imperialist writer, to have exacted seven times as much as they were entitled to. Some of these hated officials were murdered. Cities which had adhered to the emperor in his difficulties now found themselves subjected to the same oppression as others; and cries of discontent from all quarters were carried to the imperial court. Frederick resolved on a fresh expedition across the Alps, but was unprovided with a sufficient army, and found himself obliged to pay court to the princes of Germany, who were more and more disinclined to assist him. But at length, in the autumn of 1166, the emperor was able to lead a powerful army into Italy. After having crossed the Alps, he found himself beset with petitions from the Lombards, who had looked to his arrival as an opportunity for obtaining redress of their grievances; but he put these applications aside, and advanced towards Rome. The Byzantine emperor, Manuel, who feared that, if the western kingdoms were at peace, some crusading leader might

be able to employ an irresistible force against his crown and the Greek church, had taken advantage of the discords between the papacy and the empire. He had proposed to Alexander that the imperial sovereignty of Rome should be united with that of Constantinople, and had held out a prospect of reunion between the Greek and the Latin churches, to which the pope had appeared favourable. The gold of Manuel had established a strong interest in Italy, and his troops held possession of Ancona. For three weeks Frederick besieged that town; but, while he was detained by its vigorous resistance, a great success was achieved by a part of his force which had been sent on before him, under the command of Reginald of Cologne, and of Christian, who had been substituted for Conrad in the see of Mayence. These war-like prelates encountered at Monte Porzio an army which the Romans had sent forth against their feudal enemies, the imperialist and antipapal citizens of Tusculum; and they defeated it with an amount of loss which, although very variously reported, is spoken of as the greatest calamity that had befallen Rome since the battle of Cannae. On hearing of this victory, Frederick concluded an accommodation with the defenders of Ancona, and advanced to Rome, where he gained possession of the Leonine city, while Pisan galleys made their way up to the bridge of St. Angelo for his assistance. The Romans had in great numbers fled for refuge to St. Peter's, which in those unquiet times had been converted into a fortification. For several days the emperor besieged it in vain, until at length a neighbouring church was set on fire. The flames speedily caught the porch of the great basilica; the defenders were driven from their posts by smoke and heat; the gates were broken in with axes, and within the holy building a slaughter ensued which reached even to the high altar. The antipope, Paschal, was brought from Viterbo, and was enthroned in St. Peter's, where, on the feast of St. Peter ad Vincula, the emperor and the empress were crowned by his hands. An oath of fealty was exacted of the Romans, while Frederick engaged to acknowledge the privileges of their senatorial government.

Alexander had taken refuge, under the protection of the Frangipanis, in a fortress constructed within the ruins of the Colosseum. It was proposed by the emperor that both popes should resign, on condition that the orders conferred by each should be acknowledged, and that a new successor of St. Peter should be chosen. The scheme was urged on Alexander by the Romans, whom both parties had been trying to conciliate by bribes; but he again declared that the Roman pontiff was subject to no earthly judgment, and refused to cede the office which God had conferred on him. At this crisis two Sicilian vessels arrived, bearing a large sum of money for his relief, and offering him the means of escape; but, although he gladly received the money, and distributed it among his adherents, he declined to embark, and, escaping from Rome in the disguise of a pilgrim, made his way to his own city of Benevento. There the scheme for reuniting the empires and the churches of East and West was again proposed to him by ambassadors from Manuel; but he declined to engage in it on account of its formidable difficulties.

Scarcely had Frederick established himself in possession of Rome, when a pestilence of unexampled violence broke out among the Germans. In one week the greater part of his army perished. Men were struck down while mounting their horses; some, who were engaged in burying their comrades, fell dead into the open graves. Unburied corpses tainted the air, and among the Romans themselves the ravages of the disease were terrible. The emperor's loss is said to have amounted to 25,000; and the papal party saw a divine ratification of Alexander's curses in a visitation which destroyed the power of the "new Sennacherib", and carried off the chiefs of his sacrilegious host—among them, the indefatigable Reginald of Cologne, Frederick of Rothenburg, son of Conrad III, the younger Welf of Bavaria, and a multitude of other prelates and nobles. Stripped of his strength by this calamity, Frederick withdrew to the north of Italy, almost as a fugitive, and death further thinned his ranks as he went along. All Lombardy was now combined against him; for his neglect of the petitions which had been presented on his arrival in Italy had led the people to charge on the emperor himself the

oppressions which they endured at the hands of his officers; and the exactions of these officers were even aggravated beyond their old measure. While Frederick was engaged in the siege of Ancona, the chief cities of Lombardy had entered into a league for twenty years, with the declared object of restoring the state of things which had prevailed under the emperor Henry. Even the imperialist Lodi was coerced by its neighbours into joining this league, and Pavia alone stood aloof. The confederates had contrived to rebuild the walls of Milan and to restore its inhabitants; and in this they were aided with money not only by the Greek emperor, but (which we read with some surprise) by Henry of England. The spirit of revolt was fanned by the tidings of the emperor's great disaster. He summoned an assembly to meet at Pavia, but few attended; and in token of defiance to the Lombards, and of the vengeance which he was resolved to execute on them, he threw down his gauntlet as he denounced them with the ban of the empire. As he moved towards the Alps the people rose on him, and harassed him with straggling attacks which his reduced force was hardly sufficient to repel. At Susa his life was in danger, and he was driven to make his escape across the mountains in disguise. After this withdrawal, the confederate cities, with a view of keeping in check his only remaining allies—the citizens of Pavia and the marquis of Montferrat—built in a strong position, at the confluence of the Tanaro and the Bormida, a town to which, in honour of the pope, they gave the name of Alexandria. The population was brought together from all parts of the neighbouring country, and a free republican government was organized. Alexandria, although at first derided as a “city of straw”, made very rapid progress. At the end of its first year it could boast of fifteen thousand fighting men; and in its second year, Alexander, at the request of its consuls, erected it into an episcopal see. The first bishop was nominated by the pope, but he apologized for this on the ground of necessity, and assured the clergy that it should not prejudice their right of election in future. Eager as Frederick was to take vengeance on the Lombards for his late humiliation, seven years elapsed before he could again venture into Italy. In the meantime the pope was strengthening himself greatly. His alliance with the growing power of the Lombard cities was drawn closer, and he was careful to promote internal unity among them. The antipope Paschal died at Rome in September 1168, and, although an abbot named John of Struma was set up as his successor, under the name of Calixtus III, there was little reason to fear this new competitor. The contest between Henry II and Becket had ended in the archbishop's return to England, after an exile of seven years, and his murder, in his own cathedral, by four knights of the royal household. The horror excited by this crime redounded principally to the advantage of Alexander. Popular enthusiasm was arrayed on the side of the hierarchy, and Henry's enemies, lay as well as ecclesiastical, beset the pope with entreaties for vengeance on him. The king was fain to purchase reconciliation with the church by humble messages, and by submitting to terms dictated by two legates at Avranches in May 1172. His sons were stirred up by Queen Eleanor to rebellion, which was sanctified by a reference to the wrongs of St. Thomas the Martyr (for Becket had been canonized by Alexander in Lent 1173); and in the extremity of his danger the king repaired to Canterbury as a penitent, walked barefooted from the outskirts of the city to the cathedral, spent a night in prayer at the tomb of his late antagonist, and, after protesting his deep remorse for the hasty words from which the murderers had taken occasion for their crime, submitted to be scourged by every one of the monks.

Frederick, although he had required a profession of obedience to the antipope Calixtus, soon after made overtures to Alexander; but the pope steadily refused to enter into any treaty which should not include his Lombard and Sicilian allies. In Germany the emperor proceeded with vigour, and succeeded in enforcing general submission to his will, and in 1174 he was able to cross the Mont Cenis at the head of an army, which was in great measure composed of mercenaries or (as they were then styled) Brabançons. Susa, the first Italian city which he reached, was given up to the flames in revenge for the insults which it had formerly offered to him; and for four months he closely besieged Alexandria, from which, after having had his

camp burnt by a sallying party of the defenders, he was at length driven off by the approach of a Lombard army. Archbishop Christian of Mayence, who had been sent on in advance, was equally unfortunate in a renewed siege of Ancona; for the inhabitants, after having been reduced to the extremity of distress, were delivered at the end of six months by allies whom the money of the Greek emperor had raised up to their assistance. Negotiations were renewed between the emperor and the pope; but each wished to insist on terms which the other party refused to accept. Frederick received reinforcements from Germany; but, through the refusal of his cousin, Henry the Lion, of Saxony, to yield him active support—although it is said that the emperor condescended to entreat it on his knees—he found himself unequally matched with his enemies; and on the memorable field of Legnano the leagued Italian cities, which a few years before he had despised and trampled on, were victorious. Frederick himself was unhorsed in the battle, and was missing until after some days he appeared again at Pavia. By this humiliation, and by the exhaustion of his forces, the emperor was reduced to treat for peace, which all his adherents combined to urge on him. After much negotiation certain preliminaries were agreed on, and it was arranged that the pope should meet him at Venice—the Venetians and their doge being required to swear that they would not admit the emperor into their city except with the pope's consent. Alexander embarked at Viesti on the 9th of March 1177, and, after having been carried by stress of weather to the Dalmatian coast, where he was received with enthusiastic reverence, he arrived at Venice on the 24th of the same month. From Venice he proceeded to Ferrara, but on the 11th of May he returned, and in July Frederick arrived at Chioggia, where he remained until the terms of peace were agreed on. By these it was provided that the emperor should abjure the antipope, and that the imperialist bishops, on making a like abjuration, should be allowed to retain their sees. The Lombards were to yield the emperor the same obedience which they had paid to his predecessors from Henry V downwards, and admitted some of his claims as to allowances due to him when visiting Italy; while the emperor acknowledged their power to appoint their own consuls, to fortify their cities, and to combine for the defence of their liberties. Between the emperor and the papacy there was to be a perpetual peace; with the Lombards a truce of six years, and one of fifteen years with the king of Sicily.

The emperor was then allowed to approach Venice, and on the day after his arrival there, he performed his abjuration in the presence of two cardinals. On the same day his first meeting with the pope took place in the great square of St. Mark's, where Alexander and his cardinals were seated in front of the gates of the church. The emperor, laying aside his outer robe, prostrated himself and kissed the pope's feet; after which he led Alexander into the church, and conducted him up to the choir, where he bowed his head and received the pontifical blessing. On St. James's day the kissing of the pope's feet was repeated, and Frederick presented him with valuable gifts; and after mass, at which he himself officiated, Alexander was conducted to the door of the church by the emperor, who held his stirrup as he remounted his white palfrey, and, taking the bridle in his hand, would have led the horse, had not the pope courteously excused the performance of that ceremony. It is said that through the pressure of the crowd the pope was thrown off his horse, and that the emperor assisted him to remount. These meetings were followed by interviews of a less formal kind, at which the two unburdened in familiar, and even playful, conversation; and the peace between the empire and the church was solemnly ratified at a council held in St. Mark's on the 14th of August. At his parting interview with Alexander, the emperor agreed to give up all the property of St. Peter which had come into his hands, except the territories of the countess Matilda, and a similar but less important legacy which the count of Bertinoro had lately bequeathed to the papal see. Frederick had acquired a new interest in the inheritance of the great countess through the gift of his uncle Welf, marquis of Tuscany, who, after having lost his only son by the Roman pestilence of 1167, had made over to the emperor the claims of the Bavarian house. It had been agreed in the treaty that he should retain these territories for fifteen years longer; with

regard to Bertinoro, he maintained that a vassal was not entitled to dispose of his fief except with the consent of his liege lord; and Alexander, at their last meeting, acquiesced in his proposal that this and other questions should be referred to three cardinals chosen by the emperor, and three German princes chosen by the pope.

The bishops who had been promoted in the schism were in general allowed to retain their positions, on condition of submitting to Alexander. Christian of Mayence burnt the pall which he had received from the antipope Taschal; and his predecessor, Conrad, who had been deprived by Frederick for desertion to Alexander, was provided for by an appointment to Salzburg, in place of archbishop Adalbert, to whose exclusion by the emperor Alexander was willing to consent. Calixtus was now generally abandoned, and in August 1178 submitted to Alexander, by whom he was received with kindness and presented to a rich abbacy at Benevento. A fourth antipope, Lando, or Innocent III, of the Frangipani family, was set up, but after having borne his unregarded title somewhat more than a year, he was brought to Alexander as a prisoner, and was confined for life in the monastery of La Cava. The increased power of Alexander, and the triumph which had crowned his long struggle against the emperor, were not without their effect on the Romans, who despatched a mission to him, praying him, in the name of all ranks, to return to the city. Alexander received the deputies at Anagni with visible satisfaction, but, reminding them of his former experience, required that the citizens should give him securities for their future conduct. It was therefore agreed that the senate should do homage and swear fealty to the pope, that they should surrender the royalties to him, and should bind themselves for his safety and for that of all who should resort to him; and in March 1178 he reentered Rome amidst an unbounded display of enthusiasm on the part of his fickle subjects. The crowds of people who eagerly struggled to kiss his feet rendered it almost impossible for his horse to advance along the streets, and his right hand was weary of bestowing benedictions.

In March 1179 a general council, attended by nearly three hundred bishops and by about seven hundred abbots and others, was held by Alexander in the Lateran church. Among the most important of its canons was a new order as to the election of popes. The share which had been reserved to the emperor by Nicolas II had already been long obsolete, and it was now provided that the election should rest exclusively with the college of cardinals, while, by adding to the college certain official members of the Roman clergy, Alexander deprived the remaining clergy of any chiefs under whom they might have effectually complained of their exclusion from their ancient rights as to the election. It was enacted that no one should be declared pope unless he were supported by two-thirds of the electors; and that, if a minority should set up an antipope against one so chosen, every one of their party should be anathematized, without hope of forgiveness until his last sickness. At this council also a crusade against heretics was for the first time sanctioned.

During the last years of Alexander the affairs of the churches beyond the Alps were generally tranquil. The emperor was fully occupied in political business. Henry of England was disposed to maintain a good understanding with the pope, although he retained a virtual power of appointing to bishoprics, and used it in favour of persons who had been his strenuous supporters in the contest with Becket. He pathetically entreated the aid of Alexander against his rebellious sons; and we find the pope frequently mediating, by letters and by the agency of legates, between him and Lewis of France. Lewis became continually more and more absorbed in devotion. In 1179 he made a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Thomas the Martyr at Canterbury, in obedience to visions in which he had been warned by the saint himself to seek by such means the recovery of his son Philip from an illness brought on by exposure for a night in a forest where he had been hunting. Soon after his return the king was seized with paralysis, and on the 18th of September 1180 he died.

After a pontificate of twenty-two years—a time rarely equalled by any either of his predecessors or of his successors—Alexander, who had once more been obliged to leave

Rome, died at Civita Castellana on the 30th of August 1181, leaving a name which is only not in the first rank among the popes who have most signally advanced the power of their see.

CHAPTER X.

FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE LUCIUS III TO THE DEATH OF CELESTINE
III.

A.D. 1181-1198.

THE successor of Alexander, Humbald, bishop of Ostia, was chosen by the cardinals alone, in compliance with the decree of the late council, and styled himself Lucius III. The Romans, indignant at being deprived of their share in the election, rose against the new pope, and compelled him to take refuge at Velletri. For a time he obtained aid against his rebellious subjects from the imperial commander, archbishop Christian of Mayence; but this warlike prelate died in August 1183—it is said, of drinking from a poisoned well, which proved fatal to more than a thousand of his soldiers; and Lucius was never able to regain a footing in his city. The enmity of the Romans against him was of the bitterest kind. In 1184 they took twenty-six of his partisans at Tusculum, and blinded them all, except one, to whom they left one eye that he might serve as guide to the rest; they crowned them with paper mitres, each bearing the name of a cardinal, while the one-eyed chief's mock tiara was inscribed "Lucius, the wicked simoniac", and, having mounted them on asses, they made them swear to exhibit themselves in this miserable condition to the pope.

In the meanwhile Frederick made a skillful use of the time of rest allowed him by the treaty of Venice. His behaviour towards the Lombards became mild and gracious. By prudent acts of conciliation, and especially by concessions as to the choice of magistrates, he won the favour of many cities—even that of Alexandria itself which in 1183 agreed that its population should leave the walls and should be led back by an imperial commissioner, and that its name should be changed to Caesarea. In June of that year, when the truce of Venice was almost expired, a permanent settlement of the relations between the empire and the cities was concluded at Constance. The cities were to retain all those royalties which they had before held, including the rights of levying war, and of maintaining their league for mutual support. They were to choose their own magistrates, subject only to the condition that these should be invested by an imperial commissioner. Certain dues were reserved to the emperor; and an oath of fidelity to him was to be taken by all between the ages of fifteen and seventy. By these equitable terms the emperor's influence in Italy was greatly strengthened, while that of the pope was proportionally diminished.

At Whitsuntide 1184 a great assemblage, drawn together not only from all Frederick's territories but from foreign countries, met at Mayence, on the occasion of conferring knighthood on the emperor's two sons, Henry, who had reached the age of twenty, and Frederick, who was two years younger. A city of tents and wooden huts was raised on the right bank of the Rhine, and preparations were made for the festival with all possible splendour. But omens of evil were drawn from the circumstance that many of the slight erections were blown down by a violent wind, and a quarrel for precedence, which arose between the archbishop of Cologne and St. Boniface's successor, the abbot of Fulda, excited a fear that the scenes of Henry the Fourth's minority were about to be renewed. The difference was, however, allayed for the time by the prudence of Frederick and the young Henry, who, as the archbishop was withdrawing, hung on his neck and entreated him to return; and notwithstanding this untoward interruption, the festivities ended peacefully.

In the following August Frederick proceeded for the sixth time into Italy. The charm of his appearance and manner was universally felt. The cities were all eager in their welcome;

even Milan, forgetting its old animosities and sufferings, received him with splendid festivities, and was rewarded with privileges which excited the jealousy of its neighbours. At Verona he had a meeting with the pope, who requested him to assist in reducing the Romans to obedience. But Frederick, who now had little reason to dread the influence of the pope in Lombardy, and was not attended by any considerable force, felt no zeal for the cause; and more than one subject of difference arose. On being asked to acknowledge the clergy who had been ordained by the late antipopes, Lucius at first appeared favourable, but said on the following day that such recognition had been limited by the treaty of Venice to certain dioceses, and that more could not be granted without a council. The old question of Matilda's inheritance was again discussed, and documents were produced on both sides, without any satisfactory conclusion. Equally fruitless was a dispute as to the pretensions of two rival candidates for the archbishopric of Treves—Volkmar, who had secured the pope's favour, and Rudolf, who had been invested by Frederick, agreeably to the concordat of Worms. The emperor's son Henry had exercised great severities towards Volkmar's partisans, and it would seem that reports of these acts, with a suspicion of the designs which Frederick afterwards manifested as to Sicily, combined in determining Lucius to refuse to crown Henry as his father's colleague; but he professed to ground his refusal on the inconvenience of having two emperors, and added a suggestion which has the air of sarcasm—that, if Henry were to be crowned, his father must make way for him by resignation. The breach between the pope and the emperor appeared to have become hopeless, when Lucius died at Verona, on the 25th of November, 1185.

On the same day, Humbert Crivelli, archbishop of Milan, gathered together twenty-seven cardinals, under the protection of a guard, and was elected pope, with the title of Urban III. The new pope, whose name was slightly varied by his enemies so as to express the turbulence which they imputed to him, was of a Milanese family which had suffered greatly in the late contests; and private resentment on this account combined with his feelings as a citizen, and with the hierarchical opinions which had recommended him as a companion to Thomas of Canterbury in his exile in producing a bitter hostility against the emperor. The disputes between the secular and the spiritual powers became more and more exasperated. Urban, in contempt of an oath which he had sworn to the contrary, consecrated the anti-imperialist Volkmar as archbishop of Treves. As archbishop of Milan—for, out of fear that an imperialist might be appointed as his successor, he still retained that see—he refused to crown Henry as king of the Lombards; he repeated his predecessor's refusal to crown him as a colleague in the empire; and he showed himself strongly opposed to those designs on Sicily which Lucius had suspected, and which were now openly declared.

AFFAIRS OF SICILY.

Roger II, king of Sicily, had been succeeded in 1154 by his son William the Bad, and this prince had been succeeded in 1166 by his son William the Good, then a boy of fourteen. The kingdom had been for many years a prey to barbarous and cruel factions. William the Good had married in 1177 a daughter of Henry of England, but the marriage proved childless, and the Norman dominions in the south were likely to fall to Constance, a posthumous daughter of king Roger. With this princess Frederick formed the scheme of marrying his son Henry, although nine years her junior—a match which promised greatly to increase the imperial territory and power, and to deprive the pope of his chief supporter. The marriage was zealously promoted by Walter, an Englishman of obscure birth who had attained to the dignity of archbishop of Palermo; Urban's opposition was vain, and his threats against all who should take part in the celebration were unheeded. At the request of the Milanese, who were eager to signalize their newborn loyalty, the nuptials were celebrated at Milan with great magnificence in January 1186, when Frederick was crowned as king of Burgundy by the archbishop of

Vienne, Henry as king of Italy by the patriarch of Aquileia, and Constance as queen of Germany by a German bishop.

Other causes of difference concurred to inflame the pope. He complained of the emperor for detaining Matilda's inheritance; for seizing the property of bishops at their death, keeping benefices vacant, and appropriating the income; for taxing the clergy and bringing them before secular courts; for having confiscated the revenues of some convents, under pretence that the nuns were of vicious life, instead of introducing a reform; and he denounced, apparently with justice, the cruelties and other outrages which the young Henry had committed towards some bishops.

Frederick was now in great power, while the pope was still an exile from his city. It was in vain that archbishop Philip of Cologne, who had been appointed legate for Germany, endeavoured to assert Urban's pretensions, and to intrigue against the emperor; for the German bishops in general were on the side of their temporal sovereign. At an interview with Philip, Frederick declared that it was enough for the clergy to have got into their own hands the choice of bishops—a choice, he added, which they had not exercised so uprightly or with such good effect as the sovereigns who in former times had held the patronage; and that, although the imperial prerogative had been greatly curtailed as to the affairs of the church, he was determined to maintain the small remnant of it which he had inherited. The legate was forbidden to appear at a diet which was to be held at Gelnhausen in April 1186. There Frederick, in a forcible speech, declared that, in his differences with the pope, the pope had been the aggressor, and he inveighed against the Roman claims. It was, he said, ridiculous to pretend that no layman ought to hold tithes, inasmuch as the custom of thus providing for the necessary services of advocates of churches was so old as to have established a right. He asked his bishops whether they would render what was due both to Caesar and to God; to which the archbishop of Mayence (Conrad, who, on the death of Christian, had recovered the primacy) replied, in the name of the rest, that they owed a twofold duty; that it was not for them to decide the matters in dispute, but that they would write to the pope, advising him to proceed with moderation. They wrote accordingly, stating the emperor's case and their own view of the question; and the pope, on receiving the letter, was astonished to find himself opposed by those whose rights he had supposed himself to be asserting. Frederick refused to admit Volkmar as archbishop of Treves, and shut up all the ways by which appeals could be carried to the pope; Henry continued his savage outrages, and endangered the pope's person—keeping him almost a prisoner within the walls of Verona; and Urban, exasperated to the utmost, resolved to inflict the heaviest censures of the church on him. The citizens of Verona, where he had intended to pronounce his sentence, entreated that, "out of regard for their present service", he would choose some other scene; and at their request he removed to Ferrara. But while he was there preparing for the final act, tidings arrived from the East, which once more set all Europe in commotion; and Urban died at Ferrara on the 20th of October 1187.

KINGDOM OF JERUSALEM.

The course of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem had been alike discreditable and unprosperous. The sympathies of western Christians for their brethren of the Holy Land had been greatly cooled by the experiences of the second crusade; the pilgrims were now few, and these were content to perform their pilgrimage without attempting or wishing to strengthen the Latin dominion, or to take part in the incessant contests with the infidels. In 1167 king Amaury brought disgrace on the Christian name by attempting, in conjunction with a Greek force, to seize on Egypt in violation of a treaty; and in this treachery he was abetted by the knights of the Hospital, although the Templars—whether from a feeling of honour and duty, or from jealousy of the rival order—held aloof. Baldwin IV, who in 1174 succeeded his

father Amaury at the age of thirteen, had been carefully educated by the historian William, then archdeacon and afterwards archbishop of Tyre; but this young king's promise was soon clouded over by hopeless disease, and his sister Sibylla became presumptive heiress of the kingdom. Sibylla, then a widow, was sought in marriage by many princes; but she bestowed her hand on Guy of Lusignan, an adventurer from Poitou, whose personal beauty was unaccompanied by such qualities as would have fitted him to maintain the position which it had won for him. On the death of Baldwin IV, in 1185, the son of Sibylla's first marriage was crowned as Baldwin V; but this boy died within a year, whereupon his mother and her husband, who before had met with much opposition, obtained possession of the kingdoms. The princes of the Latins were distracted by jealousies and intrigues; the patriarchs and bishops were in continual strife with each other, with the chiefs, and especially with the two great knightly orders, which, relying on papal privileges and exemptions, defied all authority, ecclesiastical or secular. The Templars were especially detested for their pride, while they were charged with treachery to the Christian cause. The general state of morals was excessively depraved. In Acre alone it is said that there were 16,000 professed prostitutes. The clergy and the monks are described as infamous for their manner of life. Their chief, Heraclius of Jerusalem, who had been recommended to Sibylla by his fine person, and through her favour had been forced into the patriarchal throne, lived in open and luxurious profligacy with a tradesman's wife of Nablous, who was generally styled the patriarchess.

The power of the Mussulmans was advancing. Nouredin, who died in 1173, was succeeded as their most conspicuous leader by Saladin, son of a Kurdish mercenary, and nephew of Siracouh, a distinguished general, who under Nouredin had been vizier of Egypt. Saladin, born in 1137, is celebrated, not only by Moslem but by Christian writers, for his skill in arms, his personal bravery, his accomplishments, his justice, his magnanimity, generosity, courtesy, and truth. In him, indeed, rather than in any Christian warrior of the age, may be found the union of some of the highest qualities which adorn the ideal character of chivalry. His piety and orthodoxy, although agreeable to the strictest Mahometan standard, were wholly free from intolerance. Yet, superior as he appears in many respects to the Christians of his time in general, Saladin will not endure to be measured by a standard which should make no allowance for the disadvantages of his training in the creed and the habits of Islam. The manner in which he superseded Nouredin's minor son would have been unjustifiable, except on Oriental principles, nor did the humaneness of his general character prevent him from having occasional recourse to unscrupulous bloodshed for the accomplishment of his purposes.

"If Nouredin was a rod of the Lord's fury against the Christians", says a chronicler, "Saladin was not a rod but a hammer". In his earlier career, while extending his conquests in every direction, he had treated them with remarkable forbearance; but at length he was roused to direct hostilities by the continual attacks of some, who plundered the borders of his territory, and seized on caravans of peaceful travellers. In 1187 he invaded the Holy Land at the head of 80,000 men, and the Christians sustained a terrible defeat at the battle of Hittim or Tiberias (July 5, 1187)—fought within sight of the very scenes which had been hallowed by many of the gospel miracles. The cross on which the Saviour was believed to have died, having been brought from Jerusalem as a means of strength and victory, was lost. The king and many of the Frankish chiefs were taken, together with many templars and hospitallers, who, with the exception of the grand master of the Temple, were all beheaded on refusing to apostatize from the faith. Some of the captives, however, became renegades, and betrayed the secrets of the Latins to the enemy. Animated with fresh vigour by this victory, Saladin rapidly overran the land. Jerusalem itself was besieged, and, after a faint defence had been made for a fortnight by its scanty and disheartened garrison, it was surrendered on the 3rd of October. The cross was thrown down from the mosque of Omar amid the groans of the Christians who witnessed its fall, and the building, after having been purged with incense and rose water, was

restored to Mahometan worship. Bells were broken into pieces, relics were dispersed, and the sacred places were profaned. Yet Saladin spared the holy Sepulchre, and allowed Christians to visit it for a fixed payment; he permitted ten brethren of the Hospital to remain for the tendance of the sick, and even endowed them with a certain income; and to the captives, of whom there were many thousands, he behaved with a generosity which has found its celebration rather among Christian than among Mussulman writers. The terms of ransom offered to all were very liberal; fourteen thousand were set free without payment; and at the expense of the conqueror and of the Alexandrian Saracens, many Christians received a passage to Europe, when their own brethren refused to admit them on shipboard except on condition of paying the full cost. The Syrian and other oriental Christians were allowed to remain in their homes, on submitting to tribute. All Palestine was soon in the hands of the infidels, except the great port of Tyre, where Conrad, son of the marquis of Montferrat, arrived after it had been invested by the enemy, and, by his courage and warlike skill, aided by money which Henry of England had remitted for the defence of the Holy Land, animated the remnant of the Christians to hold out. It was noted that the holy cross, which had been recovered from the Persians by the emperor Heraclius, was again lost under a patriarch of the same name; and that as Jerusalem had been wrested from the Saracens under Urban II, it was regained by them under Urban III.

From time to time attempts had been made by the princes and prelates of the Holy Land to enlist the western nations in a new enterprise for their assistance; but they had met with little success. The emperor, the king of France, and the king of England, were all engrossed by their own affairs; and, although frequent conferences took place between Henry and Lewis with a view to an alliance for a holy war, these did not produce any actual result beyond contributions of money, in which Henry's liberality far exceeded that of the French king. In 1184 the patriarch Heraclius, accompanied by the grand master of the templars and the prior of the Hospital, bearing with them the keys of Jerusalem and of the holy Sepulchre, with the banner of the Latin kingdom, set out on a mission to enlist Europe to their aid. The templar died at Verona, but the patriarch and the hospitaller, fortified with a letter from pope Lucius, went on to Germany, France, and England. The general feeling, however, was lukewarm. King Henry was told by his prelates and nobles that his duties lay rather at home than in the East, and he could only offer money; whereupon Heraclius indignantly exclaimed: "We want a man without money, rather than money without a man!". But the events which had now taken place aroused all Europe. The tidings of the calamity which had befallen the Christians of the East at once made peace between the emperor and the pope, between England and France, between Genoa and Pisa, between Venice and Hungary. Urban III is said to have been killed by the report of the capture of Jerusalem. His successor, Gregory VIII, issued letters urgently summoning the faithful to aid their brethren in the East; and on Gregory's death, after a pontificate of less than two months, the cause was vigorously taken up by Clement III. The cardinals bound themselves to give up all pomp and luxury, to accept no bribes from suitors, never to mount on horseback "so long as the land whereon the feet of the Lord had stood should be under the enemy's feet", and to preach the crusade as mendicants. The king of Sicily vowed to assist the holy enterprise to the utmost of his power. Henry of England, Philip of France, and Philip count of Flanders, met at the "oak conference" between Gisors and Trie, on St. Agnes' day, and, with many of their followers, received the cross from the hands of the archbishop of Tyre. A heavy impost was laid on their subjects, under the name of "Saladin's tithe", and especial prayers for the Holy Land were inserted into the church-service. William of Scotland offered to contribute money, but his nobles strongly withstood the proposal that they should be taxed in the same proportion as the English.

In Germany also the crusade was preached with great success. A chronicler tells us that, at an assembly which was held at Strasburg, in December 1187, the cause of the Holy Land was at first set forth by two Italian ecclesiastics, but that their words fell dead on the

hearers. The bishop of the city then took it up, and produced a general emotion; but still men hesitated to commit themselves to the enterprise. When, however, one had at length set the example of taking the cross, the bishop began the hymn "Veni Sancte Spiritus"; and forthwith such was the crowd of people who pressed forward to enlist, with an enthusiasm which found a vent in tears, that he and his clergy were hardly able to supply them with the badges of the holy war. In the following Lent a great diet, known as the "Court of Christ", was held at Mayence, where cardinal Henry of Albano appeared as the preacher of the crusade; and, although he was unable to speak the language of the country, his words, even through the medium of an interpreter, powerfully excited the assembly. The emperor and his younger son, Frederick of Swabia, were the first to assume the cross, and were followed by an enthusiastic multitude of every class. Thus the three greatest princes of Europe were all embarked in the enterprise. Frederick Barbarossa was now sixty-seven years of age, but retained his full vigour of body; his long contests had been brought to a peaceable end; and he might hope, by engaging in the holy war, to clear himself of all imputations which had fallen on his character as a churchman, and even to adorn his name with a glory like that which rested on Godfrey of Bouillon and his comrades in the first crusade. Having accompanied his uncle Conrad on the second crusade, he was resolved to guard against a repetition of the errors by which that expedition had been frustrated. He ordered that no one should be allowed to join his force except such as were able-bodied, accustomed to bear arms, and sufficiently furnished with money to bear their own expenses for two years; carriages were provided for the sick and wounded, that they might not delay the progress of the army; and Frederick endeavored by embassies to the king of Hungary, to the Byzantine emperor, and to the Sultan of Iconium (whose adhesion to the Mussulman cause was supposed to be very slight) to assure himself of an unmolested passage and of markets for provisions along the route. From all he received favourable answers; and, having taken measures to secure the peace of his dominions during his absence, the emperor was ready to set out at the appointed time, in the spring of 1189.

From Ratisbon, where the forces were mustered, some proceeded down the Danube in boats into Hungary, where they waited for the emperor and the rest. Through Hungary their passage was prosperous. King Bela welcomed the emperor with all honour, and bestowed large gifts of provisions on the army; it is, however, complained that the natives took unfair advantages in the exchange of money. In Bulgaria provisions were refused at the instigation of the Greeks, and some of the crusaders were wounded by arrows; but Frederick by vigorous measures brought the Bulgarians to submission, while he restrained his own followers by strict discipline from plunder and other offensive acts. But on entering the Greek territories, more serious difficulties arose.

The old unkindly feeling between the Greeks and the Latins had not been lessened by late events. The interest which Manuel had laboured to create with the pope and the Italians had been destroyed by their reconciliation with Frederick. Under Andronicus, who in 1183 attained the Byzantine throne by the murder of the young Alexius, son of Manuel, a great massacre of the Latin residents had taken place at Constantinople. In this atrocity the mob was aided by the usurper's forces; the clergy were active in urging on the murderers, and burst out into a song of thanksgiving when the head of the cardinal-legate was cut off and treated with indignity. Isaac Angelus, by whom Andronicus was dethroned in 1185, had carried on friendly negotiations with Saladin, to whom, in consideration of the cession of some churches in the Holy Land, he granted leave to erect a mosque in Constantinople itself. The Greeks, who from time to time had continued to attack the western sojourners at Constantinople, were naturally uneasy at the approach of a formidable host, under a commander so renowned as Frederick. Isaac himself was especially alarmed in consequence of predictions uttered by one Dositheus, who had acquired a strong influence over him by foretelling his elevation to the empire; and, with a view of impeding the Germans, recourse was had to the arts which had already been tried in the former crusades. The patriarch had excited the populace beforehand by

denouncing the strangers as heretics and dogs. The bishop of Munster and other ambassadors whom Frederick sent to Constantinople were treated with slights, and committed to prison, where they were subjected to hunger and other sufferings; notwithstanding the assurances which had been given as to supplies and other assistance, cities were deserted or shut up as the crusaders approached them; and they were harassed by frequent and insidious attacks of Greek soldiery. It appears on Mussulman authority that the Greek emperor afterwards claimed credit with Saladin for having troubled the Germans on their expedition. Frederick, from a resolution not to waste his strength in Europe, was desirous to avoid all quarrels; but finding himself reduced to choose between perishing by hunger and the employment of force to gain the needful supplies, he took Philippopolis, Adrianople, and other towns, in which he got possession of great wealth, with abundant stores of food. The Greek emperor, on hearing of these successes, changed his policy, restored the bishop of Munster and his companions, and sent envoys of his own who were charged to offer all manner of redress and assistance if Frederick would consent to hold the west on condition of homage. The Byzantines renewed the old war of ceremony, treating Frederick as a petty prince of whose name they affected to be ignorant—as “king of the Germans”, while Isaac was styled “emperor of the Romans”. “Does your master know who I am?”, said Frederick indignantly to the Greek ambassadors at Philippopolis : “My name is Frederick; I am emperor of the Romans, crowned in the city which is mother and mistress of the world by the successor of the prince of the apostles, and have held without question for more than thirty years a sceptre which my predecessors have lawfully possessed for four hundred years, since it was transferred from Constantinople for the inertness of your rulers. Let your master style himself sovereign of the Romanians, and cease to use a title which in him is empty and ridiculous; for there is but one emperor of the Romans”. This firmness had its effect, and Isaac submitted to address Frederick as “emperor of the Germans” and at length as “most noble emperor of old Rome”.

After a stay of fourteen weeks at Adrianople, where vigorous measures were employed with imperfect success to counteract the enervating influence of the plenty which had succeeded to the former privations, the army again advanced, and at Easter it was conveyed from Gallipoli to the Asiatic coast in vessels furnished by the Greek emperor, who had agreed to make compensation for all injuries, and to bestow his daughter in marriage on Frederick's son Philip. The crossing of the Hellespont lasted seven days, and the whole number of those who crossed is reckoned at 83,000.

The first few days of the march through Asia Minor were prosperous; but it soon appeared that the Greek emperor and the sultan of Iconium (who had renewed his friendly assurances by ambassadors who waited on Frederick at Adrianople) were treacherous. No markets were to be found; the interpreters who had been furnished by the Greeks, and the sultan's ambassadors who accompanied the army, disappeared, after having lured the crusaders into a desert. The horses broke down from want of food, and their flesh was greedily eaten; while Turkish soldiers began to hover around in ever-increasing numbers, “barking around us like dogs”, says one who was in the expedition—threatening and harassing the army, but always declining an engagement. Yet Frederick was still able to maintain discipline. The festival of Pentecost was kept amidst danger and distress. The bishop of Wurzburg delivered an exhortation to the crusaders; all received the holy Eucharist, and on the following day they attacked and defeated a force commanded by the sultan's son. On approaching Iconium, the emperor found that his advance was barred by a vast force of Turks, who refused him a passage except on the payment of a bezant for every soldier in his army, while the city was closed against him. But although his cavalry were now reduced below a thousand, and were worn out with severe sufferings from hunger and thirst, he boldly attacked the Turks, and defeated them with vast slaughter, while the younger Frederick assaulted the city, and compelled the perfidious sultan to surrender it. As in earlier days, it is said that the crusaders were aided by a troop of shining warriors, bearing the red cross on their white shields, and

headed by the martial St. George, whose protection, with that of God, they had invoked before the fight. By these successes Frederick's fame was raised to the highest pitch throughout the east. The army, refreshed with provisions and enriched by the spoil of Iconium (although even there he compelled the observance of order and moderation), made its way boldly through the rocky defiles of Cilicia, and was pressing onwards with hope of speedily achieving the object of the expedition; when the hopes of Christendom sank, and the confidence of the Moslems revived, as tidings were spread that the great leader had perished in attempting to cross the river Salef or Calycadnus, near Tarsus. The loss to his army was immense and irreparable. Discipline was no longer preserved. On reaching Antioch, multitudes fell victims to the heat of the climate, or to the intemperance with which they indulged in food and drink after their late privations. Many of the survivors abandoned the crusade and returned to Europe; and the younger Frederick died soon after his arrival at Acre, where his appearance at the head of a force reduced below 5,000 had rather brought discouragement than hope to the beleaguered garrison.

In the meantime some of the Germans, who had completed their preparations early, had taken ship for the Holy Land in anticipation of Frederick's march. As in the second crusade, many adventurers from Scandinavia and the north of Germany had assembled in the English port of Dartmouth, from which they sailed again with increased numbers; and, although these for the most part contented themselves with some adventures against the Moors of the Spanish peninsula, some of them found their way to Palestine. William of Sicily dispatched a fleet to share the expedition. Henry of England, after having taken measures to secure himself a safe passage through Germany, Hungary, and Greece, had been prevented by a fresh rebellion of his son Richard, and by other political troubles, from carrying out his promise, and much of the money which had been collected for the holy war was spent in these unhappy contests at home. But Richard, who had been the first of all the western princes to take the cross, on succeeding to the crown in July 1189, embarked in the enterprise with all the eagerness of his impetuous character. He submitted to penance for having borne arms against his father after having bound himself to the crusade. To the money which was found in Henry's coffers he added by all imaginable expedients, in order to raise means for the expedition. Bishoprics, abbacies, earldoms, and all manner of other offices and dignities, were sold. The late king's ministers were imprisoned, and large sums were extorted for their ransom. Some who repented of having taken the cross were made to pay heavily for license to stay at home. The plate and ornaments of churches were seized and were turned into money. Some fortresses and territories which had been taken from the Scots were restored to them for a certain payment and the Jews were not only drained by exactions, but, as usual, were plundered and slain in the general fury against misbelievers. The demesnes of the crown were reduced by sales, and Richard declared himself ready to sell London itself if he could find a purchaser. Both in England and in France the "Saladin's tithe" was rigorously exacted, and there were loud complaints of the unfairness with which the collection was managed. The archbishop of Canterbury, Baldwin, was zealous in preaching the crusade, and was himself among those who joined it.

The kings of France and England had a meeting near Nonancourt on the 30th of December 1189, when they bound themselves by oath for mutual help and defence—Philip swearing to defend Richard's territories as if they were his own city of Paris, and Richard swearing to defend those of Philip as he would defend the Norman capital, Rouen. The expedition was again delayed for a time by the death of Philip's queen; but at midsummer 1190 the two kings, with the count of Flanders and the duke of Burgundy, assembled their forces at Vezelay, where the second crusade had been inaugurated by St. Bernard, and where Thomas of Canterbury had since made the great abbey-church resound with his denunciation of king Henry's counsellors. The side of the hill which is crowned by the town, and the broad plain below, were covered by the tents of the crusaders. The nations were distinguished by the

colour of the crosses which they wore; the French displayed the sacred symbol in red, the English in white, and the Flemings in green. At Lyons the host separated, and Richard proceeded to embark at Marseilles, while Philip, who had no Mediterranean seaport in his own dominions, went on by land to Genoa. On landing at Ostia Richard was invited by the cardinal-bishop of that place, in the pope's name, to visit Rome; but, smarting from having been lately compelled to pay 1,500 marks for a legatine commission in favour of his chancellor, William de Longchamp, bishop of Ely, he scornfully declared that he would not visit the source of so much corruption, and proceeded by land along the coast to Terracina. The kings, as had been agreed between them, met again at Messina, where, during a stay of some months, Richard's impetuous and overbearing temper continually embroiled him both with the French and with the Sicilians—who, indeed, were not backward in offering him provocation. At one time he even made himself master of the city, as a means of compelling Tancred, who had shortly before seized the government on the death of William the Good, to carry out the late king's direction as to a provision for his widow, the sister of Richard, and as to a legacy bequeathed to Henry II.

In the end of March 1191 Richard again embarked, and after having established Guy of Lusignan as king of Cyprus, instead of a petty tyrant of the Comnenian family, who styled himself emperor of the island, and had behaved with inhospitality and treachery to the crusaders, he entered the harbour of Acre on the 8th of June. Archbishop Baldwin, with a part of the English force, which had proceeded direct from Marseilles, and others who had made their way by the straits of Gibraltar, had reached Acre long before and the king of France had arrived there on Easter-eve (April 13).

Acre had been besieged by the Christians from the end of August 1189, but, placed as they were between the garrison on the one hand and Saladin's army on the other, the besiegers had suffered great distress through want of food and shelter. Horseflesh, grass, and unclean things were eaten; ships were broken up for fuel; many, unable to endure the miseries of the siege, had deserted to the enemy and apostatized; and scandalous vice and disorder prevailed throughout the camp. And now it was found that the general interest of Christendom was insufficient to overpower the jealousies of those who had allied themselves for the holy war. Richard and Philip, Leopold, duke of Austria (with whose troops the scanty remains of the emperor Frederick's army had been united), and others, all refused to act in concert, or to submit to a common head; the Genoese and the Pisans had carried their mutual hatred with them to the crusade; and to these elements of discord were added the pretensions of the templars and hospitalers, and the rival claims which Guy of Lusignan and Conrad of Montferrat set up to the kingdom of Jerusalem on the strength of their having married daughters of the royal house, whose male heirs had become extinct. The siege of Acre lasted two years, during which it is reckoned that 120,000 Christians and 180,000 Mussulmans perished. At length, on the 12th of July 1191, the city was surrendered, on condition that the lives of the inhabitants should be forfeit, unless within forty days Saladin should restore the true cross, give up 1500 Christian captives, and pay a large sum as ransom. The fulfillment of these terms, however, was found impossible within the time, and, notwithstanding Saladin's earnest entreaties for a delay, it was decided in a council of the princes that the forfeiture should be enforced. On the 20th of August, therefore, the prisoners—8000 in all, of whom Richard's share amounted to 2600—were led forth and remorselessly butchered in the sight of Saladin and his army, who could only look on in impotent distress. A few only of the more important Saracens were spared, in the hope that they might be the means of recovering the cross or the captives.

The English king's assumption, and his continual displays of contempt for his associates, produced general irritation and disgusts. To Leopold of Austria he had offered unpardonable insults, by throwing down his banner and trampling on it, as unworthy to stand beside those of kings, and even, it is said, by kicking him. By this behaviour to their leader, all

the Germans were offended; and both they and the Italians complained that the kings of France and England divided between themselves the spoils which had been taken, without allowing any share to the other crusading nations. The Germans and Italians, therefore, left the army in disgust, shortly after the taking of Acre. With Philip Augustus there were continual differences. The French king claimed half of Cyprus, on the ground that Richard had agreed to share with him whatever they might win in the crusade, while Richard denied that the conquest of the island, by his separate adventure, fell within the scope of the contract. Philip, jealous of his great vassal, not only for his superiority in prowess and in personal renown, but on account of the greater splendour which his hard-raised treasures enabled him to maintain, found an excuse in the state of his dominions at home for deserting the enterprise; and on the 31st of July—in the interval between the capture of the city and the slaughtering of the prisoners—he sailed for Europe. On his way homewards he visited the pope, from whom he solicited absolution from the oath which he had taken, and had lately renewed, to protect the English king's dominions; but Celestine refused to release him. Yet Philip, on his return to France, invaded Richard's continental territories, encouraged his brother John to intrigue against him, and charged him with having caused an illness by which the French king had suffered at Acre, and with having instigated the murder of Conrad of Montferrat, who, immediately after having been elected to the throne of Jerusalem, had been stabbed by two of the fanatical body known by the name of assassins.

Richard remained in the Holy Land more than a year after Philip's departure. During this time the "lion-hearted" king displayed the valour of a knight-errant in a degree which excited the fear and the admiration both of Mussulmans and of Christians. A large part of the coast was recovered from the infidels; but the Christians were thinned by disease and by desertion as well as by war; their internal jealousies continued, and were so little concealed that the king of England and the duke of Burgundy hired ballad-singers to ridicule each other and the object of the crusade became more and more hopeless. Richard was entreated by urgent and repeated messages to return to his disturbed kingdom, while frequent and severe illnesses warned him to quit for a time the dangerous climate of Syrian. The necessity of abandoning the enterprise became manifest; and, after having advanced within one day's march of Jerusalem, the king found himself obliged to yield, with a swelling heart which vented itself in loud expressions of indignation, to the force of circumstances, and to the spiritlessness of his remaining allies. A truce for three years, three months, three days, and three hours, was concluded with Saladin in September 1192, on condition that pilgrims should be allowed to visit the holy places, and that the coast from Tyre to Joppa should remain in possession of the Christians. It is reckoned that in the crusade which was ended by this compromise more than half a million of Christians had perished.

On the 9th of October 1192 Richard sailed for Europe. From unwillingness to run the risk of passing through Philip's dominions, he intended to take his route through Germany; but having been recognized in the neighborhood of Vienna, he was arrested and imprisoned by his enemy duke Leopold, who, in consideration of a large sum of money, made him over to the emperor Henry VI—a prince who with much of his father's ability united a selfishness, a cunning, and a cruelty which were altogether foreign to Frederick's lofty character.

After months of severe imprisonment, the king of England was brought by Henry before a diet at Worms, on charges of having thwarted the emperor in his claims on Sicily, of having instigated the murder of Conrad, of having wrongfully seized Cyprus, and of having insulted Leopold and the Germans. To these charges he answered in a strain of manly and indignant eloquence, which extorted the respect and pity even of those who were most hostile to him; but he was not yet set at liberty. Philip of France used all his influence with Henry to prolong his rivals captivity while the pope was urged by the importunities of the queen-mother Eleanor to interfere in behalf of her son. The emperor demanded a large sum by way of

ransom, and in order to raise this Richard's subjects—especially the clergy and monks—were again severely taxed. Chalices were melted down, shrines were stripped of their precious coverings and jewels, the golden ornaments were torn from the books employed in the service of the church. The impost was universal; even the Cistercians, who had, until then been exempt from all taxes, were obliged to contribute the wool of their flocks. After a confinement of nearly fourteen months, the king was able to return to his kingdom, which during his absence had been miserably distracted by feuds and intrigues; and in consequence of his complaints the pope excommunicated Leopold, and threatened the emperor and the French king with a like sentence. The miserable death of Leopold, which took place soon after in consequence of a fall from his horse at a tournament, was interpreted as a judgment of heaven on his outrage against a soldier of the cross. While Richard was in captivity the Christians of the east were delivered from their chief terror by the death of Saladin in March 1193.

Clement III had compromised the question as to the see of Treves by agreeing that both Volkmar and his opponent should be set aside, and that the canons should proceed to a new election, and in 1188 he had been able to establish himself in Rome, by means of an agreement with the citizens, who were inclined to peace by finding that without the pope their city could not be the capital of Christendom. But one condition of this compact, which must have been felt as especially hard—that Tusculum, the city so faithful to the popes and so odious to their unruly subjects, should be given up to the Romans—remained unfulfilled when Clement died, in March 1191. In his room was chosen Hyacinth, a man eighty-five years old, who had been a member of the college of cardinals for nearly half a century. At the time when the election took place, Henry VI was advancing towards Rome to claim the imperial crown, and it was resolved to take advantage of the occasion in order to gain some object at his hands. The pope deferred his own consecration, in order that he might be the better able to negotiate; a deputation of the Romans went forth to treat with Henry as he approached the city; and it was agreed that Tusculum should be given up. On Good Friday, Henry, without any warning to the Tusculans, withdrew the garrison with which, at their request, he had furnished them; whereupon the Romans rushed in through the open gates, razed the castle, destroyed the town so completely that no vestige of buildings later than the old imperial times is now to be seen, and glutted their hatred by deeds of savage cruelty. On Easter-day the pope was consecrated under the name of Celestine III, and on the two following days Henry and Constance were severally crowned by him in St. Peter's.

The emperor advanced towards the south, where, on the death of William the Good, in 1189, the inheritance of Constance had been seized by an illegitimate grandson of the first Norman king, Tancred, count of Lecce, who had received investiture from Pope Clement. Henry took Naples after a siege of three months, and reduced the continental part of the Norman territories; but his army was ravaged by a pestilence, and his own health was so seriously affected that he was compelled to retire to Germany, while his empress, who had fallen into the hands of the enemy, remained in captivity until she was at length delivered through the intercession of the pope. After the death of Tancred, who kept possession of his crown until 1193, Henry appeared in Sicily at the head of a large army, hired with the king of England's ransom, and chiefly composed of soldiers who had been enlisted for a new crusade. A Genoese fleet cooperated with his land force; the discords between the Saracens and the Norman inhabitants favoured his enterprise; and after a short resistance he made himself master of the island. His triumphal entry into Palermo was welcomed with a signal display of the wealth and luxury of the Sicilian Normans. But almost immediately after this a fearful series of severities began. Letters were produced which professed to implicate the leading men of the island in a conspiracy against the Germans; and Henry, in consequence, let loose without restraint the cruelty which was one of his most prominent characteristics. Clergy and nobles in great numbers were put to death by hanging, burning, and drowning, or were blinded or barbarously mutilated. William, the young son of Tancred, after having been deprived of

his eyesight, was shut up in a castle of the Vorarlberg, where he died obscurely. His mother and sisters were committed to German prisons. The bodies of Tancred and his son Roger were plucked from their graves, and treated with revolting indignity. It was in vain that the pope, the queen-mother of England, and other important persons, remonstrated with Henry, and even (it is said) that Celestine denounced him excommunicate. The wealth of the Norman kings and of all who were accused as parties in the conspiracy was seized; and it is said that, after large gifts to Henry's numerous soldiery, the splendid robes, the precious metals, and the gems which remained were a load for 160 horses and mules. By means of this treasure, and of concessions to the princes of Germany, Henry formed a design of securing the crown as hereditary in his family. But although he succeeded in obtaining the consent of the electors to the succession of his son Frederick, who had been born at Jesi in December 1194, and was not yet baptized, the opposition to his further project was so strong that Henry found it expedient to withdraw the proposal.

The death of Saladin and the inferior capacity of his successor, Malek al Adel, held out inducements to a new crusade. With a view of stirring up the faithful, Celestine wrote letters and sent legates in all directions; and the emperor actively forwarded the enterprise, in the hope, probably, that he might thus clear his ecclesiastical reputation. He advocated the crusade eloquently in diets at Gelnhausen and Worms, where his exhortations were followed up by speeches from cardinals and bishops; princes and prelates responded by taking the cross, and their example was followed by knights, burghers, and men of humbler condition. In France, Philip Augustus made use of the crusade as a pretext for heavy exactions, but with the intention of converting the produce to his own purposes. But the truest crusader among the sovereigns of the age, Richard of England, although he had never laid aside the cross, and burned with desire to complete the work which he had before so reluctantly abandoned by a fresh campaign against the infidels, found himself so much hampered by the exhaustion of his people, and by the continual petty warfare in which he was engaged with Philip, that he could take no share in the enterprise. It was in vain that Celestine, in a letter to the English bishops, forbade the tournaments which had been instituted by the king with a view to military training; that he desired those who wished for martial exercise to seek it, not in festive contests unsuited to the sadness of the time, but in warring against the enemies of Christ.

In his ecclesiastical policy Henry showed himself resolved to yield nothing to the papacy. He forbade appeals to Rome, and prevented his subjects from any access to the papal court. He attempted to revive the imperial privilege of deciding in cases of disputed election to bishoprics. In the case of a contest for Liege, he is supposed to have instigated the murder of a candidate who was favoured by the pope and had been consecrated by the archbishop of Reims. He refused to pay the homage which the Norman princes had performed to the pope for their Italian and Sicilian territories, and, returning into Italy, he invaded the patrimony of St. Peter, up to the very gates of the city. The pope had ceased for a time to hold correspondence with him, but now addressed him in a strain of apology mixed with complaint, and urged him to forward the crusade. At Bari the emperor, at Easter 1195, entered into an engagement to maintain 1500 cavalry and a like number of foot in the Holy Land for a year; but the zeal with which he urged on his preparations had probably other objects—that of diverting the crusaders, as before, to his own purposes, and even of using them against the Byzantine empire. But these designs were unexpectedly cut short. Henry, after having crossed into Sicily, discovered a new conspiracy against him, and in vengeance for it resumed the cruelties which had made him so deeply detested in that island; but on the 28th of September 1197 he suddenly died, most probably in consequence of a chill produced by having drunk some water while heated by hunting. But as it is certain that Constance had been greatly shocked and offended by his severities towards her countrymen, and even towards some of her own near relations, it was generally believed that the emperor fell a victim to poison administered by his own wife. The crusade which Henry had contributed to set on foot was

carried on without any religious enthusiasm. The Germans did not cooperate with the Latins of the East, but, “thinking only of the fertile coasts, and not heeding that Jerusalem should be trodden down of the Gentiles”, were wholly intent on gaining advantages for themselves. They achieved considerable successes, although not without loss, and recovered the sea-coast. But their conquests were fruitless, and they engaged in fierce quarrels with the Templars, each party charging the other with having sold the interests of Christendom. On receiving the tidings of Henry's death the crusaders resolved to return home; and, notwithstanding the pope's entreaties that they would not abandon the holy enterprise, they carried out their resolution, after having concluded a truce of six years with the infidels. In endeavouring to make their way homewards by way of Sicily and Apulia, many of them were slain by the inhabitants on account of their connection with the detested emperor.

Celestine III survived Henry only a few months, and died on the 8th of January 1198.

CHAPTER XI.

THE GREEK CHURCH—SPAIN—BRITISH CHURCHES—THE NORTH—
MISSIONS.

THE Greek Church of the twelfth century hardly requires notice, except in so far as it was brought into contact with the Christians of the West. Its state was generally one of torpor. The clergy were held in strict subjection by the secular power, so that a patriarch, on attempting to withdraw a monk from secular judgment, was met by the declaration that "the emperor's authority can do everything". They were devoted to a system of forms which in great part had lost their significance. Among the monks there was very commonly a forgetfulness of the true meaning of their profession; yet there was much of fantastic asceticism, as among the dendrites or tree-monks, the pillar-monks (who, however, were not so called from living on the tops of pillars, like the stylites of earlier days, but from inhabiting narrow pillarlike cells, or from carrying little columns as a burden), the fanatics who buried their living bodies in the earth, and those who aimed at sanctity by a profession of more than the ordinary monastic filthiness. The Gnosimachi denounced all endeavour after knowledge in religion, on the ground that God requires nothing of man but good works, and prefers simplicity to curiosity. And while among the people there lingered, by the side of their Christianity, much of uneradicated heathen superstition, there were some who, by the study of classical literature, were led back into an adoption of the old pagan creed. Thus we are told of an Italian named John, who in the reign of Alexius Comnenus became popular as a professor at Constantinople, and taught the transmigration of souls, and the Platonic doctrine of ideas. One of this man's disciples is said to have thrown himself into the sea, exclaiming, "Receive me, O Poseidon!". But the teacher himself, after having been subjected to the pressure of both ecclesiastical and imperial authority, consented to renounce his errors.

Those revivals and reformations of monachism which were continually renewed in the West had no parallel in the Greek church, where the only measures of reform were the occasional attempts of the emperors to recall the monks to their spiritual duties by means which had very much the nature of confiscation. Thus Manuel found fault with his predecessors for having enriched monasteries with lands, and revived an edict of Nicephorus Phocas against such endowments. And in order to exemplify what monachism ought to be, if freed from secular business, he removed a number of the best monks from the "Siren-like" temptations of Constantinople to a monastery which he had built in the gorges of Pontus—allowing them merely a sufficient supply for the necessities of food and clothing.

Yet it deserves to be mentioned, to the credit of the age, that under the Comnenian emperors a spirit of learning revived. A college of twelve professors presided over the studies of Constantinople, both in general literature and in theology : and the Greek church of the eleventh and twelfth centuries was adorned, if not by any original genius, yet by the industry and knowledge of such writers as the commentator Theophylact, Nicetas, bishop of Chonae or Colosse, Nicolas, bishop of Methone, Euthymius Zigadenus, Michael Psellus the younger, and Eustathius, archbishop of Thessalonica.

The imperial system had a tendency to encroach on the province of theology, and this was especially dangerous under those emperors who supposed themselves to be skilled in theological questions. They were not, says Nicetas, content to enjoy the pomps of empire, with the unrestrained power and privileges of despotism, unless they were also supposed to

be, like Solomon, heaven-taught authorities on things divine and human. Thus, as we shall see hereafter, Alexius I disputed with the Paulicians and with the Bogomiles. His grandson Manuel, in addition to his warlike talents, was possessed of eloquence and literary accomplishments, and although he is charged with adultery, and even with incest, was especially fond of mixing in theological controversies. One of those in which he took part related to a passage in the public liturgy, where Christ was said to be at once priest and sacrifice. After much discussion, the emperor was persuaded to give his adhesion to the form, and many eminent ecclesiastics who took the opposite side were deprived. At another time Manuel started a question as to the words, "My Father is greater than I", which he maintained to relate to the Saviour's created humanity alone. A third question arose out of the emperor's requiring the withdrawal of an anathema against the God of Mahomet from the catechetical tables. The patriarch Theodosius replied that the anathema was not directed against the true God, but against the imaginary deity whom Mahomet described as "neither begetter nor begotten, but holosphyrus". On this the emperor drew up a form which he violently required the clergy to subscribe—threatening them with a council to which the pope of Rome should be invited; and some of them, among whom Eustathius of Thessalonica was conspicuous, were in danger on account of their opposition. But at length the matter was compromised by the subscription of an anathema against Mahomet with "all his doctrine and succession". A later emperor, Andronicus, was so far from sharing in Manuel's theological tastes that, on hearing a discussion as to the words "My Father is greater than I", he threatened to throw the disputants into the river.

From time to time attempts were made to bring about a reconciliation between the Greek and the Latin churches. The council of Bari, under Urban II, at which Anselm of Canterbury played the principal part, has been already mentioned. In 1112 Paschal sent Peter Chrysolanus or Grosolanus, the dispossessed archbishop of Milan, to Constantinople, for the purpose of discussing the points of difference, and in 1115 the same pope addressed to the emperor Alexius a proposal for another conference, but with the unacceptable condition that the primacy of Rome should be acknowledged in all things. About the year 1135, Anselm, bishop of Havelberg, who had been sent by Lothair III as ambassador to the emperor John, engaged in discussions with Nicetas, bishop of Nicomedia, and one of the twelve principal teachers of Constantinople and in 1150, at the request of Eugenius III, he drew up a report of the conference. The chief points debated were the procession of the Holy Ghost, the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist, and the authority of the Roman see. On the first of these the disputants appear to have approached to an agreement by means of mutual explanations. On the question of the papacy, Nicetas is represented as strongly protesting against the Roman pretensions and he proposed a general council as the most hopeful means towards a reconciliation. Although Anselm's report of the arguments is naturally favourable to the author and his cause, the Greek champion is allowed to acquit himself creditably; and they parted with expressions of mutual respect. Another discussion was held at Constantinople about 1179, by Hugh Eterianus, a Tuscan, whose conduct in it was approved by Alexander III; a Greek abbot named Nectarius maintained the Greek views at the Lateran synod of 1119, and on his return was hailed "like another Olympian victor"; and the subject of reunion often engaged the attention of the popes. But on the whole, the increasing claims of Rome, the invasion of the East by Latin patriarchs, bishops, and clergy, the collisions between the eastern and the western churches which took place in the crusades, and other political causes, contributed to render the Greeks less and less favourable to such proposals; and the massacre of the Latins under Andronicus was at once a fearful proof of the bitter feeling with which they were regarded by the Greeks, and a pledge of further hostilities.

The Nestorians continued to carry on their missionary work in the East, although the successes which they claimed may in many cases have been only nominal. About the middle of the eleventh century stories began to be circulated in Europe as to a Christian nation of

north-eastern Asia, whose sovereign was at the same time king and priest, and was known by the name of Prester John. Amid the mass of fables with which the subject is encumbered, it would seem to be certain that, in the very beginning of the century, the khan of the Kerait, a tribe whose chief seat was at Karakorum, between Lake Baikal and the northern frontier of China, was converted to Nestorian Christianity—it is said, through the appearance of a saint to him when he had lost his way in hunting. By means of conversation with Christian merchants, he acquired some elementary knowledge of the faith, and, on the application of Ebed-Jesu, metropolitan of Maru, to the Nestorian patriarch Gregory, clergy were sent, who baptized the king and his subjects, to the number of 200,000. Ebed-Jesu consulted the patriarch how the fasts were to be kept, since the country did not afford any corn, or anything but flesh and milk; and the answer was, that, if no other Lenten provisions were to be had, milk should be the only diet for seasons of abstinence.

The earliest western notice of this nation is given by Otho of Freising, from the relation of an Armenian bishop who visited the court of pope Eugenius III. This report is largely tinctured with fable, and deduces the Tartar chiefs descent from the Magi who visited the Saviour in His cradle. It would seem that the Nestorians of Syria, for the sake of vying with the boasts of the Latins, delighted in inventing tales as to the wealth, the splendour, and the happiness of their convert's kingdom; and to them is probably to be ascribed an extravagantly absurd letter, in which Prester John is made to dilate on the greatness and the riches of his dominions, the magnificence of his state and the beauty of his wives, and to offer the Byzantine emperor, Manuel, if he be of the true faith, the office of lord chamberlain in the court of Karakorum. In 1177 Alexander III was induced by reports which a physician named Philip had brought back from Tartary, as to Prester John's desire to be received into communion with the pope, to address a letter to the king, recommending Philip as a religious instructor. But nothing is known as to the result of this; and in 1202 the Kerait kingdom was overthrown by the Tartar conqueror Genghis Khan.

In explanation of the story as to the union of priesthood with royalty in Prester John, many theories have been proposed, of which two may be mentioned here : that it arose out of the fact of a Nestorian priest's having got possession of the kingdom on the death of a khan; or that, the Tartar prince's title being compounded of the Chinese *wang* (king) and the Mongol *Khan*, the first of these words was confounded by the Nestorians of Syria with the name John, and the second with *cohen* (a priest).

AFFAIRS OF SPAIN

Among the triumphs of Gregory VII was the submission of the Spanish church, which had until then been independent, and had looked to no higher authority than the primate of Toledo. The Spanish kings were induced to favour this submission by the wish to ally themselves with the rest of Christendom, as a means of strength against their unbelieving neighbours; and it was forwarded by the influence of many Frenchmen who had been promoted to ecclesiastical dignities in Spain. In consequence of the union, Gregory wrote to Alfonso VI of Castile and to Sancho of Aragon, exhorting them to adopt the Roman ritual as a symbol of unity; and it is said that Alfonso referred the question to an ordeal, by setting up champions to fight for the Roman and the Mozarabic liturgies respectively. The national champion was victorious, and this result was hailed with great delight by the people; but Alfonso, at his queen's instigation, declared that the decision must be made by fire, and the rival books were placed on a blazing pile, from which the Mozarabic office leaped out unhurt, while the Roman or Gallican was consumed. But, says the chronicler who relates this, "Laws go as kings will", and notwithstanding its double victory, the national liturgy was abolished, except in a few monasteries. On the recovery of Toledo from the Saracens by Alfonso, Urban II bestowed on that city the primacy over all Spain, which it had enjoyed under the

Gothic kings; but the other Spanish metropolitans contested this primacy until the Lateran council of 1215.

The popes further interfered in the Spanish peninsula by acknowledging Portugal as an independent kingdom, under the especial protection of the Roman see, and professing to grant the kings a right over all that they might be able to rescue from the Saracens. In consideration of the connection with Rome, an annual tribute was paid to St. Peter's successors.

ENGLAND. REIGN OF STEPHEN.

In 1125 England was visited by a legate, John of Crema, cardinal of St. Chrysogonus, whose exactions and insolence excited general disgust. The primate, William of Corboyl, feeling himself injured by the precedence which this legate, although only a priest, assumed over archbishops and bishops, accompanied him on his return to Rome, with a view of vindicating the rights of his see; and the matter was accommodated by the pope's bestowing on the archbishop, for his own person, a commission as ordinary legate in England. William of Corboyl, in 1135, sanctioned the usurpation of the crown by Stephen; and it was remarked as a sign of the Divine displeasure that he died within a year. During the troubles of Stephen's reign much invasion of ecclesiastical and monastic property took place. Churches were burnt or were converted into fortresses, and the wealth of monasteries was violently plundered by the irregularly-paid mercenaries who held the country in terror. "Never yet had more wretchedness been in the land", says the Saxon chronicler, in his striking description of the miseries of Stephen's reign, "nor did heathen men ever do worse than they did; for everywhere at times they forbore neither church nor churchyard, but took all the property that was therein, and then burned the church and all together. Nor forbore they a bishop's land, nor an abbot's, nor a priest's, but robbed monks and clerks, and every man another, who anywhere could. The bishops and clergy constantly cursed them, but nothing came of it; for they were all accursed, and forsworn, and lost". But on the other hand, the clergy were in such times a body whose support could not but be very valuable; and thus they were able to increase their privileges and their power. Henry, bishop of Winchester and brother of the king, had obtained the office of legate after archbishop William, and was the most powerful member of the episcopate, while he was devoted to high hierarchical principles. It is said that he had a design of erecting his see into an archbishopric, with seven suffragans and Stephen, although greatly indebted to him for assistance at the outset of his reign, found it necessary to balance the legate's power by promoting Theobald, abbot of Le Bec, to Canterbury; whereupon Henry in disgust transferred himself to the party of the legitimate claimant of the kingdom, Matilda, daughter of Henry I, and widow of the emperor Henry V, pretending, at an assembly of the clergy in 1141, that the right of electing a sovereign belonged chiefly to that order. The new primate found himself greatly embarrassed by the position of the legate, who, although his own suffragan, claimed authority over him, and presided at councils as his superior, until Lucius II, on succeeding to the papacy, instead of renewing the bishop of Winchester's legation, gave Theobald a commission by which the archbishop of Canterbury for the time being was appointed *legatus natus* of the pope. By these legatine commissions the English church was brought into more direct connection with Rome; and it is to the time of Henry of Winchester's legation that the frequency, if not the origin, of appeals from England to the pope is traced.

In the beginning of Stephen's reign, the bishops, on swearing fealty to him, "so long as he should preserve the liberty of the church, and the rigour of discipline", had exacted from him an oath that he would redress the grievances which had been inflicted on the Church by Henry I, with a very full assurance of privileges and immunities; but these promises were ill observed. The clergy, however, continued to make good their interest. When the bishops of Ely, Lincoln, and Salisbury had built themselves strong castles, which they held out against

the king, Henry of Winchester, as legate, declared that these prelates ought not to be liable to any other than ecclesiastical judgment. The archbishop of Rouen maintained that, if bishops were allowed to possess castles, the king ought, as in other countries, to hold the keys, and to have the right of entering. But Stephen, in fear of Matilda's growing power, submitted to appear by proxy when summoned before a council for his treatment of the three bishops, and did penance in obedience to its sentence.

The relations between Stephen and Theobald became less friendly than they had been at first. At the instance, it is said, of his brother, who had again changed sides, the king forbade the archbishop to attend the council held by Eugenius III at Reims in 1148. Theobald, however, resolved to disregard this; and, as the coasts were guarded, he crossed the sea in a small open boat. He was welcomed by the pope with the remark that he "had come rather by swimming than by sailing"; but on attempting to return, he was met by a sentence of banishment and confiscation, to which he replied by pronouncing an interdict. In 1152 the primate was again embroiled with the king, in consequence of having refused to crown his son Eustace; but peace was restored by the death of Eustace, and by the arrangement which secured the reversion of the crown to Henry II, the son of Matilda.

SCOTLAND—ST. MARGARET.

In Scotland the church was led during this time to discard the peculiarities of its earlier system, and was gradually assimilated to the church of southern Britain—chiefly through the influence of the Cistercians and of the Augustinian canons. The beginning of this change is ascribed to the influence of the English princess Margaret, sister of Edgar Atheling, wife of Malcolm Canmore, and mother of David I of Scotland and of "Maud the Good", the first wife of Henry Beauclerc. Margaret's piety, charity, and ascetic life are celebrated with enthusiasm by her confessor and biographer, Turgot, a monk of Durham and afterwards bishop of St. Andrew's. She built churches, redeemed captives, and provided hospitals for the use of pilgrims. Her husband's affection for her was unbounded; in token of it we are told that, although himself unable to read, he used to handle her books with interest, to kiss those which he observed that she loved most, and sometimes to surprise her by presenting her with one of her favourite volumes in a new and splendid binding. Under Margaret's influence the Celtic element was depressed in Scotland, while the court took an English tone and character. Councils were assembled for the reformation of the church; and at one of these it is said that Margaret, almost unaided except by the presence and countenance of the king, who acted as interpreter, maintained for three days, with "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God", the cause of opposition to the usages or abuses which prevailed in Scotland. The beginning of Lent had been reckoned forty days before Easter, without excepting Sundays; communion, even at Easter, had been disused, even by the clergy, who alleged that they were unworthy to receive the sacrament; and marriages had been allowed which the general law of the church denounced as incestuous. Against these and other irregularities Margaret contended, and she succeeded in doing away with them.

To this time is also referred the more thorough and regular division of the country into dioceses, which seems to have been in progress from the reign of Malcolm Canmore (A.D. 1057-93) to that of David I (A.D. 1124-54), whose munificence in the endowment of bishoprics and abbeys has earned him the zealous praise of the monastic writers, and has not wanted defenders in later times against those who have censured it as tending to the impoverishment of the crown and the oppressive taxation of the people. Nor did David, who had been educated in the English court, neglect, in his care for religion, to use other means of advancing the civilization of his subjects, who, notwithstanding the influence of many English and Norman settlers, were generally in a very rude condition. Among other changes which took place during this period may be mentioned the extinction of the ancient order of clergy

styled Culdees, who, although not without a struggle, were superseded by canons living under the same rules as those of other western churches.

After the death of bishop Turgot, in 1115, a remarkable case of difference took place as to the see of St. Andrews, which had by this time become the seat of the primacy, so that its bishops were styled bishops or archbishops “of the Scots”. Alexander I of Scotland applied to Ralph, archbishop of Canterbury, on the ground that the bishops of St. Andrews had always been consecrated either by the archbishop of Canterbury or by the pope, until Lanfranc allowed them for a time to be consecrated at York. The vacancy continued until 1120, when Alexander again wrote to the archbishop, requesting that Edmer, the monk of Canterbury to whom we are chiefly indebted for the knowledge of St. Anselm's life and character, should be allowed to accept the see; and to this Ralph assented, and obtained the consent of Henry I. But after Edmer had been invested, although he was not yet consecrated, a serious disagreement arose. The Scottish king, who had intended nothing more than to evade the claims of York, was disgusted at finding that the monk asserted the title of Canterbury to jurisdiction over all Britain. Edmer, on the other hand, declared that he would not, for St. Andrews or for all Scotland, give up his connection with Canterbury; and, although a friend named Nicolas advised him to solve the difficulty by seeking consecration from the pope, it seemed to Edmer that all hope of usefulness in the northern church was shut out by his difference with the king. He therefore returned the episcopal ring to Alexander, laid his cross on the altar from which he had taken it, and returned to England. Robert, prior of Scone, an Englishman by birth, who was appointed in his stead, refused to profess obedience to York so long as Alexander lived: but after the king's death he submitted to be consecrated by archbishop Thurstan, with the understanding that there should be no prejudice to the rights of either see.

The claims of the see of York to jurisdiction over Scotland—claims which had no real foundation except in so far as concerned that part of Scotland which had formerly been within the Northumbrian kingdom—were now renewed and kept up, chiefly perhaps with a view of counterbalancing the increased greatness of the southern metropolitan. But as to the details of this question, there is a difference between the English and the Scottish writers, as the ancient chronicles of Scotland have perished, and the later Scottish authors charge the English chroniclers not only with falsehood but with forgery. On a vacancy in the see of Glasgow, the archdeacon Ingelram, having been sent by Malcolm IV to Alexander III, was consecrated by him at Sens, notwithstanding the opposition of envoys from the archbishop of York, and returned with an acknowledgment that the Scottish church was exempt from all jurisdiction except that of the pope. In 1175, according to the English writers, when William of Scotland had been taken prisoner at Alnwick, his bishops and abbots swore at York that they would pay such submission as was due and customary to the see of York, and that the bishops of Scotland should repair to that archbishop for consecration. But at a meeting at Northampton in the following year, under the legate Uguccio Pierleone, the Scottish bishops denied that there had ever been, either by right or in fact, any such subjection as was claimed. Roger of York produced documents in proof that the bishops of Candida Casa (Whitherne) and Glasgow had formerly been subject to York; but, fortunately for the Scots, a dispute arose between the two English archbishops as to the claims of their sees over Scotland, and the matter remained undecided. Both parties appealed to Rome, and in 1176 Vivian, cardinal of St. Stephen's on the Caelian (who had formerly been employed as a commissioner in the differences between Henry II and Becket), was sent as legate into Scotland, where he is described by the Melrose chronicler as “treading down and breaking to pieces all that fell in his way—alert to take, and not slow to seize”. The bishop of Whitherne declined the legate's summons to a council, on the ground that he was subject to the see of York; and a war of ecclesiastical censures followed, without any decisive result. Shortly after this a dispute arose as to the appointment of a bishop of St. Andrews, which brought the Scottish king into collision with the archbishop of York and with the pope. Roger of York, who had received a commission as legate for

Scotland, issued a sentence of excommunication and interdict in 1181; but after the death of this turbulent prelate the question was settled by an arrangement favourable to William, who was absolved by Lucius III in 1182, and obtained from Clement III and Celestine III an acknowledgment of the freedom of the Scottish church from all jurisdiction but that of the pope himself or of legates specially commissioned by him.

IRELAND. MALACHY OF ARMAGH

In Ireland also this period is marked, even more strongly than in Scotland, by changes which obliterated the ancient peculiarities of the church, and reduced it under the same power which had mastered the rest of western Christendom. We have already seen that the Danes who had established themselves in that country were led, on embracing the Christian faith, to seek their pastors, not from among the natives whom they had dispossessed, but from their own Norman kindred who had become masters of England. It was to the archbishops of Canterbury that the bishops of the Danish cities, Dublin, Limerick, and Waterford, repaired for consecration, and made profession of canonical obedience; and these bishops, although sometimes of Irish birth, were generally persons who had been trained in English monasteries. The connection thus begun, although at first it reached no further than England, could not fail in time to bring the Irish church into new relations with Rome.

A letter in which Gregory VII appears as addressing the Irish king Torlogh, and claiming Ireland for the Roman see, would seem to have had no effect. But in the beginning of the next century, Gille or Gilbert, bishop of Limerick (who had known Anselm as abbot of Le Bec, and had renewed his intercourse with him by letters after the conclusion of his struggle with Henry I), received a commission as legate for Ireland, perhaps through Anselm's influence with the pope. As legate he presided over a synod at Rathbreasil, at which his influence was successfully exerted in favour of Roman customs. Ireland was to be portioned out into regular dioceses, instead of having bishops unlimited in number and without local jurisdiction; and the form of discipline and divine service was to be reduced to the Roman model—an object which Gille had before endeavored to promote by a treatise which is still extant. It is not to be wondered at that the clergy in general were glad, in the fearful miseries of their country, to catch at any scheme which appeared to promise strength to the Church; yet it would seem that Gille's Romanizing policy was not universally acceptable.

In this policy Gille was followed by Maolmaadhog or Malachy, whose fame has been greatly enhanced by the circumstance that St. Bernard became his biographer. Malachy, of whom Bernard says that he was no more affected by the barbarism of his nation than fishes are by the saltiness of the sea, was born about the year 1095 at Armagh, where his father, an ecclesiastic, was chief lecturer. After having acted as vicar under Kellach (or Celsus), archbishop of Armagh, he was consecrated to the see of Connor in 1125. "But", says the biographer, "when he began to perform the duties of his office, then the man of God came to understand that he had been destined not to men but to beasts. Nowhere had he yet experienced such people, so shameless as to manners, so savage as to rites, so impious as to faith, so barbarous as to laws, so stiff-necked as to discipline, so filthy as to life". But by the zealous labours of Malachy, who went throughout his diocese on foot, "distributing even to the ungrateful the measure of heavenly wheat", we are told that "their hardness ceased, their barbarism was stilled; the barbaric laws were done away with, the Roman were introduced; everywhere the customs of the Church were received, and those contrary to them were rejected; churches were rebuilt, and clergy were ordained in them".

In 1127 Celsus of Armagh on his death-bed recommended Malachy as his successor. But for five years the new bishop was kept out by Murtoth, a layman of a family which for fifteen successions had occupied the temporalities of the see—the last eight holders having moreover been married men; and, after Murtoth's death, he had for two years longer to

encounter the opposition of one Niall, whose influence among the Irish was rendered formidable by the possession of the episcopal insignia. At length Malachy obtained peaceable possession of the see; and he then insisted on fulfilling a resolution that, whenever this should be achieved, he would resign. Returning to his old diocese of Connor, he restored the ancient division of it into two, and chose for himself the inferior of these, the bishopric of Down. Here he laboured with the same zeal and energy which he had displayed elsewhere—preaching, hearing confessions, founding monasteries, and endeavouring to enforce the observance of the regular hours and manner of psalmody, which in Ireland had hitherto been unknown beyond the monasteries.

The government of the church was still but imperfectly organized. The see of Armagh had retained a superiority in consideration of its connexion with St. Patrick; but there were no regular archbishops in other sees, and Malachy resolved to remedy the defect by asking for palls in favour of Armagh and the newly-founded see of Cashel. It was not without much difficulty that the Irish nobles and clergy would allow him to set out for Rome : but after lots had been thrice cast, and always with a result in favour of the expedition, their consent could not be withheld. At Rome he was received with great honour by Innocent II, who bestowed on him the legatine commission which Gille had resigned on account of age and infirmity. The pope also confirmed the archiepiscopal dignity of Cashel; but, in answer to Malachy's proposal as to the palls, he said that it was a matter to be managed with greater solemnity—that an application ought to be made for them by a national council of bishops, clergy, and nobles. Malachy requested the pope's leave to become a monk at Clairvaux, which he had visited on his way to Rome; but was told that he must continue his more active labours. On his journey homewards he again visited the abbey, where he left some of his companions for instruction; and by these, and some of Bernard's disciples who accompanied them on their return, the Cistercian order was introduced into Ireland.

Malachy carried out his legation rigidly as to the enforcement of the Roman usages, while in his personal habits he still retained his original simplicity and severity. But it would seem that Pope Innocent's caution as to the palls was borne out by the actual result—that the legate found his countrymen reluctant to submit to such an acknowledgment of the Roman superiority; for he allowed the matter to rest for several years. At length, in 1148, he resolved to take advantage of Pope Eugenius's visit to France for the purpose of renewing his suit, in the hope that his friendship with St. Bernard might recommend it to a pontiff who had formerly been a monk of Clairvaux. The consent of an Irish council was obtained, although it was again with difficulty that Malachy was allowed to go abroad in person. In passing through England he was delayed by the suspicions of King Stephen, who had forbidden that any bishop should be allowed to embark for the continent; and thus he was unable to reach Clairvaux until the pope had already returned to Rome. He was received at Clairvaux, says St. Bernard, "like a real dayspring from on high visiting us"; but soon after his arrival he fell ill, and on All-Souls' day 1148 he died in the arms of the abbot—in the place which he had desired, and on the day which he had foretold.

It would seem that, notwithstanding Malachy's death, the application of which he had been the bearer reached the pope; and in 1152 a cardinal-legate, John Paparo, held a synod at Kells, where palls were bestowed, not only on the archbishops of Armagh and Cashel, but also on those of Dublin and Tuam. "And this", says Robert of Mont St. Michel, "was done contrary to the customs of the ancients, and to the dignity of the church of Canterbury, from which the bishops of Ireland had been wont to ask and to receive the blessing of consecration".

Amongst the earliest acts of Adrian IV's pontificate was the grant of a privilege to the sovereign of his native country, bestowed at the instance of John of Salisbury. In this document the pope asserts for himself a right to dispose of all islands "on which Christ, the Sun of righteousness, hath shined"; and in virtue of this right (which, as John of Salisbury

informs us, was grounded on the donation of Constantine), he authorizes Henry to invade Ireland with a view to the extension of the church, and the increase of religion and virtue, on condition that a penny shall be yearly paid from each house to the see of Rome. In 1155, accordingly, the project of an expedition against the Irish—a project which had been entertained by William the Conqueror and by Henry I—was proposed by the king to his council, but, out of deference to the objections of his mother Matilda, it was abandoned. Many years had passed, when Dermot Macmurrough, the expelled king of Munster, waited on Henry in Aquitaine, and entreated aid for the recovery of his kingdoms Henry, although too much engaged in other business to undertake the matter on his own account, gave license for his subjects to enlist under Dermot; and a body of adventurers, under Richard de Clare, earl of Strigul or Chepstow, who was known by the name of Strongbow, succeeded in restoring Dermot to his throne, and in winning for themselves a footing in Ireland. On the death of Dermot, in 1171, Strongbow, who had married his daughter Eva, succeeded to his territories; but, finding that his own force was insufficient, he repaired to Henry, and entreated his intervention, offering to make over to him part of his acquisitions, and to hold the rest in fee under him. In October 1171, accordingly, the king of England landed with an army at Waterford. A council had already been held at Armagh, in which the Irish bishops concluded that the success of the English was a judgment on their countrymen for the practice of buying English slaves, and, in the hope of escaping the full retribution of being themselves enslaved by the English, it was decreed that all English slaves should be set free. At Waterford Henry received the homage of many princes, and of almost all the Irish prelates; and a council was soon after held at Cashel, under the legate, Christian, bishop of Lismore, at which the English king was represented by two ecclesiastics. This synod, says Giraldus Cambrensis, endeavored by all means to reduce the Irish church to the form of the English. It was enacted that baptism should be administered in the name of the Trinity, and in the fonts of baptismal churches; for according to the English chroniclers it had been the custom in Ireland that the child, immediately after birth, should be dipped by the father in water (or, if the father were a rich man, in milk), and that the liquid should afterwards be thrown away without any reverence. The payment of tithes, which the synod of Kells had before ordered, but seemingly in vain, was now again enacted. Another canon ordered that marriages should be according to the laws of the church; for, it is said, the Irish were in the habit of having as many wives as they thought fit, and of disregarding the ecclesiastical prohibitions as to kin. The clergy were to be exempt from all taxes and lay exactions, a privilege which, in combination with the wealth provided by the introduction of tithes, had the effect of raising the Irish clergy from their previous subordination under the lay chiefs to a position like that of their brethren in other parts of the Latin church. The payment of Peter pence was also enacted; and it was ordered that the service of the church should everywhere be conformed to that of England. The proceedings of the synod were reported to the pope, who in three letters, dated in September 1172, expressed his approval of them, and desired the princes, nobles, and clergy of Ireland to cooperate for the reformation of religion.

The chroniclers of the time tell us that, while Henry was in Ireland, all communication with England or the continent was prevented by the violence of the winds; but it has been suspected that this stoppage of communication was partly caused by the king's wish to shut out the risk of dangerous missives from Rome, on account of the recent murder of archbishop Becket. On Easter-day 1172, in consequence of information that two legates had arrived in Normandy with a commission to decide in that matter, Henry embarked at Cork, and, after a rapid journey across England, proceeded to meet them at Avranches. His departure was followed by a rising of the Irish; and in order to suppress this he availed himself of the papal authority, by causing to be published in a council at Waterford the long-neglected letter of Adrian IV, together with a bull of Alexander III to the same effect. The insurrection proved unsuccessful; in 1175 Roderick O'Connor, king of Connaught, made his submission to Henry

at Windsor, and Ireland was—partly through the influence of English clergy who were put into the highest dignities of the church—gradually reduced to the same ecclesiastical condition as other countries of the west. Many of the old Irish monasteries, which had been desolated by the Danish invasions, were now replaced by brotherhoods of Cistercians and of Augustinian canons; and, among other outward changes, may be mentioned the abandonment of the rude style of church-building in wood and wattles which was known by the name of “Scottish work”, and to which the Irish had been in some districts so exclusively addicted that, when St. Malachy attempted to build a church of stone, he was met by an indignant cry of “We are Scots, and not Frenchmen”.

The English and other contemporary writers are very strong in their denunciations of the Irish national character, and of the alleged barbarism of the people; but, without rejecting these charges so entirely as the patriotism of the more injudicious later Irish writers requires, we cannot doubt that they are much exaggerated, while it seems certain that the calamities of the Danish invasions had thrown the civilization of Ireland greatly backward. Giraldus expresses surprise that a nation which had professed Christianity from the days of St. Patrick should still be so ignorant and barbarous; but he accounts for this by the fact that the Irish were more inclined to religious contemplation than to such work as required courage and zeal, and that therefore their clergy had been rather monks than evangelists. Hence, he says, it is remarkable that the saints of Ireland are all confessors, and not one of them is a martyr; and he reports the answer which Maurice, archbishop of Cashel, made to this remark in the age of the English invasions, when the murder of Thomas of Canterbury was fresh in all memories. “Our people, however rude, have always respected the church, so that there has been no opportunity of martyrdom. But now a nation is come into the realm which is in the habit of making martyrs, and Ireland will have its share of them”. We must, indeed, modify Giraldus’s statement as to the clergy by the recollection of the many missionaries whom the Irish church sent forth; but it would seem that the zeal which sought an exercise in foreign missions disdained the humbler labours of the pastoral office at home.

DENMARK. SCANDINAVIA.

The claims of the archbishops of Hamburg or Bremen to jurisdiction over the Danish church had been resisted or impatiently endured. Adalbert of Bremen, who had even conceived the idea of erecting his see into a patriarchate, obtained from Leo IX and Alexander II privileges by which he and his successors were authorized to consecrate bishops for all the northern kingdoms, even against the will of the sovereigns, and Alexander forbade the king of Norway to violate the rights of Bremen by getting bishops consecrated in France or England. But, on the other hand, the Danish kings entreated that their kingdom might have an independent primate; and, at the council of Bari, in 1097, Eric the Good, who was present, obtained from Urban II a promise to that effect—a promise which was the more readily given because archbishop Liemar of Bremen was obnoxious to the pope on account of his adherence to Henry IV. The Danish king died in Cyprus, on his way to the Holy Land; but in 1103 or the following year a legate appeared in Scandinavia, and made choice of Lund, in Schonen (which then belonged to Denmark), as the seat of a primate to whom the northern kingdoms, with Iceland, Greenland, and other dependencies, should be subject. It would seem, however, that the bull for this arrangement was not completed; and through the influence of the emperor Lothair, who wished to recover the old superiority of Germany over the north, Innocent II, in 1133, addressed letters to the archbishop of Hamburg and other persons concerned, by which the jurisdiction of that see was confirmed in all its former extent, and the claims of Lund were in no way recognized.

The archbishops of Lund afterwards recovered their independence of Hamburg, but the Swedes and the Norwegians were discontented on account of their subjection to Lund. The

mission of Cardinal Breakspear (afterwards Adrian IV) under Eugenius III resulted in the establishment of Nidaros (or Drontheim) as the seat of a primate for Norway, the islands, and Greenland. The legate provided for the erection of a primacy of Sweden, which was afterwards Axed at Upsal; while Eskil of Lund was in some measure consoled for the loss of his metropolitan rights over Sweden and Norway by being invested with the office of *legatus natus* for the whole north. It was also ordered by Alexander III that the archbishops of Upsal should be consecrated by those of Lund; and this became a subject of contention which lasted even into the fifteenth century. The German prelates, however, had not yet relinquished their pretensions to jurisdiction over the Scandinavian kingdoms, as appears from a letter of Lucius III, who tells Hartwig, archbishop of Hamburg, in 1185, that the consideration of the question must be deferred, because the troubled state of the north prevented the attendance of the bishops in order to an investigation of it. And in another quarter the archbishops of Nidaros were involved in contentions with those of York, as to jurisdiction over the Orkneys, the Hebrides, and the Isle of Man.

The gospel, in making its way in the northern kingdoms, had to struggle both against the barbarism of the people and against the faults of its own ministers. The cost of the new religion gave occasion to serious troubles. In Sweden complaints were raised that dying persons were induced to make bequests to the church without the consent of their heirs; and Alexander III ordered that the amount of such bequests should be limited. In 1087 the imposition of tithes in Denmark produced a commotion in which Canute the Good—afterwards the patron saint of the kingdom—was slain; and a century later the impost, with the enforcement of celibacy on the clergy, provoked a violent outbreak in Schonen, where it was demanded that the archbishopric should be abolished as a matter of useless expense, and that the clergy should marry, “lest, as heretofore, they should abuse the wives and children” of the peasantry. Breakspear, on his legation, succeeded in imposing the payment of Peterpence in Norway and Sweden, and a very similar exaction—although Danish historians indignantly deny that it was the same—appears to have been established in Denmark. To Absalom, bishop of Roskiel, and afterwards archbishop of Lund, a prelate who united to his ecclesiastical function the characters of a warrior and a statesman, is ascribed the reduction of the Danish church to uniformity in the celebration of divine offices.

In Denmark and Norway, the archbishops and bishops almost rivalled the sovereigns in dignity, in the secular pomp and state which they maintained, and in the privileges which they enjoyed. Among the evidences of this, it is recorded that Pope Celestine III in 1194 renewed to Henry, archbishop of Drontheim, the royal privilege of buying falcons.

FINLAND. POMERANIA. OTHO OF BAMBERG.

The Finns were subdued by Eric IX of Sweden in a war to which a religious character was given, and attempts were made to spread the gospel among them. Alexander III complains that their pretence of conversion was commonly given up when it had served the purpose of saving them from danger. Henry, archbishop of Upsal, an Englishman, who met his death among this people, was canonized by Adrian IV, and is celebrated as the apostle of Finland.

The conversion of the Pomeranians, a rude and fierce Slavonic people, who were at continual war with their neighbours of Poland, had been attempted as early as the year 1000 by Boleslav, king of Poland, who founded the see of Colberg with a view to this work; but the attempt was fruitless, the bishopric ended with its first holder, Reinbern, and later endeavours on the part of the Poles had succeeded only in producing false and transient appearances of conversion. About the year 1120 a Spaniard named Bernard, who had been consecrated by Paschal II (probably in the room of some bishop deposed for adhering to the imperial cause), on finding that he could not gain possession of his see, resolved to undertake a mission to the

Pomeranians. But the poverty of his appearance excited the contempt of the people, who are described as living in such plenty that no poor man or beggar was to be seen among them. "How", they asked, "can we believe that a man so miserable as not even to have shoes can be the messenger of the God to whom all things belong?" It was in vain that Bernard offered to prove his truth by allowing a house to be burnt over him, and even that he assailed a sacred pillar with an axe; he was put on board a boat, and dismissed, with a charge to exercise his zeal, if he would, in preaching to the fowls and to the fishes. After this failure he withdrew to a monastery at Bamberg; and there his reports as to Pomerania were heard with interest by the bishop, Otho.

Otho, a native of Swabia, was born about 1060, and in his youth had sought a livelihood as a schoolmaster in Poland, where he learned the language of the country. The duke, Wladislav (for this prince had given up the royal title), made him his chaplain, and employed him to negotiate a marriage with a sister of Henry IV; and thus Otho became known to the emperor, who invited him to his court, appointed him his chancellor, and in 1102 nominated him to the see of Bamberg. The canons of the cathedral expressed their disappointment that a clerk of obscure origin was recommended to them, whereas they had expected some man of distinguished family and already known to them. "If you wish", said Henry, "to know who he is, know that I am his father, and that your church must be his mother". Otho had already refused two bishoprics, from a scruple that such preferment, being intended by the emperor as a reward for his services, might involve something of simony; but he regarded the third offer as a sign of God's will, and accepted it. He received investiture in the usual form from the emperor, but, not being satisfied with this, he waited on Paschal II at Anagni, Whitsunday, laid the episcopal ring and staff at his feet, and received a second investiture from the pope, who then proceeded to consecrate him. In the contests between Henry V and the pope, Otho took the hierarchical side, but with a moderation which was so unsatisfactory to the zealots of his party that Adalbert of Mayence even threatened him with excommunication. He rebuilt his cathedral, which had been destroyed by fire; he was distinguished for his exemplary life and successful labours as a bishop, and was especially famous for an unrivalled power of preaching to the people in their native tongue. In 1111 Paschal, in acknowledgment of his merits, bestowed on him and his successors the privilege of using the archiepiscopal pall and crosier.

Boleslav III of Poland, a prince whose zeal for religion was quickened by remorse for having put to death his brother and competitor Zbigniew, reduced the eastern part of Pomerania to tribute in 1121. Eight thousand of his prisoners, with their wives and children, were settled on the Polish frontier and compelled to profess Christianity; and the duke conceived the design of converting the whole country. Finding that his bishops, discouraged by the failure of former attempts, hung back, the duke bethought him of the bishop of Bamberg, whom he had known as his father's chaplain; and Otho, with the consent of pope Calixtus and of the emperor, gladly undertook the work, although he had already passed his sixtieth year. Warned by Bernard's experience, he resolved to present himself to the Pomeranians in such fashion as should prove to them that his expedition was not undertaken for the sake of gaining by them. He furnished himself largely with horses, splendid vestments, rich stuffs, precious vessels for sacred uses, and with various things which were likely to be acceptable as presents; and in April 1124 he set out attended by a numerous body of clergy.

At Gnesen the missionaries were received with great honour by Boleslav, who supplied them with interpreters, a military guard, and provisions; and, after having overcome the difficulties of the journey into Pomerania, they were welcomed by the duke, Wartislav, who had been baptized when a prisoner or a hostage in Poland, although he had not since ventured to avow himself a Christian. At Pyritz, the first considerable town which they reached, seven thousand converts were speedily made; and these, after a week's instruction in the faith, followed by a fast of three days, were baptized in large casks or troughs, which were

sunk into the earth, and were surrounded by curtains. The solemnity and decency with which the rite was performed is said to have made a great impression, and this was doubtless strengthened by the presents which were bestowed on every convert. Among the duties which Otho inculcated in his addresses were the abandonment of polygamy and of the custom of putting female infants to death; the doctrine of the sacraments was laid down; the converts were charged to communicate three or four times a year; and they were exhorted to devote their sons to be educated for the ministry of the church.

At Camin Otho found the duchess, a Christian, who eagerly exerted herself for the furtherance of his mission. The duke agreed to give up the twenty-four concubines who had shared his bed; many who had been Christians professed repentance for having forsaken the faith; a church was built, and, in the course of forty days, a great number of converts was made. A wealthy lady, annoyed at finding that labour on the Lord's day was forbidden, broke out into blasphemous words against the new religion, called her servants to reap as they had been used to do under the gods who had hitherto prospered the country, and proceeded to show them the example; but hardly had she begun, when she suddenly fell down, and "breathed forth her guilty soul into the fire of hell". This judgment, we are told, produced a general awe, and served to procure obedience to Otho's precepts.

At Julin the bishop's life was in danger, and he was driven out of the town; but he afterwards obtained from the chief inhabitants a promise that they would be guided by the example of the capital, Stettin. To Stettin, therefore, he repaired, but for some time his preaching was ineffectual. The Pomeranians, it is said, were free from the vices which poverty engenders; they were surprised that the missionaries locked up their property, as among themselves no such protection was necessary.

"Why should we turn Christians?" they asked; "among Christians there are thieves and robbers, men are punished by loss of eyes and feet, and they practise all manner of cruelty and wickedness towards each other". It was agreed, however, that the duke of Poland should be consulted, and in the meantime Otho preached on market-days to attentive audiences of the country people. His first converts were two youths, the sons of an influential man named Domuzlav. Their mother, who had been brought up as a Christian, was delighted at finding that they had been baptized, and by her the servants of the family, with many of their kindred and neighbours, and at length Domuzlav himself were brought over to the faith. The boys themselves, by celebrating the kindness, munificence, and charitable labours of the bishop, as contrasted with the behaviour of the heathen priests, persuaded many of their own age to become converts, and the people were disposed to look on him as a god who had descended among them for the good of their country.

An answer was at length received from Boleslav, who styled himself "the enemy of all pagans", and rebuked the Stettiners for their treatment of Otho, but declared that for his sake, and as an inducement to receive the yoke of Christ, he would remit one-half of the tribute which they were bound to pay. Fortified by this assistance, Otho told the people that he would prove to them the impotence of their gods. After having received the holy Eucharist, he and his clergy made a general attack on the idols, which fell without resistance, and the effect of this success was heightened by the disinterestedness with which he refused to accept any share of the vast wealth of the principal temple. The triple head of Triglav, the Slavonic Neptune, was sent as a trophy to pope Honorius, and the temple was converted into a church, dedicated to the martyr St. Adalbert. A splendid black horse, which had been employed to decide questions of peace and war by walking over nine lances laid on the ground, was sent into another country for sale, "as being fit rather for a chariot than for prophesying"; and the priest who had the charge of him—the only person who ventured to oppose the general movement—was suddenly struck dead. The people of Julin—a town which claimed Julius Caesar as its founder, and reckoner among the objects of its idolatry a rusty spear which was said to have been his—fulfilled their promise by conforming to the example of Stettin. Two-and-twenty

thousand of the inhabitants received baptism; and Otho, after having built two churches there and having appointed a bishop, returned to Bamberg, where he arrived on Easter-eve 1125.

Otho again visited the scene of his missionary labours in 1127 or 1128, when he sailed down the Saale and the Elbe, and entered the country from the west. At Demmin, he ransomed and baptized many Leutician captives whom duke Wartislav had taken, and thus made an impression which was strengthened by the duke's commendations of his wealth, his greatness, and his disinterested zeal. As he advanced into the country, he found that the rapid successes of his former labours had not been lasting. The number of clergy had been insufficient, and the heathen party had used all possible means to recover their influence. At Wolgast the people had been exasperated against the missionaries by the trick of a priest who dressed himself up, and, showing himself to a rustic in a wood, declared himself to be the old god of the country. At Stettin a mixed religion, "after the manner of the Samaritans", had been established. A priest had taken advantage of an unfavourable season, attended by disease among men and cattle, to assault the altar of St. Adalbert; but the hand which held his hammer fell powerless. On this he exclaimed, "It is useless to strive against the Germans' god; let us worship both him and our old gods"; and a heathen altar had been erected beside the Christian altar. As Otho was preaching, a burly and loud-voiced priest excited the people to fall on him; but, as they lifted up their spears, their arms were stiffened in the air. Then Otho proceeded to discourse on the power of the true God, and at his blessing the use of the stiffened limbs was restored. The pagan altar was demolished; and the catching of a fish so large that all the people of Stettin partook of it was regarded as setting the seal of heaven on their reconversion. At Julin a man, on being reproved by one of the missionaries for reaping on the festival of the Assumption, said, "Yesterday we were forbidden to reap because it was the Lord's day, and today we are again told to be idle. What is the meaning of this religion, which bids us cease from good and necessary things? or when shall we get our harvest in?". But as he began to cut his corn, he fell down dead, and his wife, who had followed his example, was unable to unloose her hold either on her sickle or on the corn which she had grasped, until after her husband had been buried. In addition to the effect of his preaching and of his alleged miracles, Otho was powerfully aided by the support of the duke of Poland, and by prevailing on him to give up a projected invasion of Pomerania he increased his own influence among the people. The conversion of Pomerania, rapid, wholesale, and in part effected by force, could not but be very imperfect; yet from the time of Otho's second mission the country always retained its profession of Christianity. After an absence of somewhat more than a year, Otho returned to Bamberg, in obedience to a summons from the emperor, and he died in 1139.

Among the designs which Otho entertained was that of a mission to the heathens of Rügen. The chief idol of these people, Swantevit, was worshipped with human sacrifices; no merchant was allowed to trade on the island until after having made some offering to the god; and so strongly were the Rugians attached to their religion, that, on being informed of the conversion of Stettin, they broke off all intercourse with the traders of that city, sank such of their ships as were within reach, and threatened to kill any missionaries who should venture to land on their shore. One of Otho's companions, named Ulric, resolved to brave the danger; but he was thrice driven back by storms, and Otho himself was unable to make any attempt. In 1135 the Rugians agreed to receive Christianity from the Danes on condition that Swantevit should be spared; but as soon as the Danish fleet was gone, they drove out a bishop who had been left among them, and resumed their profession of paganism. It was not until 1168 that the paganism of the islanders was overcome by the arms of Waldemar, king of Denmark, and by the skilful management of Absalom, then bishop of Roskiel, to which see the island was subjected by Alexander III. But the annalist of Magdeburg speaks of the Christianity thus "impressed" on the Rugians as "a shadow, which in a short time was done away with by Waldemar's avarice, and by the scantiness and inactivity of the teachers".

In the neighbouring country, where the Christian king Gottschalk had reigned in the preceding century, the progress of the gospel was urged on by the power of the emperor Lothair, of Albert the Bear, marquis of Brandenburg, and Henry the Lion, of Saxony, while it was resisted by the discontent of the Slavonic population at the sway of their German masters. At one time a formidable insurrection was excited by the exactions of Norbert, as archbishop of Magdeburg; churches were destroyed, the Christians were slain or driven out, and the people loudly declared that they would rather die than again become Christians. During the general fervour against infidels in 1147, while Lewis and Conrad led their hosts to the East, and other crusaders fought the Moors in Spain, a crusade was set on foot against the pagans of north Germany, under Henry the Lion, and Albero, archbishop of Hamburg. The country was invaded by two German armies, which are reckoned at 60,000 and 40,000 respectively; and two rival claimants of the Danish crown combined for the holy cause. But the war was carried on with little spirit, and was ended by the submission of the Slaves to receive a nominal baptism.

In this region the most eminent preacher of the gospel was Vicelin, a pupil of Anselm of Laon, and afterwards a Praemonstratensian, who was consecrated as bishop of Oldenburg, and laboured with single-minded zeal from 1121 until disabled by palsy two years before his death, which took place in 1154. When required by Henry the Lion to do homage for his bishopric, Vicelin was strongly dissuaded by the archbishop and clergy of Hamburg. “We submit to the emperor”, they said, “because by this submission to one we gain the power of ruling over many; for what duke or marquis is there who does not desire to become the church’s vassal, whether it will or no?”—but they urged that to do homage to a duke would be a degradation of the church. After some hesitation, however, Vicelin complied, in order to ensure Henry’s support; and Frederick Barbarossa afterwards bestowed on the duke authority to nominate and invest bishops for all the Slavonic territory which had been subdued by his ancestors or himself. In consequence of this grant, Vicelin’s example was followed by his successor, Gerold, and by the bishops of Ratzeburg and Mecklenburg, “for His sake who humbled himself for us, and that the newly-planted church should take no damage”; but on the fall of Henry, in 1180, Frederick withdrew the three bishoprics from their subjection to the dukes of Saxony. As great numbers of the Slaves had perished in war, many Germans, Hollanders, and Flemings, were brought in to supply their places; and this contributed powerfully to establish the profession of Christianity in those regions.

CHAP. XII.

SECTARIES—VISIONARIES

ALEXIUS COMNENUS receives from his daughter Anna the title of “thirteenth apostle”, for his zeal against the Paulicians of Thrace, who, in addition to then heterodoxy, had offended him by deserting him in his wars with the Normans of Southern Italy. Under the same emperor another remarkable party attracted for a time the attention of the Byzantine government.

The Euchites or Massalians, who derived their name from their practice of praying, are mentioned among the sects of the fourth century by Epiphanius and Theodoret, and are said to have held that every man has within him from his birth an evil spirit, who is to be kept down only by unceasing prayer. The party had been generally supposed to have been long extinct; but in the eleventh century it either emerged again from obscurity, or a new sect, known by the same name and holding similar opinions, arose independently. These later euchites, being persecuted by the Greeks, sought a vent for their opinions among the Bulgarians and Slaves who bordered on the empire; and they now, perhaps with opinions somewhat affected by contact with the Paulicians, attempted, under the name of Bogomiles, to regain a footing at Constantinople.

The new name of these sectaries has been variously derived—from Bulgarian words which might refer to their frequent prayers for the divine mercy; and as meaning in Slavonic “Friends of God”. In many respects their opinions resembled those of the early Gnostics. God, they said, had two sons, the elder of whom, Satanael, was associated with Him in the government of the world, until for rebellion he was cast down from heaven, with a third part of the angelic host, who had shared his crime. Satanael, like the demiurge of gnosticism, framed the world, and created man, on whom God, at his entreaty, bestowed a living soul. But Satanael became jealous of the privileges granted to his creature, and in the form of a serpent he begat Cain; in consequence of which he was stripped of the divine form which had until then been left to him, and of his creative power. Continuing his enmity against mankind, he gave the law by his servant Moses, and deluded the Jews into the belief that he was the supreme God. But in the 5500th year of the world, God in compassion sent forth his Son or Word, the archangel Michael, as to whose birth and humanity the doctrine of the sect was docetic. Satanael, like the demiurge, instigated the Jews to persecute and slay the Christ; and after the Son's resurrection he was punished by being deprived of the which he had retained as part of his name, and thus was reduced to Satan. It was held that the Son and the Spirit (who was said to be begotten by the Son) would be reabsorbed into the Godhead when their work in relation to man should be completed; but that in the meantime respect should be paid to Satan and his angels, although not out of love, but lest they should do hurt. It was said that God, although immaterial, had the form of an old man with a flowing beard; that the Son appeared as a bearded man, the Spirit as a smooth-faced youth; and under these forms the bogomiles professed to see them in dreams and visions. As in older heretical systems, it was taught that men are by nature of various classes; and it was held that at death the body is to be shaken off as an unclean garment, and is to be annihilated for ever.

In their worship the bogomiles were distinguished by a simplicity which has in later times raised up champions to deny their manifest heterodoxy. They disparaged the sacraments of the church—maintaining that its baptism was but the baptism of John, whom they despised as a teacher of legality; and that the Eucharist was a sacrifice of devils, whom they supposed to dwell in all consecrated buildings. They professed to have a true baptism of their own,

which they administered to converts, with other rites of gradual initiation into their mysteries. For the Lord's supper they substituted the repetition of the supplication for daily bread; and, while they objected to prayers in churches, their own devotions consisted of repeating the Lord's prayer in stated numbers (as two or fifteen) and at stated times. They denounced images and relics, and paid honour to the memory of the iconoclastic emperors. They disparaged the saints of the church, and, although they admitted the miracles done by the relics of saints, they supposed these to be wrought through the power of evil spirits. They were enemies to all learning, classing "grammarians" with the Jewish scribes. They rejected much of Holy Scripture, and, when pressed with texts from those books which they admitted, they escaped by allegorical explanations of them. They maintained the lawfulness of disguising their tenets, on the ground that our Lord enjoined on us an outward conformity to authorities which we disapprove, and that his own parables are instances of disguise. In their appearance and manners they affected a monastic solemnity and austerity; yet with this it need hardly be said that, as in all similar cases, their enemies accuse them of combining not only abominable rites, but gross licentiousness.

This sect had made great progress among the subjects of Alexius, when his attention was called to it by public rumour. On this, he ordered some suspected persons to be seized; and one of these, Diblatius, was brought by torture to avow himself one of twelve apostles sent out by Basil, the chief teacher of the bogomiles. Basil, who is described as a physician, was a man far advanced in life; it was said that he had spent fifteen years in learning his system, and fifty-two in teaching it. The emperor, having caused him to be arrested, affected to treat him with great reverence, admitted him to his own table, and professed a wish to receive instruction from him; and after some hesitation Basil fell into the snare. In a secret chamber of the palace, he was drawn into unfolding his doctrines to Alexius and his brother; and, when the exposition was complete, the emperor, drawing aside a curtain, showed him a scribe who had noted down his words. The doors of the room were then opened, and the heresiarch found himself confronted with the patriarch, the senators, and the clergy of the city. As it was impossible to deny the truth of the written report, he strongly asserted the truth of his opinions, and declared himself willing to endure innumerable deaths for them. After this scene, all who were suspected of heresy were seized, and were brought before the emperor in a place where two great fires had been made, one of them having a cross beside it. Alexius told them that they were all to be burnt, but desired that those who held the orthodox faith would range themselves under the cross, since it would be better to die in orthodoxy than to live under suspicion of heresy. After this not infallible test, all who had chosen the side of the cross were set free; the others were imprisoned, and were plied from time to time with inducements to recant. Many of them died in prison; but Basil alone, on whom repeated conferences made no impression, was condemned to the flames, and, after having in vain expected an angel to appear for his deliverance, suffered in the hippodrome of Constantinople.

The opinions of the bogomiles did not die out with Basil. In the reign of Manuel similar doctrines were taught by Constantius Chrysolalos, and by a monk named Nephon, whose sway over the patriarch Cosmas was such that for his sake the patriarch submitted to deprivation. Bogomilism was secretly spread by teachers of both sexes; it found adherents among the Greek monks in Egypt, although it does not appear to have made any progress, it excited so much apprehension that the patriarch Eulogius of Alexandria wrote a treatise against it and even after the middle of the thirteenth century, the patriarch Germanus of Constantinople found it necessary to compose discourses in refutation of this obstinate heresy.

WESTERN SECTS

In the West many circumstances concurred to favour the growth of sectarianism. Foremost among these was the corruption of the clergy; and the very efforts of Gregory VII

and others at a reform in the interest of Rome tended, by marking out the defects of the clergy for reprobation, to encourage a spirit of opposition to them. Among other causes which contributed to the same result were the fierce quarrels between the ecclesiastical and the secular powers; the growing pretensions of the hierarchy to authority over the things of this world; the narrowing of the limits of thought allowed within the church; the frequent and scandalous contests of bishops for particular sees; the interdicts and curses which inclined the minds of many to seek from some other quarter the religious ordinances and consolations which the church denied them. Accordingly, we now meet with sectaries in many places, and of various characters.

(1.) TANCHELM. The name of Tanchelm has already been incidentally mentioned. This man appeared in Flanders early in the twelfth century, and the chief scene of his activity was Antwerp, where the people had been prepared to welcome irregular teaching by the circumstance that their populous town was under the charge of a single priest, whose life is said to have been scandalous. The accounts of Tanchelm, as has been truly remarked, have much in common with those of the anabaptists of the sixteenth century. He affected a royal state, being attended by a bodyguard of 3,000 ruffians, wearing a crown, and having a banner and a sword borne before him when he preached. It is said that he claimed a divine character; that hymns were sung to him, that a church was dedicated in his honour, and that the water in which he had bathed was drunk or treasured up by his followers. He inveighed violently against the priesthood and the sacraments; and it is said that he combined with his lofty pretensions not only the practice but the teaching of the grossest licentiousness. The career of this blasphemous and sanguinary fanatic was cut short by a blow on the head from a priest, about the year 1116; and, although the sect did not immediately come to an end, his followers were reclaimed by Norbert about 1124.

(2.) EON. Another fanatical teacher of this time was Eudo or Eon de Stella, who spread his opinions chiefly in Brittany. Although not sprung from the lowest class of society, he is said to have been almost ignorant of the alphabet, and the accounts of him are incredible unless on the supposition that he was insane. He lived in great splendour, ordained bishops and priests, distinguished his chief followers by the names of apostles and of cardinal virtues, and is said to have kept his party together by means of food prepared by the spirits of the air, of which the effect was such that they who had once tasted it became irrevocably attached to the sect. Eon was brought before Eugenius III at the council of Reims, in 1148, and, on being questioned, avowed his belief that he was He who should come to judge the quick and the dead. At the request of the bishop who had brought him to the council, his life and limbs were spared; and the pope committed him to the care Samson, archbishop of Reims, in whose custody he soon after died.

(3.) PETER OF BRUIS. A sectary of a more respectable kind was a priest named Peter of Bruis, whose followers were known by the name of Petrobrusians. After having, for some unknown cause, been deprived of a pastoral cure which he had held, Peter, about the beginning of the century, appeared as an independent teacher in the Alpine dioceses of Embrun, Gap, Digne, and Arles; and, on being driven from that region, he removed into Gascony. There he found a population prepared by the earlier prevalence of sectarian opinions to receive him; he is described as "no longer whispering in hamlets, but openly preaching to multitudes in towns"; and his success, especially in the important city of Toulouse, was such as to astonish those who had been disposed to attribute his earlier successes to the ignorance of the mountaineers whom he had addressed. He vehemently attacked the system of the church in doctrine and in government; his aim was to restore a nakedly scriptural Christianity, without any allowance for change of circumstances, or any consideration for the historical development of ages. Yet it would seem that, while professing to regard scripture as the only source of religious knowledge, he was inclined to discard the Old Testament, and perhaps to retain no part of the New except the Gospels.

The points on which Peter chiefly insisted were five in number: (1) That infants ought not to be baptized, inasmuch as conscious personal faith is necessary in order to receive the benefits of the sacrament. (2) That there ought to be no churches or other places hallowed for worship, forasmuch as the true Church consists of the congregated faithful, and God hears prayer equally wherever it may be offered. (3) That crosses ought not to be revered, but, as being the memorials of the Saviour's sufferings, ought to be dishonoured, broken, and burnt. (4) He not only denied the change of the eucharistic elements into the Lord's body, but held that the sacrament, having been celebrated by our Lord once for all, ought not to be repeated. (5) He taught that prayers, alms, and masses were unavailing for the dead.

The preaching of these doctrines was attended with great effect. Multitudes who had been baptized in infancy submitted to rebaptism; churches were profaned and destroyed; altars were overthrown, crosses were burnt, priests were beaten by excited mobs, and monks were compelled by torture to marry. Once, on Good Friday, Peter caused all the crosses in the town where he was to be thrown into a bonfire, at which he roasted flesh, and then, in disregard of the solemn fast, invited the spectators to partake of it. But the feeling which usually waited on his preaching was not universal; for, after a career of twenty years, he was seized by the populace of St. Gilles in Provence, and, in vengeance for his outrages against the cross, was himself burnt to death. Peter of Bruis was still alive, when the "venerable" Peter of Cluny, in passing through his original haunts, found his opinions largely prevailing there, and thus was induced to compose a treatise, which is almost our only source of information as to the sect. In this book he defends the whole system of the church, although it need hardly be said that his arguments are often of a questionable kind. The preface, written after the heresiarch's death, is addressed to the four prelates whose dioceses were infected, and in it the abbot expresses a hope that they may find his tract useful in argument, which he declares to be the more Christian manner of dealing with heretics, although he holds that, in case of necessity, the secular power may lawfully be called in to coerce them.

In the meantime, as the abbot of Cluny mentions, the heresiarch had found a successor in one Henry, whom some suppose to have been an Italian, and others to have been a Swiss. Henry was a deacon, and had been a member of the Cluniac order. In his habits he still affected the severity of a monk or a hermit, wearing a long beard, walking barefooted even in the depth of winter, living on alms, and professing to limit himself to such things as were merely necessary. Yet Hildebert and Bernard charge him with licentiousness of life, and especially with a fondness for gaming. His eloquence was said to be such that nothing but a heart of stone could resist it, and it was believed that by his mere look he could read the secrets of the heart. He also enjoyed the reputation of learning; but his right to this is denied by his opponents, who allow him no other accomplishments than those of preaching and dicing. The first place at which Henry is described as having made himself conspicuous was Lausanne; and, as we soon after find that opinions closely resembling his were entertained by some persons at Treves and at Cologne, it is probable that he may have visited those cities on his way from Switzerland to Le Mans, where he appeared in 1116. Having obtained from the bishop, Hildebert, permission to preach during Lent, he made use of it to excite the people against the clergy, who were insulted, attacked, and plundered, and were only saved from yet worse outrages by the interference of the civil power. He also made strange attempts at moral reform by encouraging marriages with prostitutes and women of servile condition; and it is said that all such unions were unfortunate in their consequences. During these proceedings, Hildebert had been absent on an expedition to Rome; but on his return he was able, although not without much difficulty, to drive out Henry, who afterwards preached at Poitiers and Bordeaux—everywhere, according to St. Bernard, leaving such an impression that he could not venture to revisit the place. In the south of France he met with Peter of Bruis, and after Peter's death he became the leader of the sect, to whose errors he is said to have made some

additions, although the only further difference from the system of the church that is recorded is a denunciation of the system of chanting.

Peter of Cluny's tract against the Petrobrusians was not without effect. At the council of Pisa, in 1135, Henry was brought by the archbishop of Arles before Innocent II, by whom he was condemned as a heretic, compelled to a retraction, and given over for custody to Bernard, who furnished him with an order that he should be received as a monk of Clairvaux. After a short detention he was set at liberty, on condition that he should not return to his former haunts; but he speedily resumed his labours in the south of France, and with such effect that, as Bernard reports, the churches were soon without people, the people without priests, the priests without due respect; that holy places were reckoned unholy, festivals were neglected, sacraments were scorned, children remained unbaptized, and sinners died without penance or the holy communion. In 1147 Eugenius II, who was then in France, desired Alberic, cardinal-bishop of Ostia, to undertake a mission against Henry, and Bernard, then fresh from his triumphs in preaching the crusade, was persuaded by Alberic to accompany him. Nowhere had the abbot's successes been more signal than on this mission. At Albi, where the people were especially infected with error, the cardinal was received with insult; but when Bernard arrived, five days later, his appearance was hailed with enthusiasm. The cathedral was unable to contain the multitudes which pressed to hear him; and when, after having discoursed on the chief points of difference, he desired that all who preferred the catholic faith to heresy would hold up their hands, every hand in the assembly was raised. Miracles were performed in such abundance that the heretics slunk off in dismay, and wherever Bernard appeared, so great was the excitement, that he was even afraid to encounter the crowds of his admirers. On one occasion, when bread was carried to him for his blessing (as was usual), he declared that, for the decision of the question between the church and the heretics, every sick person who should taste of that bread would be made whole. "If they receive with right faith they will be healed", interposed Geoffrey, bishop of Chartres, who feared that the abbot had been carried too far by his enthusiasm. "That is not what I say", cried Bernard, "but of a truth those who taste shall be healed, that they may know us to be the true and faithful messengers of God!". The miracle is said to have followed and the effect of it was decisive. Henry, driven from the city, had found a refuge among the nobles of the neighbourhood, who, although indifferent to his doctrines, were favourable to him as an enemy of the clergy. But at Bernard's instance he was given up in chains to the bishop of Toulouse. His further history appears to be unknown, and the sect, as a distinct body, seems to have become speedily extinct, partly through the effect produced by a young girl of Gascony, who, about the year 1151, used to lie insensible three days in each month, and, on awaking, to testily eloquently and learnedly against the errors of the Henricians.

(4.) CATHARI. The heretical opinions most widely spread during this time were those of a Manichaean character, which are found from England to the south of Italy, from the Hellespont to the Ebro. Appearances of this kind have already come before us in the early part of the eleventh century. But whereas those appearances, however similar to each other, seem to have been isolated, we now find in the heretics a knowledge of their own numbers and of the wide extent of their communion, with a formidable system of organization. The connection with the East becomes more distinct, and the oriental tone of their doctrine is too plain to be mistaken.

Of the names by which these sectaries were known, the commonest was that of *Cathari* (in Italian, *Gazzari*, and in German, *Ketzer*), as to which, although other derivations have been proposed for it, there appears to be no reason for doubting that it is of Greek origin, and relates to their profession of purity. Among their other names were—*Publicani* or *Poplicani*, which seems to point to a connection with the Paulicians; *Patarini*, a name which, from having belonged to the opponents of clerical marriage at Milan in the preceding century, was now transferred to parties which disparaged all marriage, or perhaps

had come to be used, in forgetfulness of its origin, as a convenient designation for sectaries; *Apostolici*, from their pretension to an apostolical manner of life; *Bonshommes*, a name which was affected by themselves and bestowed on them by those who favoured them; *Bulgari* or *Bougres* which connects them with Bulgaria, but came to bear a meaning of the most odious kind. In Flanders they were styled *Pyphles*, as belonging to the “people” or poorer classes; in the south of France, *Tisserands*, because many of them were weavers; some of them were called after the names of leaders, as the *Arnoldists*, who were probably connected with an “arch-catharist” of Cologne named Arnold; while other names were derived from places—such as that of *Agenenses*, and, at a later time, the more celebrated name of *Albigenses*.

Sectaries who may be identified with the cathari appear during this time in many quarters — at Cologne and Bonn, at Reims and Toul, at Liege, Arras, and other places in Flanders; at Soissons, at Auxerre (where a bishop named Hugh was styled the “hammer of the heretics”), and at Vezelay; at Besançon, and perhaps at Perigueux (although the Manichaeism of the sectaries there is somewhat doubtful). An English writer of the time describes them as numerous in Anjou, but as swarming in Burgundy and Aquitaine. Spain was also infested by them; and in England itself a party of about thirty “Publicans” was discovered at Oxford about 1160. They were all Germans except a female English convert, who afterwards recanted; and all are described as utterly illiterate, with the exception of their leader, one Gerard. These sectaries were examined by a council held at Oxford, in the presence of Henry II, who was especially desirous at that time to give the exiled primate's party no pretext for representing him as favourable to heresy. By the king's command they were branded in the face, severely flogged, and driven out of the town, after which, according to some writers, they perished in the fields by cold and hunger, as the people would hold no communication with them, while other authorities tell us that they were sent across the sea.

In the treatment of such persons in general, the king of England is honourably distinguished from most of his contemporaries; for we are told that while the Publicans were burnt in many places throughout France, king Henry would by no means allow this in his dominions, although there were many of them there; and it would seem that even warnings and calamities, which were represented as miraculous, were unable to change his policy in this respect. In most places where heretics were found, they were committed to the flames under the authority of bishops and princes, or by the violence of the multitude, and it is generally related that they bore their fate with a courage, and even with an appearance of exultation, which were traced to demoniacal influence. Yet there were eminent teachers who took a truer view of the manner in which error should be dealt with, and among these Bernard was conspicuous. In 1146 he received from Everwin, provost of Steinfeld, an account of some sectaries at Cologne, who were divided into two parties—the one unquestionably Manichaeian, while the other seems to have been nearly akin to the Petrobrusians and Henricians. It was through the dissensions of these parties among themselves that they had been discovered; some of them, after a discussion with the clergy, had been hurried away and burnt by the mob; and Everwin expresses his regret for this violence, and asks Bernard to furnish him with arguments and authorities against the errors which he reports to him. In consequence of this application, Bernard composed two sermons on the text, “Take us the foxes, the little foxes, that spoil the vines”. In these sermons he argues zealously against the sectaries, and strongly denounces their peculiarities. But as to the right manner of dealing with them, his opinion is decidedly against persecution and bloodshed. “They are to be taken”, he says, “not with arms but with arguments; and, if possible, they are to be reconciled to the Catholic church, and recalled to the true faith. And that this is the will of Him who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth, appears from its being said, not simply, ‘Take the foxes’ but ‘Take the foxes’ He commands that they be gained for Himself and for his spouse, the church”. The utmost that Bernard would sanction is that obstinate heretics should be

driven away or imprisoned, rather than that they should destroy the spiritual vines. In like manner, St. Hildegard, while she everywhere expresses a strong detestation of heretics, and exhorts the secular authorities to drive them away by confiscation and banishment, adds that they ought not to be slain, “forasmuch as they are God’s image”. And Peter the Chanter of Paris, in the end of the century, condemns both capital punishment of heretics and the use of ordeals for their trial.

In Italy the cathari were to be found even as far south as Calabria. But they were especially numerous in Lombardy, where the heretics of Monteforte had appeared at an earlier time, and from the days of Ariald and Herlembald there had been a strong feeling against the clergy; and there they are described as abounding in cities and in suburbs, in villages and in castles, and as teaching publicly without fear or hindrance. The sectaries of Lombardy were divided into parties—those of Concorrezzo and of Albano mutually excommunicating each other; but with this exception it is said that their congregations were everywhere in communion. Of these churches sixteen are enumerated—in Italy and France, in Slavonia, at Constantinople (where there were one of Latins and one of Greeks), and elsewhere in the east; and it is said that all the rest were derived from those of Bulgaria and Dugunthia. The writer who gives this information reckons the whole number of the sect, including both sexes, at less than four thousand; but it would seem that this estimate was meant to exclude all but the “perfect” or highest grade of them.

But the chief stronghold of these sectaries was in the south of France, where circumstances were very favourable to the spreading of their opinions. The population of this territory were widely different from the northern French, to whom their dialect, the *langue d’oc*, was even unintelligible. Toulouse, the capital, was the ancient seat of the Arian Gothic monarchy, and heresy is said to have always lingered in the region. The nobles were remarkable for their gay and luxurious manner of life, and among them was cultivated a vernacular poetry of love and chivalry, strongly tinged with licentiousness, and unsparing in its satire against the clergy, who had fallen into tastes and habits too strongly resembling their own. The citizens had been enriched by commerce, and had achieved for themselves a degree of political freedom which was elsewhere unknown. The tone of thought and feeling was independent; Peter of Bruis and Henry had found an eager reception among the people, and had paved the way for other teaching hostile to the church. To the more serious, the heresy was commended by its professions of austerity; to those of opposite character, by its enmity to the clergy, and by the indulgence which it allowed to such of its converts as had not yet taken on themselves the obligations of its highest grade. We have already seen that in the beginning of the eleventh century some Manicheans were discovered and put to death at Toulouse. The renewed progress of heresy in the same region had been noticed and denounced as early as the year 1119, when Calixtus II held a council at that city; and the denunciation had been repeated by the Lateran council of 1139, by the council of Reims in 1148, and by that of Tours in 1163—all held under the presidency of popes. In 1165 a conference took place between some bishops and some of the “good men” (as they styled themselves) at Lombers, a little town near Albi; where the sectaries behaved with all the consciousness of strength, defied the sentence which was passed against their opinions, and were allowed to depart without any attempt to extend it to their persons. Some years later, we read of a council held by the heretics themselves at St. Felix de Caraman, near Toulouse, under the presidency of a personage styled “Pope Niquinta”—a name which has been identified with that of one Nicetas, who is said by a writer of the time to have come from Constantinople into Lombardy. A vast multitude of both sexes flocked to receive from this chief the mystical rite which was styled *consolamentum*. Representatives of several catharist churches appeared; bishops were chosen and ordained for these communities; and, with a view to the preservation of harmony among the sectaries, Niquinta told them that all churches were, like the seven churches of

Asia, originally independent of each other; that such was still the case with their brethren of Bulgaria, Dalmatia, and the east; and he charged them to do in like manner.

In 1177 Raymond V, count of Toulouse, addressed a letter to the abbot of Citeaux and his chapter, requesting the assistance of the order against the heretics by whom his dominions were infested. About the same time the kings of France and England—probably at the count's instance—concerted measures for the suppression of the heresy; and at their request Peter, cardinal of St. Chrysogonus, Henry, abbot of Clairvaux, Guarin, archbishop of Bourges, Reginald, bishop of Bath, John, bishop of Poitiers, and others undertook a mission into the affected country. These commissioners describe the heresy as triumphant, not only among the people but among the clergy. On entering Toulouse they were hooted, and were reviled as hypocrites and heretics. They disputed with two leaders of the cathari, who disavowed the chief errors which were laid to their charge, and denied that they had ever taught so. But count Raymond and others deposed that they had often heard them vent those doctrines, and, as they refused to abjure, on the ground that oaths were unlawful, they were solemnly excommunicated. The chief supporter of the heresy at Toulouse, an old man of great wealth and powerful connexions, named Peter Moran, who is said to have been styled John the Evangelist, abjured his errors, and was punished by being repeatedly flogged, amerced in all his property, and sent on pilgrimage to the Holy Land. Roger, viscount of Beziers, on being summoned to expel the heretics, and to procure the release of the bishop of Albi, who was in their hands, withdrew into an inaccessible part of his territories. He was therefore denounced excommunicate in the name of the pope, and was defied in feudal form on the part of the two kings. Many of the sectaries were brought to an abjuration; but this was in some cases only evasive and insincere, and the mission is described by a contemporary as having had little success.

In 1179 the council of Lateran passed a canon against the “Cathari, Patarini, or Publicani”, denouncing all who should favour them, and promising the indulgences and privileges of crusaders to those who should take arms against them. In 1181 Henry of Clairvaux, who at the council had been created cardinal-bishop of Albano, again proceeded into the south of France, as papal legate. His preaching was seconded, not only by miracles in refutation of the heretical opinions as to the Eucharist, but by an army which caused much devastation and bloodshed. Roger of Beziers was compelled to profess that he would show no favour to heretics, and after his death, in 1194, an oath to the same effect was taken by the guardians of his son, Raymond Rogers. Lucius III, in conjunction with the emperor Frederick, sent forth from Verona in 1184 a decree against all heretics, and prescribed measures for the suppression of their errors. But we shall see hereafter that, notwithstanding all the measures both of persuasion and of force which had been employed, the heresy continued to retain its hold on the population of Languedoc.

The leading principle of these sectaries was dualism; but, while some held this in the full Manichaeian sense of supposing two gods, independent of and opposed to each other, others held a modified opinion, nearly resembling that of the bogomiles—that the creator of evil was himself created by the good god, and had fallen from his first estate by rebellion. The creation of the elements was by some ascribed to the good god, and by others to the bad; but all agreed in referring the division of the elements, and the formation of the world from out of them, to the bad god; and from the imperfection of the world—from the fire which burns and the water which drowns—it was argued that it could not be the work of Him who is all-perfect. The Son of God was said to be the highest angel, and was held to be inferior to the Father, as the Holy Ghost to the Son.

It was said that Adam and Eve were formed by the devil, and had souls of light imprisoned within their fleshly bodies; that the forbidden fruit was carnal intercourse; and that Cain was begotten by the devil. The god of the Old Testament was declared to be cruel, false, and changeable. The angel who foretold the birth of St. John the Baptist was said to have been

sent by the devil, as was also John himself; the baptism of John was of the devil, and whatever was well spoken by him as to Christ, was spoken without his will or understanding. The reality of the Saviour's incarnation was denied by the sectaries in general; by some the blessed Virgin was supposed to be an angel, while some regarded her as an allegorical representative of the church, and others supposed her to have been born of a woman alone, without any human father.

The bodily form of the Saviour, his actions and sufferings, were explained on the docetic principle; the gospel miracles were said to have been wrought in no other than a spiritual sense—such as feeding spiritual hunger, healing the diseases of the soul, or raising from the death of sin; and in this sense the sectaries claimed for themselves a continuance of miraculous power, by virtue of the Saviour's promise.

The later miracles of the church were denied, and members of the sect sometimes threw ridicule on them by applying to some famous worker of miracles for the cure of a pretended ailment, and afterwards exposing the imposture.

The cathari professed an especial knowledge of Scripture, and a reverence for it which excluded all deference to tradition, and to the authority of the doctors of the church. Yet, like many other sectaries whom we have met with, they regarded Moses as an organ of the devil, and disparaged the Old Testament in general, although they made exceptions in favour of such parts of it as are quoted in the New Testament, and some of them seem to have admitted the poetical and prophetic books. They had vernacular versions of the Scriptures, and it is a significant fact as to the origin of the sect that these were based on the Greek. With these, they received some apocryphal books, which were also of eastern origin—among them, an apocryphal Gospel of St. John.

The cathari are said to have held the doctrine of absolute predestination, and to have been traducianists in their opinion as to the soul. By their Manichaean view as to the origin of all visible things they were led to deny the efficacy of Baptism administered with water, and the possibility of any change in the Eucharist. Christ, they said, did not baptize with water, but with the word and the Holy Spirit. They also derided the rite of confirmation, and the whole ecclesiastical system of confession, penance, and excommunication. Yet they had sacraments of their own, which, with a rigour far exceeding the most rigid system of the church, they declared to be absolutely necessary to salvation; so that, from their manner of insisting on rites and works, their adversaries took occasion to charge them with denying the power of faith. Of these sacraments, the chief was the *consolamentum*, which they supposed to be the true baptism of fire—the rite which at once restored to each man for his guide the original heavenly soul which had been lost by the fall, and conveyed the gift of the consoling Spirit or Paraclete. The form of administering this began with the novice's publicly confessing his sins, and professing a desire to give himself to God and the gospel; after which the minister, holding the Gospel of St. John (or, according to some authorities, the whole New Testament) before his breast, pronounced absolution, laid the book on the novice's head, repeating the Lord's prayer seven times, and welcomed him by taking his right hand and kissing him. The administration of this rite was not limited to the clergy of the sect, but might, in case of need, be performed by any one who had received it—even by women. But if it were given by a sinner, it was null; and, in order to guard in some degree against the danger of its invalidity, it was commonly received twice, or oftener. For any grievous sin committed afterwards—such as eating flesh, cheese, or eggs—it was necessary to do penance and to be reconsoled but as to the more venial sins, a sincere confession was regarded as sufficient, and for this purpose there was a solemn monthly confession, styled *apparcilamentum*.

The other sacraments of the sect were—Blessing of Bread (which was performed over their daily food, and by which they supposed themselves to receive the spiritual nourishment of the Saviour's body), Penance, and Ordination. The whole ritual system of the church was condemned; churches were said to be dens of thieves, church bells to be trumpets of devils,

the cross to be the mark of the beast, the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place. Images were denounced, and it is said that, by way of bringing them into contempt, the sectaries painted the saints under an uncomely form, and departed from the traditional type in representing the Saviour's cross. Lights and incense, vestments, altars, chanting, the ceremonies of the mass and of ordination, holy water, relics, pilgrimages, unction of the sick, the doctrine of purgatory, the intercession of saints, the use of aims, prayers and masses for the dead, the festivals of the saints and all other holy days of the church, were utterly disallowed. But the cathari are said to have kept in honour of their founder a festival called *Malilosa*, which is identified by Eckbert of Schonau with the Manichaeian *Bema*, although that was celebrated in March, and the *Melilosa* in autumn.

Their opinion as to the origin of matter involved the denial of the resurrection of the body; and they are said—(although this seems irreconcilable with other opinions imputed to them)—to have held that all sins are equal, and will be equally punished—that “the traitor Judas will fare no worse than the child of one day old”. They denied that the true priesthood was in the Roman church, which they supposed to have been apostate from the time of pope Sylvester, whom they regarded as the Antichrist. The church was the harlot of the Apocalypse; all its ministrations were vain, and the true priesthood was confined to their own communion. But, unless many ancient writers are mistaken, they had a pope of their own in Bulgaria, with whom the western sectaries kept up an intercourse. They had also an order of bishops, under each of whom were two chief assistants, known as his elder and his younger son, and an order of deacons.

The members of the sect were divided into two classes — the *imperfect* or *foederati* (who, according to some writers, were subdivided into *hearers* and *believers*) and the *elect* or *perfect*. The perfect were those who had received the and by the form of admission to it were pledged to great severity of life. They no longer belonged to themselves, but were bound to travel and to labour for the service of the sect; they were to avoid and to renounce marriage, which was declared to be so fatal that no married persons could hope for salvation unless they separated before death; and, as a consequence of the opinion as to the unlawfulness of all sexual intercourse, they were to abstain from eating animals or their productions—fish alone, as coming out of the water, being excepted. And as it was held that penance for sins would be wrought out in this world by means of a transmigration of the soul, it was forbidden to kill all animals, except creeping things, in which it was believed that souls capable of salvation could not be contained.

The cathari reproached the church for assuming that there were various states of life in which men might be saved, and taught that their own sect and state only were lawful. As, in order to salvation, it was absolutely necessary to die in the sect, the *foederati* were required to receive the *consolamentum* on their sick-beds, if not before; many entered into an agreement known as “*la Convenenza*”, that it should be administered to them in their last moments; and some, after having received it, starved themselves to death lest they should be again defiled by a relapse into sin. Besides this, which was styled *endura*, suicide was allowed in various cases, such as that of extreme persecution; and it is said that, in order to obtain for the receivers of clinical consolation a higher place in glory, it was usual for their friends to starve or to strangle them.

Reinerius Sacconi tells us that many of those who had been admitted into the perfect grade, regretted that they had not taken advantage of their former immunity to indulge more fully in sin; that, in consequence of the belief in the all-purifying virtue of the *consolamentum*, the lives of the *foederati* were very lax; and that he himself, during a connection of seventeen years with the sect, had never seen any member of it pray by himself, or show any token of sorrow for sin. Other writers bring against the cathari accusations of magic, incest, and other abominations such as are usually laid to the charge of heretical parties. Oaths, and even affirmations, such as “truly” and “certainly”, were strictly forbidden; it is said that the

“perfect” would rather die than swear, although the “believers” swore as freely as they lied. The use of equivocation was sanctioned, especially in answer to questions as to the sect, so that the opponents of the cathari compare them to eels, “which, the more tightly they are squeezed, the more easily they slip away”. They considered all war and all capital punishment to be murder, and declared the pope and his bishops to be murderers for countenancing wars; and they denounced with especial severity all wars and persecutions for the sake of religion. The “perfect” renounced all property, professing to follow the Saviour and his apostles in poverty, and they were constant in declaiming against the wealth and secularity of the clergy. It is, however, said that they themselves were fond of money, that they practised usury and other unscrupulous means of getting it, and that—partly from avarice, and partly from a disbelief in the efficacy of alms towards salvation—they were uncharitable to the poor. The graver invectives against the clergy were relieved by the performance of ludicrous parodies on the services of the church.

The zeal of the cathari in attempting to gain proselytes was indefatigable. They distributed little tracts in favour of their opinions—sometimes leaving them on the mountains, in the hope that shepherds might find them and might carry them to the clergy to read. The missionaries of the sect disguised themselves, changed their names, and assumed the character of catholics, that they might enter into disputation with avowed catharists, and might allow these to gain the appearance of victory. In order that they might have the arts of disputation at their command, young men of promising abilities were commonly sent from Lombardy and Tuscany to acquire dialectical and theological knowledge in the schools of Paris. The members of the sect were made known to their brethren by letters of recommendation and by secret signs; even their houses were distinguished by marks which enabled the initiated to recognize them. Their hospitality to members of their own community was unbounded, as we learn especially from a letter written by a person who, affecting the character of a brother, had lived on them for some years—being recommended by one congregation to another, from Lombardy to the Danube, and partaking of the luxuries which they enjoyed in secret. The rigid lives (in appearance, at least) of the perfect produced a strong impression on those who saw them, so that many of them even gained a high reputation for sanctity. Thus, after the death of one Armanno Pungiluppo, at Ferrara, in 1269, the Ferrarese demanded canonization for him on the strength of his holy life and of miracles which he was said to have done, and the claim was supported not only by the canons of the cathedral, but apparently by the bishop. The investigation of the case lasted for no less than thirty years; but at length it was clearly proved that Pungiluppo, while professing to forswear the patarine errors with which he had at one time been charged, had continued to be in reality an active official of the sect; and, although the canons had almost to the last adhered to his cause, Boniface VIII, decreed in 1301 that his body should be taken up and burnt as that of a heretic, and that an altar which had been erected to him, with all pictures and sculptures in honour of him, should be destroyed.

(5.) PASAGINI. Among the minor sects of the time, the Pasagini, of northern Italy, may be mentioned on account of the opposite nature of their errors in some respects to those of the cathari. By some, the name of these sectaries has been deduced from their unsettled manner of life; by others, from *pasagium*, a common term for the crusades, by means of which expeditions it is supposed that their opinions were brought into the west. Like the Manichæan heretics, the *pasagini* denied the unity and the equality of the Divine Persons, and condemned the Roman church; but, in marked opposition to the catharist doctrines as to the Old Testament, they maintained the abiding obligation of the Mosaic law—of circumcision, the sabbath, and the distinction of clean and unclean meats.

(6.) WALDENSES. The early history of the Waldenses has been obscured by two opposite parties who identify them with the Albigenses—the one party with a view of involving Waldenses as well as Albigenses in a common charge of Manichæism, while the

other party regards the Albigenses, no less than the Waldenses properly so called, as free from Manichaeian error, and as the inheritors and maintainers of a pure and scriptural Christianity. By the supporters of this latter view, the name of the sect is derived from the *valleys* of Piedmont, where its faith is supposed to have been preserved and transmitted from the time of the apostles by a chain of witnesses, among whom Vigilantius, in the fourth century, and Claudius of Turin, in the ninth, are conspicuous. The Waldenses themselves, in the thirteenth century, professed to have existed as a distinct body from the time of pope Sylvester I—when they supposed that the poison of secularity had been poured into the church by the imaginary donation of Constantine—or even from the days of the apostles. But such pretensions are contradicted by the unanimous testimony of writers who lived soon after the origin of the sect—that it was founded by one Waldo or Waldensis, about the year 1170. And the only connection of their name with valleys in the early writers is of a figurative kind; as where one tells us that they styled themselves Vallenses from sojourning in the *vale* of tears, or where another derives the name of *Waldenses* from their dwelling in the deep and *dense valleys* of darkness and error.

Peter Waldo, a rich merchant of Lyons, is said to have been deeply impressed by the death of one of his fellow-citizens, which took place at a meeting of the chief inhabitants of the place. His mind being thus turned to spiritual things, he became desirous to understand the Gospels which he had been accustomed to hear in church; and he employed two ecclesiastics, Stephen of Evisa (or Ansa), and Bernard Ydros, to translate them into the vernacular tongue, with other portions of scripture and some passages of the fathers, which were regularly arranged under heads. Struck with the idea of imitating our Lord and His apostles in voluntary poverty, Peter threw all his wealth to the poor, and, in company with some associates of both sexes whom he had gained, he began to preach in the streets of the city, and in the neighbouring villages. But the archbishop of Lyons, on hearing of these proceedings, forbade Peter and his friends to teach; and on receiving the answer that they must “obey God rather than man”—that the Saviour had commanded them to “preach the gospel to every creature”—he excommunicated them, and expelled them from his diocese. On this, Peter, who had no intention of separating from the church, but aimed at the revival of what he supposed to be apostolical purity within it, sent two of his party to Rome, with orders to exhibit to Alexander III some specimens of their translations from the Scriptures, and to request his sanction for their labours. The subject was referred by the pope to a commission, and Walter Map, archdeacon of Oxford, who has left an account of the proceedings, was appointed to examine the Waldenses. Their simplicity and their ignorance of theological language excited the laughter of the examiners, and their application to the pope was ineffectual, although the Lateran council, which was sitting at the time, did not include them in its condemnation of heretical parties. In 1184, however, those who falsely style themselves *humilliati*, or “poor men of Lyons”, were, with other sectaries, put under perpetual anathema by Lucius III; and it would seem that to them the pope intended especially to point in his denunciation of some who, under an appearance of piety, presume to preach without being duly sent, so that the condemnation was not for heterodoxy, but for irregularity.

From this time the “poor men of Lyons” (as they were called from their claim to evangelical poverty of spirit) became more decidedly separate from the church, and their opinions were more distinctly developed in opposition to it. They spread into the south of France, into Lombardy, and into Aragon, wherein 1194 Alfonso II issued a decree for their expulsion as enemies of the cross and of the kingdom. The earliest real evidence which connects them with Piedmont is of the year 1198, when James, bishop of Turin, obtained from the emperor Otho IV authority to use forcible measures against them. The progress of the sect was rapid. In Lombardy and Provence the Waldenses had more schools than the Catholics; their preachers disputed and taught publicly, while the number and importance of the patrons whom they had gained rendered it dangerous to interfere with them. In Germany we are told

that they had forty-one schools in the diocese of Passau, and they were numerous in the dioceses of Metz and Toul. In most of these quarters the ground had been prepared for them by the labours of earlier sectaries, and by the faults and unpopularity of the clergy; and their zeal in endeavouring to gain converts was unremitting. Female agency was largely employed, and through it the men were won “as the serpent deceived Adam by means of Eve”. The missionaries of the sect are said to have used underhand arts for the purpose of spreading their doctrines; thus they would disguise themselves as pedlars, and having in that character obtained access to the houses of nobles, they took occasion from the nature of their wares to exhort to the purchase of heavenly jewels. With the simpler people, they began by promising to disclose great things to them; and, after having tried their secrecy by imparting to them some plain lessons of morality with a confidential and mysterious air, they went on to teach the more peculiar doctrines of the sect. Their eagerness to study and to learn, and their remarkable acquaintance with the vernacular Scriptures, are acknowledged by their adversaries. Labourers and artisans, after the work of the day, devoted their evening hours to study; and it is stated, in reproof of the indolence of the clergy, that a poor Waldensian used to swim across a river in wintry nights to reach a catholic whom he wished to convert. They taught and learned everywhere—even in lazar-houses. If any ignorant person met their exhortations to learn by pleading inability, they told him that, by learning a single word daily, he would in a year master more than three hundred. But the knowledge of the sectaries was not of any wide or scholarly kind, so that they are often derided for their illiteracy, through which it is said that they fell into ludicrous misinterpretations of Scripture and as they were themselves illiterate, they made their ignorance a ground for condemning all “privileged” or liberal studies. It is said, too, that in consequence of their occupation in the study of Scripture, they allowed but little time for devotion, and that they admitted no other form of prayer but the Paternoster.

The especial peculiarity of the Waldenses was that, while they avoided the Manichaeism by which the sectaries of their time were for the most part infected, they endeavoured more thoroughly than the Petrobrusians or the Henricians to form a system of belief and practice derived from the Scriptures only. At first their distinctive tenet had been the right of the laity to preach; and this they gradually carried out to the extent of maintaining, not only that lay persons might teach in subordination to the authorities of the church, but that they might preach and might administer all Christian rites in opposition to the clergy; that the right to minister was not conferred by ordination, but depended on personal piety. In the early days of the sect this claim was not limited to the male sex; but it would seem that the ministrations of women were afterwards forbidden. From this principle the Waldenses proceeded to a general enmity against the clergy, whom they charged with having cast them out of the church from envy of their virtue and popularity, and decried in all possible ways. After their excommunication, they declared the pope to be the source of all error, the church to be the apocalyptic beast and the whore of Babylon; that it had been apostate, and had lost its spiritual power, from the time of Sylvester, whom they identified with the “little horn” of Daniel’s prophecy, although they held that in all ages there had been some who maintained the true faith, and were inheritors of salvation. They limited salvation to their own sect, as being the only body which lived like the Saviour and his apostles. They declared monks and clergy to be the scribes and pharisees, children of the devil, disallowed all distinctions of order and rank among them, and wished to confiscate all their endowments and privileges, so as to reduce them to the condition of diggers, earning their bread by the labour of their hands. Yet, while they themselves professed rigid evangelical poverty, and avoided the pursuits by which wealth might be gained, it was held that the teachers were entitled to be maintained by the “imperfect” members of the sect and some of their opponents represent them as notorious for idleness, and for a love of basking lazily in the sunshine.

Like the cathari, the Waldenses opposed the whole ritual system of the church, with everything that pretended to a symbolical character, and denied the claims of the clergy to the powers of excommunication, absolution, and exorcism. They also disallowed the right of the church to make laws or constitutions, alleging that the Saviour's teaching was enough. They attended the public services, confessed and communicated, but it is said that in their hearts they mocked at such observances. They denied the efficacy of baptism, especially in the case of infants, whom they believed to be saved without it. As to the Eucharist, some represent them as supposing it to be merely figurative; but according to other authorities they held that the elements really underwent a change—not, however, in the hands of the priest, but in the mouth of the faithful receiver. In the consecration, as in the rest of their services, they made use of the vernacular tongue. They denounced the penitential system of the church, as alike burdensome and unavailing, and contrasted with it the full and free forgiveness which their own sect offered, after the example of the Saviour's words, "Go, and sin no more". They denied the doctrine of purgatory, and the lawfulness of the practices connected with it—some of them believing in an intermediate state of rest or of punishment, while others held that souls on leaving the body go at once to their final abode. They denied the miracles of the church, and pretended to none of their own, although in later times some of them professed to see visions.

The Waldenses are described as quiet, modest, and formal in their manners. They regarded a lie as a mortal sin, which no circumstances could excuse; but it is said that they avoided answering directly, and had "feigned consciences" which suggested ingenious evasions to them. They eschewed commerce on account of the falsehoods which were supposed to be involved in the practice of it, and restricted themselves to manual labour. As to oaths, war, and capital punishment, their views agreed with those of the cathari. At the outset they affected poverty of dress, and one of their names—or—was derived from the sandals which they wore in imitation of the apostles but such peculiarities were afterwards abandoned, and they are described as grave but not sordid in their attire. They avoided and sternly denounced the ordinary amusements of the world; "every step that one takes at a dance", it was said, "is a leap towards hell". They were scrupulous in the use of blessings before and after meals. Unlike the cathari, they held it lawful to eat meat, even on days when it was forbidden by the church and they held marriage to be lawful, although they regarded celibacy as higher.

Much as the Waldenses differed from the church, it is admitted by their ecclesiastical opponents that they were "far less perverse than other heretic", that they were sound in their faith as to the doctrines which relate to God, and received all the articles of the creed so that, in the south of France, they were sometimes allied with the clergy in defence of these truths against Manichaeism and other sectaries. While they highly exalted the gospel above the law, it was in no spirit of Manichaeism disparagement of the older scriptures. And, although they did not escape the popular charges of secret and abominable rites, or the imputation of hypocrisy, the general purity of their morals is allowed by their opponents.

From the sectaries of this age the transition is easy to the visionaries who were among its remarkable features; for, however devoted to the papacy these might be, they agreed with the sectaries in denouncing the secularity of the clergy, in crying out for a reform, and often in prophesying their downfall. Among the most noted of these visionaries were two German abbesses—Hildegard, of St. Rupert's near Bingen, whose name as already come before us, and Elizabeth of Schonau. Elizabeth appears to have been of a very nervous temperament, and was frequently visited with illness. It is said that, from the age of twenty-three, she was in the habit of falling into trances on Sundays and holidays, at the hours when the church was engaged in its most fervent devotions. In these trances she uttered oracles in Latin, although unacquainted with that language; and, after having long refrained from telling the visions with which she was favoured, she was at last constrained by the threats of an angel, and by the

authority of her ecclesiastical superior, to dictate a report of them to her brother Eckbert—the same who has already been mentioned as a controversialist against the cathari. In her visions she was admitted to behold the saints, the angelic hierarchy, and the blessed Virgin—whom she speaks of by the title of “Queen of Heaven”—and from them she received revelations on difficult and doubtful points. Among other things, she is said to have learned, after much inquiry, that the mother of our Lord was “assumed” both in body and in soul; she contributed to the legend of St. Ursula, by giving names to many of the newly-found relics of the 11,000 virgins; and in connection with that fabulous company were revealed to her the existence and the history of a fabulous pope Cyriac, who was said to have resigned his dignity that he might share in their travels and their martyrdom. In a letter to Hildegard, Elizabeth complains that forged prophecies were circulated under her name; among them, that she was reported to have foretold the day of judgments. Both Hildegard and Elizabeth, although they were devoted to the Roman church, and have, without any formal canonization, attained the honour of sainthood, were strong in their denunciations of the faults of the clergy and Hildegard foretold that these would be punished by heavy chastisements, of which the heretics were to be the instrument. Such prophetesses as these nervous and enthusiastic women had a powerful influence on their age but it is probable that the writings which bear their names have been largely tampered with, or in great part composed, by those through whose hands they have passed.

The most famous and the most remarkable of all the visionaries was Joachim, a Calabrian, who was born in 1145 (or, according to some, as early as 1130) and died in 1202. In his youth he was introduced by his father to the court of Roger II of Sicily; but in disgust at the courtly life he broke away, and went on a pilgrimage to Egypt and the Holy Land, where he distinguished himself by the severest ascetic exercises. On his return he became an inmate, and afterwards abbot, of Corace, a Cistercian monastery near Squillace; and, after a time of solitary retirement and study, he founded the abbey of Fiore, near the confluence of the Albula and the Neto, which became the head of a new and very rigid order. Although Joachim's opinions did not pass without question among his contemporaries, he exercised a powerful influence over important persons both ecclesiastical and secular. His labours on the obscurer parts of Scripture were encouraged and approved by three successive popes—Lucius, Urban, and Clement. Richard of England and Philip of France, on their way to the Holy Land, held conferences with him at Messina, when it is said that Richard was greatly impressed by the prophecies which he professed to have derived from the Apocalypse, and in 1191 he threw himself in the way of Henry VI with such effect that the emperor was persuaded to desist from his ravages and cruelties, and requested him to expound the prophecy of Jeremiah.

Joachim is described as remarkable not only for piety, but for modesty. The gift which he claimed was not that of prophecy, but of understanding. This gift, however, was supposed to have rendered him independent of the ordinary means of learning, for it is said that, until supernaturally enlightened, he was wholly illiterate, and hence it was natural that he should denounce the method of the schoolmen, whose attempts to attain to spiritual knowledge by means of their own reason he likened to the efforts of the men of Sodom to break in the door of Lot's house—the house of contemplation. Thus he was led to make a violent attack on Peter Lombard's doctrine as to the Trinity, and to draw on himself in consequence the censure of the fourth Lateran council, as having vented a heresy which savoured of tritheism. With his doctrine of the Trinity, however, was connected one of the chief parts of his prophetic system—the doctrine of the Three States, in which the government of the world was conducted by the three Persons of the Godhead respectively. These states were not wholly distinct in time; for one was said to begin when another was at its height, and as the earlier state ended, the next attained to its height of “fructification” or “clarity”. Thus, the first state, in which men lived according to the flesh, began with Adam, reached its clarity in Abraham, and ended with Zacharias, the father of St. John the Baptist. The second state, which is

divided between the flesh and the Spirit, began with Elijah, and reached clarity in Zacharias; the third began with St Benedict, and its clarity—the outpouring of the Spirit upon flesh—was to be at the end of the forty-second generation from the Nativity—in the year 1260. The character and mutual relation of these states were illustrated by a variety of comparisons. In the first, the mystery of the kingdom of God was shown as by stars in the darkness of night; the second was as the dawn, and the third as the perfect day. The three answered to the respective attributes of the Divine Persons—power, wisdom, and love. The letter of the Old Testament was of the Father; the letter of the New Testament, of the Son; and, as the Holy Ghost proceedeth from both the Father and the Son, so under His dispensation the spirit of both Testaments would be manifested. The first was the state of slavery; the second, of filial service; the third, of friendship and freedom. There was first the state of married persons; next, that of clerks; lastly, that of monks, hermits, and contemplatives. The three were respectively typified in St. Peter, who represents the power of faith; in St. Paul, the representative of knowledge; and in St. John, the representative of love and contemplation, who was to tarry till his Lord should come. According to this system, the world was on the eve of a great change; the first sixty years of the thirteenth century—the last years of the forty-two generations between the Incarnation and the consummation of all things—were to be a middle period; and in the last three years and a half of this time Antichrist would come. It is said that Joachim told Richard of England that Antichrist was already born at Rome; and that the king replied that in that case he must be no other than the reigning pope, Clement. But Joachim looked for Antichrist to arise from among the patarines, and expected him to be supported by an antipope, who would stir him up against the faithful, as Simon Magus stirred up Nero.

Against the existing clergy Joachim inveighed in the strongest terms; and he especially denounced the corruptions of the Roman cardinals, legates, and court, while he spoke with peculiar reverence of the papacy itself. He regarded Rome as being at once Jerusalem and Babylon—Jerusalem, as the seat of the papacy; Babylon, as the seat of the empire, committing fornication with the kings of the earth. For he regarded the German empire with especial abhorrence, and denounced all reliance of the church on secular help; the bondage of the church under the empire was the Babylonian captivity; the popes, in relying on the king of France, were leaning on a broken reed which would surely pierce their hands.

On account of the connexion with the Byzantine empire, as well as of its errors as to the Holy Ghost, he very strongly censures the Greek church, which he compares to Israel, while the Roman church is typified by Judah; yet, in accordance with that comparison, he supposes the eastern church to contain a remnant of faithful ones, like those seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal. The only merit which he acknowledges in the Greeks is, that among them the order of monks and hermits originated. These he considers to be figured in Jacob, while the secular clergy are as Esau. The seculars were to perish as martyrs in the final contest with Antichrist; and after his fall the monks would shine forth in glory. Thus the papacy was to triumph, but its triumph was to be shared by the monks only; and Joachim's view of the final state of liberty and enlightenment, through the immediate agency of the Holy Spirit, excluded the need of any human teachers.

That Joachim's works have been largely tampered with appears to be unquestioned; and this was the case with a passage in which he was supposed to have foretold the rise of the Dominican and the Franciscan orders. In its original shape the prophecy contained nothing beyond what might have been conjectured by his natural sagacity; he speaks of two men who are to begin the contest with Antichrist, and he seems to expect that these will arise from among the Cistercians. But in its later form the two individuals become two new orders, which are to preach the “everlasting gospel”, to convert Jews and Mahometans, and to gather out the faithful remnant of the Greek church, that it may be united to the Roman; and the characteristics of the Dominicans and Franciscans are marked with a precision which proves

the spuriousness of the passage. And as, of the two new orders, the Franciscans are preferred, it would seem that the forgery is rather to be traced to them than to the Dominicans.

That there was much danger in Joachim's speculations is evident, although he protested that his belief was entirely in accordance with that of the church; yet it would be a mistake (however natural) to suppose that he meant to represent Christianity itself as something temporary and transitory. For he speaks only of two Testaments, which, according to him, were to be followed, not by a third, but by an enlightenment as to the meaning of the two. And his reputation, supported on one side by papal approbation of his works and of his order, while on the other side it was disparaged by the general council's condemnation of his doctrine as to the Trinity—continued to be of a mixed and doubtful kind. Notwithstanding that the gift of miracles, as well as that of prophecy, was claimed for him, an attempt to procure his canonization at Rome in 1346 was unsuccessful but he has obtained at the hands of the great Florentine poet a place among the beatified spirits in Paradise.

CHAPTER XIII.
SUPPLEMENTARY.

I.
THE HIERARCHY

By the labours of Gregory VII and his followers the papacy was exalted, not only in opposition to the secular powers, but in its relations to the rest of the hierarchy; and the continual increase of its influence over the whole church was unchecked by those frequent displays of insubordination among the subjects of its temporal power which compelled the popes of this time to be in great part exiles from their city. While emperors, instead of confirming the elections of popes, as in earlier ages, were fain to seek the papal confirmation of their own election—while they and other sovereigns were required to hold the pope's stirrup, to walk as grooms by the side of his horse, and to kiss his feet—while it was taught that to him belonged the "two swords", that kingdoms were held under him, and that the highest earthly dignities were conferred by him—the principles of Gregory went beyond those of the False Decretals by making St. Peter's successor not merely the highest authority in the church, but the sole authority—all other spiritual power being represented as held by delegation from him. Thus Innocent II told the Lateran council of 1139 that all ecclesiastical dignity was derived from the Roman see by a sort of feudal tenure, and that it could not be lawfully held except by the pope's permission. We have seen that an oath of fidelity to the pope was exacted of St. Boniface, when sent as a missionary bishop into Germany; and in other special cases such oaths had been sometimes required. Now, however, an important change was introduced by Gregory, who in 1079 exacted of the patriarch of Aquileia a new episcopal oath, which was in part modelled on the oath of secular fealty, and which thus implied a feudal dependence of the bishop on the pope, as the source of all his powers. By Gregory himself this was not imposed on any others than metropolitans and his own immediate suffragans; but in no long time it was exacted of all bishops, who now professed to hold their office not only "by the grace of God", but also by that "of the apostolic see". In some instances Gregory appeared to scruple as to interfering with the ancient right of metropolitans to consecrate their suffragans; and even later popes thought it well to make courteous apologies for having invaded the metropolitan privileges by such acts. But Gregory's council of 1080 had decreed that the election of bishops should be approved by the pope or the metropolitan and, as bishops-elect became more and more disposed to flock to Rome (especially in cases of disputed election, as to which the popes claimed an exclusive right to decide, and in most cases established it before the end of the century), the power of confirmation and consecration was gradually transferred from the metropolitans to the pope alone.

The exercise of penitential discipline was also now assumed by the popes in a greater degree, although they still make occasional professions of respecting the rights of the local bishops. The fondness for appealing to Rome in every case is a subject of complaint, not only on the part of princes, such as Henry II of England, but of such ecclesiastics as Hildebert of Tours and Bernard. Gregory VIII complained of being distracted by needless appeals, and tried to check the practice; but his pontificate was too short to have much effect. As excommunication deprived of the power of appearing in ecclesiastical courts, bishops and archdeacons sometimes resorted to it as a means for the prevention of appeals; but this was forbidden by the Lateran council of 1179.

But it was not by appeals only that causes were transferred from the provinces to the Roman court. There was a tendency to carry questions at once to the pope—passing over the local authorities to whose jurisdiction they in the first instance belonged and the reservation of “greater causes” to the pope alone became more and more injurious to the rights of the bishops and metropolitans. Among these causes were canonization, which (as we have already seen) was for the first time reserved to the holy see by Alexander III, and dispensations as to marriage, oaths, translation of bishops, and other matters. Dispensations, in the sense of a license given beforehand to do something which was forbidden by the laws of the church, had been unknown in earlier times, when the only kind of dispensation granted was a forgiveness of past irregularity. But now popes began to claim the right of granting dispensations beforehand, and of exercising this power in all parts of the church, concurrently with the local bishops. In this, as in other things, the tendency of the age led men to apply to the pope or to his legates rather than to their own bishops; and thus by degrees the pope’s authority in such matters, from having been concurrent with that of the bishops, was established as exclusive by Innocent III.

Among the means of enforcing the idea that all ecclesiastical power belonged to the pope, the system of legation was the chief. In former times, the only representatives whom the popes had maintained in foreign countries were their “apocrisiaries” at Constantinople, or at the court of the earlier Frankish emperors at a later date, such legates as were sent forth were employed only on special occasions, and for some particular business. But from the time of Leo IX legates were appointed with commissions unlimited either as to the nature of their business or as to the duration of their power; and this system was developed by Gregory VII so that every country had its regular legate—whether one of the local prelates, or an emissary sent directly from the papal court. These legates, according to Gregory, were to be heard even as the pope himself. It had before been held that the pope, on personally visiting a country, might summon the bishops to a council; and now this power was extended to the legates, in contempt of the authority of the metropolitans. The legates acted everywhere as the highest authorities, although themselves perhaps in no higher order than that of deacon or subdeacon. They cited metropolitans and all bishops under pain of suspension, deposed bishops, wrested cases from the ordinary courts, and threatened the vengeance of the pope against all who might oppose them. Yet the alliance of these Roman emissaries was so important to bishops, and especially in strengthening them against the secular power, that few bishops dared to provoke their enmity. The assumption, the rapacity, the corruption of the legates were excessive and even proverbial. They were authorized to draw their maintenance from the countries which they passed through, as well as from those to which they were destined, and no limits were set to the demands which they were allowed to make for procurations, so that John of Salisbury speaks of them as “raging in the provinces as if Satan had gone forth from the presence of the Lord for the scourging of the church”.

Bernard, in a letter to a cardinal-bishop of Ostia, has given a remarkable picture of another cardinal, named Jordan, in the character of legate to France—“He has passed from nation to nation, and from one kingdom to another people, everywhere leaving foul and horrible traces among us. He is said to have everywhere committed disgraceful things; to have carried off the spoils of churches; to have promoted pretty little boys to ecclesiastical honours wherever he could; and to have wished to do so where he could not. Many have bought themselves off, that he might not come to them; those whom he could not visit, he taxed and squeezed by means of messengers. In schools, in courts, in the places where roads meet, he has made himself a by-word. Seculars and religious, all speak ill of him; the poor, the monks, and the clergy complain of him”. In some cases sovereigns obtained a promise from the pope that legates should not be sent into their dominions without their consent, but such promises were sometimes broken, and were more frequently evaded by committing the business of legates to persons who were styled by some other title; while, on the other hand, kings

sometimes excluded or expelled legates from their territories, or made them swear before admittance that they would do no mischief.

The pretensions of popes with regard to councils rose higher. Princes now no longer convoked such assemblies as in former times; indeed the emperors had no longer that general sway which would have procured for any order of theirs obedience from the subjects of other sovereigns. The councils of Piacenza and Clermont were summoned by Urban II on his own authority, in reliance on the general excitement in favour of the crusading cause. For such a step the ground had been laid by Gregory's summoning bishops from all quarters to his lenten synods at Rome; and in the new episcopal oath there was a promise of attendance at all councils to which the bishop should be cited by the pope. The claims which had been set up for the popes in the False Decretals were now more than realized; for it was held that provincial councils required the pope's authority, not only to confirm them, but to summon them, and it became usual that papal legates should be the presidents. And for all such assemblies there was the dread of an appeal to Rome, with the knowledge that appeals were likely to be favourably entertained. Towards councils themselves, also, the pope's tone became higher than before; thus Paschal II, in answer to the objection that the new episcopal oath had not been sanctioned by any council, declares that the pope is sufficient without a council, although a council is not sufficient without the pope.

A sort of infallibility now began to be claimed for the popes—chiefly on the ground of our Lord's words to St. Peter, "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not". Yet this official infallibility was not supposed to secure the pope against personal errors; and Gratian goes so far as to declare that certain words of Gregory II are utterly opposed, not only to the canons, but to the doctrine of the Gospels and of the apostles..

In consequence of the agitation excited by Hildebrand, the election of bishops fell into the hands of the clergy, and more especially of the canons of cathedrals. It was, indeed, admitted by the hierarchical writers that, according to the precedent of early times, the laity ought to have some part in the election. But those whom such writers were willing to admit as representatives of the laity were the great retainers and officers of the church; the sovereign was declared to be shut out from all share in the choice and, after the pattern of papal elections, which were now confined to the cardinals alone, the election of bishops came to be regarded as belonging to the cathedral clergy exclusively. It was found, however, that the change in the manner of appointment, instead of doing away with that corruption which had been the subject of such indignant denunciations, had only the effect of transferring it from courtiers to canons; and in its new form it worked worse than before, inasmuch as the clergy might choose a bishop with a view of benefiting by his defects, or might make a bargain with him which would be more injurious to the church than any that could be made by a layman. Jealousies, intrigues, and disputed rights, which led to long and ruinous suits, and sometimes to actual war, now became rife, and Frederick Barbarossa had probably good reason for declaring in a well-known speech that the bishops appointed by the imperial power had been better than those whom the clergy had chosen for themselves.

In many countries, however, the sovereigns still retained their influence. In France, England, and Spain, the king's licence was necessary before an election, and his confirmation of the bishop-elect was also necessary; while in the Sicilies, Hungary, Denmark, and Sweden the kings still enjoyed the power of nomination. The appointment of archbishops of Canterbury was the subject of struggles which were renewed at every vacancy, as, in addition to the claims of the king and of the monks of the cathedral, the bishops of the province claimed a share in the election. The most remarkable of these contests was perhaps that which followed on the death of Becket's successor, Richard. The bishops made choice of Baldwin, bishop of Worcester, but the monks refused to concur in this, and pretended to an exclusive right of election, which, they said, had been confirmed to them by the king in penitence for the death of St. Thomas. This claim was asserted with such obstinacy as to provoke Henry to

exclaim that the prior of Canterbury, Alan, wished to be a second pope in England; but after a long contest, and much skillful management on the part of the king, it was contrived that some representatives of the monks, who had been summoned to Westminster, should, after declaring the election by the bishops to be null, independently elect the same person on whom the choice of the bishops and of the king had already fallen.

Sovereigns no longer ventured to found bishoprics without the consent of popes; but they strongly resisted the attempts of the popes to parcel out their dominions by new foundations or new arrangements of sees. Yet we have seen that Henry the Lion, of Saxony, although his rank was not that of king but of duke, took it on himself to erect bishoprics in the north of Germany, to nominate bishops, and to grant them investiture.

The question of investiture, after the long contests which it had occasioned, was settled by means of compromises. We have seen how this was arranged in England, and by the concordat of Worms; and also that in 1119 the form of investing by ring and staff was not used in France. But the substance of investiture still remained. A distinction was drawn between *homagium* and *ligium*— the former implying general faithfulness and obedience, while the other included an obligation to serve the feudal lord “against all men who may live or die”; and it was held that the episcopal homage, being unencumbered with this last condition, was lawful. The name of investiture was applied to the ceremony of homage, and Bernard himself speaks of such investiture as unobjectionable. Hugh of Fleury wrote a tract with the intention of mediating between the claims of the church and of the state. He holds that temporal as well as spiritual power is derived from God; that the priesthood, although higher in order than royalty, cannot claim earthly dignity; and that bishops may rightly be invested with their temporalities by princes, although the investiture with ring and staff, as being the symbols of spiritual office, ought to be reserved for the metropolitans. And, although some bishops were disposed to claim an exemption from feudal duties, even such popes as Alexander III and Innocent III acknowledged that in regard of their temporalities they were liable to the usual feudal obligations, and were subject to the courts of their liege lord.

In this age popes began to interfere with the patronage of ecclesiastical dignities and offices throughout the western church, the earliest instance being a letter of Adrian IV to the bishop, dean, and chapter of Paris, as to the bestowal of a canonry on Hugh, the chancellor of Lewis VII. The favoured objects of the papal requests (*preces*) were styled *precistoe*, but, as the requests were the less likely to meet with attention in proportion as their number was unreasonably increased, the more peremptory form of a mandate was adopted—at first as an addition to the requests, and afterwards as a substitute for them. And until a suitable preferment should fall vacant, the patrons were desired to provide out of their own funds a pension for the person recommended to them. When, however, sovereigns attempted any practices of the same kind, the popes were naturally vehement in denouncing them. As yet the papal recommendations, while interfering with patronage, admitted that it rightfully belonged to the prelates, chapters, or monastic societies to whom they were addressed. But in the next century this came to be denied, and the revenues of the church in countries north of the Alps—most especially in England—were preyed on by a host of Italians, forcibly quartered on them by the popes.

RELATIONS OF CHURCH AND STATE

In France the growth of the royal power affected the relations of the state with the church. Philip Augustus was sovereign of a territory twice as large as that of Philip I, and the kingdom had advanced very greatly in culture and in wealth. The kings were getting the mastery over their great vassals, and, although in their struggle against these they had been allied with the clergy, they now put forward new pretensions of dignity against the hierarchy

itself; thus Philip refused to do homage for certain lands held under the church, like the former tenants, the counts of Flanders, on the ground that the king must not do homage to any one. On the other hand also the bishops lost, both in Italy and in France, by the rise of the municipal communities. The amount of this rise, indeed, was less in France, where the towns were less populous and more distant from each other, where they were not aided by the influence of the clergy, and, instead of being able to combine their energies against one common foe, each town had, as its first necessity, to carry on a feud with some neighbouring noble. All, therefore, that the French communes as yet claimed was civic freedom—not such independence as the Italians achieved. In many cases bishops were the lords from whom emancipation was desired; and, while some struggled against the movement, others accommodated themselves to it. Sometimes they sold privileges to the citizens; sometimes they freely granted them; while in many cases, especially under Philip Augustus, privileges detrimental to the power of the bishops were granted by the sovereign, on condition of payments to the royal exchequer. By means of friendly arrangements with the citizens, indeed, the bishops were able to secure these as allies against the neighbouring nobles; but, although they still retained their high rank in the state, much of the power which had formerly belonged to their order had now passed into the hands either of the sovereign or of the commonalty.

When Gregory VII propounded his doctrines as to the relations of the ecclesiastical and the secular powers, the imperial cause found many champions among the clergy. But after a time it began to be understood how advantageous the hierarchical pretensions were to the whole clerical body—that the greatness of the pope, as the Hildebrandine system represented him, was reflected in a degree even on the most inconsiderable ecclesiastic. When, too, it was believed that all secular power emanated from the pope, there was less difficulty in believing the same as to spiritual power; and thus, in no long time, the clergy in general were possessed by ideas which ranged them on the side of the papacy in its differences with temporal sovereigns.

The claims of the church as to matters of judicature were continually growing. In this respect the popes made a great step by exempting crusaders from all power of civil magistrates, and by forbidding that they should be sued for debts; and this measure, which was allowed to pass unquestioned amid the general enthusiasm for the holy war, became a foundation for other pretensions, which, if they had been nakedly advanced in ordinary circumstances, would have encountered a strong opposition. As the church was supposed to have jurisdiction in all matters to which the canons related, the condemnation of any offence by a pope or a council was supposed to bring that offence within the cognizance of the ecclesiastical courts, which thus claimed the power of judging, whether solely or concurrently, of such crimes as incendiarism and false coining. These courts also claimed exclusive jurisdiction in all cases relating to wills, marriages, and usury; and this jurisdiction was extended by ingenious subtleties. Thus, under the head of usury, a vast number of commercial transactions were brought within their cognizance, and all dealings with Jews were considered to belong to the province of the ecclesiastical courts. In like manner, if a contract were ratified by an oath, a breach of contract became perjury, and a subject for these courts; and on the ground that the vassal took an oath to his lord, an attempt was even made in France to claim for them a right of deciding questions as to fiefs, although this attempt was checked by Philip Augustus and his nobles. When a French council had forbidden the sale of corn on Sunday, it was held that all cases as to the sale of corn were matter for the ecclesiastical tribunals, because the first question in such cases was the inquiry on what day the sale took place. And such extensions of the province of the spiritual courts were made with general approbation, as these were usually less violent in their processes and in their sentences than the secular courts; while ecclesiastics found an inducement to encroach on the business of the secular judges, not only in the increase of their power, but in the fees and other payments which were transferred to them. But the multiplicity of business which was thus brought into the hands of the clergy

became, as St. Bernard complains, a temptation to neglect their more proper pursuits; and many canons were passed to check their fondness for acting as advocates, even in the secular courts. The claim advanced in England, that the church should have exclusive jurisdiction over clerks, and in all cases relating to them, has been mentioned in connection with the name of archbishop Becket. In other countries, too, similar pretensions were set up; but it was soon found that in their full extent they were too monstrous to be admitted, and compromises were made, by which, while a large immunity was secured for the clergy, they were yet not to be exempt from the secular magistrates “for man-slaying, theft, arson, or such like common crimes which belong to the pleas of the sword”.

The change introduced into the functions of archdeacons as to the administration of the church has been already mentioned. But now these officers began to set up pretensions to an increase of dignity and influence. Whereas they had formerly attended on the bishops in their visitations, and, if they themselves visited, it was merely as the delegates of the bishops, they now claimed for themselves independent rights of visitation and jurisdiction; they tyrannized over the clergy, and defied the episcopal authority. In some cases, where a new see had been formed by the subdivision of a diocese, the archdeacons attempted to exercise jurisdiction over the bishops; but this claim was disallowed by the popes, who also found it necessary in other respects to check the assumption and rapacity of the archdeacons. When, however, an archbishop of Canterbury attempted to exempt some places from the jurisdiction of archdeacons, Alexander III forbade this innovation. The advantages of the office continued, as in former times, to attract the desires of laymen, and canons were passed that no one under the order of priest or deacon should be allowed to hold an archdeaconry. Laymen who for the sake of gain desire such an office, says Innocent II, are not to be called archdeacons, but archdevils.

The exactions of archdeacons and rural deans were the subject of many complaints, especially as to the matter of penance, in which they are described as making a gain of sins. John of Salisbury, in a letter to Nicholas de Sigillo on his appointment to the archdeaconry of Huntingdon, amusingly reminds him of the terms in which he had formerly spoken of archdeacons as a class excluded from the hope of salvation by their love of money, which led them to lie and plunder, and to “eat and drink the sins of the people”. From the time of the council of London in 1108, canons were passed with a view of checking such practices. Bishops at length attempted to get over the annoyance which they experienced from the archdeacons, by erecting new courts of their own, on the principles of the canon law, and by appointing persons with the title of officials to preside in these, while they employed “vicars” or rural deans to assist them in their pastoral work. But here again corruptions crept in; for it was soon complained that the bishops made a gain of the new offices by selling them or letting them for hire, and thus compelling the holders to indemnify themselves by extortion; and Peter of Blois (himself an archdeacon) speaks of the officials by the significant name of “bishops’ leeches”.

In the following century, we find that the practices of archdeacons in England are still complained of, as to exacting money, burdening the clergy with the expense of entertaining an unreasonably large train of their men and horses at visitations, preventing the peaceable settlement of disputes in order to profit by the expenses of litigation, and allowing persons who had been guilty of grievous sin to compound for their offences by pecuniary payments.

The decrease of gifts to the church has been noted at an earlier date. It seems to have been thought that the endowments were already ample, and the wealth of the clergy and monks, with the corruptions which were traced to it, formed a constant theme of complaint for sectaries, for reformers such as Arnold of Brescia, for visionaries like Hildegard and Joachim, and for satirical poets who now arose in Germany, France, and England. Yet the church’s possessions were still increasing by other means. Many advantageous purchases, exchanges, or other arrangements were made with crusaders who were in haste to furnish themselves for

the holy war. Much was also acquired by bequest; and the influence of the clergy with persons on their deathbed, together with the circumstance that all testamentary questions belonged to ecclesiastical courts, rendered this an important source of wealth, although in some countries the civil powers already began to check such bequests. And a new species of contract, by which a landowner made over his property to the church, on condition that he should receive it back in fee, was also a means of adding to the possessions of the clergy. For, although these *feuda oblate* differed from the *precariae*, inasmuch as the fief was granted to the donor's heirs as well as to himself, the church not only derived some present advantages from such arrangements, but had a chance of seeing the lineal heirs become extinct, and so of coming eventually into undivided possession of the property.

Tithes were also made more productive than before. It was laid down that they were due on every kind of trade and on military pay; the commentators on such laws even held that the obligation extended to the receipts of beggars and prostitutes. It was, however, found impossible to enforce these rules to the full; and, although Gregory VII designed the entire recovery of such tithes as had fallen in the hands of laymen, he found it necessary to give up this intention, in order to secure the alliance of the nobles, which was essential to him in his enterprise against the power of sovereigns. The Lateran council of 1179 declared the holding of tithes by laymen to be perilous to the soul, and forbade the transfer of them to other laymen, under penalty of exclusion from Christian burial for any who should receive them, and should not make them over to the church; but this canon (whatever its intended meaning may have been) came to be interpreted as forbidding only transfers and fresh alienations of tithes,—the idea of recovering that which was already alienated being apparently given up. Yet in this time many laymen were persuaded to surrender the tithes which they had appropriated, although in such cases the tithes were often given to a monastery, or to some clerk other than the rightful owner.

First fruits—a thirtieth or a sixtieth part of the produce—began also now to be claimed.

But while others complained of the wealth of the clergy, the clergy were incessantly crying out against spoliation. The advocates subdivided their power by appointing vice-advocates; and these deputies, with a great train of inferior functionaries attached to them, rivalled their chiefs in oppressing the churches which they professed to defend. The advocates built castles not only on that portion of the church's land which was allotted to themselves, but on any part of its lands; their exactions, both from the church and from its tenants, became heavier and heavier, so that in some cases the tenants were reduced to beggary. Canons were passed to check these evils, but with little effect; and when Urban III attempted to do away with the office of advocate in Germany, he found that the emperor Frederick, although favourable to a limitation of the power of the advocates, was opposed to the abolition, and that the bishops were not prepared to support it. The evil pressed no less on monasteries than on cathedrals, and various means were tried to overcome it. Some churches or monasteries acquired the right to remove their advocates—a right, however, which could not always be readily enforced; some bought them off, or were able to bring them under a measure of restraint by the help of the sovereign while others, in despair of all human aid, instituted solemn daily prayers for deliverance from the tyranny of these oppressive protectors.

Nor were the advocates the only lay officers who preyed severely on the funds of churches and monasteries. Great nobles, and even sovereign princes, enrolled themselves among their officials in order to share in their revenues. Thus, at Cologne, the ten gates of the city had for their guardians five dukes and five counts, to each of whom an annual allowance of 2,000 silver marks was paid for his services; and even the emperor Frederick submitted to become truchsess or seneschal of Bamberg cathedral, as the condition of obtaining certain lands to be held under it.

By these exactions, and by the necessity of maintaining soldiers for their feuds, the bishops were heavily burdened, and were frequently obliged to incur debts to a large amount. They had lost their old control over the division of the church's income, and had now under their management only the lands assigned for their own maintenance; and these they charged with their debts, to the impoverishment of the see. This practice, however, was forbidden by decrees of Conrad III, of Frederick I, and of Henry VI.

REGALE. JUS EXUVIARUM.

The claims of sovereigns to the *regale* and to the *jus exuviarium* excited much contention. By the first of these was meant the right to enjoy the income of vacant sees—a privilege which in Germany did not extend beyond one year, while in England it seems to have been limited only by the king's will; and both in France and in England, although perhaps not in Germany, to this was annexed the disposal of all patronage belonging to the vacant see. The origin of this custom in France is traced to the circumstance that in the seventh and eighth centuries, when dukes or counts seized on the property of a vacant bishopric, the king often intervened to rescue it from their hands; and hence arose the idea that the king himself, as chief advocate of the church, was entitled to the custody and the profits of vacant sees. It is, however, uncertain at what time the claim was established in France. However it may have originated, the *regale* was now grounded on the feudal system, by which a vacant fief reverted to the liege lord, until again granted away by him; and monasteries were subject to this exaction during the vacancy of the headship.

By the *jus exuviarium* was meant the right to inherit the furniture and other property of deceased bishops. In early times it had been held that a bishop might dispose by will of his inherited property, but that any savings out of his official income belonged to the church. Hence the money which was found in a bishop's coffers, and the furniture of the episcopal house, were usually shared among the clergy of his cathedral, and the successor, on taking possession of his residence, found nothing but bare walls. It is easy to conceive that, in lawless ages, such opportunities of plunder attracted the rapacity of the nobles; and in the tenth century we find the council of Trosley, and Atto, bishop of Vercelli, complaining that, on a bishop's death, his goods became the prey of his powerful neighbours. In this case, therefore, as in that of the *regale*, the intervention of kings for the prevention of worse evils became the foundation of a claim. In France and Germany this privilege was fully established in the twelfth century, and when Frederick I defended it against Urban III, even the refractory archbishop Philip of Cologne admitted that the emperor's claim, although unbecoming, was not unjust. In some cases the *jus exuviarium* belonged to the great vassals; and it was mutually exercised by the archbishops of Lyons and the bishops of Autun. In England both the *regale* and the *jus exuviarium* were introduced by William Rufus, who abused his power very scandalously in this respect.

In this age an attempt was made for the first time by the clergy to procure an exemption from taxation for secular purposes, such as contributions towards the national army. Urban II, at the council of Melfi, in 1089, enacted that the laity should not make any exaction from the clergy, either on account of their benefices or of their inherited property; and that any clerk holding a possession under a layman should either provide a deputy to discharge the duties connected with it, or should give it up. The object of this was to render the clergy entirely independent of the state, and it was natural that such a scheme should be strenuously opposed, not only by sovereigns, but by nobles, who saw that any burdens which might be thrown off by the clergy must necessarily fall on themselves. The claim to exemption, therefore, could not be maintained; and the third Lateran council contented itself with an anathema against the arbitrary and unequal manner in which the clergy had very

commonly been assessed, as compared with other classes, in cases of taxation for public works or for maintenance of soldiers.

But while the popes attempted to exempt the clergy from national and local imposts, they themselves taxed them very heavily, under the pretence of a war against the infidels, or for some other religious purpose, such as the maintenance of a pope in opposition to a rival claimant of the apostolic chair, or to an emperor who withstood his power. The “Saladin’s tithes” was at first resisted by the clergy and monks, on the ground that their prayers were their proper and sufficient contribution towards the holy cause; those who fight for the church, said Peter of Blois, ought rather to enrich her with the spoils of her enemies than to rob her. But the popes enforced this tithe, and continued to exact it long after the necessity which gave rise to it had come to an end.

The moral condition of the clergy in general during the twelfth century is very unfavourably represented, alike by zealous churchmen, such as Gerhoh of Reichersperg, by satirists, like Walter von der Vogelweide and the author of “Reynard the Fox”, and by sober observers, such as John of Salisbury. “The insolence of the clergy”, says Bernard, “of which the negligence of the bishops is mother, everywhere disturbs and molests the church”. Among the causes of their deterioration may be mentioned the constant struggles between the popes and secular princes, the frequent internal troubles of kingdoms (such as the long anarchy of Stephen’s reign in England), and the disorders produced by the crusades. Bishops also contributed not a little to the discredit of the clerical body by the growing abuse of ordaining clergy without a title. Gerhoh speaks of many of these *acephali* as being very learned, but regards them as a sort of centaurs—neither clerks nor laymen—enjoying as they did the ecclesiastical privileges without being bound by ecclesiastical duties. But it would seem that the great mass of them were chiefly distinguished, not for their learning, but for their disorderly and disreputable lives. Attempts were made to check the practice of ordination to the higher degrees, at least, without a title and with this view the third Lateran council enacted that any bishop who should ordain a priest or a deacon without a title should be bound to maintain him until he were provided with a maintenance from some church. But this rule was open to many evasions—some bishops even frustrated it by requiring the candidate for ordination to swear that he would never become chargeable to them—and it proved utterly ineffectual. Nor did any better success attend some attempts to keep the acephalous clerks in check by a revival of the ancient letters of communion.

The encroachments of the popes on the power of the bishops had also a large share in producing the decay of discipline; for now that the popes held themselves entitled to interfere with every diocese, not only by receiving appeals, but by acting as judges in the first instance, the bishops were deterred from exercising discipline by the fear of a mandate from Rome, which might forbid them to judge or might reverse their sentence.

As in earlier times, there are many complaints of lay-patronage; of the employment of stipendiary chaplains, as exercised without the sanction of bishops, and tending to withdraw the clergy from episcopal superintendence; of pluralities, which grew to an enormous extent, so that, while the third Lateran council denounces the practice of accumulating six or more churches on one incumbent, we are told that some clerks had as many as twenty or thirty, and the preferments enjoyed by Becket while as yet only a deacon would seem to have exceeded even this ample measure. But of all pluralists, in England and probably in the whole church, the most rapacious was John Hansel, who served Henry III in the following century as chaplain, counsellor, judge, and soldier, and is said to have enjoyed benefices to the value of four thousand marks a year.

The promotion of boys to ecclesiastical offices and dignities continued in defiance of all the protests of Bernard and other eminent men, and of frequent prohibitions by popes and councils; some bishops, it is said, not only allowed nobles to thrust boys into spiritual preferments, but themselves made a profit of the abuse by pocketing the income during the

incumbent's minority. And, notwithstanding the war which Gregory VII and his school had so rigorously waged against simony, the practice still continued. As on the one hand the definition of simony became more refined, so that under this name were forbidden not only all payments for spiritual offices, but even fees for the lessons of cathedral and monastic schools, so on the other hand the scholastic subtlety was more and more exercised in devising distinctions by which the condemnations of simony might be evaded. While the popes professed a zeal for the suppression of this offence, they themselves were continually accused of it; some of them, indeed, are said to have so notoriously bought their office that they can be vindicated only by the desperate expedient of asserting that the pope cannot be guilty of simony. And nothing could exceed the corruption of the Roman *curia*, which, in order that it might be equal to dealing with the increase of business that was referred to the pope, was newly organized with a staff of ravenous officials. The schemes of Gregory for delivering the church from secular influence had resulted in the secularization of the church itself.

The worldly occupations, amusements, and habits of the bishops and higher clergy were the subject of frequent complaints. The German prelates in particular were so much involved in secular business—leading, for the most part, the lives of great nobles rather than of clergymen—that Caesarius of Heisterbach reports a clerk of Paris as having on this account questioned their salvability. In particular, the warlike propensities of bishops would seem to have become more active than ever; for now that the wars against the infidels had consecrated their military service in some cases, the justification of episcopal fighting was not unnaturally extended to other wars. The chroniclers describe with a mixture of admiration and reprobation the exploits of such prelates as Christian of Mayence, who appeared in full armour at the head of armies, and, after having in one battle slain nine men with his spiked club, arrayed himself on the following day in pontificals, and solemnly celebrated a mass of thanksgiving for the victory. Reginald and Philip of Cologne, Absalom of Lund, and many other bishops, are celebrated for their warlike deeds. Hubert Walter, bishop of Salisbury, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, attracted the admiration of the lion-hearted Richard himself by his prowess as a crusader, and after his return found exercise for his military talents in the feuds of his own country. And the story is well-known how Richard, having taken prisoner Philip, count-bishop of Beauvais, met the pope's interference in behalf of the warlike prelate by sending to him Philip's coat of mail, with the scriptural quotation—"Know now whether it be thy son's coat or no".

MARRIAGE AND CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY.

Of all matters relating to the life and morals of the clergy, the question of marriage or celibacy continued to be the chief occasion of complaint and difficulty. The successors of Gregory VII, in endeavoring to carry on his policy in this respect, met with a long and obstinate resistance in many quarters, and as to some points they found themselves obliged to make concessions. Thus, whereas Gregory had forbidden the faithful to receive the Eucharist at the hands of a married priest, Paschal II, on being asked by Anselm of Canterbury whether a person in danger of death might receive from such a priest, replied that it was better to do so than to die without the viaticum; and he added that if a married priest, on being applied to in such circumstances, should refuse his ministry, on the ground of its having been formerly despised, he would be guilty of soul-murder. In like manner, when the knights of the order of St. James asked Lucius III whether they might frequent the churches of married priests, and how they should reconcile the command against attending the mass of such priests with the principle that the sin of the minister does not pollute the ordinances which he administers, the pope replied by distinguishing between notorious sins and those which are hidden or tolerated—telling them that, so long as the church bears with a priest, they might rightly receive the sacraments and other rites from him.

With regard to the sons of priests, too, it was found necessary to deal more gently than the zealots for clerical celibacy would have wished. There was, indeed, a steady endeavour to prevent the transmission of benefices from father to son : and with this view it was sometimes enacted that the sons of priests should not be ordained, unless they became either monks or regular canons; sometimes, that they should not hold the same benefice which their fathers had held, or, at least, that they should not immediately succeed them. But even these prohibitions allow the ordination of the sons of priests under certain restrictions; and even such a pope as Alexander III was always ready to deal tenderly with such cases. In 1161 Richard Peche, the son of a bishop of Coventry, was appointed to succeed his father in the see; and the chronicler Ralph de Diceto, in relating the fact, takes occasion to cite the opinion of Ivo of Chartres, that the sons of priests, if their own life be respectable, are not to be excluded from any ecclesiastical office, even up to the papacy itself.

Notwithstanding the many prohibitions of marriage to persons in the higher orders of the ministry, the decree of the first Lateran council, in 1123, is said to have been the first that dissolved such marriages. In the following year, John of Crema, cardinal of St. Chrysogonus, held a council at Westminster, where he severely denounced the marriage of the clergy, and a canon was enacted against it; but it is said that on the evening of the same day the cardinal was detected in company with a prostitute, and that he was obliged to leave England in disgrace. In 1127 Archbishop William of Canterbury sent forth some strong prohibitions of marriage; but the practice still maintained a struggle in England. In 1129 Henry I, reverting to an expedient for raising money which he had attempted in the primacy of Anselm, imprisoned the housekeepers (who were supposed to be also the wives or concubines) of many of the London clergy, whom he compelled to pay heavily for their liberation and it appears that, both in England and elsewhere, even bishops licensed the cohabitation of the clergy with their wives on condition of an annual payment. The continued marriage of the English clergy is mentioned in many letters of Alexander III and among other evidence of it may be mentioned that of Giraldus Cambrensis, who states that among the parish priests of England the keeping of *focariae* was almost universal, and that the canons of St. David's—especially such of them as were Welchmen—were notorious for their irregularities in this respect, filling the precincts of their cathedral with concubines, midwives, children, and nurses, connecting their families with each other by intermarriage, and transmitting their benefices by inheritance. He tells us also that the like customs prevailed among the kindred people of Brittany.

In Normandy we are told that in the beginning of the twelfth century the priests celebrated their marriages publicly, that they left their benefices to their sons, and sometimes provided in a like manner for the portioning of their daughters. Geoffrey, archbishop of Rouen, in endeavouring to enforce on his province the prohibitions of marriage enacted by the council of Reims in 1119, was violently assaulted, as his predecessor John had been for a similar attempt in the pontificate of Gregory, and his life was in danger in a serious tumult which ensued.

In Spain, where the marriage of the clergy had been tolerated before the submission of the church to Rome, the legitimacy of their children was sanctioned by Paschal II. Didacus (Diego), archbishop of Compostella, endeavored to enforce the new regulations, but in this and in his other attempts at discipline he met with obstinate resistance.

In Germany, the last place which retained clerical marriage was Liège, where, as we have seen, the practice had been defended by the pen of Sigebert of Gemblours. Even so late as 1220 the canons celebrated their nuptials "like laymen", and are said to have paraded their wives in a strange and hardly credible manner.

In Bohemia the first attempt to separate clergymen from their wives was made by a legate in 1143 but the separation was not effected until the time of Innocent III or later. In Hungary, which was affected by the neighborhood of the Greek church, a council of spiritual and temporal dignitaries in 1092 forbade the second marriage of priests,—a prohibition which

implies that a single marriage was regarded as lawful; and on this footing the matter rested in that country until after the middle of the thirteenth century. The imperfectly organised church of Poland was for a long time untouched by Gregory's reforms; the clergy married into the families of the nobles, and even till the thirteenth century their benefices were often hereditary. The earliest attempt to enforce celibacy in Denmark was made in 1123, but was ineffectual. Even the influence of Breakspear, as legate, was unable to establish the system in the northern kingdoms. Eskil of Lund, and other eminent bishops, were themselves married. The apprehension of evils which might arise from the compulsory celibacy of the clergy was, as we have seen, among the causes which produced a formidable outbreak in the end of the century. It appears from a letter of Innocent III that the Swedish clergy professed to have a papal sanction for their marriage; and the practice continued into the thirteenth century. In the remote island of Iceland the license for marriage or concubinage of the clergy took a peculiar form—a payment to the bishop on the birth of every child.

While the legislation of the church was steady in the direction of suppressing the marriage of the clergy, it is remarkable that some of the most eminent writers were very moderate in their opinions on the subject. Thus Gratian, although he takes the view which the church had sanctioned in his time, yet allows the greater freedom of earlier ages to be fully represented in his digest of the ecclesiastical laws. Peter Comestor, a famous professor of Paris, is said by his pupil Giraldus Cambrensis to have publicly taught that the devil had never so much circumvented the church as in enforcing the vow of celibacy; that, although no authority less than that of a general council could set the clergy free in this matter, there is nothing in Scripture to forbid marriage; and that Alexander III would have rescinded the law but for the opposition of his secretary, who afterwards became pope under the name of Gregory VIII. And while, in the following century, Thomas of Aquino declares the celibacy of the secular clergy to be merely of human institution, and differs from the zealots of celibacy in regarding secret marriage as less culpable than unchastity, the younger Durandus of Mende frankly owns the futility of all repressive measures, and suggests that it might be expedient to return to the practice of the early church, as it was still maintained among the orientals.

Among the clergy who were charged with irregularity of life, none were more conspicuous than the canons of cathedrals; and the rise of this class in dignity and importance made their ill example the more mischievous. Ever since the ninth century, canons had endeavored to get into their own hands the independent management of their property; and in this they had generally been successful. The common table and dormitory, which had been parts of the original institution, had fallen into disuse, so that, if the canons ate together on any occasion, it was not in order to fulfill their rule, but to enjoy the extraordinary cheer of a festival. The canons had become proud, luxurious, ostentatious in affecting the fashions of the world as to dress and habits, and utterly neglectful of their ecclesiastical duties, which were in part devolved on hired substitutes. Preferment of this kind was coveted by noble, and even princely, families, as a stepping-stone for their members towards higher dignities, and as affording a comfortable income in the meantime. Not only was illegitimate or servile birth regarded as a disqualification, but in many cases it was required that the canons should be noble by descent on one side, at least, if not (as at Strasburg) on both. Any who without this qualification were appointed by papal provisions, were regarded with contempt by the rest; and sometimes a chapter ventured to withstand even the authority of a pope in defence of its exclusive restrictions. In some cases canonries became hereditary in families.

The canons were no longer content to be styled *brethren*, but were now addressed as *domini*. The elder among them depressed the younger, whom they treated as an inferior class—curtailing their share of the revenues, and in some cases even exacting homage from them. Now that they had got the election of bishops into their hands, the canons made terms beforehand with the future bishop, and, in addition to much individual jobbery, they very commonly extorted from him the right of appointing to places in their own chapter and to

other offices in the church. They affected great independence of the bishops; they attended councils; they claimed all the administration of dioceses, and even of provinces, during the vacancy of sees; and in all their assumptions they were generally supported by their powerful family connections.

The difficulties occasioned by the degeneracy of the canons are the subject of continual papal letters. Many attempts were made to recall them to the practice of living in common and to their other ecclesiastical duties; while some bishops and princes, regarding such attempts as hopeless, ejected the secular canons, and planted in their stead either monks, or canons of the class which was styled regular, and which was distinguished from the seculars chiefly by the renunciation of all individual property. In Germany the seculars had such strength that the only course for reforming bishops was to leave them in possession, and to found new societies of canons on a more rigid footing.

Monasticism—Religious Associations.

The twelfth century saw the rise of several new orders, in addition to those which have been already described. Among them was that of the Carmelites, founded by Berthold, a native of Calabria, who about the year 1180 settled on Mount Carmel—a place to which, from the fourth century downwards, many recluses had been drawn by its connection with the prophet Elijah. But in later times the Carmelites, disdaining to acknowledge Berthold as their founder, professed to trace themselves up to Elijah himself through a line which included the Rechabites and some of the Old Testament prophets; and whereas their oldest rule was really given by Albert, patriarch of Jerusalem, in 1209, they pretended to reckon among their legislators St. Basil, in the fourth century, and John of Jerusalem, the contemporary of St. Jerome. These pretensions led, in the seventeenth century, to a fierce controversy between the Carmelites—chiefly those of Flanders—and the Bollandist hagiologists, who maintained the truth of history; and the war was carried on not only in learned dissertations, but in satirical pamphlets. Innocent XII., in 1698, in accordance with a decision of the Congregation of the Index, attempted to allay the quarrel by imposing silence on both parties under pain of excommunication; but Benedict XIII afterwards countenanced the pretensions of the Carmelites by allowing a statue of Elijah to be erected in St. Peter's among those of the great founders of monachism.

On the expulsion of the Latins from the Holy Land, the Carmelites, who professed to have been warned by the Blessed Virgin to quit their mountain, acquired settlements in Europe, and it is said (although perhaps with exaggeration), that at one time they possessed 7,500 monasteries, with upwards of 180,000 members. The original rule of the order was very rigid; but on leaving Carmel they petitioned Innocent IV for a mitigation of it, on the ground that they were no longer hermits. The pope, accordingly, relaxed it in some respects in 1247; and in the fifteenth century further relaxations were granted. In consequence of this, the order was divided into two branches—the stricter being styled *barefooted* or *observants*, while those who adopted the milder rule were known as *shod* or *conventuals*.

Another order of this time (which has already been mentioned on account of the confusion which its name has sometimes produced between it and the Waldensian sectaries) was that of the *Humiliati*, which seems to have been confined to Lombardy. The origin of this order is traced to some Milanese who were carried off into Germany by an emperor, but were afterwards allowed to return to Milan. In their exile they adopted a strict manner of life, and supported themselves by cloth-weaving; and this occupation was afterwards continued among them—their skill in the art being famous, and much of their cloth being given to the poor. To the secular men and women of whom the society at first consisted was afterwards added an order of monks and nuns; and about 1140 a priest named John of Meda completed the

organization by the addition of an order of priests. The institution was confirmed by Innocent III, who in 1201 provided it with a rule mainly derived from that of St. Benedict, and its members were distinguished for their charitable labours. In the course of centuries, however, the *Humiliati* showed the usual degeneracy. An attempt of St. Charles Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, to reform them provoked a violent uproar, so that his life was even in danger; and in consequence of this the order was abolished by Pius V in 1571.

Among the other orders of the twelfth century may be named that of Fiore, which has been already mentioned in connection with its founder, Joachim and the English order of Sempringham, founded by Gilbert, after whom the members—male and female—were commonly called Gilbertines.

CLUNIACS AND CISTERCIANS

The new orders, being founded in a spirit of reaction from the laxity of those which before existed, were likely to excite the rivalry of their elders; and this rivalry was especially shown in France between the Cistercians and the Cluniacs. The contrast between the black dress of Cluny and the white dress of Citeaux was enough to proclaim at sight the difference of the orders; and, while the Cistercians were not slow to tax the Cluniacs with degeneracy, these retorted by charges of vanity and presumption against the younger society. Hence, about the year 1125, a discussion took place between Bernard of Clairvaux and Peter the Venerable of Cluny—each the chief ornament of his order, each respecting the other, and both free from the more vulgar feelings by which many of their partisans were animated. Bernard wrote his 'Apology' at the suggestion of William, abbot of St. Thierry, a Cluniac, with a view of satisfying those who complained of the Cistercians as detractors. In the outset, he is very severe on such of his own brethren as had indulged in censures on the alleged laxity of the Cluniacs. As men differ in character, he says, so a corresponding difference of usages may be lawful pride and censoriousness are evidences of a want of charity far worse than the slight indulgences which it attacks. He professes a high regard for the order of Cluny, and says that he had always dissuaded those who wished to forsake it for the Cistercian order. But from this Bernard goes on to blame the Cluniacs for their disobedience to the rule of St. Benedict. While admitting the lawfulness of dispensations, he holds that the secular manner of life which prevails in some monasteries is such as no dispensation can warrant. Many of the monks, though young and vigorous, pretend sickness, that they may be allowed to eat flesh; and those who abstain from flesh indulge their palate without limit by exquisite varieties of cookery, while, in order to provoke the appetite, they drink largely of the strongest and most fragrant wines, which are often rendered yet more stimulant by spices. At table, instead of grave silence, light worldly gossip, jests, and idle laughter prevail. The Cluniacs have coverlets of fur or other rich and variegated materials for their beds; they dress themselves in the costliest furs, in silk, and in cloth fine enough for royal robes; and a ludicrous picture is drawn of a Cluniac choosing the stuff for his cowl with feminine care and fastidiousness. This excessive care for the body, says Bernard, is a consequence of the neglect of mental culture. But even more than for their personal luxury, he taxes the Cluniacs for the excessive splendour of their worship, and for the unsuitable magnificence of their buildings. The walls of their churches are adorned, while the poor are left in nakedness; the pictures distract the mind, instead of raising it to devotion; and the monstrous and grotesque carvings which abound are altogether unfit for a religious house. The chandeliers and tree-like candlesticks are of vast labour and cost, and are set with jewels; the pavements are inlaid with figures of saints and angels, which in such a position cannot escape irreverent usage; the sight of the golden shrines in which the relics are encased fattens the eyes and unlooses the purse-strings of beholders. Such things, he says, might be allowable in churches intended for lay worshippers, whose carnal minds may need them; but for monks, who have renounced the

delights of the senses, they are incongruous and unseemly. Bernard also blames the Cluniacs for their exemption from episcopal authority, and for improprating the tithes of parish-churches; and he denounces the pomp of many abbots, who, on going barely four leagues from home, took with them baggage enough for a campaign, or for a journey through the desert—especially of one whom he had seen travelling with sixty horses, and a train sufficient for two bishops.

Peter's defence of his order, written in 1143, although addressed to Bernard, is not a reply to his tract, but to the Cistercian accusations in general. He taxes the Cistercians with breach of the charity inculcated by their rule, and speaks of their white dress as a blamable singularity, whereas the black of the older orders was suitable as an emblem of sadness. He justifies, as far as possible, the Cluniac departure from the letter of the Benedictine rule, which, he says, is beyond what the men of his day could bear; and he adds that the Cistercians sin against charity by the severity of their discipline, which often drives monks to forsake the order, or renders them discontented, and impairs their health. The use of furs and other such materials in dress and bedding, and the abatement of the precepts as to fasting, he excuses under the allowance which the Benedictine rule had made for diversities of climate, and of the discretion which it vested in the abbot; moreover, as coats of skins were given to Adam and Eve not for pride but for shame, the use of furs might serve to remind us that we are exiles from our heavenly country. If the Cluniacs have lands, they are kinder to their tenants than lay landowners; if they have serfs, it is because they could not but accept them with the lands to which they were attached; if they get possession of castles, they turn them into houses of prayer. They may rightly possess tolls, since it was only from the injustice of the toll-gatherer's trade that St. Matthew was called; if tithes were given to the Levites because they had no inheritance, they may rightly be given to monks, who have forsaken all earthly possessions; and if they are given to clerks for their pastoral care, why not to monks for their prayers, their tears, their alms, and their other good works for the benefit of men? As manual labour was prescribed by St. Benedict by way of a remedy against idleness, it is needless when idleness may be avoided by other means; and for men who are weak from the nature of their diet, prayer, study, psalmody, and spiritual labours are more suitable than the works of husbandry. The Benedictine precepts as to receiving strangers and washing their feet could not be literally performed without inconvenience and grievous waste of time; but they are observed in spirits. And whereas the Cluniacs had been censured for being under no bishops, they have the truest and holiest bishop of all, the bishop of Rome, while they have the privilege of obtaining episcopal offices from any bishop of their own choice.

The rivalry between Cluny and Citeaux was exasperated by the circumstance that the general exemption of the Cistercians from tithes affected some lands which had formerly paid tithes to the Cluniacs; and from this collisions frequently arose. In one of these quarrels the Cluniacs burnt down a Cistercian monastery; and the enmity of the two orders outlived both Peter and Bernard.

It would seem that Bernard's *Apology*, written soon after the scandals which the misconduct of abbot Pontius had occasioned among the Cluniacs, contributed to suggest the important reforms which Peter effected in his order. But the Cistercians themselves, although they continued to find eulogists, although their salvation was declared by visions, and although for a time their order was the refuge of spirits which sought a rigid discipline, began early to show symptoms of decay. A prophetess of Lorraine in 1153 addressed to them a letter on their decline in zeal and love. The records of their general chapters contain many significant notices; thus, in 1181 it is said that some monasteries had run into debt by purchasing wine; in 1182 it appears that their rule had been broken by the introduction of painted windows into churches; in 1191 the chapter endeavors to take measures for the removal of the imputations of greediness which had been fixed on the Cistercians. Alexander III found it necessary to reprove them for having deviated from their rule by

possessing farms and mills, parish-churches and altars, receiving fealty and homage, holding the offices of judges and tax-gatherers, and using all their endeavors to enlarge their borders on earth, whereas their conversation ought to be in heaven; and he threatens, if they live like ordinary men, to take away the privileges which had been granted to them in consideration of their extraordinary strictness. Privileges had, indeed, been so largely bestowed on the Cistercians that pope Clement IV, in the middle of the thirteenth century, speaks of these as “against the law of God and man”, and already they had everywhere acquired exemptions like those which Bernard had strongly censured in other orders. Walter Map in the end of the twelfth century speaks of the Cistercians with especial abhorrence, and ridicules their pretensions to superior holiness and mortification.

The increase of monachism, through the foundation of the new orders, and other causes, was enormous. Thus, it is said that whereas in England there had not at the Conquest been above a hundred monasteries, the number founded under Henry I and his two successors was upwards of three hundred. Of these some owed their origin to compositions for vows of service in the holy war. There was a general desire for all sorts of papal privileges; and, as has been already stated, where these could not be proved by genuine documents, recourse was often had to forgery. The abbots aimed at entire independence of the episcopal authority—even attempting, like the lawless barons of the time, to present clerks to parish-churches without submitting them to the bishop of the diocese for institution. They affected the use of episcopal ornaments, and the episcopal right of bestowing benedictions. “How much more would they pay”, asks St. Bernard, “if they might have the name as well as the privileges of bishops?”. Peter of Blois says that the monasteries most distinguished for holiness were those which either had never desired such privileges or had voluntarily resigned them; that in any one but a bishop the use of episcopal ornaments is a mark of pride and presumption: and he prevailed on his own brother to give up an abbacy to which the pope had granted the use of those ornaments. So jealously was the privilege of exemption guarded that when Maurice, bishop of Paris appeared at the consecration of the new church of St. Germain-des-Prés by Alexander III the monks rose in tumult, as if his very presence were a claim of jurisdiction over them, and the pope sent three cardinals to beg that he would withdraw. In England we find quarrels of this kind between the bishops and the great monasteries in many quarters; thus the bishops of Chichester had contests with the abbots of Battle, the bishops of Bath with the abbots of Glastonbury, the bishops of Sarum with the abbots of Malmesbury, the bishops of Lincoln with the abbots of St. Albans. But nowhere was there a more remarkable display of such differences than in the city of Canterbury, where the archbishops were engaged in long and bitter feuds, not only with the abbots and brethren of St. Augustine's, but with the monks of their own cathedral.

The great monastery founded by the apostle of England was the first in rank of English religious houses, and in western Christendom was second only to Monte Cassino. It was the burial-place of Augustine and of his successors in the throne of Canterbury, and on that account its members looked down on the cathedral of Christchurch or Trinity, until Archbishop Cuthbert, when dying in 758, took measures that his death should be kept secret from the Augustinians until he should have been interred in the cathedral. From that time the archbishops, with the exception of Cuthbert's second successor, Janbert, who had himself been abbot of St. Augustine's, were buried in the cathedral, and its monks were thus enabled to take a higher standing than before against their Augustinian neighbours. But in the twelfth century serious disputes arose between the archbishops and the monks of St. Augustine's. The monks asserted that their house had been wholly independent of the see of Canterbury until Lanfranc, taking advantage of his ancient friendship with the Norman abbot Scolland, persuaded him to cede privileges which the monastery had before enjoyed; while on the other side it was maintained that the abbey and the patronage of the abbacy had belonged to the archbishops until the Norman conquests. The abbots claimed that the archbishops should give

them the benediction in their own monastery, and without exacting any payment, or any profession of obedience. They claimed, not only the patronage of parish-churches on their estates, but exclusive jurisdiction over the incumbents. They disputed certain yearly payments which they were required to make to the cathedral, and the archbishop's charges for supplying them with consecrated oil and chrism. They professed to have privileges, reaching down from the age of king Ethelbert and St. Augustine, by which the monastery was rendered independent of all power, ecclesiastical or secular. In one of these documents Augustine was made to charge his successors in the see to regard the abbot not as their subject, but as their "brother, colleague, and fellow-minister in the word of God". According to another document, pope John XIII ordered that the abbot should be treated "as a Roman legate"; and (as we have seen) it was said that the abbots had been privileged by Alexander II to wear the mitre (with the sandals and other episcopal ornaments), although they did not make use of the right until a hundred and twenty years later. These claims were the subject of continual appeals to the popes, who, according to their usual policy, for the most part sided with the abbey, while the officials of the Roman court were not sorry to make a profit out of the complicated litigation. At one time, when Eugenius III had desired archbishop Theobald to bless abbot Sylvester without exacting any profession, the archbishop repaired to the monastery for the purpose; but there (by his contrivance, according to the Augustinian chroniclers), the prior of Christchurch appeared, with a force of armed men, to protest against the benediction; and the archbishop caught at this pretext for delay, although a further reference to Rome obliged him at last to perform the office in the manner required. At another time, when Alexander III had ordered the benediction of abbot Roger, not only the archbishop of Canterbury, but the bishop of Worcester and the archbishop of Rouen refused to officiate; and the abbot found it necessary to seek the blessing from the pope himself, who gave it at Tusculum, granting to the abbot the use of the episcopal mitre, ring, and gloves, but with a reservation of the archbishop's rights. On another occasion, when Theobald had interdicted England in consequence of his differences with king Stephen, the Augustinians continued to ring their bells and to celebrate divine offices as usual; but for this they were put to penance by pope Eugenius, on the ground that they were bound to obey Theobald as legate, if not as archbishop; and when the pope, after some difficulty, absolved them, he declared that he acted not as apostolic pontiff but in the room of the archbishop of Canterbury.

The monks were extremely unwilling to produce the originals of the privileges on which they relied; but, after having eluded two papal orders for their production, they were at length, in 1182, compelled to exhibit them to three commissioners appointed by Alexander III; when it was found that as to materials, form, and substance, the documents which pretended to the greatest antiquity were suspicious in the extreme. They were, however, approved by Lucius III, and archbishop Richard was obliged to withdraw the charge of forgery which he had thrown out against them. A compromise was agreed on as to some of the rival claims; but as to the benediction in the monastery all the papal authority was unable to enforce obedience from the archbishops; and the abbots were obliged to receive their blessing, sometimes from the pope in person, sometimes from any bishop who could be persuaded to give it, until in 1406 abbot Thomas Hunden was blessed in St. Paul's, London, by archbishop Arundel, who acknowledged him, in the words of the charter ascribed to St. Augustine, as his "brother, colleague, and fellow-minister".

But while the monks of Christchurch were allied with the archbishops against the rival monastery, their own relations with them were far from harmonious. "It seems", wrote John of Salisbury during Becket's exile, "as if hatred of their archbishops were an inheritance of the monks of Canterbury. When Anselm was twice banished for righteousness' sake, they never bestowed any consolation on him. They despised Ralph, they hated William, they laid snares for Theobald, and now, without any cause, they insatiably persecute Thomas". Theobald turned out two of their priors (who were the virtual heads of the monastery, as the archbishop

himself was supposed to be abbot); and at a later time a more serious difference broke out. The circumstances of archbishop Baldwin's election had naturally left unpleasant remembrances on both sides; and soon after entering on his see, the archbishop and the monks were violently embroiled. They complained that he interfered with their revenues and privileges; that he seized the management of their estates, expelled their officials, whose places he filled with his own servants, suspended the prior, confined the monks within their own precincts, cutting off their supplies of food, so that they were indebted for the means of life to the charity of their neighbors—even of Jews; and that he excommunicated them.

In order to rid himself of the annoyances resulting from his connection with them, he formed the scheme of erecting a new church of secular canons, to bear the name of St. Thomas the Martyr, and of supporting it chiefly at the expense of Christchurch. As the germ of this, he began to rebuild and enlarge the church of St. Stephen at Hackington, about a mile distant from the cathedral, and afterwards removed the site to another place in the neighborhood. In order to carry out his scheme he caused collections to be made throughout all England, with the inducement of ample indulgences; he endeavoured to draw the other bishops into taking part in the foundation; and he was encouraged by the support of Henry II, who had abundant reasons for disliking the monks of Christchurch. These, however, showed themselves determined to resist by appealing to the pope, and enlisting in their cause the influence of the French king and of other foreign patrons. They declared that the archbishop intended, by bestowing the canonries of his new church on the bishops of his province, not only to transfer to these the rights of the cathedral as to the election of archbishops, but to constitute himself a pope, surrounded by a college of cardinals, subject to the influence of the crown in ecclesiastical matters, but independent of the apostolic see. The popes were naturally inclined to side with the monks, more especially as the usual means of securing the favour of Rome were largely employed; and, with the exception of Gregory VIII, they showed themselves favourable to the convent. In 1189 two legates were sent by Gregory to investigate the matter; but one of them died by the way, and the other, John of Anagni, was not allowed to approach Canterbury until the question had been compromised by Richard I, on the footing that a prior whom Baldwin had nominated should be otherwise provided for, that another should be appointed by the king and the archbishop, and that the archbishop should give up the project of a collegiate church on condition of receiving from the monks the same obedience which they had paid to his predecessors. The legate indignantly declared that this agreement was void, as having been extorted from the monks, and it was afterwards annulled by Celestine III, who ordered the new buildings to be destroyed. Baldwin, before setting out on the crusade, directed that the materials should be removed to Lambeth, which he had lately acquired for his see but on hearing of his death at the siege of Acre, the monks of Christchurch drove out their prior, appointed another in his room, and elected to the primacy Reginald, bishop of Bath, who ordered the demolition of his predecessor's college at Lambeth. Reginald, however, died before consecration, and his successor, Hubert Walter, revived the project. But, although he had the support of king Richard, although all the Cistercian abbots in England exerted themselves for him, and although the authority of archbishops Anselm, Theobald, and Thomas was alleged in favour of the design, he was compelled by Innocent III in 1199 to pull down the buildings which he had begun to erect.

In other English cathedrals which were in the hands of monks, similar troubles often arose; and it is said that archbishop Baldwin induced all the bishops to promise that they would follow his example by turning their episcopal churches into colleges of secular clergy. Hugh of Nunant, bishop of Lichfield, nephew of Arnulf of Lisieux, incurred the especial abuse of the monastic writers, with the single exception of Giraldus Cambrensis, by substituting secular canons for the monks of Coventry, and is said to have advised Richard I to suppress all the monks in England; but a few years after he was obliged to succumb, and

archbishop Hubert, in obedience to papal authority, reinstated the monks whom Hugh had ejected.

While monks were thus brought into rivalry and actual collision with secular canons, they were involved in a continual controversy with the regular canons as to the superiority of their respective manners of life, while the canons denied the right of the monks to preach, and would have confined them to the strict duties of religious seclusion. Among the writers who took the monastic side were Abelard, Hugh of Amiens, archbishop of Rouen, and Rupert, abbot of Deutz; among the champions of the canons were Anselm, bishop of Havelberg, Philip of Harveng, a Prémonstratensian abbot in the diocese of Cambrai, and Lambert, abbot of St. Rufus, near Avignon.

Notwithstanding the frequent attempts at a reformation of monastic life, and the institution of new orders with a view to a greater severity of discipline, we still find that the state of monachism is a subject of frequent complaint. Godfrey of Vigeois describes the monks of his day as spurious heirs of the older coenobites; as lax in their diet, devoted to the vanities of fashion, and otherwise unfaithful to the true idea of their profession. In some cases the monastic food and clothing were commuted for an allowance in money—an arrangement utterly opposed to the principles of the monastic system. Giraldus Cambrensis mentions as a chief cause of disorder among the English monks the custom of sending them by twos or threes to remote cells, where they were free from the discipline of the convents on which the cells depended. Although the life in such places often involved much of roughness and privation, the monks greatly preferred it to the “imprisonment of the cloister”, on account of its freedom from restraint; but the system became the cause of general laxity, and of frequent and serious scandals. Wibald of Stablo speaks of some monastic societies as careless of their rule, and engrossed by talk of canons, decrees, appeals, councils, rights, laws, condemnations and the like; as devoted to bodily indulgences and temporal good things, and impatient of all control from their superiors. Nor were the attempts at reform always of such a kind as to deserve approval. Thus cardinal Walter of Albano, after mentioning with praise the zeal of some abbots and others who had agreed to meet annually at Reims with a view to monastic reformation—that by their means houses which had been temples of voluptuousness, the haunts of owls and hedgehogs, syrens and satyrs, had become “glorious sheepfolds of Christ”—goes on to censure them for indiscreet innovation in some respects. Anselm of Havelberg represents people as perplexed by the number, the eccentric affectations, and the contradictory rules of the new orders which had arisen; and John of Salisbury strongly denounces the practices of hypocritical monks, who pretended to an extreme severity of life in order to cloak their ambition, avarice, and malignity.

MILITARY ORDERS.

The history of the military orders of the Temple and the Hospital has in part been noticed by anticipation, and partly in connection with the crusades. In addition to their quarrels with each other, with the patriarchs, and with their other neighbours in the east, we find them continually engaged in disputes as to privileges and exemptions in the west. By the abuse which they made of these (as by keeping their churches open in time of interdict, receiving excommunicate persons to the sacraments, and giving them Christian burial) they were drawn into frequent collisions with the bishops and clergy; and such abuses were strongly denounced by Alexander III and by the Lateran council of 1179.

In addition to the templars and hospitallers, other orders, in which religion was combined with special objects, took their origin from the crusades.

The Teutonic order, which afterwards became famous, arose out of the association of about forty crusaders from north Germany, who, at the siege of Acre, formed themselves into a brotherhood for the care of the sick and wounded—sheltering them in tents made out of the

sails of their vessels. The new society gained the patronage of the king of Jerusalem, of the patriarch, and of other important personages; and Frederick of Swabia, during the short interval between his arrival at Acre and his death, recommended it to his brother, Henry VI, and also to pope Celestine, who in 1196 confirmed its institution. The order was governed by provincials, with a grand-master at its head. The first master was Henry of Walpot, but the great extension of the order was due mainly to his third successor, Herman of Salza, who, according to a chronicler, had the pope and the emperor, with other princes and great men, in his own hand, so that he obtained whatever he might ask for its honour and advantage. Under him it acquired great privileges and emoluments, and entered on its career of conquest on the shores of the Baltic; and whereas Herman had expressed a wish that by the sacrifice of one of his eyes he might raise the order to the number of ten military brethren in arms, it counted soon after his death more than 2,000 knights of noble German families.

At Acre also was instituted an English order of hospitallers, named after St. Thomas the Martyr, whose birth came by a romantic story of later date to be connected with the Holy Land; and in the last year of the century arose the order of Trinitarians or Mathurins, founded by John of Matha, a priest of Provençal birth, for the redemption of captives from the infidels, and confirmed by Innocent III.

In Spain various military orders arose, such as those of Calatrava and Avisá, both instituted for the defence of the faith against the Moors, and connected with the Cistercian order; and the order of St. James, intended for the protection of pilgrims to the shrine of the apostle at Compostella.

An association which in so far resembled the military orders as it was formed under a religious sanction for a warlike purpose, was that of the *Caputiati*, or White Hoods of Auvergne. Large bodies of the mercenary soldiers whom it had become usual to employ in war, and who, from the province which originally supplied them, were known by the name of Brabançons, had betaken themselves to a life of plunder and violence, and kept that country in terror. Their numbers were swelled by desperate and disreputable persons of all classes, among whom it is said that there were many clerks, monks, and even nuns. These "hellish legions", as they were styled by a chronicler of the age, robbed, burnt, slew, carried off the precious ornaments of churches, profaned the holy sacrament, and treated the clergy with savage insult and cruelty, so that some even died of their blows. Although in this they appear to have been moved rather by utter irreligion than by any heretical opinions, they were condemned by the Lateran council of 1179 in the same canon which proscribed the Cathari. But the beginning of active measures against them was made in 1182 by one Durand, a carpenter of Le Puy-en-Velay, which had been a popular place of pilgrimage until the outrages of these ruffians made the roads unsafe. Durand professed to have been repeatedly warned by the blessed Virgin to exhort his neighbors to the establishment of peace and the bishop of Le Puy gave his sanction to the undertaking. Bishops and abbots, nobles, clergy, and men of all classes banded themselves together in an association for the purpose. The members were pledged to eschew gaming, excess in meat and drink, swearing, and other vices; to do no wrong, and to carry on implacable hostilities against all wrong-doers; and such, it is said, was their union, that, if one had killed the brother of another, the surviving brother admitted the slayer to the kiss of peace and was bound to supply his needs. The mark of their profession was a white hood, of monastic shape, with a leaden image of the Virgin sewed on to it.

The enterprise thus set on foot was crowned with success; it is said that in one engagement 7,000 of the Brabançons or cottreaux were slain, but the clergy of the victorious party disgraced themselves by inciting their companions to cruelties against the prisoners, and fifteen hundred wretched women of loose life, who were among the number, were burnt at a slow fire. The country which had been infested by the cottreaux was speedily cleared of them; but the white-hoods themselves began to show symptoms of opinions dangerous to social order, maintaining the equality of all men, and attacking the nobles who were within

their reach; so that Philip Augustus, who had aided their undertaking at the outset, found it necessary to suppress the association.

Rites and Usages

In the early church, the term *sacrament* had been applied to any symbolical religious act, so that, while baptism and the Eucharist were regarded as rites having a peculiar character of their own, there was no limit to the number of things which might be styled sacraments. And thus, as late as the twelfth century, we find the name given by Godfrey of Vendome to the symbolical ring and staff which were used in the investiture of bishops, and by Bernard to the symbolical washing of feet. From this vagueness in the use of the term, the number of sacraments had been very variously stated. Thus Raban Maur and Paschasius Radbert, in the ninth century, laid down that there are four sacraments—Baptism, Unction, the Body and the Blood of the Lord, whereas Peter Damiani, in the eleventh century, speaks of twelve, but elsewhere distinguishes three as chief—namely, Baptism, the Eucharist, and Ordination.

In the eastern church, although John of Damascus speaks only of Baptism and the Eucharist, yet from the time of the pretended Dionysius the Areopagite, in the sixth century, six sacraments had been generally acknowledged—namely, Baptism, the Eucharist, the Consecration of Chrism, Ordination, Monastic Profession, and the Rites for the Dead. But now, in the western church, the mystical number of seven was fixed as that of the sacraments, from the idea of a correspondence with the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Ghost. This number is insisted on in the report of Otho of Bamberg's missionary teaching, and may be gathered from the writings of Hugh of St. Victor, although he also uses the term *sacrament* in the more general sense of the older writers; but the establishment of the number is chiefly to be ascribed to the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard, the most popular theological manual of the age, in which the sacraments are said to be Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Ordination, and Matrimony.

The doctrine of Berengar as to the Eucharist, although condemned, was not extinct. Thus we are told of some who, while they held with Berengar in substance, joined with the church in condemning him, because, instead of contenting himself with the language of Scripture, he had put forward his ideas too nakedly. Abelard speaks of the question, "whether the bread which is seen be only a figure of the Lord's body, or be also the real substance of the Lord's very flesh", as being yet undetermined. And Rupert of Deutz expresses himself in such a manner as to the continuance of the bread and wine in their own substance as at least to need a subtle vindication of his conformity with the modern Roman doctrine against the apparent meaning of his words. But the doctrine of transubstantiation—a word which is first found in a treatise professing to contain the opinions of Peter Damiani,—made way, and the impression of it on the popular mind was strengthened by an ever-increasing multitude of miraculous tales—as that the eucharistic wafer was seen by the priest to change into a beautiful infant; that the bread appeared as flesh, and the wine as blood; and that the consecrated host resisted the power of fire.

The growing opinion of a material presence in the eucharist introduced an important change in the manner of administration. In early ages, the sacrament had been always given under both kinds, although in Africa it had been usual to allow morsels of the consecrated bread to be carried from the church for the sick, or for the use of devout persons at times when they could not attend the public communion. The declaration of pope Gelasius I against a separation of the elements has been already quoted; and, although primarily directed against the Manicheans, who condemned the use of wine, it is equally applicable against all mutilated administration. Now, however, it began to be thought that there was a danger of profanation in receiving the wine, from the dipping of the beard into the chalice, or from the inability of sick persons to swallow. In order to guard against such accidents, it had been usual from the eighth

century to employ a tube in drinking from the chalice; but in the latter part of the eleventh century, a custom arose of dipping the bread into the wine, and so administering both elements together, and, from having at first been practised in the communion of infants and of the sick, it was extended to other cases. This usage was condemned by Urban II at the council of Clermont, and by Paschal II in a letter to abbot Pontius, of Cluny, which allows no exception other than the cases of infants or very sick persons, who could not swallow the breads. Ernulf, bishop of Rochester, however, on being questioned by a friend as to the propriety of thus administering in a manner different from, and almost contrary to the Saviour's institution, answered by maintaining the right of the church to legislate in such matters, and defending the practice as a safeguard against profanation. And in England it kept its ground until forbidden by the council of London in 1175. The doctrine of concomitancy—that Christ is contained entire under each of the eucharistic elements—had been laid down by St. Anselm on independent grounds, and, while stating it, he had spoken of communion in both kinds; but it was now brought to support the novel practice of administering in one kind only. The writers of the age, in general, however, —even those who held that administration in one kind was sufficient, and that a contrary opinion was heretical,—yet maintained the ancient usage of administering in both kinds.

The belief in the necessity of infant-communion had died out in the West, and, in consequence of the supposed especial danger of profanation by spilling the consecrated wine, the practice was now forbidden, although it was not yet wholly disused. In this case, as in that of adults, unconsecrated wine was sometimes given as a substitute for the eucharistic cup; but Hugh of St. Victor (or a writer who has been identified with him) ascribes such usages to the ignorance of the clergy, and declares that it is better to rely on the grace of baptism, as sufficient for the salvation of young children. At a later time the communion of infants became a subject of controversy between the Greeks, who retained it, and the Latins.

The more rigid view as to the observance of the Lord's day continued to grow in the church, and attempts were made to enforce it by some of those pretended revelations which have been used in behalf of the same cause from the time of Charlemagne, or earlier, to the miracle of La Salette in our own days. Thus, when Henry II of England was at Cardiff on his way from Ireland to Normandy, as he was mounting his horse after mass, he was accosted by a man apparently about forty years of age, tall and spare in figure, with yellow hair displaying a tonsure, dressed in a white robe, with a girdle around his waist, and with naked feet. After having greeted the king in English this personage charged him, in the names of the Saviour, the Blessed Virgin, St. Peter, and St. Paul, to allow no markets to be held, or any but the most necessary secular works to be done, on the Lord's day, and warned him that a neglect of this command would be followed by heavy judgments; and having delivered his message he disappeared. Again, in 1199, it was said that a letter from the Saviour was found in the church of the holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, denouncing terrible chastisements for breach of the Lord's day; and this letter was used by Eustace, abbot of Flai, in the diocese of Beauvais, who preached in England with great effect. Eustace denounced the holding of markets on the Lord's day, and the sale of anything, except that of necessary food and drink to travellers—in the case of which sale, one-fourth of the price was to be devoted to pious and charitable uses. He prescribed the observance of rest from the ninth hour on Saturday to sunrise on Monday; and it is said that his preaching was confirmed by miraculous judgments on some who ventured to profane this extended Sabbath. But a chronicler tells us that the king and other great men questioned the truth of the abbot's doctrine, and that the people feared them more than God.

The observance of the Lord's day, and of other holy days also, is said to have been especially strict in Norway, so that the people never ventured of their own accord to do anything either great or small.

To the great festivals of the year Trinity Sunday was now added. It differed from the rest in character, inasmuch as it was not the commemoration of any event, but was consecrated to a doctrine; yet it seemed a fitting completion for the circle of festivals, and, although not without some opposition on the ground of novelty, it succeeded in establishing itself and has continued to hold its place.

Reverence for the blessed Virgin was continually rising to a greater and greater excess. The idea of her acting as a mediatrix for those who might fear to approach the Saviour immediately is inculcated by St. Bernard. She was spoken of as “Queen of heaven”; the angelic salutation was repeated as an address to her fifty, a hundred, or even a thousand times a day, and in monasteries offices were said in her honor from the time of Gregory VII. As Sundays and festivals were dedicated to God, so Saturdays and eves were dedicated to St. Mary; and the recitation of her office on Saturday was ordered by Urban II at the council of Clermont. The new orders of monks—above all the Cistercians—were under her especial protection. The most extravagant and hyperbolic language was employed to express her greatness; while on the other hand, in the vernacular poetry of Germany, she was addressed in strains which borrowed something from the feelings of chivalry.

The heightened reverence for the Virgin had long assumed that she was without sin; but it had been supposed, as by Paschasius Radbert and by Anselm, that she was conceived in sin, and was afterwards sanctified, either before or after her birth, by the special operation of the Holy Spirit. A festival was instituted in honor of her conception, and although it met with opposition in some places, was generally received in England in the course of the century. But now the opinion began to be broached that she was herself conceived without sin, and about 1140 the canons of Lyons proceeded to celebrate the new doctrine by a festival of the Conception, on the 8th of December. By this, Bernard was drawn to write a letter of remonstrance, in which he states his belief that the Virgin was sanctified in her mother’s womb, but that Christ alone was conceived without sin. If, he says, we were to suppose that the Saviour’s mother must have been so conceived in order that she might be fitted to give him birth, we might be required to suppose the like as to her parents also on both sides, and so of all her ancestors; and he censures the institution of such a festival without the sanction Of the apostolic see. Other eminent divines of the age took the same view with Bernard; as Peter of La Celle, who strongly defended him in two letters against a monk of St. Alban’s named Nicolas; Potho, a monk of Prüm; and the ritualist John Beleth, who says that the feast of the Virgin’s immaculate conception ought to be suppressed, forasmuch as she was conceived in sin..

The ancient pagan festival of the Saturnalia, with its wild license and misrule, had affected the Christian celebration of the Christmas season, as appears by the protests of a chain of witnesses which reaches down from the fourth century. Out of this arose a class of mock festivals, in which the rites of religion were parodied in a strange and startling fashion—at first, perhaps, without any evil intention, but gradually developing into gross profanity. The Feast of Fools was celebrated in some places on the Circumcision, and in others on the Epiphany or its octave, when the subdeacons chose a Bishop of Fools. This prelate was arrayed in pontificals, and performed a burlesque mass, during which his attendant minister ate sausages, and carried on all manner of extravagant gambols in church. In 1198 a papal legate, cardinal Peter, strongly condemned this profane mummery at Paris, and in the following year it was suppressed in that church by bishop Eudes of Sully. In the thirteenth century, a still stranger festival of like kind—the “Feast of Asses”, in mock commemoration of the ass which carried the infant Saviour into Egypt—was celebrated at Rouen and elsewhere and in England the boy bishop or abbot was chosen by the choristers of the greater churches on the feast of St. Nicolas, the patron of children, down to the time of the Reformation.

The passion for relics was greatly encouraged and nourished by the crusades, which introduced to the Christians of the West many saints before unknown to them—such as the virgin Catharine of Alexandria—and supplied a vast quantity of materials for superstitious reverence. Among the chief of the relics which now became famous was the “holy dish”, brought by the Genoese from Caesarea, after the capture of that place in 1101, and still preserved in the cathedral of their city—a vessel which, although in reality made of green glass, was believed to be of emerald, and was venerated as having been used at the last supper. Another was the Veronica—a cloth on which our Lord was said to have miraculously impressed his countenance while on his way to Calvary. The Veronica was exhibited in St. Peter's at Rome from the year 1011, and was connected with a legend that it had been brought to Italy for the cure of the emperor Tiberius, when afflicted with leprosy, and a *saint* Veronica was imagined as the person who handed the cloth to the Saviour. Another relic of great fame was the seamless coat of our Lord found at Argenteuil in 1156—one of many coats which claimed the same sacred connection, but distinguished from the rest as having been made for Him in his childhood by his virgin mother; and from this age also comes the first authentic mention of the holy coat which the empress Helena was said to have presented to an imaginary archbishop of her pretended birthplace, Treves.

To a different class belong the renowned relics at Cologne—the bodies of the holy three kings, which, as we have already seen, were translated from Milan by archbishop Reginald, and those of St. Ursula and the 11,000 virgins. The legend of the British princess and her virgin companions, who are said to have been martyred by the Huns at Cologne, had been told by Sigebert of Gemblours, early in the twelfth century, under the date of 453. But when heresy afterwards became rife at Cologne, and miraculous aid was desirable in opposition to it, some bodies were opportunely found, and were sent to St. Elizabeth of Schonau, who referred the martyrdom of the virgin company to the year 238—a date inconsistent with the story of their martyrdom by the Huns—and had visions of their heavenly glory. In connection with this affair, it is mentioned that the relics had been suspected, because some persons were in the habit of practising frauds in such matters for the sake of money; and of such practices there is abundant evidence.

In the end of the eleventh century, Guibert of Nogent-sous-Couci was led to compose a treatise “On the Relics of Saints”,—the immediate provocation being the impudence and the success with which the monks of St. Medard's at Soissons displayed a pretended tooth of our Lord. Guibert altogether denies that such bodily relics of the Saviour could be genuine; he opposes the practice of disturbing the saints in their graves, and enclosing their remains in gold and silver; and he speaks without reserve of the arts by which both relics and saintly reputations were manufactured. As a specimen of the audacity with which impostures of this kind were carried through, he mentions that once, while listening to a sermon, he was astonished by the preacher's pointing at him as a witness for the genuineness of some crusts which were said to have come from our Lord's own table!, and that, although he blushed at the falsehood, he allowed it to pass, out of deference for those who had taken such means of filling their monastic purse. The superstition which Guibert attacked, however, found a zealous defender in his contemporary Thiofrid, abbot of Epternach, and continued in undiminished popularity.

The practice of pilgrimage had produced the great movement of the crusades, and, after the success of the Latins, the crowds which flocked to the Holy Land were, for a time, greater than ever. Particular indulgences were attached to the longer pilgrimages—such as those of Rome, Compostella, and Jerusalem; and Innocent III complains that, for the sake of the privileges connected with the Compostella pilgrimage, the scallop-shells which were the token of it were counterfeited. But warnings continued, as in early times, to be lifted up by eminent teachers against a reliance on pilgrimage. Thus Hildebert praises a widow for having chosen, instead of running after the Saviour's burial-place, to “follow Him in his burial” by

entering a convent, and remonstrates with count Fulk, of Anjou, for neglecting his duties that he might go on pilgrimage to Compostella:—"Among the talents which the Householder hath distributed to his servants", he says, "no doctor and no scripture mentions that of wandering round the world". In like manner, Bernard exhorted against leaving the duties of home in order to visit the Holy Land; and Peter of Cluny strongly reproveth a monk for intending to set out on pilgrimage. "It is", he says, "a greater thing to serve God continually in humility and poverty than to perform the journey to Jerusalem in pride and luxury. If it be well to visit Jerusalem, where the feet of our Lord stood, it is far better to pant after heaven, where He himself is beheld face to face". It was held that a vow of pilgrimage was fulfilled by entering a monastic order—that so to vow the whole life to God was more than the partial vows of pilgrims. Other commutations for the longer pilgrimages were also sanctioned; thus Calixtus I allowed the English and Scots, instead of going to Rome, to content themselves with resorting to St. David's—two visits to the Welsh sanctuary being reckoned as equivalent to one pilgrimage to Rome. And in this, as in other things, the idea of performing duties by proxy was introduced; for instance, a lady left estates to a Danish convent in 1272 on condition that, for the good of her soul, the monks should send off three pilgrims to Jerusalem, Rome, and Aarhus.

The belief in the continued performance of miracles was unabated; and special collections of miraculous stories were formed, as by Peter of Cluny, Herbert, archbishop of Torre, in Sardinia, and in the next century by Caesarius of Heisterbach; to which may be added the books on the miracles of St. Thomas of Canterbury, by William of Canterbury and Benedict of Peterborough. Yet Abelard ventured to deride the miracles of his most famous contemporaries, such as Norbert and Bernard—declaring that they did not rely on their prayers alone for a cure, but sometimes employed medicine in simple cases; that they sometimes ludicrously failed; and that all such failures were set down to the unbelief of the people, while the cures were ascribed to the holiness of those who wrought them.

The system of penance became more and more widely different from what it had originally been. Not only did pecuniary commutations hold their ground (especially in England), notwithstanding all the prohibitions which councils could utter against them, but other things of a new kind contributed to destroy the ancient system. Among these new influences, the pope's assumption of a right to interfere with the penitential discipline in every diocese has been already mentioned. But most especially the penitential discipline suffered from a system which now superseded the penitential books of earlier times—the system of indulgences which were granted by way of inducement to perform some service for the church. These, unlike the indulgences of former days, were not limited to the forgiveness of particular sins, but extended to all. Thus Gregory VII, in the names of St. Peter and St. Paul, promised absolution of all their sins to those who should take part with Rudolf of Swabia against Henry IV; and Victor III endeavored by a like promise to enlist men for a religious war against the Saracens of Africa. This system was brought into its fullest operation by the crusades, from the time when Urban II at Clermont proclaimed a plenary indulgence for all who should share in the holy war. These indulgences, indeed, were intended as remissions of those temporal penalties only which it was believed that the sinner must undergo either in this life or in purgatory; but the people in general understood them, and persisted in understanding them, as promises of eternal forgiveness, while they overlooked any conditions of repentance or charity which had been annexed to them. And the license which marked the lives of the crusaders, and of the Latins who settled in the Holy Land, is an unquestionable proof of the sense in which the papal offers were interpreted.

In addition to the enterprises in which life was risked, and to which, therefore, the ancient belief in the cleansing power of martyrdom might be extended, indulgences of lesser degrees were granted by bishops for all manner of small performances—such as the recitation of a certain prayer before a certain altar, visiting a church on a certain day, pilgrimages to

relics and miraculous pictures, or the like; and in furtherance of local undertakings, such as the building or enlargement of a church, the building of a bridge, the making of a road, or the enclosure of a forest. Payment towards the expenses of the holy war was rewarded with indulgences in proportion to its amount; and the allowance of indulgence was greatly increased. Thus an act which in an earlier age would have earned an indulgence of forty days, was now rewarded with absolution from a hundred years or more of purgatorial pain. There were, however, those who, as Abelard, and Stephen, abbot of Obaize, did not hesitate to express their objections to the trade which was driven in indulgences, or their doubts as to the efficacy of these. The question whether confession to a priest were necessary in order to forgiveness of sin was often discussed. Both Gratian and Peter Lombard give the arguments on each side; Gratian, with some qualification, decides against the necessity, while the Master of the Sentences takes the opposite view. Peter teaches, as Hildebert had before taught, that true repentance must consist of three parts—the compunction of the heart, the confession of the mouth, and the satisfaction of work; but he holds that, if the assistance of a priest cannot be had, confession to a lay Christian is allowable. As to the effect of priestly absolution, he thinks that the priest cannot forgive sins, but can only declare them to be remitted or retained; that, although we may have been forgiven by God, yet absolution by the priest's judgment is necessary “in the face of the church”; but that this absolution is valid in so far only as it agrees with the Divine judgment. This opinion is spoken of by Richard of St. Victor as frivolous and ridiculous; yet Richard himself did not venture to maintain that the priest had absolute power to forgive as with God's authority; and as yet the form of absolution continued to be precatory, not declaratory.

State of Learning

The rise of great schools, and the increase of intellectual activity which marked the twelfth century, have been already noticed. The foundation of the university of Oxford has been referred to Alfred; that of Paris, to Charlemagne; while Bologna has been carried back, by fable which has called forgery to its support, as far as the reign of Theodosius II, in the year 433. For Cambridge too has been claimed an origin from Sigebert king of Essex, in the seventh century, from the British hero Arthur, in the fifth, and even from some date as early at least as the second century, when the professors of Cambridge are said to have converted king Lucius to the Christian faith. But in truth the oldest of these famous seminaries cannot be traced to any earlier time than the twelfth century; nor can any formal foundation of them be shown, inasmuch as they did not owe their origin to any acts of papal or sovereign authority, but to the spontaneous concourse of lecturers and students. Their distinct organization and the bestowal of privileges by papal, imperial, or other charters, followed on the establishment of each body, as regulation became necessary, and as privileges were felt to be desirable; and at a later time the sanction of popes and princes was called in to give new universities a rank equal with those of earlier foundation, and especially to secure a general recognition for the degrees which they conferred. The name of University, by which these great schools became distinguished, was not derived from their teaching of universal learning, but from the usage of the Roman law, in which it signified a corporation. Thus, according to the varieties of constitution, the “university” might consist of the masters only (as at Paris), or might include the students also (as at Bologna); a single faculty might form an university, as we And the expressions *universitas artistarum* (*i.e.* the professors and students of the arts included in the trivium and quadrivium) and *universitas juristarum*; and that which is popularly styled the university of a place might in reality consist of two or more universities—as at Bologna, from the time of Innocent VI., there were four universities, each under its own rector—two of them being devoted to law, one to medicine and philosophy, and one to theology.

The story that the knowledge of Roman law, after having been extinct for ages, was revived by the discovery of a celebrated copy of the Pandects at Amalfi on the taking of that place by Lothair in 1135—that the emperor presented the book to his allies, the Pisans, in whose city it was long preserved with reverence—and that, at the instance of the great jurist Irnerius, he decreed that all men should thenceforth obey the Roman law only—appears to be utterly fabulous. For traces of acquaintance with the Roman law are to be found throughout all the ages which had intervened since the time of Justinian, and not only were other copies of the Pandects known before the date of the alleged discovery at Amalfi, but there is reason to believe that the book in question had been at Pisa long before that date—perhaps even from the days of Justinian himself.

The increased study of Roman law would seem rather to have grown out of the needs of the Lombard cities, which, long before they extorted an acknowledgment of their liberties from Frederick Barbarossa, set up pretensions to independence, and wished for a system of law more suitable to their circumstances than the barbaric codes. Moreover, the ancient civil law was regarded as having a claim on all the West beyond the immediate occasion, inasmuch as from the time of Charlemagne the states of western Europe had all been considered as forming one empire. Hence arose the law-school of Bologna, under Irnerius, who has been supposed by some to have been a German, but was more probably a native of the city; and the first formal recognition of it is in a rescript which Frederick issued at Roncaglia in 1158. By this document special privileges are bestowed on the schools. The students, and the messengers or posts by whom they kept up communication with their homes, are to travel without hindrance; it is ordered that no one shall be held liable for the misdeeds or for the debts of his countrymen; the students are exempted from the jurisdiction of the secular magistrates, and are subjected to the judgment of their professors or of the bishop.

The method of teaching and the writings of Irnerius and his followers, the “Four Doctors of Bologna”, excited a desire for a compendium of church-law, which had been regarded as a branch of theology and the need of such a work was the more felt, because the Bolognese lawyers were imperialist and antipapalist in their principles. Collections of ecclesiastical law had, indeed, been formed in times not remote, by Regino, abbot of Prüm, by Burkhard, bishop of Worms, by Ivo of Chartres, and others. But these collections were not reduced to a system, and one great purpose of the digest which was now compiled by Gratian, a monk of Bologna, may be understood from the title which was given to it (although possibly not by the author), “A Concordance of discordant Rules”. In this the matter was classified under proper heads; the various sentences of councils, popes, and fathers were cited, and harmony was as far as possible established between them, while Gratian, unlike the earlier compilers, added to the usefulness of the book by introducing his own views and “dicta”. The genuineness of the False Decretals was assumed, and their principles were carried throughout the work, which thus served to establish those principles instead of the older canonical system. The *Decretum* (as it was generally styled) was recommended not only by its superiority over other collections in method and completeness, but by the circumstance that it emanated from the city which was the chief seat of legal science. It was valuable as preserving many important fragments which would otherwise have perished, and became popular as the source of much second-hand learning which is displayed by writers of the middle ages. But it abounds in uncritical blunders, and the compiler's attempts at a harmony of authorities were after all so far from satisfactory that a Cistercian chapter in 1188 ordered the book to be locked up, lest the promiscuous reading of it should propagate errors. Eugenius III is said to have approved the *Decretum* in 1152, and, although this statement seems to be very questionable, the importance of Gratian's compilation for the papacy was speedily understood. It became the great text-book of the subject; within a few years after its publication, special professorships of canon law were established both at Bologna and at Paris; the faculty of canonists or decretalists arose in rivalry to that of legists, and each

conferred degrees on its members. From this time the popes, if they wished to give currency to new decrees, had only to send them to the professors of the chief universities, by whom they were eagerly caught up, expounded, and disseminated through the agency of their pupils.

The university of Paris owes its origin to William of Champeaux, Abelard, William of Conches, and their contemporaries, whose lectures attracted a great concourse of hearers to the city; and it speedily grew to such an extent that the number of students is said to have exceeded that of the citizens. The earliest documents which recognize the existence of the university are two decretals of Alexander III. Celestine III exempted the students in all questions as to money from the jurisdiction of the secular magistrates, and ordered that they should be judged according to the canon law, before the bishop, or the abbot of St. Genevieve, and in the last year of the century, in consequence of a great quarrel between the students and the citizens, a grant of privileges was bestowed by Philip Augustus, who acknowledges the office of rector as already existing. As the cathedral school had been the germ of the university, the chancellor of the cathedral was its superintendent; and hence, in other universities founded on the same model, the chief officer bore the title of chancellor. The students of Paris were divided into four nations—a division which was afterwards imitated elsewhere. This arrangement is said to have been fully established before 1169, when Henry II of England offered to refer his differences with archbishop Becket to the judgment of the university; but the evidence appears unsatisfactory.

As Bologna was the great school of law, so Paris took the lead in theology; but it also became eminent in the other faculties. Giraldus Cambrensis, who had studied at Bologna as well as at Paris, tells us that both civil and canon law were best taught in the French university, and quotes the opinion of another, that Paris was the best school for every sort of learning which might be taken up there; and whereas, in John of Salisbury's time, it was usual for the students of medicine to repair from Paris to Montpellier or Salerno, which were then in the highest fame as medical schools, Paris itself under Philip Augustus, was provided with facilities of all sorts for teaching medical science.

England bore its share in the intellectual progress of the century. Englishmen, such as Robert Pulleyn, Robert, who, from the place where he lectured, was styled of Melun, and John of Salisbury, became famous abroad for their learning; and to this time is to be ascribed the real origin of the university of Oxford. The earliest fact which seems to be certain in the literary history of Oxford is the establishment of Vacarius, a Lombard, as professor of civil law there, under the patronage of Archbishop Theobald, in 1149; from which we may infer that it was already known as a place of study. It is remarkable that John of Salisbury, although he mentions Vacarius, says nothing of his having taught at Oxford; but Giraldus Cambrensis, about the year 1185, speaks of Oxford as the place most distinguished in England for the excellence of its clerks. The sister university of Cambridge, according to the continuation of Ingulf which bears the name of Peter of Blois, existed as early as 1109, when Joffrid, abbot of Croyland, taught there. But the authority is worthless, and the statement is encumbered by the difficulty that Averroes, whose works Joffrid is said to have expounded, was then unborn. It is not until the beginning of the thirteenth century that any trustworthy mention of Cambridge as a seat of learning is to be found.

The theologians of the western church in these times laboured under the disadvantage of being unacquainted with the original languages of Scripture. Anselm appears to have been ignorant of Greek; Abelard's knowledge of it seems to have been limited to such Greek words as are to be found in Latin writers, and he avows that he was unable to read some works of Aristotle and Plato because they had not been translated into Latin; John of Salisbury, although his knowledge of the classical Latin authors was unrivalled among his contemporaries, on meeting with the word *ousiain* a treatise of St Ambrose, was unable either to understand it or to find any western teacher who could explain it to him. In consequence of this ignorance, the expositors of Scripture did not so much aim at discovering its real sense as

at forcing into it such matter as they supposed to be edifying; and hence they not only disguised all that they treated by a mystical system of interpretation, but in their choice of subjects there was an especial fondness for the obscurest books, such as the Canticles, Ezekiel, and the Apocalypse. The theologians of the time were divided into three classes—those who, like Bernard, followed the ancient expositors; the more speculative and adventurous thinkers, of whom Abelard is the chief representative; and a middle class, who, after the example of Lanfranc and Anselm, endeavored to combine original thought with a deference to antiquity. These three classes were respectively known as Positives, Scholastics (a word which, from having been used as a general term for learned men, was now applied more especially to signify the professors of philosophical theology), and Sententiaries.

A service like that which Gratian had rendered to ecclesiastical law was performed for theology by Peter Lombard, a native of Novara, who, after having long taught with great reputation at Paris, became bishop of that city in 1159, and died in 1164. The name of Sentences had before been given to the collections of ancient authorities which had been popular since the seventh century. Such a collection of opinions had been formed by Abelard, under the title of “Yes and No”, with a view of exhibiting their contradictions; but Peter Lombard, on the contrary, in his “Four Books of Sentences” aimed a harmonizing them. He discusses questions down to those raised by Abelard, although without naming the authors; and the authorities which he cites come down to the time of Bede. The method which was observed in the work gave it the charm of novelty, while in substance it was intended to accord with antiquity; and it speedily obtained a great popularity. The “Master of the Sentences”, indeed, was not exempt from censure; Gerhoh of Reichersperg denounced him to Alexander III, and one of his own pupils, John of Cornwall, attacked him both while living and after death. An opinion imputed to him—that our Lord, in so far as He is man, is nothing—was brought before the council of Tours in 1163, and before the Lateran council of 1179, and was condemned by Alexander, who directed the French bishops to teach “that Christ, as He is perfect God, so also is He perfect man, consisting, according to his manhood, of soul and body”. Joachim of Fiore also charged Peter with heterodoxy, as has been already mentioned; but the Fourth Lateran council in 1215 pronounced in favour of the Master of the Sentences; and from that time his reputation and authority were greatly increased. Lectures and commentaries on his “Sentences” were composed in vast abundance, and among the authors of them were the most eminent teachers of the church; England alone is said to have produced no less than a hundred and sixty-four writers who illustrated this famous text-book. Yet the work, while it aimed at settling every point of doctrine, was often found rather to suggest questions than to answer them; and in the year 1300 the professors of Paris extracted from it sixteen propositions as to which the Master’s opinions were not generally held.

The school of St. Victor at Paris, founded by William of Champeaux, while it endeavored to reconcile the scholastic method of inquiry with practical piety, was especially opposed to the dialectical subtleties which were now in fashion, and was itself inclined to mysticism. The most famous teachers of this school were Hugh—a Saxon, according to some writers, while others suppose him a native of Ypres—who died in 1141; Richard, a Scotsman, who died in 1170 and Walter, who, in 1174, wrote against “The Four Labyrinths of Gaul”, under which name he denounced Abelard, Gilbert de la Porrée, Peter Lombard, and his disciple Peter of Poitiers.

Other writers, who were no enemies to letters or philosophy, agreed in censuring the dialectical arts which, from having been regarded with suspicion in the preceding century, were now the great weapon of the most popular teachers. John of Salisbury complains of the modern systems of study as ruinous to solid knowledge, and describes a professor whom he styles Cornificius as teaching his pupils to despise all that was ancient, to neglect the old methods of learning, and to consider themselves accomplished philosophers after a course no longer than the time in which young birds become fledged. Other writers of the age agree with

John in their complaints as to the waste of time in speculations, the fondness for words rather than things, the abuse of dialectical art in mere quibbling, the too prevalent separation between knowledge and practice in those who professed themselves followers of literature, the tendency to hurry on to the higher subjects without having laid a substantial foundation. It was complained that Scripture was neglected in comparison of the new and showy kinds of knowledge, that the study of law drew men away from that of other literature; and, useful as the labours of Gratian and Peter Lombard were, when rightly employed, they tended, by offering a short and easy way to an appearance of familiarity with earlier writers, to discourage any endeavour after a deeper acquaintance with the original works from which their materials were derived.

BOOK VII.
FROM THE ELECTION OF INNOCENT III. TO THE DEATH OF BONIFACE
VIII.,
A.D. 1198-1303.

CHAPTER I.

INNOCENT III. A.D. 1198-1216

I

AFFAIRS OF GERMANY.

At the death of Celestine the Third, the urgency of affairs appeared to supersede the observance of the rule which prescribed that the election of a pope should be deferred until after the funeral of his predecessor. On the same day on which Celestine breathed his last, a meeting of cardinals, attended by all but four of the twenty-eight who then formed the college, was held in a church near the Colosseum—probably the monastic church of St. Gregory, on the Coelian hill. Of three names proposed for the vacant dignity, that of John, bishop of Sabina, found the greatest favor; but this cardinal himself, and the aged Octavian of Ostia, whose influence was powerful in the consistory, exerted themselves that the votes should be united in favour of Lothair, cardinal of SS. Sergius and Bacchus; and Lothair, although he endeavored by tears and struggles to decline the papacy, was elected by his brethren, invested with the mantle, presented to the expectant people, and enthroned in the Lateran as Innocent the Third.

Innocent was of the family of the Counts of Segni, who took from their rank the surname of Conti. The Conti had mixed deeply in the feuds of their neighborhood, and had usually been arrayed in opposition to the late pope's family, the Orsini. Innocent had studied at Paris, a circumstance to which he refers with interest in a letter addressed to Philip Augustus; and he had displayed and strengthened his hierarchical feeling by a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Thomas the Martyr at Canterbury. After having further prosecuted his studies at Bologna, where he acquired a profound knowledge of ecclesiastical law, he returned to Rome, was ordained sub-deacon by Gregory VIII, and soon after became a canon of St. Peter's. In the twenty-ninth year of his age, he was advanced to the dignity of cardinal by Clement III, to whom he was nearly related; and under this pope, as under his predecessor, Lucius, he was employed in important missions. The papacy of Celestine, to whom he was obnoxious on account of the hostility between their families, condemned him for a time to inaction, and he employed himself chiefly in study, which produced its fruit in a treatise "On the Contempt of the World", and in other writings. The general tone of these is that of a rigid ascetic, withdrawn from the world and despising it—a tone seemingly very alien from the vigorous practical character which the author was soon to display. His sermons are remarkable for the acquaintance with Scripture which appears in them, and for his extraordinary delight in perverting its meaning by allegory—a practice which in later times enabled him to produce scriptural authority for all his pretensions and for everything that he might desire to recommend. And in his books "On the Sacred Mystery of the Altar", he had laid down the highest Roman doctrine as to the elevation of St. Peter and his successors over all other apostles and bishops.

At the time of his election, Innocent was only thirty-seven years old, and on this account fears were entertained by some that he would not prove equal to the burden of the papal office. But all such apprehensions were speedily dispelled by the display of a character which united the boldness of Gregory VII with the politic caution and patience of Alexander III, and under him the papacy attained its highest elevation. The vast, although imperfect, collection of his letters attests that immense and varied activity which justified him in saying of himself—"Not only am I not allowed to contemplate, but I cannot even get leave to breathe; I am in such a degree made over to others that I almost seem to be altogether taken away from myself". In what degree these letters may be regarded as his own compositions, it may be impossible to say; but there is in them a remarkable unity not only of character but of style. With much redundancy of words, and with that systematic abuse of Scripture which has been already mentioned as characteristic of him, they are marked throughout by the impress of his clear mind and of his powerful will. Yet stern as Innocent was in principle, fully as he upheld the proudest claims of the papacy—and not the less so for his continual affectation of personal humility—he appears to have been amiable in his private character. His contemporary biographer describes him as bountiful but not prodigal, as hot in temper, but easily appeased, and of a magnanimous and generous spirit. He is said to have been even playful in intercourse; he was a lover of poetry and of music, and some well-known hymns of the church have been ascribed to him. Among his defects is noted the common papal failing of a too great devotion to the interest of his own family; he erected a principality for his brother Richard, and provided for other kinsmen with a care which exposed him to reproach.

Innocent when chosen to the papacy was as yet only a deacon. Out of scrupulous regard for the laws of the church, he deferred his promotion to the order of priesthood until the next ember season; and, having then been duly ordained, he was consecrated and enthroned in St. Peter's on the festival of the apostle's Chair.

The pope immediately set on foot a reformation of his own household. The luxury of the court was exchanged for a rigid simplicity. The multitude of nobles who had lately thronged the palace were discarded, except on occasions of high ceremony, and the ordinary services were committed to ecclesiastics. The high-born pages were dismissed, but each of them was presented with a gift sufficient to pay the expenses of knighthood, and an attempt was made to extend to the general administration of the curia that freedom from corruption by which Innocent himself had been honorably distinguished as cardinal. A moderate table of fees for the preparation of bulls and for other official acts was established, and it was ordered that no officer should demand anything of suitors; but the permission to accept voluntary offerings may perhaps have been enough to frustrate in a great degree the effect of this salutary measure. By dismissing most of the doorkeepers Innocent rendered access to his own person more easy. He sat often in his consistory, where the clearness and equity of his judgments were greatly admired, so that lawyers and men of learning were in the habit of frequenting the court in order to hear him.

At the election of the pope, the Romans were clamorous for the donative with which they had been usually gratified on such occasions. Innocent thought it well to comply with their wishes, although he put off the payment until after his consecration; and thus he secured the support of the multitude for the important changes which he intended to effect. Hitherto the prefect of the city had held his office under the emperor. But Innocent abolished this last vestige of the imperial sovereignty, by compelling the prefect to take an oath of fidelity to himself, and to receive investiture at his hands, not by the secular symbol, a sword, but by a mantle and a silver cup. The citizens were also required to swear obedience to the pope. The power of the senate had centered in a single person, who bore the title of senator or consul. Innocent persuaded the senator, Scoto Papparoni, to retire, and substituted another, who was bound by an oath to him, and whose tenure of office was annual. Thus the exclusive authority of the pope was established in Rome, although the pontificate of Innocent was not free from

serious troubles in the municipal government, or from those outbreaks of the Roman factions which had so often disquieted his predecessors.

2

A.D. 1198. AFFAIRS OF SICILY.

Next to the affairs of his own city, those of central and southern Italy and of Sicily demanded the pope's attention. The late emperor had established his military officers as dukes and counts, and these with their troops held possession of the country, even to the gates of Rome. In order to rid himself of his dangerous neighbors, Innocent was able to take advantage of the hatred which the Italians felt towards the Germans—an ancient hatred which had lately been rendered more intense by Henry's violence and cruelties—and of the jealousies and rivalries by which the German chiefs were divided among themselves, each labouring for his own interest alone, while during the infancy of the young Frederick there was no power that could control or unite them. Conrad of Lützenburg, duke of Spoleto, whose wild and unsteady character had got for him from the Italians the name of *Moscancervello*, was persuaded to swear that he would obey the pope's commands, and then, notwithstanding all that he could offer for leave to remain in Italy, was compelled to return to Germany. Greater difficulty was found in the case of Markwald of Anweiler, duke of Ravenna and seneschal of the empire—a bold, ambitious, and perfidious man, who was believed to have instigated his late sovereign to some of his worst excesses. Markwald professed to have been nominated by Henry on his death-bed as executor of his will and regent of Sicily. He had been expelled from Sicily by the emperor's widow, Constance, who heartily espoused the cause of her own countrymen against the detested Germans; but he held possession of the Romagna with the march of Ancona, and was formidable from his power and wealth. Markwald, on being required by the pope to give up the patrimony of the church, attempted to draw Innocent into his interest—offering, on the strength of the late emperor's testament, to raise the church to a grandeur such as it had never enjoyed since the days of Constantine. The pope, however, withstood this and all Markwald's offers, whether of money or of other things, and compelled him, after having been excommunicated by two cardinals, to withdraw from the marches into the Apulian kingdom. The pope went about from city to city, receiving the allegiance of one after another. He got possession of many fortresses in the Campagna, and reduced its robber-nobility to order. The cities of Tuscany and of the duchy of Spoleto (with the exception of Pisa, which was excommunicated for its adherence to the Ghibelline party) were united in a league resembling that of the Lombards, under the patronage of the pope, to whom they took an oath of fidelity; and Innocent found that he could afford to refrain for a time from pressing the claims of the Roman church as to the countess Matilda's donation, the exarchate of Ravenna, and the territory of Bertinoro—leaving these in the hands of their actual possessors, with an acknowledgment of the papal suzerainty. Among the acquisitions made during this rapid progress, although all were claimed as the ancient possessions of the church, there were many which really belonged to the empire; and these, when the imperial throne had again found an occupant, became subjects of dispute.

By a document which professed to be the will of the late emperor, it was directed that his widow and son should perform to the pope all the services that had been done by former kings of Sicily; that, in case of Frederick's dying without an heir, the kingdom should devolve to the pope; that the pope should confirm to Frederick the empire and the kingdom of Sicily, and that in consideration of this certain territories, including almost the whole of the countess Matilda's inheritance, should be given up to the Roman church. The genuineness of this document, however, has been much questioned, partly on the ground that it was never displayed by Markwald while it was in his possession; and that the deed on which Innocent afterwards rested his claims to Sicily was not this, but the will of the empress Constance.

Constance, soon after her husband's death, caused her son, then four years old, to be taken from the custody of the duchess of Spoleto (wife of Moscancervello), and conveyed to Sicily, where he was crowned as king in May 1198. In order to secure herself against the Germans, she opened negotiations with the pope, proposing to place the kingdom and its young sovereign under his especial protection; and Innocent took the opportunity to make favorable terms for the papacy, by requiring a renunciation of the privileges which had been granted to the Sicilian kings by Adrian IV, and confirmed by Clement, as to the election of bishops, and the matters of legations, appeals, and councils; he also required a yearly tribute of 600 tarenos for Apulia, and of 400 for Marsia. Constance's envoys were forced, after a struggle, to submit; but before the treaty could reach Sicily, the empress died, leaving the pope as chief guardian of her son. Sicily and Apulia were for years a scene of anarchy, violence, bloodshed, and ceaseless intrigues. The pope provided Frederick with a tutor, Cencio Savelli, and endeavored to exercise authority by means of a legate. But the chancellor, Walter of Pagliara, bishop of Troia, who contrived also to possess himself in an irregular way of the vacant archbishopric of Palermo, compelled the legate to leave Sicily; and the kingdom was distracted and ravaged by the movements of Markwald, and of another German soldier, Diephold (or Theobald), count of Acerra, whom the pope ineffectually denounced with all the thunders of the church. With these two the chancellor Walter was sometimes at enmity, and sometimes in intimate alliance. At one time he held nearly absolute power, which he abused by a profligate disposal of dignities, and by selling part of the royal demesnes; at another time he was driven from Sicily, and reduced to wander about Apulia in poverty and contempt; and yet again he was able to recover his authority. He was deposed and excommunicated, defied the sentence, sued humbly for absolution, was admitted to mercy, and incurred a fresh excommunication. In July 1200, Markwald was defeated in Sicily by the pope's cousin and general, James; his baggage was captured, and in it was found the alleged testament of Henry VI. Yet Markwald contrived once more to regain the ascendancy, and got possession of the young king's person; but in 1202 his career was cut short by death in consequence of a surgical operation.

A new turn was given to Sicilian affairs by Walter of Brienne, a noble and gallant Frenchman, who had married one of king Tancred's daughters after her release from her German prison, and in her right claimed the county of Lecce and the principality of Taranto, the original possessions of Tancred, which the late emperor had promised to restore to his family. Walter's determination to attempt the recovery of these territories was sanctioned by the pope, on condition of his swearing before the college of cardinals that he would be faithful to Frederick, and would aid him against all his enemies. In order to raise money for the enterprise, Innocent authorized Walter to pledge his security for a large sum, and even assisted him with gifts; and Walter appeared in Apulia at the head of a French force which he had been able to enlist by means of pay and of promises.

The chancellor, Walter of Pagliara, after the death of Markwald, again entreated that he might be released from his excommunication; but, although this was granted, his petitions for restoration to the sees of Palermo and Troia were unsuccessful. The legate who pronounced his absolution endeavored to exact a promise that he would not oppose Walter of Brienne; but his answer was that he could not make such a promise, even if St. Peter himself required it, and if he knew that his refusal would involve his damnation. He therefore joined Diephold, who was the chief antagonist of the new adventurer. For a time Walter of Brienne was successful; he repeatedly defeated Diephold, and for four years the advantage of the war was on his side. But his successes produced an overweening confidence in the prowess of the French, as compared with the Germans; and in consequence of this he was surprised, defeated, and taken prisoner by Diephold in 1205. He died of the wounds which he had received in battle.

In 1207, while Frederick was in the hands of the chancellor Walter, a letter complaining of the duration in which he was held was circulated in his name. While the

Germans were wholly bent on securing for themselves some advantages from the prevailing anarchy, Innocent, although mainly intent on keeping up the papal suzerainty over Sicily, was sincerely desirous to preserve Frederick's royalty, and appears to have performed his duties as guardian with fidelity. In 1208, when the king had reached the age of fourteen, the guardianship expired, and in the following year, through Innocent's mediation, Frederick married a daughter of the king of Aragon.

3

FREDERICK II

With regard to the greater dignity which had lately been connected with the kingdom of Sicily, Innocent was resolved to take advantage of circumstances for the enforcement of his theory as to the superiority of ecclesiastical over temporal power. Ever since the death of Henry III of Germany, the papacy had been gaining on the empire; for, although the Hildebrandine doctrine as to the supremacy of the church had been confronted by the despotic theory of the imperial power which had been propounded by the civil lawyers under Frederick Barbarossa, this had never been much more than a theory. And now that the representative of the imperial family was an infant, the time appeared to be come when the Hildebrandine claims might be successfully asserted in their fullest extent. Frederick had, indeed, already received the homage of the Germans as his father's successor. But the inexpediency of a minor's reign was strongly impressed on the minds of all by the remembrance of the troubles of Henry IV's youth, and the obligation to Frederick was set aside under the pretext that it had been wrongfully extorted; that when it was exacted, he was but an infant, and even unbaptized; and that his father's death, at a time when the son was too young to assume the government, had altered the conditions of the case. Philip, duke of Swabia, the youngest son of Frederick Barbarossa, on hearing of his brother's death, hurried from Tuscany, of which he had been governor, to check by his presence the disorders which were certain to break out in Germany, and to secure the interest of his young nephew. But he found the feeling of opposition to the election of the child as king to be irresistibly strong, and the adherents of the Hohenstaufen interest entreated him to become himself the representative of his family in opposition to the other candidates who were set up for the crown. Of these, Berthold, duke of Zähringen, after having spent a large sum, shrank from further outlay, and was persuaded by an ample bribe to give in his adhesion to Philip; and Bernard of Saxony withdrew, partly from a dread of expense, and partly because he felt his health unequal to the labours of the office. The choice of the party opposed to the Swabian family—headed by Adolphus of Altena, archbishop of Cologne, a man of great ability, but ambitious, artful, and rapacious,—fell on Otho, a younger son of Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony, and nephew by his mother's side of Richard king of England, by whom he had been created duke of Aquitaine and count of Poitou. Otho, who in childhood was involved in his father's banishment, had grown up in England, and had been employed by his uncle as viceroy of Poitou; and Richard, who could not forget his German captivity, although he declined to attend an election, to which he was summoned in right of the titular kingdom of Provence, bestowed on him by the late emperor, sent commissioners to represent him, recommended the cause of his nephew to the pope, and aided Otho with money which he levied by additional taxes on his subjects. Philip was chosen defender of the kingdom by an assembly of princes and prelates, mostly from the eastern part of Germany, at Arnstadt, near Erfurt, on the 6th of March 1198; Otho, whose strength lay along the Rhine and in the north-west of the country, was elected about Easter by a rival assembly at Andernach, but did not arrive in Germany until Philip had appeared for ten weeks to be without a rival. Each of the competitors was in the earliest manhood—Otho, twenty-three years of age, and Philip younger by a year. In personal character, in wealth, and in the number of his adherents, Philip had the advantage. The chroniclers praise his moderation and

his love of justice; his mind had been cultivated by literature to a degree then very unusual among princes,—a circumstance which is explained by the fact that he had been intended for an ecclesiastical career, until the death of an elder brother diverted him from it; and his popular manners contrasted favorably with the pride and roughness of Otho. But Otho was the favorite with the great body of the clergy, to whom Philip was obnoxious as the representative of a family which was regarded as opposed to the interests of the hierarchy. Philip was said to have been excommunicated by pope Celestine for invading the property of the Roman church; and Innocent insisted on this, although Philip himself declared that he had never had any knowledge of having incurred such a sentence. The truth seems to be that he had either done so by holding intercourse with his excommunicate brother Henry, or had fallen under some general denunciation against all who should interfere with ecclesiastical property; and, without admitting all that was said against him, he was now desirous of reconciliation with the church. The pope sent the bishop of Sutri, a German by birth, into Germany, with instructions to demand the release of Tancred's wife and daughters, and of the archbishop of Salerno, who had been carried off as a captive by the late emperor; and he authorized him to absolve Philip on his surrendering these prisoners and swearing to obey the papal judgment as to all the matters for which he had been excommunicated.

But although the release was effected, the bishop incurred his master's censure by pronouncing the absolution without insisting on the terms which had been prescribed. On the 12th of July, Otho was crowned by the archbishop of Cologne at Aix-la-Chapelle, which he had gained from Philip by winning over the officer who commanded the garrison. He swore to maintain the Roman church, and to relinquish the abuses of his predecessors, especially the *jus exuviarum*; and a similar oath was taken by the electors who were present. Philip, who, although excluded from Charlemagne's city, was in possession of the insignia of the kingdom, and was supported by all the great officers of the imperial court, was crowned at Mayence on the 8th of September, and was hailed as the second of his name—the first having been the Arabian Philip, in the middle of the third century, who had come to be erroneously regarded as the earliest Christian emperor. Although the archbishop of Treves, a vacillating man, who had left the party of Otho, was present, he did not venture to deviate from the tradition in favor of Aix by performing the coronation, and the archbishop of Tarentaise officiated; for which he was cited to answer by the pope. The bishop of Sutri was also present, and in punishment of this and of his other offences, was deposed and was banished to a monastery in an island, where he soon after died.

Innocent, even if he had not wished to interfere, was called on to do so by applications from both parties. The king of England sent an embassy to him in behalf of Otho, who himself wrote to him, making great offers of privileges for the churchy and Philip Augustus of France exerted his interest for Philip. The pope wrote to the princes of Germany, telling them that Philip's coronation was invalid. It had not been performed at the right place or by the right person; his absolution had been pronounced without regard to the conditions prescribed, and was therefore null; he had been crowned while excommunicate, so that the oaths to him were of no force; to have him for king would be to forfeit the right of election, and to admit that the kingdom was hereditary. To Philip's envoys he addressed a warning from Scripture and history, that the empire had no chance of success in opposition to the priesthood; but he added that he would consider of the question; and he drew up a formal statement of the case under the title of a "Deliberation on the Three Elect". In this paper, after laying down (as he had already done in his speech to the envoys) that to the papacy belongs "principally and finally" the disposal of the empire—inasmuch as by the pope it had been transferred from the Greeks to the West, and it was the pope who bestowed the crown—he discussed successively the claims of Frederick, Philip, and Otho. In favor of Frederick were the oath which the princes had taken to him during his father's life, and his connection with the pope as his guardian. Innocent, however, pronounces the oath to be invalid, inasmuch as it was taken when

Frederick was an infant and unbaptized, and because the unforeseen death of his father had occasioned the necessity of choosing another king at a time when Frederick was unfit to perform the duties of the office. The papal guardianship he declares to relate to the kingdom of Sicily only, not to the empire; and he points out the inconveniences which would result from the union of the Sicilian kingdom with the imperial dignity. As to Philip it is admitted that he had been elected by a greater number than Otho; but numbers, it is said, are not the only thing to be regarded; and the objections to Philip are insisted on—his excommunication, the irregularity of the absolution pronounced by the bishop of Sutri, his alleged connection with Markwald and Diephold, the offences of his family against the church, the danger of appearing to substitute the principle of hereditary right for that of election. And the judgment concludes in favor of Otho, as having been chosen by the more judicious, if not the larger, party, as descended on both sides from ancestors devoted to the church, and in himself possessing the qualities requisite for the empire. The pope is said to have declared that either he must take the crown from Philip, or Philip must take from him the ensigns of apostolical dignity.

War immediately broke out along the Rhine, and for ten years it was carried on with extraordinary ferocity—the Bohemians, as in former wars, being branded as guilty of atrocities surpassing those of the Germans. Among the disastrous effects of this war on religion, it is noted that in the choice of bishops regard was chiefly had to their martial qualities, and that this contributed greatly to swell the general disorder of the German church.

From both the contending parties Innocent received frequent applications for his support. Conrad, archbishop of Mayence and primate of Germany, who had been engaged in the crusade during the earlier proceedings, in returning from the Holy Land in 1199, had frequent interviews with the pope, who entreated him to use the influence of his high dignity, his age, his great experience, and his revered character, for the reestablishment of peace. But the archbishop, on reaching his own country, found the undertaking beyond his power, and withdrew into Hungary, where he attempted to mediate between two rival claimants of the Hungarian crown. In returning from this mission, Conrad died at Passau, in October 1200, leaving his see to become the object of a contest between representatives of the parties of Philip and Otho. The anti-papal candidate, Leopold, bishop of Worms, a man of resolute character, who had taken part in the affairs of Italy both as a negotiator and as a warrior, is said to have gone so far as to retaliate the pope's excommunication of him by pronouncing with all the most solemn forms an anathema against Innocent himself. Of the other great Rhenish prelates, John of Treves continued to waver from one party to the other, while Adolphus of Cologne, the chief author of Otho's elevation, forsook his interest, and in November 1204 did homage to Philip. The pope threatened him, and appointed in his stead another archbishop, who for a time got possession of Cologne, and was supported by the citizens. It was remarkable that, of the German bishops, many sided with what was supposed to be the national cause, notwithstanding the terrors of spiritual censure; while the abbots, from their greater dependence on Rome, were generally in favor of Otho. Everywhere there were contests for churches, and appeals to Rome for a decision between rivals; and it is said that, in consequence of the dissensions which prevailed, many members of monastic societies fell away from the communion of the church.

In 1201 legates were sent into Germany, carrying with them the "Deliberation on the Three Elect", as their instructions. It would seem that, from whatever reason, their intercourse was almost wholly with Otho's party, and that they listened to its representations exclusively. They published the pope's judgment at Cologne, declared Otho to be king and "semper Augustus", and reported to their master that Otho had almost all Germany with him, that he had 100,000 men ready to take the field, while Philip was reduced so low that he could not venture to show himself.

The pope wrote letters in all directions, zealously recommending the cause of Otho; but, although he was careful to enforce his lofty hierarchical doctrines by considerations of temporal advantage, his exertions had but little success. Richard of England, who had warmly supported Otho, was succeeded in 1199 by John, and Innocent repeatedly urged the new king to give his nephew effectual assistance. But John was indifferent in the matter; in 1200 he concluded a treaty with France, by which he swore to refrain from helping Otho; and he even alleged this treaty as a reason for withholding payment of a legacy which Richard had bequeathed to his nephew. The pope annulled the oath; but it was with difficulty that he persuaded John to pay even a portion of the legacy; and, although Otho received some money from England in 1202, it was either too little or too late to be availing. To Philip Augustus, Innocent urged the dangers which might be apprehended from the union of Sicily with Germany, as a reason for opposing the Swabian house; but he found that the French king was more powerfully swayed by his jealousy of England, which inclined him to make common cause with Philip against Otho. He endeavored to secure Ottocar of Bohemia to the cause of Otho, by confirming the royal title which he had received from Philip, and by favorably entertaining a proposal to erect a metropolitanical see, so as to render the Bohemian church independent of the primate of Mayence. He reminded the Lombards of the ancient enmity between them and the Hohenstaufen family. He urged again and again on the princes and prelates of Germany the misdeeds of the Swabian house, the personal demerits of Philip, the danger of allowing the principle of inheritance to supersede their electoral rights, while he disclaimed for himself all wish to interfere with these rights, or to overrule their decision; it is not, he said, the man that is to be provided with an empire, but the empire that is to be provided with a man worthy to govern it. He declared all oaths which had been taken to Philip to be null and void; and he showered privileges and immunities of all sorts on the bishops and the monastic societies who espoused the party of Otho. Yet, notwithstanding the pope's strenuous opposition, Philip's strength increased from year to year. His arms prevailed in the held, and he was able to gain some of his rival's chief partisans—such as Adolphus of Cologne, king Ottocar, and Henry, duke of Lorraine and Brabant—so that at length Otho had hardly any other support than that of the people of Cologne; and even this city, the most important in Germany, which had been long the great mart of northern commerce, and had lately acquired a new religious significance through the possession of the relics of the holy Three Kings, was compelled to forsake Otho's party for that of Philip, in October 1206. In order that the defects of form in his earlier election might be remedied, Philip in 1205 resigned the crown at Aix-la-Chapelle, in the presence of a great assemblage of princes; he was enthusiastically reelected, and was crowned in Charlemagne's minster by his new adherent Adolphus of Cologne.

Each of the rivals from time to time endeavored to propitiate the pope by large offers of concession as to the subjects which had been disputed between the ecclesiastical and the secular powers—the election of bishops and abbots, the *jus exuviarum*, and the like; by promising to employ the secular authority for the enforcement of ecclesiastical and monastic discipline, and for the protection of the church's property. Philip offered to submit to the judgment of the Roman church in all points as to which he might have offended; to restore all that his predecessors or himself had taken from the church; to assume the cross, and to use the influence of his connection with the imperial family of Constantinople for the subjection of the Greek church to Rome.

The course of events in Germany told even on Innocent's resolution. In August 1207, his legates were commissioned to absolve Philip, although without any acknowledgment of his title as king, and to endeavor to procure a peace, or at least a truce for two years. The absolution was pronounced at Worms, while Philip agreed to give up Bruno, the papal archbishop of Cologne, who was his prisoner, to admit Siegfried as archbishop of Mayence, and to send the antipapal claimant of that see, Leopold, with Adolphus of Cologne, to the

pope for his judgment. It seemed that Innocent, in despair of Otho's success, was about to abandon his cause; even a matrimonial connection between the pope's family and that of Hohenstaufen was projected. But on the 21st of June 1208, Philip was assassinated at the castle of Altenberg, near Bamberg, by Otho of Wittelsbach, count palatine of Bavaria, in revenge, as was supposed, for having retracted a promise of giving him his daughter Beatrice in marriage. The news of this crime—which excited general horror, and made the perpetrator an outcast until, some months later, he was discovered in a stable and slain by one of his victim's officers—overtook the legates on their return from Germany; and Innocent hastened to write to the German princes, charging them to acquiesce in the manifest declaration of Divine Providence in favor of Otho, by refraining from all opposition to him. He exhorted Otho to moderation and conciliation, and for a time this advice was followed. Philip had left no son, and the only male representative of the Hohenstaufen family was the young Frederick of Sicily. On both sides there was an ardent desire for peace after the troubles which for ten years had desolated Germany; and a proposal that Otho should marry the daughter of his rival, which had in vain been urged on Philip, was now renewed with better success. In a great assembly at Frankfort, on St. Martin's day, Otho was invested with the diadem and the holy lance; and the princess Beatrice, a child of twelve years of age, was led in by the bishop of Spire, who in her name demanded punishment of her father's murderers. She avowed her consent to the proposed marriage, and the canonical objections, which existed in this as in most other cases of princely marriages, were overruled by the pope's dispensation, on condition that Otho should rule with justice, should protect widows and orphans, monasteries, and the church, and should go in person on the crusade. In March 1209, Otho executed at Spire a document by which he renewed his promises to the pope as to the freedom of appeals and elections, the property of deceased bishops, and respect for the rights of the church, and engaged himself to give effectual aid for the extirpation of heresy, and to assist the pope in recovering all the territory which rightfully belonged to the see of Rome. The betrothal with Beatrice was celebrated at Wurzburg on the octave of Pentecost; and in the middle of July Otho set out, with an imposing train of nobles and prelates, at the head of a powerful army, to receive the imperial crown.

In the north of Italy, the feuds of the imperialists and the papalists had raged with great fury. Not only was city opposed to city, but each city was distracted between the two embittered factions—Guelfs and Ghibellines, as they were now called—which divided every class of society, and were outwardly distinguished from each other not only by varieties of dress, but even by the architecture of their houses, and by differences in the minutest habits of life. Some of the cities which had achieved independence, had already fallen under the dominion of lords or tyrants. The first of these was Azzo, marquis of Este, who was chosen by Ferrara, and other nobles after his example made themselves masters of towns in their neighbourhood. Otho, in his progress southward, found much to do in endeavoring to reconcile the enmities of the Italians. The statement of some writers, that he received the Lombard crown either at Milan or at Monza, appears to be mistaken; indeed, it is very questionable whether he even visited Milan at this time. After a succession of festive receptions at Bologna and other cities, he was met by the pope at Viterbo; on the 4th of October, he was crowned as emperor by the hands of Innocent in St. Peter's at Rome, renewing by an oath the promises which he had subscribed at Spire; and for the first and last time an emperor professed to hold his dignity "by the grace of God and the apostolic see". But hardly was the ceremony completed by which Innocent raised to the temporal headship of Christendom a prince of his own choice, when differences began to show themselves. Otho, hitherto so profuse of offers and promises, now felt himself in a new position, and bound to maintain the prerogatives of his crown against the encroachments of the spiritual power. He was assured by jurists that such promises as he had made to the pope in ignorance were not

binding; and perhaps a knowledge of Innocent's late negotiations with Philip may have set his mind at ease as to any obligations of gratitude.

Immediately after the coronation, the quarrels which had become customary on such occasions were renewed between the Romans and the emperor's troops, and many of the Germans were slain. Otho demanded compensation for his loss in men and horses, and on the pope's refusal, retired from the city; but, on being requested to withdraw his troops from the neighborhood, he declared that he would remain until they should have exhausted its provisions. He refused to pay the donative which the Romans claimed at imperial coronations, and enriched himself by the plunder of pilgrims whom his soldiery intercepted on their way to Rome. He seized on some towns and fortresses which the pope had occupied during the vacancy of the empire, and which partly belonged to the inheritance of the countess Matilda; and when Innocent remonstrated, and reminded him of his oath to respect the property of the church, he replied that he had also taken an oath, imposed by the pope himself, to maintain the rights of his crown; that, while he owned the authority of the pope in spiritual things, he was himself supreme in the affairs of this world. After having spent about twelve months in Tuscany and Lombardy, Otho, in November 1210, proceeded into Apulia, where he received the adhesion of Diephold, and invested him anew in the duchy of Spoleto. On this invasion of a territory which was under the special guardianship of the apostolic see, Innocent issued a sentence of anathema against the emperor and his adherents, interdicted the clergy of Capua for having celebrated divine offices in his presence, and declared his subjects to be released from the duty of obedience; and, after having made fruitless attempts by the offer of large concessions to reconcile Otho and Frederick—for which purpose the abbot of Morimond visited the emperor five times in his winter quarters at Capua—he renewed the anathema on Maundy Thursday 1212. Innocent took active measures to make this sentence generally known, and to stir up against Otho those whom he had formerly labored to enlist in his favor, and, in allusion to the disappointment of his policy, he quoted the text—"It repenteth me that I have made man on the earth".

Otho was recalled from his career of success in Italy by tidings of serious disturbances in Germany, which he endeavored to quell by arms and by negotiation. On the 7th of August 1212, his marriage with the daughter of his late rival was celebrated at Nordhausen; but within four days Beatrice suddenly died. Her death was popularly ascribed to poison, supposed to have been administered by one of the mistresses whom the emperor had brought with him from Italy; and the result was disastrous for Otho. The feelings of attachment to the Swabian house, which he had hoped to secure for himself by his late marriage, were now centered on the undoubted and only heir of the Hohenstaufens, Frederick of Sicily, who was already on his way to claim the German kingdom. Otho had made himself unpopular by his pride, by the roughness of his manners, by his illiberality as to money, which was unfavorably compared with the remembrances of Philip's generosity, and by the heavy taxation which he found it necessary to lay on his subjects. The great prelates,—among them Adolphus of Cologne, whom Innocent, in disgust at Otho, now allowed to resume his see, had turned against him, and had been followed by the clergy in general, who were offended by the rudeness with which he treated the highest members of the hierarchy, and by his proposing to reduce their state and their revenues; and some of the chief personages who had by turns sided with both parties in the late contest, such as the king of Bohemia and the duke of Austria, with many of those who were specially attached to the imperial service, had joined the movement of opposition. Otho was declared by the princes to have forfeited the empire, and in the end of 1211 envoys were sent in their name to invite Frederick to Germany.

To the pope the election of Frederick could not be altogether pleasing. He was yet but a boy of sixteen; his claims were founded on that principle of inheritance which Innocent had always striven to exclude from the election; he was the representative of a family which the pope had continually denounced, and already he had shown symptoms of having inherited the

traditions and the feelings of his race. But no other policy than that of supporting Frederick seemed possible; and Innocent gave his approval of the choice. By Frederick himself the invitation of the Germans was eagerly welcomed. The promptings of ambition, the desire to emulate the renown of his forefathers, to find a wider scene for himself than the kingdom of the Sicilian Normans, prevailed over the advice of his southern counsellors and the entreaties of his wife; and, having seen his infant son Henry crowned as his successor, he set out from Palermo on his bold enterprise on Palm Sunday 1212. In April he arrived at Rome, where he had frequent conferences with the pope, and received from him a large supply of money. He then proceeded by sea to Genoa, where he remained nearly three months; and, as the Alpine passes were in the hands of Otho's partisans, he made his way across the north of Italy to Trent, under the escort of cities which were friendly to him, and not without occasional danger from those of the opposite party, such as Milan and Piacenza. From Trent, with a handful of companions, he crossed the mountains to the great monastery of St. Gall, where the abbot received him with honor, and secured to his interest the wavering bishop of Constance. On reaching that city, he was informed that Otho was at hand, and that his culinary train was already within the walls; but the emperor, on arriving three hours later, found that the gates were shut against him, and that the citizens had declared for his rival. As Frederick proceeded down the Rhine, accessions of strength continually poured in on him, and the general disposition in his favor was increased by his popular manners and by his bountiful largesses. On the 12th of November, he was met at Vaucouleurs in Lorraine by the dauphin, Lewis, who in the name of his father, Philip Augustus, assured him of support; and a week later a formal alliance with the French king was concluded at Toul. In the meantime Otho was so deeply engaged in a war with France, that he was unable to check the progress of Frederick. At the great battle of Bouvines, near Tournay, on the 27th of July 1214, Philip Augustus was victorious over Otho and his allies; and for the remaining five years of his life the emperor was forced to confine himself within his hereditary territory of Brunswick. On St. July 25, James's day in the following year, Frederick received the German crown at Aix-la-Chapelle, from the primate Siegfried of Mayence; and, in the enthusiasm of the moment, he, with many others, took the badge of the crusade, to which he afterwards more fully pledged himself by oath at Nuremberg, in the presence of a Roman legate.

The ambition to emulate the fame of Frederick Barbarossa and his other ancestors prevailed over the advice of counsellors who represented to the young prince that the difficulties of Germany required his presence at home; but the result of the engagements into which he thus rashly entered was such as he little expected. In the same year, the question of the empire was considered in the great council of the Lateran, and the pope, after having once adjourned the meeting on account of the heat of the discussion, pronounced in favor of Frederick.

On the other hand, Frederick repaid the pope for his support by large promises in favor of the hierarchy and of the Roman see. In July 1213, he pledged himself at Eger, in Bohemia, in the very words of the oath which Otho had taken and had broken, to allow freedom of elections and appeals, to renounce the *jus exuviarum*, to labor for the suppression of heresy, and to do all that might be in his power towards recovering for the papacy all the territories which it claimed under the donation of Matilda or otherwise. In May 1216, he granted fresh immunities to the church, and in the same year he executed at Strasburg an act by which he promised that, on his coronation as emperor, his son Henry should be emancipated from the paternal control, and should alone hold the kingdom of Sicily, both beyond and within the Strait, under the Roman church; that during his minority, he should be under the care of a governor responsible to the pope; and that the Sicilian kingdom should always be separate from the empire.

PHILIP AUGUSTUS AND INGEBURGA.

With Philip Augustus of France Innocent was drawn into a contest which lasted many years. In this contest the pope appeared as the protector of innocence against wrong; nor is there any reason for supposing that he was influenced by a mixture of lower motives, although his conduct was marked by much of the assumption which had become characteristic of the papacy. Philip, an able, ambitious, prudent, and unscrupulous prince, under whose reign the kingdom of France was doubled in extent, and the power of the crown was much strengthened as against that of the great feudatories, had lost his first wife while preparing to set out on the crusade in 1190. On his return from the East, he was attracted by the fame of the beauty and virtues of Ingeburga, sister of the king of Denmark, a country which at that time had much intercourse with France, as appears from the fact that in the University of Paris there was a special college for Danish students. It is said that, on being sounded by the Danish king as to his expectations of dowry, Philip answered by asking for a transfer of the claims on the crown of England which Denmark had derived from the great Canute, with a year's service of a Danish fleet and army for the assertion of them; but that Canute VI, from unwillingness to involve himself in a war with the formidable Richard of England, preferred to portion his sister in money. In 1193 the princess was conducted to Amiens, and her marriage with Philip was celebrated on the day of her arrival. Next day the royal pair were crowned; but during the ceremony Philip was observed to look pale and to tremble. It was found that since the preceding day he had conceived an unconquerable aversion for Ingeburga, which, as the real cause of it was not disclosed, was popularly ascribed to sorcery. The Danish nobles who had escorted the queen refused to take her back to her native country, and she herself was determined to remain in France. Philip knew, by the experience of some of his predecessors, that he could not hope for peace unless a divorce could be obtained in regular form. The usual objection of relationship within the forbidden degrees between Ingeburga and his former wife was therefore set up against the marriage; and a council at Compiègne, composed of bishops devoted to the king, pronounced for a separation on this ground. Ingeburga, who was present, was filled with astonishment and grief when the sentence was explained to her. In her scanty knowledge of French, she could only give notice of an appeal by crying out—"Wicked France! Rome! Rome!" and the suit was earnestly urged by her brother on Celestine III. The pope declared the sentence of the late council to be annulled by apostolical authority, reproved the French bishops for the part which they had taken in the matter, and charged them to prevent the king from contracting another marriage. But it was in vain that he desired Philip to restore his queen to her rights. Ingeburga was shut up in a convent at Beaurepaire, in the diocese of Arras, where her piety and gentleness won the respect of all who approached her; and Philip, after having met with refusals in other quarters, married Agnes, the beautiful daughter of the duke of Merania, who ruled over a large territory in Istria, the Tyrol, and Bohemia.

The aged Celestine's interest in the matter appears to have cooled, and no decided step was taken during the remainder of his pontificate. But Innocent, on succeeding him, took up the question with characteristic vigor. Even before his consecration, he wrote to the bishop of Paris, desiring him to admonish the king to put away Agnes and to restore Ingeburga; he soon after addressed to Philip himself a letter in which arguments of all sorts were enforced by threats of the heaviest ecclesiastical penalties; and he sent Peter, cardinal of St. Mary in the Via Lata, as legate into France, with authority, in case of the king's obstinacy, to lay his dominions under an interdict. The legate held a council at Dijon, from which the king, by his representatives, appealed to Rome; and the legate—"not out of deference to the appeal, but that he might find a more convenient time and place for fulfilling his commission"—put off the sentence to another council, which he held at Vienne, then within the imperial territory. There the interdict was proclaimed, and, as the king showed no sign of repentance, it was

generally published by the bishops in the beginning of February 1200. Some bishops who at first refused, were compelled by the pope to carry out his orders, although a few still continued to celebrate the offices of religion as usual.

The innocent—such was the theory of the interdict— were to suffer for the guilty sovereign, in order that his heart might be softened either by pity for their misery, or by fear of their discontent. And the sentence of general interdict was one which had never before been felt in France; for that against Robert and Bertha had been limited to their persons, and that against Philip I and Bertrada had been of force only in the places where the sinful pair should be found. The misery now inflicted was extreme. “Awful and wonderful it was”, says Ralph of Coggeshale, “to see in every city the doors of the churches locked, Christians debarred like dogs from entering them, a cessation of divine offices, no consecration of the sacraments of the Lord’s body and blood, no flocking of the people, as had been usual, to the high solemnities of the saints, the bodies of the dead not committed to burial with Christian rites; but the stench of them infected the air, while the frightful sight of them struck horror into the minds of the living”.

For a time Philip met the interdict with defiance. He expelled from their sees some of the bishops who had published it, and reproached them with their indifference to the sufferings of the people. Instead of restoring Ingeburga, he removed her to the castle of Etampes, where she was treated with greater severity than before; and he declared himself ready to turn Mussulman, and professed to envy Saladin for having no pope to annoy him. But after a time the fear of personal excommunication induced him to send envoys to Rome; and there were circumstances which tended to procure for them a favorable hearing. Bishops who had not shrunk from a conflict with the secular power began to fear that their people might learn to despise the ordinances of religion which were denied to them, and might thus fall a prey to heresy; Innocent himself, too, had reason to foresee a contest with England, and was thus disposed to conciliate the king of France. Cardinal Octavian, of Ostia, was therefore sent into France, with orders to require that Philip should receive Ingeburga as queen, should send Agnes out of his dominions, and should make compensation to the clergy for the damages which they had suffered; if the king should wish to impugn the validity of his marriage with the Danish princess, he must begin the proceedings within six months. The legate had an interview with Philip at Sens, where he reproved him for his misdeeds, and Philip with tears promised to obey the pope’s commands. The king and queen afterwards met in Octavian’s presence; Ingeburga was treated with royal pomp, and was publicly displayed as queen; and on this the interdict was taken off, after having weighed on the people of France for upwards of seven months, and the bishops who had been suspended for refusing to publish it were released from their suspension, on swearing to go to Rome and to obey the pope’s commands.

But although Philip complained to the pope that Octavian had dealt hardly with him, the cardinal had contented himself with receiving promises which were not to be performed. Ingeburga was again sent back to her prison-like seclusion at Etampes, until the question of the marriage should be tried before Octavian and another legate. For this purpose a council was held at Soissons in Lent 1201. The king’s lawyers began by arguing the objection on the ground of affinity; but the advocates who had been sent from Denmark for the queen’s cause appealed to the pope, on the ground that Philip had not treated her as his nobles had sworn for him that he would treat her, and also because Octavian, as being related to the king, and for other reasons, was suspected of partiality in the case. The legate desired them to wait for the arrival of his colleague, cardinal John of St. Paul; but they refused and withdrew. Ingeburga was left alone and friendless; but after a discussion of several days, in which Philip’s counsel exhausted the resources of their learning, an unknown clerk stood forward, and, having asked leave to speak in the queen’s behalf, argued her cause with a skill and a power which extorted admiration even from the king himself. Philip saw that the judgment of the council, which cardinal John was about to pronounce, would be against him, and resolved to prevent such a

result. He announced his intention to treat Ingeburga as a wife and a queen; and, proceeding to the convent where she lodged, after a long interview with her, he placed her behind him on his horse and carried her away. On being informed of this, the council broke up. But when Philip's object had been gained by averting a sentence, the unfortunate Ingeburga was again removed to the castle of Etampes, where she was treated with increased rigour.

Agnes of Merania, while the interdict was in force, had implored the pope to let her enjoy the society of Philip as a husband; for the crown she declared that she did not care. The French nobles had advised the king to send her out of the country; but it was impossible to act on this advice after the council of Soissons, as she was then far advanced in pregnancy; and she soon after died of grief, having given birth to a son, on whom she bestowed the significant name of Tristan. This child did not long survive his mother; but at the earnest suit of Philip, who represented that the divorce pronounced by the council of Compiègne had led him to think himself free to marry—and perhaps also from motives of policy—Innocent consented to acknowledge the two elder children of Agnes as legitimate, and capable of inheriting after their father. Agnes was buried at Nantes with great splendor, and in memory of her Philip erected and endowed a convent for a hundred and twenty monks.

From time to time Ingeburga addressed to the pope complaints of the treatment which she received, and entreaties that he would interfere in her behalf. It is represented that she was kept in close seclusion, seeing no one except occasionally a priest; that her character was aspersed by slander; that she was denied the opportunity of confessing, and was rarely admitted to the mass; that she was cut off from all communication with her native land, and that even her two Danish chaplains were not allowed to speak with her except in French and in the presence of Frenchmen; that her guards were persons of low condition and of rude behavior; that she was ill supplied with food and clothing, so as to be reduced even to accept charitable gifts for her comfort; that she was denied the use of the bath and of medical attendance; and she prays that any concession which may be wrung from her by such treatment may not be allowed to prejudice her rights. The pope in consequence of these letters often wrote to Philip, exhorting him to fulfill his promises to Ingeburga, or, if he could not love her, at least to show her outward respect. Philip endeavored by various means to procure a divorce; by ascribing his aversion to the influence of magic, by endeavoring to induce Ingeburga to become a nun, or to make such statements as should agree with his own account of their conjugal connection. But the pope steadily adhered to his purpose—exhorting Philip, if he believed himself to be under magical influence, to strive against it by fasting and prayer, and telling him that compliance with his wishes was unlawful and impossible.

At length, in the year 1213—twenty years after the repudiation, and seventeen years after Ingeburga had been committed to seclusion—Philip, after consultation with the cardinal-legate, Robert Curzon, and probably with a view to popular support in his quarrels with England and Flanders—consented to receive her as queen. They lived together until his death in 1223 and Ingeburga founded at Corbeil, where she spent her fourteen years of widowhood, a college of priests in connection with the military order of St. John, for the benefit of her husband's soul.

5

AFFAIRS OF ENGLAND

The sovereign of England, during all but the first year of Innocent's pontificate, was one whose character—sensual, faithless, cruel, violent and weak, without religion, but not without superstition—afforded ample opportunities for the encroachment of the papacy on the secular power. John, after having been forgiven by his brother Richard for many offences, had been declared by him his heir, in preference to Arthur, the son of an elder but deceased

brother. The crown of England, although limited to one family, had hardly ever since the Norman conquest descended according to the strict rule of inheritance; and it is said that at John's coronation the archbishop of Canterbury, Hubert Walter, addressed the assembled nobles in words which declared it to depend on election. John had already given general scandal by carrying off the betrothed bride of the count of la Marche, while he himself had another wife living; he was believed to have instigated the murder of his nephew Arthur, or even to have murdered him with his own hand. For this he was cited by Philip Augustus, as suzerain of his continental territories, to answer before the peers of France—a court of fabulous origin, and of which this is the first mention in authentic history. In default of appearing, he was condemned to forfeiture; and, through the disaffection which his vices and his extravagant taxation had excited among his subjects, Philip was enabled to wrest from him within a few months the great inheritance of Rollo. His matrimonial irregularities, although really as criminal as those of Philip Augustus, had passed without censure from the pope. But he had already been involved in serious differences with Innocent on account of his disposal of sees, his taxation of monasteries, and other offences, when a question as to the appointment of a primate brought him into direct collision with the papacy.

On the death of Archbishop Hubert, in 1205, the younger monks of Canterbury hastily assembled by night and elected the sub-prior, Reginald, placed him on the high altar, seated him in the archiepiscopal chair, and sent him off to sue for the pall at Rome, under an obligation to keep his election secret until he should appear in the pope's own presence. But Reginald's vanity was too strong for this promise, and immediately on landing in Flanders he proclaimed his new dignity. When this was known in England, the monks—even those who had elected him—became ashamed of their choice, and, in order to disarm the king's indignation, they applied to him for leave to proceed to a fresh election. John recommended one of his chief counsellors, John de Grey, bishop of Norwich, who was accordingly chosen, invested with the temporalities of the see, and sent to Rome with a statement on the king's part that he had been unanimously elected, and with a protest against any claims which might be set up in favor of a rival. The bishops of the province, however, who had been disregarded in the affair, sent envoys to assert their customary right to a share in the election; and Innocent saw in these circumstances an opportunity for effectually interfering with the Anglo-Norman system, by which, wherever the choice of bishops might nominally be lodged, it was really in the hands of the sovereign. He therefore disallowed both the elections, denied the claim of the suffragan bishops to a share in the appointment of their metropolitan, and desired that fifteen monks of Christ-church should be sent to Rome by a certain day, as representatives of the convent, to choose on the spot an archbishop of his own nomination. The person whom the pope recommended was Stephen Langton, an Englishman, who had been his fellow-student at Paris, and, after having taught in that university with great distinction, had lately been promoted to the cardinalate of St. Chrysogonus. It was in vain that the representatives of the Canterbury monks urged the necessity of the king's approval. Innocent peremptorily declared that such was not the case when an election was made at the place of the pope's own residence; and, with the protest of a single monk, on the part of the king and of his candidate, Langton was elected by the deputies of Christ-church, and was thereupon consecrated by the pope.

Such an interference with the rights of the national church, in entire disregard of the crown, was wholly new in England, and might reasonably have awakened the king's resentment. But through the unpopularity and folly of John, the high reputation of Stephen Langton, and the energy with which Innocent carried out his policy, the result was very different from what it might otherwise have been.

On receiving an account of the late proceedings from Innocent, with a request for his approval (although the pope intimated that this was unnecessary), John violently objected to Langton as one who, although by birth an English subject, was personally unknown to him,

and had lived among his “public enemies” in France. He reminded the pope that England contributed more to the income of the Roman church than all the other countries north of the Alps; he declared himself resolved to carry through the promotion of the bishop of Norwich, and, in case of the pope’s refusal, to cut off all communication between his dominions and Rome. In the meantime he turned his rage against the monks of Canterbury, whom two of his officers, with the assistance of mercenary soldiers, ejected from their convent; and he seized their lands, together with those belonging to the archbishopric. The monks, however, as had been usual in the case of ecclesiastics driven from England for opposition to the royal will, found an eager welcome abroad, and were entertained at St. Bertin’s and in other foreign monasteries. The pope continued the correspondence for some time. He remarked that John could not well be unacquainted with Langton’s character, inasmuch as he had congratulated him on his advancement to the cardinalate, and, in disregard both of the king’s threats and of the money with which the English envoys were furnished, he bestowed the pall on Langton with his own hands at Viterbo.

Innocent, after some further exchange of letters, empowered the bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester to interdict the kingdom of England, without excepting even the churches of monastic or military orders, if John should obstinately refuse to hearken to the admonitions which they were charged to deliver. On the announcement of this, John burst out in a paroxysm of rage, uttering violent abuse against the pope, with threats against the clergy and all who should bring any message from the Roman court; and he drove the bishops from his presence. The interdict was therefore published in Lent 1208, and John met it by putting his threats into execution. At first, he was disposed to deny the clergy the protection of the laws, so that, when a man was charged with the murder of a priest, the king exclaimed: “He has slain one of my enemies; let him go free”. But he afterwards changed his policy in this respect, and ordered that anyone who should outrage a clerk should be hanged on the nearest oak. A general order was issued for the banishment of all clergymen; and, as many of them would not leave the country, it was directed that their property should be seized, but that enough to sustain life should be allowed them. Severe measures were also taken against the wives or concubines of the clergy. The bishops who had published the interdict fled across the sea, and were followed by all their brethren except those who enjoyed the king’s favor; and a chronicler strongly blames them for leaving their flocks to the wolf, while they themselves lived “in all manner of delights abroad”. At length Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester, was the only member of his order who remained in England, and he, says a chronicler, remained, not as a defender of the church, but as a minister of the king. The Cistercians at first continued to celebrate their rites, in neglect of the interdict, but were compelled by the pope to refrain; and when, at a later time, some other societies of monks were allowed at the primate’s intercession to celebrate, the Cistercians were punished by exclusion from this favor. It was in vain that the king’s nephews, the duke of Saxony and Otho of Germany, entreated him to make peace with the church; but, although the sufferings of the English during the time of the interdict were great, they were far less severe than the misery which had lately been produced by a like sentence in France. For it was found impossible to enforce the interdict in all its rigor; the nobles, who at other times stoutly opposed the crown, had no wish to see the hierarchy supreme, and even among the clergy there was a strong feeling of nationality. And thus it was that, while the powerful and able Philip Augustus was reduced to submission by an interdict in seven months, the weak, pusillanimous, and unpopular John was able to hold out against the pressure of a like censure for upwards of six years, even although an excommunication of his person was added to the general sentence. In 1209 the bishops of London, Ely, Worcester, and Arras were authorized to pronounce the anathema; but they did not venture into England for the purpose, and John took all possible means to prevent the introduction of letters conveying the sentence, as it was considered that a formal delivery of such a document was necessary to its taking effect. But reports of the excommunication

reached England, and were acted on by the more scrupulous of the ecclesiastics who remained in the country. Geoffrey, archdeacon of Norwich, resigned a judgeship in the Exchequer on the ground that he could not serve an excommunicated sovereign; whereupon he was imprisoned, loaded with a leaden cope, and scantily fed; and under these severities he died. Hugh of Wells, a royal chaplain who was much employed in the king's affairs, having been elected to the bishopric of Lincoln in 1209, obtained leave to go abroad that he might be consecrated by the archbishop of Rouen; but on landing in France, he took his way to Pontigny, where Langton, like his predecessor Becket, had found a refuge, and there he received consecration from the banished primate. In punishment of this, the revenues of Lincoln were confiscated, and the bishop was compelled to remain in exile. In the meantime John endeavored to obtain supplies of money by taxing the monasteries excessively, and the Cistercians, as they were longest spared, had at last to pay heavily in proportion. In 1210 the pope absolved all John's subjects from their oath of fealty; and it is said that the king, on his part, endeavored to strengthen himself by sending a mission to seek an alliance with the Mahometans of Africa.

In 1212 Langton went to Rome, in company with the bishops of London and Ely, to represent to the pope the crimes of John against the church, and the sufferings which the bishops and clergy had endured. Indignant that his spiritual thunders should have been so long spent without effect, Innocent resolved to employ means of another kind, and the archbishop on his return to France was authorized to pronounce the deposition of John, and to invite Philip Augustus to an invasion of England, promising to all who should take part in this enterprise the privileges of crusaders. Philip eagerly caught at the hope of adding England to the territories which he had already wrested from John; the crusade was resolved on at a national assembly at Soissons, and preparations were made for a speedy and formidable descent on England, while John endeavored to prepare for meeting it by assembling a fleet at Portsmouth, and an army on Barham Downs, near Canterbury. John's superstitious mind had been much alarmed by a prophecy of one Peter, a hermit of Pontefract or Wakefield, that he would cease to reign before Ascension-day, the anniversary of his coronation; and this prediction, with others of the same person, or feigned in his name, had become generally current, and had produced a strong impression on the people, although Peter, on being questioned by the king, professed himself unable to explain in what manner the fulfillment was to take place. While men's minds were in general alarm, and while the forces on either side were mustering, Pandulf, a Roman sub-deacon of great experience in affairs, arrived in England, with two knights of the Temple, and had a meeting with the king at Dover. They represented to him the imminent danger in which he was from enemies both abroad and at home, and Pandulf suggested that there was but one way of safety possible—namely, through reconciliation with the church—through resigning the kingdoms of England and Ireland to St. Peter, and consenting to hold them in vassalage, and on condition of a yearly tribute, under the Roman see. To this proposal—not the less degrading because in other kingdoms and in other circumstances some similar tenure had been admitted in consideration of special benefits and privileges—John was fain to consent. He promised to submit to the pope's judgment as to all the matters which had caused his excommunication; to recall the banished bishops and clergy, and to pay them a compensation for their losses; and on the eve of Ascension-day, at a house of the templars near Dover, he formally yielded up the crowns of England and Ireland, and did homage for his kingdoms to the papal envoy. The Yorkshire hermit's prophecy was popularly regarded as fulfilled; and whether in acknowledgment or in denial of its truth, John caused Peter and his son to be dragged at the tails of horses from Corfe Castle (where he had imprisoned them) to Wareham, and there to be hanged. The interdict was relaxed, and Pandulf, on his return to France, charged Philip in the pope's name to refrain from carrying out his designs against England, as the king had become the vassal of St. Peter. Philip indignantly exclaimed against the pope for having lured him by deceitful hopes to incur vast

trouble and expense in preparing for the expedition which his representative had now forbidden. In the meantime John summoned his liegemen to attend him on an expedition into Poitou, and, on their hesitating to comply, under the pretext that he was not yet formally absolved, he invited Langton and the other banished bishops to return. The primate was received with great honor, and on St. Margaret's day, in Winchester Cathedral, the king swore in his presence to do justice in his courts to all men, keep the ancient laws, (especially those of Edward the Confessor,) to restore all church property, and to compensate the owners for all that they had lost. With a view to the settlement of all remaining difficulties, as well as to the preaching of a crusade and summoning a general council, Nicolas, cardinal-bishop of Tusculum, arrived in England as legate about Michaelmas; and at a council which was held at St. Paul's in October, John again went through the humiliation of doing homage for his kingdom to the representative of Rome, and paid the first portion of the stipulated tribute.

In the beginning of February 1214, John set out for his campaign in Poitou, where his army met with considerable success. But he was recalled by the tidings of the great victory gained by Philip at Bouvines, where among Otho's allies was a large force of English under the earl of Salisbury, who himself was struck down and taken prisoner by the martial bishop Philip of Beauvais. On hearing of this defeat, John passionately exclaimed that since his reconciliation with God and the church everything had gone ill with him.

The removal of the interdict was delayed by negotiations as to the indemnity which was to be paid to the clergy. But Innocent was now disposed to take part with his new vassal, and the legate Nicolas disgusted the English clergy by insisting on a compromise which was far short of their demands. When this had at length been settled, the interdict was formally taken off on St. Peter's and St. Paul's day 1214.

The barons of England felt deeply the degradation which John's abject submission to the pope had inflicted on them and on the whole kingdom; and his long misgovernment, his reckless indulgence in excesses of tyranny and lust, had excited a general desire for the privileges and the control of settled law. It was therefore resolved to insist on the fulfillment of the king's solemn promise to observe the laws of king Edward; and in this movement the primate took the lead, with the intention of guiding it according to equity and to written right. At a meeting held at St. Paul's, London, in August 1213, he announced to the assembled nobles that he had found a charter of liberties, granted by Henry I at his coronation, and confirmed by Henry II; and on this it was determined by the bishops and barons that they would take their stand. The spiritual and the lay chiefs swore to support each other in the attempt, and the compact was renewed in a later meeting at Bury St. Edmund's. It was in vain that the legate Nicolas threw all his influence into the opposite scale; that the king raged, and swore never to consent to a claim of liberties which would reduce him to the condition of a slave; that he tried to detach the bishops from their alliance with the barons by offering entire freedom of election to sees; that he took the cross at the hands of the bishop of London, in order to secure the privileges of a crusader; that he surrounded himself with foreign mercenary soldiers. He found himself deserted by all but the nobles of his court; the barons pressed steadily onwards, possessed themselves of the capital, and on the 15th of June, 1215, extorted from the king at Runnymede the signature of the Great Charter—a document intended to record with unquestionable certainty, and thereby to secure, the rights to which English subjects were already entitled on the ground of earlier laws, with such new provisions as were necessary to counteract new dangers and usurpations. In the first article of this it is declared, with a reference to the king's spontaneous grant of freedom of election, that the church of England shall be free, and shall have her rights entire and her liberties uninjured.

John reckoned on evading his obligations under the pretext that, as the pope was now suzerain of England, the charter could have no validity without his consent. It is said that Innocent, on hearing of the meeting at Runnymede, burst out into an indignant exclamation, swearing by St. Peter to punish the barons for attempting to dethrone a king who had taken the

badge of a crusader, and had placed himself under the protection of the Roman church; and on the 24th of August he issued a bull by which he condemned and annulled the charter, released all men from their obligations to observe it, and severely censured the English primate for the part which he had taken in extorting it from the king. Against Langton, in whom he had expected to find a submissive instrument of Rome, Innocent was especially provoked, not only by his political conduct, but by his opposition to the legate Nicolas, who had thrown himself wholly into the king's interest, and by claims as to patronage and other matters had frequently come into collision with the ancient privileges of Canterbury. The bishop of Winchester, the abbot of Reading, and Pandulf, who about this time was elected to the see of Norwich, were charged to pronounce an excommunication against all who should oppose the king, and to suspend any prelate who should refuse to publish the sentence. Langton was on the point of setting out for the Lateran council when he received notice from the commissioners that he was suspended by the pope's commands. But, while professing obedience to the papal authority, he declared that the order had been issued on false information, declined to publish it until he should have had an opportunity of conferring with the pope, and proceeded on his way to the council. At that great assembly John had his representatives, who dwelt on the primate's alleged offences, and the pope declared himself unreservedly for the king. Excommunication was denounced against all who should oppose John; Langton was severely censured by Innocent for having taken part with the barons, and for having disregarded the notice of suspension; and the election of his brother Simon to York was disallowed in favor of the king's nominee, Walter de Grey, bishop of Worcester. The primate's suspension was removed in February 1216, but with the condition that he should not return to England until peace should have been concluded between the king and the barons, by a party of whom Lewis, eldest son of the king of France, had been invited into England, as the only means of successfully opposing the foreign mercenaries whom John kept in his pay. Lewis had eagerly embraced the opportunity, in defiance of solemn and repeated warnings and threats from the pope's legate, Gualo—alleging that John had never been rightful king, that he had been condemned for the murder of his nephew, that he had violated his coronation-oath, that his surrender of the kingdom was void, because unsanctioned by the barons. Philip Augustus, although he professed to take no share in his son's enterprise, secretly encouraged it, and England was for a time a prey to the ravages of three foreign armies—the French, the Scots, who took the opportunity to break in on the north, and the king's Brabançons, or mercenaries.

In the meantime Innocent endeavored to support John by spiritual denunciations against his chief opponents, and by interdicting the city of London, which took part with the invaders. But these sentences were generally disregarded, and John at his death, on the 16th of October 1216 (three months after that of Innocent), left to a boy only nine years old a kingdom of which the soil was in great part occupied by a foreign invader.

6

AFFAIRS OF HUNGARY, SPAIN, ETC.

In his dealings with the less considerable states of Christendom, Innocent displayed the same lofty conception of his authority, the same vigor and firmness in asserting it, the same skill in finding opportunities for intervention, which we have seen in his policy toward the empire, France, and England. Thus in Hungary he took advantage of a disturbed succession, when, on the death of Bela III, Andrew employed against his brother Emmerich the forces which he had raised as if for a crusade; and the pope, by persuading the rivals to lay down their arms, while he restored peace to the country, established his own spiritual sway.

In the Christian kingdoms of Spain, he benefited by the irregular marriages of sovereigns, which placed them at his mercy for the employment of spiritual punishments, such

as interdict and anathema, and compelled them to submit to his decisions. The reigning family of Aragon had risen from being counts of Barcelona to a degree of importance which seemed to warrant the assumption of the royal title; but they had never been crowned, and the young king Peter resolved to seek the papal confirmation of his dignity. In 1204 he received the crown from Innocent's hands in the church of St. Pancras without the walls of Rome, and then, accompanying the pope to St. Peter's, he laid his crown and sceptre on the altar. Having thus offered his kingdom to St. Peter, he was reinvested in it by the symbol of the sword, and promised to hold it as a fief of the apostolic see, paying a yearly tribute, and granting entire freedom of election to bishoprics and abbeys, for the disposal of which the consent of the sovereign had until then been necessary. On returning home, Peter found that his concessions to Rome had excited some discontent among his subjects; but the compact was observed, and although Peter himself, as we shall see, was drawn into opposition to the cause which the pope sanctioned in the religious war of southern France, it was not from any want of loyalty to the papacy, but from sympathy with his own relations and allies, for whom he had interceded with Innocent in vain.

Innocent earnestly exerted himself to persuade the Christians of Spain to peace among themselves, and to combination against their Moslem enemies. When a great invasion from Africa, under the miramolin Mahomet el Nazir, was threatened in 1211, he authorized the raising of a crusading force from other countries for the assistance of the Spanish Christians, and instituted solemn prayers at Rome for the success of their arms. In 1212 the invaders were overthrown by the kings of Aragon and Castile, with their allies, in the battle of Navas de Tolosa—a victory which recalls that of Charles Martel at Poitiers by its greatness both in itself and its results, inasmuch as it for ever delivered Europe from the fear of invasion on the side of Africa. In acknowledgment of the pope's assistance, the victors sent the banner and the lance of the Saracen leader to be hung up in St. Peter's; and a solemn thanksgiving was there celebrated, in which the king of Castile's report of the victory was publicly read, and the pope addressed the assembled multitude on the deliverance which had been wrought for Christendom.

In Portugal, in Scotland, in the Scandinavian kingdoms, and in Poland, the vigilance and the vigor of Innocent's administration made themselves felt, in inculcating the obligations of Christian morality and religion, as well as in asserting the pretensions of the Roman see. In countries where the claims of the Greek church conflicted with those of the Latin, he labored to secure the allegiance of the princes and of their people to St. Peter; but, although he was successful in Dalmatia, and in Bulgaria, where he conferred the title of king on the barbarian prince Joannicius, it was in vain, that he attempted to conciliate the Russians by the offer of a similar dignity, with the power of St. Peter's sword. "Has your master a weapon like this?" said the Russian prince Roman to the papal envoy, laying his hand on his own sword—"If so, he may dispose of kingdoms and cities; but so long as I carry this on my thigh, I need no other". And when the overtures were renewed after the Latin conquest of Constantinople, the Russians continued obstinately to hold to the Greek patriarch who had established himself at Nicaea.

With Armenia Innocent was drawn into particular communication by the connection of the crusaders with that country. The differences of doctrine and usages which had divided the churches were smoothed over; the Armenian patriarch accepted a pall from Rome, and promised to appear either in person or by deputy at councils convoked by the pope, and to send a representative to Rome every fifth year.

The state of the Latin kingdom in the East engaged the attention of Innocent from the very beginning of his pontificate. The late attempt at a crusade had not only failed of its object, but had thrown discredit on the western nations which had been concerned in it. Even before the Germans had relinquished the expedition, the pope endeavored to stir up fresh volunteers to take their place in fighting the infidels. He attempted, by correspondence with the emperor and with the patriarch, to draw the Greeks of Constantinople into a new enterprise for the common cause of Christendom; and in the last days of the year 1199, he issued letters summoning the west to the deliverance of the Holy Land. He bound himself and the cardinals to give a tenth of their income towards the cost of the expedition; from other ecclesiastics a fortieth at least was required. For the Cistercians and Premonstratensians, the Carthusians, and the order of Grammont, the demand was only a fiftieth; but the Cistercians pleaded the privileges granted by former popes, and it is said that a threatening vision of their patroness, the blessed Virgin, terrified the pope into exempting them from all contribution, except their prayers for the success of the crusade. The old privileges of crusaders were renewed and extended; and this, we are told by Villehardouin, was an inducement which persuaded many to take the cross. But the legates and the preachers who were sent to publish the crusade in various countries, found in general a lack of zeal for the cause. There was a prevailing suspicion that the money contributed for the Holy Land was sometimes detained in the Roman coffers; and Innocent condescended to counteract this suspicion, by announcing that the funds for the new crusade would not pass through his hands—that in every parish a chest with three locks was to be provided for the collection, and that the keys were to be entrusted to the bishop of the diocese, with a knight of the Temple, and one of the Hospital. Among those who enlisted themselves for the crusade there was no prince of the highest rank. In Germany, Philip and Otho were contending for the possession of the imperial crown. The pope's endeavors to unite the rival kings of France and England in a new expedition to the East had been fruitless; and after the death of Richard, Philip Augustus was engrossed by the interests of his kingdom at home, and by the difficulties which had arisen out of his marriage. The highest in dignity and importance of those who took the cross was Baldwin, count of Flanders and Hainault, whose father, Philip, had died in the Holy Land.

In France, a remarkable excitement was produced by the preaching of an ecclesiastic named Fulk, of Neuilly on the Marne. Fulk had been for years a parish-priest of the ordinary kind, when he became impressed with the desire of something higher and better than the life which until then had satisfied him. Feeling his ignorance, he resorted to the lectures of Peter the Chanter, a famous teacher of Paris and with the knowledge which he thus acquired, a spirit and a fervor altogether new appeared to animate him. His preaching became famous; he eloquently denounced the errors of heretics, the subtleties of dialecticians and decretalists, and reprobated the vices of all classes—especially those of usurers. He reclaimed many women from a life of sin, and either persuaded them to enter into convents, or portioned them for marriage. He sent disciples to preach in various parts of France and in other countries—among them, Eustace of Flai, whose visit to England has been already mentioned. After a time, the power of Fulk's preaching was reinforced by miracles; he cast out devils, he cured the blind, the dumb, the deaf, and the lame—discovering by a special gift who were likely to receive spiritual benefit from the bodily cures which he bestowed on them; and those who refused to believe were delivered by him to Satan—a sentence which was followed by the vengeance of heaven. Nor were the admonitions of Fulk confined to the multitudes of low condition who flocked around him with such eagerness that sometimes he was even in danger from their pressure; it was he, according to some authorities, who reproved Richard of England for cherishing as his three daughters, pride, covetousness, and luxury; to which the king replied that he bestowed his pride in marriage on the templars, his greed on the Cistercians, and his luxury on the prelates of the church. Yet in the midst of his success Fulk incurred much suspicion by the difference of his habits from the asceticism which was

generally affected by such preachers; for he rode on horseback, shaved his hair, and professed no austerity as to clothing or diet. By these suspicions the effect of his sermons was impaired, so that many of his converts fell away; the offence which he had given to many persons seemed to stand in the way of his work; and it would seem that the freshness and energy of his discourse had worn off, when he was commissioned to preach the crusade in the room of Peter the Chanter, who had undertaken the task, but had died, and had bequeathed it to his pupil. For this new object Fulk exerted his eloquence with even more than his former vigor and effect. He presented himself at the general chapter of the Cistercians, where he, with the bishop of Langres and others, solemnly took the cross. At Écry, a castle on the Aisne, he arrived at the time of a great tournament given by the young count Theobald of Champagne, brother of Henry, the late king of Jerusalem; and such was the effect of his fervid words, that the count himself, with most of his guests, took the cross—among them, Walter of Brienne (who, however, afterwards relinquished the crusade for his attempt in southern Italy), Simon de Montfort, who had already been distinguished as a crusader, and Geoffrey of Villehardouin, marshal of Champagne, who eventually became the historian of the expedition.

At meetings which were afterwards held, it was resolved that the surest way to weaken the Mussulman power was by means of an attack on Egypt; and with a view to this, as well as from a remembrance of the disasters which had befallen former expeditions by land, it was resolved to proceed by sea. Villehardouin was therefore dispatched, with five others, to Venice, in order to negotiate for the means of transport.

Venice had by this time become the most important of the Italian trading cities; excelling her rivals Genoa and Pisa, not only in the number of her ships, but in their size and build, and in the boldness, the skill, and the discipline of their crews. She was the great centre of commerce between the East and the West, and had a factory or quarter of her own in all the chief cities of the Levant. The Lateran council of 1179 had forbidden all Christians to supply munitions of war to the Saracens, and Innocent had endeavored to put an end to all commerce with the infidels; but the Venetians represented to him that, as they had no agriculture, a suppression of their traffic would be ruinous to them; and the pope relaxed his order by allowing them for a time to trade with “the kingdoms of Egypt and Babylon” in everything but warlike stores, adding the expression of a hope that this indulgence would render them more zealous to help Jerusalem. The Venetians, although always respectful to the papacy, had been accustomed—perhaps through some influence of their communication with the infidels and the schismatics of the East—to behave with firmness in their dealings with Rome, and had thus achieved for themselves a peculiar amount of spiritual independence. Their relations with Constantinople had been for some time unfriendly; their merchants had been plundered by the emperor Manuel, their settlers had been massacred under Andronicus, and, although Isaac Angelus had restored their privileges, the dethronement of that emperor by Alexius, in 1195, had produced a new and unfavorable turn in the state of affairs.

At Venice, Villehardouin and his companions found a ready hearing. Henry Dandolo, the doge, who, although ninety-four years old, and almost entirely blind, retained all his mental vigor, and even his martial spirit, entered eagerly into the project, and after a solemn mass in St. Mark’s, an agreement was ratified by the acclamations of 10,000 Venetians who were present, and by mutual oaths on the holy Gospels. In consideration of a certain sum, the Venetians were to provide, by the feast of St. John at midsummer 1202, ships and provisions for the transport and maintenance of the crusading force; they were to add at least fifty galleys of their own, and, so long as the partnership should last, any conquests which might be made were to be equally divided between the contracting parties. The pope sanctioned the enterprise, with the significant condition that no attack should be made on any Christian people.

On returning to France, the envoys found the gallant Theobald of Champagne dangerously sick, and he soon after died, at the age of twenty-five. The command of the

expedition was thus left vacant, and, after having been declined by the duke of Burgundy and other princes, it was accepted by Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, and brother of the famous Conrad. Boniface, in consequence of an invitation to France, appeared at an assembly at Soissons, where he was invested with the cross and with a general's staff by the bishop of the place and Fulk of Neuilly; and at a chapter which the marquis afterwards attended at Citeaux, Fulk was able to declare that he had given the cross to 200,000 men.

At the appointed time, the crusaders appeared in great numbers at Venice, and it was found that the Venetians, in their naval preparations, had more than fulfilled their part of the engagement. But as many of the crusaders, in the hope of finding cheaper terms of passage, had preferred to embark at Marseilles, or at some port of southern Italy, those who assembled at Venice were unable to make up the stipulated sum; and although count Baldwin and other chiefs liberally contributed all that they had with them, including plate and jewels, and even all that they could borrow, a large deficiency still remained. Although the price had been calculated for a much larger number, yet, as it had been promised in one sum, the Venetians were peremptory in requiring full payment before they would consent to sail; and at length, when the fulfillment of this condition was evidently hopeless, the doge proposed to the Venetian council that, instead of insisting on further money, or of using their right to seize as forfeit that which had already been paid, they should persuade the crusaders to join them in an expedition against Zara, in Dalmatia, which had been lately taken from the republic by the king of Hungary. The crusaders were informed that, if this proposal were accepted, the forces of Venice would go with them to the holy war; and at a great assemblage in St. Mark's, the doge announced from one of the lecterns that he himself, although old, infirm, and needing rest, would gladly take the lead of his countrymen in so glorious an enterprise. His words were received with acclamations of joy, mixed with tears; and Dandolo, descending from the lectern, proceeded to the altar, where, amidst intense excitement of the multitude, he fell on his knees, weeping profusely, and received the cross.

On the 8th of October 1202, a fleet of 480 vessels sailed from the port of Venice, and, after having reduced some of the small islands of the Adriatic to subjection, the crusaders arrived off Zara. A cardinal, whom the pope had sent to accompany the expedition, had returned to his master, on finding himself refused by the Venetians as legate, although they were willing to admit him as a preacher; and on his report Innocent had threatened to anathematize the crusaders if they made war on any Christians. Guy, abbot of Vaux-Cernay, who had accompanied Simon de Montfort, now protested in the pope's name against attacking a Christian city, belonging to a king who himself had taken the cross. But Dandolo replied that the king of Hungary's crusading was only a pretense, and it was with difficulty that Simon was able to save the zealous abbot from the fury of the Venetians. On Martinmas day, siege was laid to Zara, and on the sixth day the defenders, after having in vain appealed to the sympathy of the crusaders by displaying crosses and sacred pictures from the walls, were forced to surrender. The expedition was now joined by the marquis of Montferrat, who had been unable to accompany it at the outset; but it was weakened by the departure of Simon de Montfort and others, who had taken no part in the assault on Zara.

During the winter, which was spent at Zara, some serious conflicts took place between the French and Venetians, and negotiations were actively carried on with the pope. Innocent, after having severely reproofed and excommunicated the crusaders for their transgression of his orders, was at length persuaded to accept their professions of repentance, and to absolve them, charging them to restore Zara to the king of Hungary, and to undertake no further expedition against Christians, but to go on to the Holy Land.

But a new object was now suggested for their enterprise, and was rendered the more attractive by the necessities into which a great part of them had by this time fallen. Alexius, son of the dethroned emperor Isaac Angelus of Constantinople, and brother-in-law of Philip of Swabia, had entreated their leaders while at Venice to help in the recovery of his father's

throne. His first application had been fruitless, and he had been unable to obtain any decided answer from the pope. But at Zara the crusaders received envoys from Philip, who recommended the cause of his Byzantine connections, and held forth on the part of the young Alexius tempting offers of money and of cooperation towards their great object, with the hope of reunion between the Greek and the Latin churches, if they would turn aside for a short time to restore the rightful emperor to the throne of Constantinople. Innocent again remonstrated through his representatives, and there was much division of opinion among the crusaders. The French were inclined to obey the pope, but the keen Venetians, who were animated not only by the desire of gain, but by the feeling of national and even personal enmity, were for closing with the new proposal, and prevailed.

About the middle of May 1203, forty thousand men sailed from Zara, and, after having spent three weeks at Corfu, they came in sight of Constantinople on St. John's eve. "Much", says Villehardouin, "did those look at Constantinople who had never before seen it; for they could never have believed that in all the world there could be a city so rich and so beautiful; when they saw its high walls, and the fair towers wherewith it was surrounded on all sides, and its sumptuous palaces and its lofty churches, whereof there were so many as no man could believe unless he beheld it with his own eyes, and the length and breadth of the city which was mistress of all others. No one was there among them so bold but that his heart beat; and no wonder, for never since the world began was so great an enterprise undertaken by a like number of people". The usurper, in his devotion to his pleasures, had neglected to prepare against invasion, and the Greeks looked on with stolid or affected contempt while the western armament passed along the quays, with Alexius the son of Isaac conspicuously placed on the stern of one of the ships as the rightful heir of the empire. On the 6th of July the grand assault was made; the tower of Galata, which commanded the harbor, was taken, and the chain which stretched across the Golden Horn was burst by the force of a Venetian ship driven against it with the sails swollen by a strong wind. Dandolo appeared in the prow of the foremost vessel, with the banner of St. Mark displayed before him, and, after having been the first to land, exposed himself gallantly while he cheered on his men to the fight. The usurper Alexius, after having been roused with difficulty to show himself at the head of his troops, who were tenfold as many as the assailants, deserted them. It was in vain that the "axe-bearing barbarians" (as a Greek historian styles them)—the English and Danes of the Varangian guard—fought manfully, and that the Genoese and the Pisan settlers exerted themselves in defense of the privileges which they had acquired in preference to the Venetians. Alexius ran off the following night; the blinded Isaac was brought forth from his prison, hastily arrayed in imperial robes, placed in a chair of state, and surrounded with the magnificence of a court, that he might give audience to Villehardouin and another noble Frank, who appeared as envoys from the crusaders, to offer him the restoration of his crown on condition of his ratifying the terms of their compact with his son. On hearing the statement of these terms, Isaac declared that he felt them to be heavy and difficult, but that no recompense could be too great for the allies to whom he owed his deliverance; he swore to the compact, sealed it, and was then allowed to embrace his son. On the feast of St. Peter's chains, Isaac was again enthroned with great pomp, in St. Sophia's, and the young Alexius was anointed as his colleague in the empire.

The crusaders were now desirous to go on; but the young emperor entreated them to remain at Constantinople until the following Easter, for the purpose of securing his father's throne, as the Greeks were not to be trusted; and the offers of further benefits which accompanied the proposal prevailed on them, although not until after some opposition had been manifested. The payment of the stipulated money to the allies was begun by installments; but while the Greeks complained that in order to this they were heavily taxed, and that churches were stripped of their precious ornaments, the Latins cried out that the payments were irregular, scanty, and continually diminishing, until at length they ceased

altogether. Other causes of quarrel speedily appeared. The reconciliation of the Greek and Latin churches, which Innocent in the beginning of his pontificate had urged on the late emperor and on the patriarch, and to which Isaac and his son had pledged themselves, was hindered by the assumption of the Latins, and by the bigoted prejudices of both parties. The Greeks saw with disgust that Alexius degraded the crown by familiarly associating with the Franks, conforming to their manners, and playing at dice in their tents; the Latins complained that the emperors were estranged from them, and that their services were requited with ingratitude. While Alexius and the marquis of Montferrat were engaged in an expedition to reduce the country to subjection and order, a serious affray took place in consequence of an attack which was made on the Mahometan mosque by some Flemings, Pisans, and Venetians. In the defense of their building, the Mussulmans were assisted by the Greeks; the mosque was set on fire, and a conflagration ensued, which raged for two days, and is said to have destroyed a fourth part of the city. By this calamity the hatred of the Greeks against the Latins was further exasperated; continual skirmishes took place, and an attempt was made to burn the crusading fleet. A deputation from the crusaders, of which Villehardouin was a member, waited on the emperors, to reproach them with their ingratitude, and insist on the fulfillment of their promises, with a threat that otherwise the Latins would hold themselves released from their own engagements. Jealousies arose between the elder and the younger emperors, and Isaac, whose misfortunes might have bespoken pity, made himself hated by his vices, and ridiculous by his belief in the flatteries of monks and astrologers, who lived luxuriously at his expense, and repaid him by promising the recovery of his sight and vigor. An attempt to set up one Nicolas Cannabus as emperor proved futile; but soon after this a more dangerous design was matured and executed by Alexius Ducas, a prince of the blood, who, from the meeting of his bushy eyebrows, was commonly called Murzuflus. Having failed to draw the Latins into a scheme for the dethronement of the princes whom their arms had restored, Murzuflus decoyed Alexius into a prison, where it is believed that the young emperor was murdered, although the usurper pretended that his death was natural, and honored him with a costly funeral; and Isaac soon after died of grief.

By these unexpected events all terms of peace were necessarily brought to an end, and the Latins, after some fruitless negotiation, and many slight encounters both by sea and land, resolved to take possession of Constantinople for themselves. Their first assault was repulsed with heavy loss; but three days later they again made an attempt; Murzuflus, after calling all the holiest relics to his assistance, and after having vigorously withstood the enemy for a time, was driven to flight, and the imperial city fell into their hands. A great slaughter followed; but the cruelties which were inflicted on the Greeks were not so much the work of the crusaders as of the Latin settlers, who had lately been plundered and driven out of the city to seek a refuge in the camp of the besiegers. In the wildness of their triumph acts of profanity were committed by the crusaders, which not only revolted the feelings of the Greeks, but drew down the indignant reproof of the pope. Pictures of the Redeemer and of the saints were torn from the walls of churches, and were scattered on the ground or used as seats and benches; sacred relics were thrown into filthy places, and the consecrated host was trodden under foot; hallowed vessels were used as plates and drinking-cups; the imperial tombs—among them that of the great Justinian—were violated and rifled; the splendid ornaments of St. Sophia's and other churches were stripped off and sold to pedlars; a prostitute was seated on the patriarchal throne, and indecent songs and dances were performed around her. No wonder that the historian Nicetas, who himself was a sufferer by the capture of Constantinople, apostrophizes the crusaders as to the inconsistency of such things with their profession, or that he holds up by way of contrast the humane and decent conduct of the Saracens on getting possession of Jerusalem.

The spoil of Constantinople was of immense value, but much that was precious perished. Bronze statues, the masterpieces of ancient art, were melted down for coinage. The

Venetians alone among the conquerors had an eye for art; and thus, while others carried home with delight such treasures as Jacob's stone pillow, fragments of the true cross, one of the heads of St. John the Baptist, which forms the glory of Amiens cathedral, and other relics of holy personages, from those of Scripture down to the martyrs and confessors of the iconoclastic controversy, the Venetians secured the famous bronze horses, which, after having within the present century served as trophies of a later conquest, have been restored to their place on St. Mark's.

It had been resolved before the attack on Constantinople, that, in case of success, the imperial crown should be awarded by six representatives of the French and six of the Venetians, who should swear to choose the fittest man. The claims of Dandolo might have seemed preeminent before all others; but his own countrymen dreaded such an elevation of one Venetian family above the rest, and perhaps apprehended that under a Venetian emperor of the east, Venice itself might sink into an inferior position. To them too Boniface of Montferrat was objectionable, as a near neighbor, whose interests might possibly clash with their own. The electors, therefore, on the 9th of May, made choice of count Baldwin of Flanders, a man of Carolingian descent, of high character, and in the full vigor of manhood. The marquis of Montferrat was the first to do homage; and a week later Baldwin received the crown from the bishop of Bethlehem, a papal legate who had lately arrived from Palestine.

It had been agreed that the patriarchate should be given up to that division of the allies which should not obtain the empire; and agreeably to this, the Venetians chose Thomas Morosini, a man of noble Venetian birth, a subdeacon of the Roman church, and one whose personal acquaintance with Innocent might be expected to bespeak the pope's approval of the choice. Innocent had received from Baldwin a letter announcing the conquest, asking for the assistance of clergy from the west, and proposing a general council with a view to a reconciliation of the churches. It seems as if the brilliancy of the exploit, and the prospects which it opened for the Latin Church, in some measure overpowered his objections to the diversion of the crusade from its proper object. He therefore replied favorably; he reproved the crusaders severely for their excesses in the capture of Constantinople, especially for their sacrilegious plunder of holy things, which, he said, would make the Greeks hate the Latins worse than dogs, and so must hinder their return to the unity of the church; he disallowed the absolution which had been pronounced by the bishop of Bethlehem, as having been given without proper authority; he declared the compact between the French and the Venetians as to the disposal of the ecclesiastical property to be null, and the election of a patriarch to be informal, while, in consideration of Morosini's merits, he appointed him to the patriarchate as if by his own authority. Morosini had been compelled by the Venetians to swear that he would bestow the dignities of St. Sophia's and the chief offices of the hierarchy exclusively on Venetians or on persons who should have resided ten years at Venice. But on his appearance at Rome, the pope pronounced this oath to be void, and made him swear that he would not observe it. Morosini was then ordained deacon, priest, and bishop, and took the usual oath of metropolitan to the pope, who affected to bestow on the church of Constantinople precedence next to that of Rome, declaring that the precedence of "new Rome" in former times had been granted through the favor of the elder Rome. But the patriarch, in returning by Venice to Constantinople, found his fellow-citizens bent on exacting from him a renewal of his former oath as the only condition on which they would agree to show him due honor; and the pope, on being informed of the new oath, again declared it invalid. Innocent furnished the patriarch with instructions for the administration of his church: in places where the population was Greek, he was to place Greek bishops whose fidelity to Rome might be relied on, if such could be found; where it was mixed, the bishops were to be Latins. But it was soon found that, instead of forwarding the conversion of the Greeks, this and other measures conceived in a like spirit tended only to increase their alienation from the Latin church. Even among the Latins, the patriarch was unable to obtain submission to his authority. The French clergy

charged him with having gained his office by trickery and by imposing on the pope; he was brought into conflict on questions of jurisdiction and patronage with the secular power, and with the patriarch of Grado; and the pope, although he endeavored to support him as far as possible, had to reprove him for his exclusive patronage of Venetians in appointments to ecclesiastical dignities, and for other acts inconsistent with Innocent's view of his duty.

The new empire was from the beginning sickly, and, instead of strengthening the Latin power in the east, was a burden on it. Baldwin invited Christians from all countries of the west to join the settlement, and the pope exhorted both laity and clergy to reinforce the crusaders; but those who acted on these invitations were for the most part grievously disappointed. An attempt was made, as in the kingdom of Jerusalem, to establish the feudal system, which was here the more unsuitable on account of its unlikeness both to the republican institutions of the Venetians, and to the old traditions of the empire. The partition of the conquests produced much disagreement among the Franks. Baldwin soon quarreled with Boniface of Montferrat, and in 1205, on a disastrous expedition, he fell into the hands of Joannicius, a perfidious savage to whom the pope had confirmed the title of king over Bulgaria and Wallachia, and whom the crusaders had provoked by scornfully refusing his offers of alliance. It is believed that Baldwin was put to death in prison, with circumstances of great cruelty, and to the pope's intercessions for him Joannicius answered that they were too late. Two years afterwards, Boniface was killed in action against the same enemy, whom the pope in vain solicited to be at peace with the Latins of Constantinople; but in the same year they were delivered from the fear of Joannicius, who died by some unknown means. Henry, the brother of Baldwin, who had acted as regent since the emperor's capture, was crowned as his successor in August 1206, and for ten years administered the empire with vigor and skill, contending on the one hand against the Bulgarians, and on the other against the Byzantine princes who furnished rallying points for their countrymen by founding little principalities in Asia and Epirus. Murzuflus, who had for a time combined with the dethroned usurper Alexius, might perhaps have been a dangerous enemy; but having been blinded by Alexius, he fell into the hands of the Latins, and, after a trial, was thrown from the top of the pillar of Theodosius at Constantinople. Alexius was also caught, and was shut up in a monastery. Henry wisely endeavored to conciliate the Greeks, both by checking religious persecution and by relaxing that rule of exclusion from all public employments which had branded them as a servile race. The pope also after a time mitigated the rules which he had laid down as to the preference of Latin over Greek clergy; but such concessions, even if they had been greater, would have come too late.

The people, who most substantially and lastingly profited by the Latin conquest of Constantinople were the Venetians. To them it brought a vast increase of the trade by which they flourished; and, while they declined to set up one of their own citizens as a candidate for the empire, they allowed them to make private conquests, so that the islands of the Levant became filled with petty Venetian princes. Henry Dandolo had become lord of Romania, and the dignity continued in his family for more than a century and a half. The aged doge himself died in June 1205, and was buried with great splendor in the church of St. Sophia.

While the main body of the crusaders had turned aside for the expedition against Constantinople, a part of them had gone on to the Holy Land, where other adventurers arrived by way of Marseilles and from northern ports; but these were not enough to engage in any great attempts against the infidels, and many of them, on hearing of the successes of their companions, had rejoined them in the new Latin empire. Innocent, however, although deeply grieved by the result of the expedition which had been undertaken for the deliverance of the Holy Land, abated nothing of his zeal for the cause, and throughout the remainder of his pontificate we find him repeatedly pressing on the sovereigns and people of the west the duty of a new crusade. For some years, indeed, the state of southern France was such that he thought it well to extend the privileges of crusaders to the men who were there warring for the

extirpation of heresy; and during this time it was obviously inexpedient that those who were disposed to fight in behalf of the faith should be distracted between rival objects. But in 1213, when the Albigenses appeared to be effectually defeated, he recalled the indulgences for southern France, and sent Robert Curzon—an Englishman who had been his fellow-student, afterwards a preacher under Fulk of Neuilly, and was now cardinal of St. Stephen's on the Coelian hill—to preach in France an expedition for the recovery of the Holy Land. Orders were issued that solemn monthly services should be instituted for the success of the crusade; and all who should take part in it were encouraged by the declaration that the religion of the false prophet must be near its fall, since of the 666 years allotted to it more than 600 were already completed. But Curzon showed himself indiscreet in the fulfillment of his commission. In order to win the popular ear, he inveighed bitterly and unscrupulously against the ordinary clergy; and by giving the cross to multitudes of inefficient persons—old, blind, deaf, lame, lepers, women and children—he rendered those who were fit for war unwilling to undertake an enterprise in which they were to be encumbered by such associates. The king and the clergy of France appealed to the pope against the legate; but Innocent approved of his proceedings, on the ground that those who were personally incapable of fulfilling their vow might help the crusade by paying a commutation.

About the same time many were enlisted for the holy war in England and in Germany; and a strange independent movement was set on foot by one Stephen, a shepherd boy at the village of Cloies, near Vendome, who professed to have been charged by the Saviour in a vision to preach the cross. By this tale he gathered some children about him, and they went on through towns and villages chanting, “O Lord, help us to recover thy true and holy cross!”. Their numbers swelled as they advanced, so that when they reached Paris, they are said to have amounted to 15,000; they displayed banners, crosses, and censers. We are told that all the efforts of parents to restrain their children from joining the party were unavailing; nay, it is said that, when some of them were privately shut up, bars and locks gave way for their escape. Philip Augustus, after having consulted the university of Paris, endeavored to check the movement, but without success. Stephen had acquired the reputation of miraculous power; threads of his dress were treasured up as precious relics; and the number of his followers continually increased, so that it is said to have amounted to 30,000 when they arrived at Marseilles, which Stephen entered in a triumphal car, surrounded by a body-guard. Some shipmasters undertook to convey them gratuitously to Egypt and Africa; but these wretches were kidnapers, and their unfortunate victims were either wrecked on a rock of the Mediterranean, or, on reaching the African coast, were sold into slavery. In Germany a similar movement was set on foot by a boy named Nicolas, who, after having lost many of his companions through hunger and fatigue, arrived at Genoa with 7000 of them, among whom were many grown-up persons, and not a few women of bad reputation. Thence they struggled onwards to Brindisi, where the bishop of the place discovered that the father of Nicolas had a design of selling them into slavery. By this discovery the crusade was broken up; the unfortunate children tried to return home, but the greater part of them fell victims to the hardships of the way. The father of Nicolas was executed at Cologne.

Innocent, although he had taken no share in these insane and calamitous expeditions, declared that the zeal manifested by the children put to shame the listlessness of their elders; and the question of a new crusade was one of the subjects proposed for the great council which he assembled in 1215.

Innocent was zealous and indefatigable in his exertions against the heresies of his time. Among the most remarkable of these (although from its nature it was not likely to win

much popular acceptance, even if free course had been allowed it) was the doctrine taught by a clerk named Amalric, a native of Bène, in the diocese of Chartres, who is described as a man of very subtle, but perverse and paradoxical mind. Amalric had been eminent as a teacher of logic and the liberal sciences at Paris before he betook himself to the study of theology. He is accused by his contemporaries of paying greater regard to Aristotle than to Holy Scripture; but later inquirers suppose that his errors are rather to be traced to the Arabian commentators than to Aristotle himself, and yet more to the influence of Plato and of Scotus Erigena's book "On the Division of Nature". His doctrine was pantheistic—that God is all, and that all is God; that everything issues from the All and will return to it. Hence he inferred that God was as truly incarnate in Abraham as in Christ; that the Holy Spirit spoke as really through Ovid as through Augustine. He is said to have maintained that the Trinity denotes three forms of the Divine manifestation, connected with the same number of stages in the history of mankind; that the second stage, under the Son, was nearly at an end, and that the third, under the Holy Ghost, would follow; that every Christian must believe himself to be a member of Christ, and that this was the only way of salvation. In consequence of a complaint from the University of Paris, Amalric was summoned to appear before the pope, who, after having heard him, pronounced against him. The university required him to retract his errors; and, having submitted to this humiliation, he soon after died of shame and grief.

After Amalric's death his doctrine was taught by David of Dinant, although apparently in a coarser form and with new developments. Whereas Amalric had said that God is the source and the end of all things, David declared Him to be the material principle of all things. He asserted that the reign of the Holy Ghost was already come; that outward rites were needless; that acts done in the body were no sins, forasmuch as nothing could be sinful if it were done in love. Every one, he said, carries hell within, him, "like a bad tooth in the mouth". And he held that the soul could by contemplation exchange its separate existence for that which it has in the Divine soul.

In 1209 an inquiry into the tenets of this sect was held by the bishop of Paris, in the presence of some lay magistrates. Fourteen of the sectaries were made over to the secular arm as guilty, and of these ten were burnt, and the others were committed to close confinements. It was ordered that Amalric's bones should be disinterred and burnt; and his books were also condemned to the flames, with some of Aristotle's writings, which had lately been brought from Constantinople and translated into Latin. The doctrines of Amalric were again condemned at the Lateran council of 1215; and in 1225 the work of Scotus, to which Amalric and his followers had directed attention, was proscribed by Honorius III. The last teacher of the party is said to have been one Godin, who was burnt at Amiens.

Notices are occasionally found of sectaries professing the Waldensian opinions. Thus, in 1199, Innocent wrote to the bishop and the faithful of Metz, in denunciation of a party of laymen and women who used French translations of the Scriptures, and on the strength of their acquaintance with these despised the clergy and their ministrations. The pope admits that a desire to know the Scriptures is not only innocent but praiseworthy; but he censures the party at Metz for their sectarian spirit, for imagining that the mysteries of the faith are open to the unlearned, and for their behavior towards the clergy—as to which he is careful to deprive them of such warrant as they might allege from the parallel of Balaam's ass rebuking the prophet. He desires the bishop to inquire into the authorship and character of the vernacular translations; and in the following year he commissioned some Cistercian abbots to labour in conjunction with the bishop for the suppression of the heresy at Metz. In consequence of this appointment, it is said, the vernacular Scriptures were burnt, and the Waldensian opinions were extinguished.

There is mention of heretical, and seemingly Waldensian, teaching at Auxerre and in the neighboring dioceses; and in 1210 Innocent records the form in which some Waldenses abjured their errors, among which that of regarding ordination as unnecessary for the ministers

of Christ is especially dwelt on. The presumption of preaching without a regular mission is also denounced by the Lateran council of 1215, in which those who should be guilty of it “under the appearance of piety”, are threatened with excommunication, and, in case of obstinacy, with yet heavier punishments.

Of all sectarian parties in this time the cathari were by far the most numerous and the most widely spread. Even within the papal territory they abounded. At Orvieto the opinions of this sect were especially rife among the female sex. A bishop, named Richard, endeavored to suppress them by severe punishments, such as banishment, and even death; but during his absence from the city, and through the influence of a new teacher, the cathari became so strong that they threatened to expel their orthodox fellow-citizens. On this the orthodox applied to the Romans for a leader, and, with the pope’s consent, a young man of high courage and ardent zeal, named Peter Parenzio, was sent to them in February 1199. Peter at once proceeded to take strong measures for the repression of the opposite party, and, after having proceeded in this course until the approach of Easter, returned to Rome for the festival. The pope, at an interview in a street near the Lateran, told him that he must now take an oath of fidelity as governor of Orvieto; to which Peter replied that he was willing to do so, but added that the heretics were so much exasperated as to threaten his life. He received full absolution from the pope, as if in prospect of death; settled his worldly affairs; and, notwithstanding the entreaties of his mother and wife, returned to his government, ready and eager for martyrdom. Three weeks later he met with the fate which he had expected—being dragged out of the town and murdered by some sectaries, who had gained admission to his house through the treachery of a servant. His death is said to have been followed by judgments on the murderers, by miracles at his tomb, and eventually by the suppression of heresy in Orvieto.

At Viterbo the heretics had gained such influence that an attempt was made to elect two of the “believers” as consuls, and the chief of the sect as chamberlain of the city, although he had been formally excommunicated. Innocent desired the bishops of Viterbo and Orvieto to eject these magistrates; and in 1207 he himself proceeded to Viterbo for the purpose of rooting out the heresy. The patarenes took flight; but this did not prevent the pope from inquiring into the matter, and he ordered that their property should be confiscated, that their houses should be demolished, and that all heretics, especially the members of this sect, should be “delivered to the secular arm”—a phrase which now occurs for the first time—in order to punishment. In the same spirit Innocent wrote to the authorities at Faenza, Bologna, Florence, Verona, Treviso, and other places. He severely censures the Milanese for their encouragement of the sectaries; that they not only did not “take the little foxes”, but cherished them until the foxes grew into lions, and the locusts into horses ready to battle; and he tells them that he had been urged to send a crusade to Milan as well as into Provence. Beyond the bounds of Italy we read of heretics in Dalmatian Bosnia, and the Tyrol; at Strasburg, where about eighty were put to the trial of hot iron, and most of them were convicted and burnt; and of similar executions at Paris, Troyes, Rouen, Langres, and in various parts of northern France and Belgium, where a Dominican friar named Robert earned by his severities the glorious name (as the annalist Rinaldi considers it) of “the hammer of heretics”.

But it was in the south of France that the catharist doctrines chiefly prevailed. In this region they had become so general that the church and the clergy had fallen into the greatest contempt. The nobles and knights no longer allowed their younger sons to be trained for the ministry of the church, but put sons of their serfs into benefices, of which they themselves appropriated the tithes, while the priests were obliged to be content with a miserable pittance. As an instance of the disrepute into which the clergy had sunk, we are told that, instead of the expression “I would rather be a Jew than do such a thing”, it was now customary to say “I would rather be a chaplain”. They themselves were so sensible of their ignominy, that they were fain to hide their tonsure by drawing the hair from the back of the head over it. The heretics were so audacious that in the sight of the bishops and clergy they defiled the chalices

and other sacred vessels, and threw the holy Gospels into the dirt. The princes of southern France were for the most part ill-affected to the hierarchy. Raymond VI, count of Toulouse, the most powerful of them next to the king of Aragon, had in early life associated much with heretics, and was suspected of inclining to their opinions, although rather on account of his roughness towards the clergy than of any expression of his belief. He had been excommunicated by Celestine for his aggressions on the abbey of St. Gilles; but he was able to obtain absolution from Innocent. The laxity of his life was notorious; of his five wives, three were living at the same time; he is even charged with incest by the unscrupulous writers of the orthodox party. The count of Foix was married to a Waldensian; of his two sisters, one was said to be Waldensian and the other a catharist; and, in common with the counts of Béarn and Comminges, the viscount of Beziers, and other princes of the neighborhood, he is described as an oppressor of the bishops and clergy.

Innocent, in the first year of his pontificate, addressed a letter to the prelates and nobles of southern France, exhorting them to take vigorous measures for the suppression of heresy. Patarenes, Waldensians, and others were to be anathematized and banished; but there is no distinct mention of death as a penalty, although it may perhaps be implied in the declaration that heresy is murder of the soul. But this letter met with little attention. To Raymond of Toulouse and his subjects, the requisition to persecute those whom they respected as peaceable neighbors was unwelcome. "We have been brought up with them", they said; "we have relations among them, and we know that their life is honest".

The pope in his letter had announced that two Cistercians, Rainier and Guy, were sent as legates into the country affected with heresy. Rainier soon after fell sick, and was succeeded by Peter of Castelnaud, archdeacon of Maguelone, who, after having been a teacher of theology at Paris, had become a member of the Cistercian order. In 1204, the power of these envoys was extended; the cognizance of questions of heresy was transferred to them from the bishops, and they were authorized to suspend such bishops as should be found lukewarm in the cause; and on this they acted in some cases, although they found among the members of the episcopal order a general disinclination to submit to two monks, however specially empowered by the pope. At Peter of Castelnaud's request, the cardinal of St. Prisca was fixed as legate at Montpellier; and in 1204, Arnold Amalric, abbot of Citeaux, a bitter and unsparing enemy of heresy, with twelve members of his order, was added to the mission. Yet the work made little progress. The envoys held conferences with the heretics, but found themselves continually baffled by objections drawn from the evil lives of the clergy. In May 1205, they were strengthened by the appointment of a new bishop to Toulouse—Fulk or Folquet of Marseilles—a man who, as a famous troubadour, had formerly been among the ornaments of gay and licentious courts, but had lately been turned to a different career, had entered the Cistercian order, while his wife became a nun, and had taken up with a fervor natural to such converts an extreme zeal for the orthodox faith, with a fierce hostility against heresy. Still, the efforts of the missionaries were attended with little success; and they were almost in despair, when they fell in at Montpellier with Diego (Didacus) bishop of Osma, and Dominic, the sub-prior of his cathedral, who were returning from Rome with a commission to labor against heresy.

The legates, in conversation with the Spaniards, lamented their want of success; whereupon Diego told them that mere words would not be of any avail; that the only hopeful course for them was to counteract the professed simplicity of the heretics by putting aside their gold and silver, their pomp and splendor, and going forth like the apostles, barefooted and in poverty. The legates professed their willingness to follow this advice, if they might have the example of any sufficient authority; and the bishop told them that he would himself show them the way. Sending away his servants, horses, and baggage, and retaining with him only a few clerks, of whom Dominic was the chief, he remained in Languedoc, and provided by a large outlay of money for the support of those with whom he had associated himself. The

Cistercians, according to their promise, sent away everything but their books of devotion and study, and followed the course which Diego had pointed out. The missionaries went barefooted, in companies of two or three, from place to place, and engaged the heretics in conferences, one of which lasted fifteen days; and in no long time the effects of the new system began to show themselves.

Another Spaniard, Durand of Huesca, who had been converted from Waldensianism, wishing to carry on the ascetic life to which he had been accustomed, proposed to found a society of "catholic poor", who should be bound by a strict rule, as a means of counteracting the profession of poverty which gave a strength to heresy; and, having obtained the pope's approval, he labored for a time with good effect, although his society soon disappears from view, having probably been superseded by the rise of the two great mendicant orders. In the end of 1207, the bishop of Osma returned to his diocese, where he died within a few months; and by the temporary withdrawal of the Cistercians about the same time. Dominic was left to carry on his work almost alone; but he persevered, and it is said that miracles were wrought by him in support of his teaching.

Peter of Castelnau had distinguished himself by his zeal, and had made himself especially obnoxious to the sectaries and those who favored them. In 1206, he excommunicated Raymond of Toulouse for refusing to turn his arms against the heretics. His companions, fearing for his safety in consequence of threats which had been uttered, sent him away for a time; but he soon returned, declaring that the cause of orthodoxy would never prosper until one of the preachers should be killed, and expressing a wish that he might himself be the first martyr, Count Raymond submitted and was absolved, on condition that he should take part in the persecution; and when Peter charged him with breach of this promise, he was violently enraged, so as to utter threats against the legate's life. The magistrates and people of St. Gilles, dreading some fatal consequences, escorted Peter as far as the place at which he was to cross the Rhone; but next day, as he was about to embark, a man who had lodged at the same inn entered into conversation with him, sought a quarrel, and mortally wounded him. Peter's last words were, "God forgive thee, as I forgive thee!" Suspicion of having instigated the murder fell on Count Raymond, to whose household the murderer belonged. The pope denounced him, absolved his subjects from their allegiance, and urgently and repeatedly exhorted the king and the nobles of France to take arms for the punishment of his crime, and for the extirpation of heresy. Raymond (who seems to have been really innocent of any share in the murder) feeling himself hardly pressed, entreated the pope to send some other representative than the abbot of Citeaux, whom he dreaded as his personal enemy; and Innocent affected to comply with this request by joining in commission with Arnold his own secretary Milo, while he strictly charged him to be guided in all things by the abbot. Cardinal Gualo was sent into France to proclaim a crusade for the extirpation of heresy, with all the privileges which had been bestowed on the warriors of the Holy Land, and the scheme (which had indeed been announced even before the murder of Peter) was proposed at a great national assembly at Villeneuve on the Yonne. Philip Augustus excused himself and his son, on the ground that while they were threatened on each side by "two great lions"—the king of England and the emperor—they could not leave their own territory undefended; but he granted leave for his subjects to take part in the enterprise, and at his own expense maintained 15,000 soldiers. The clergy were to pay a subsidy of a tenth for the support of the crusade; and multitudes enlisted, not only from religious enthusiasm, but partly from a wish to obtain the benefits of the crusading indulgences more cheaply than by an expedition to Palestine; partly from the northern hatred of the southern people, and in the hope of gaining settlements in the lands which were to be conquered. Among the leaders of the host were the archbishop of Sens, the bishops of Autan, Clermont, and Nevers, the duke of Burgundy, the count of Nevers, and Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, who became the hero of the Albigensian war.

Simon was now about sixty years of age, and was regarded as a model of the chivalry of the time. In person he was tall, strong, and active; as a leader, he was at once daring and skillful; and his affable and popular manners contributed to secure for him the enthusiastic love and confidence of his followers. The sincerity of his devotion to the church had been shown in the late crusade, when he resolutely opposed the diversion of the armament from its proper object, and, refusing to share in the attacks on Zara and Constantinople, held on his course for the Holy Land. He was remarkable for his regularity in the exercises of religion, daily hearing mass and the offices of the canonical hours; and he was upheld by a lofty confidence in the protection of heaven. "Think you that I am afraid?" he said to one who attempted to encourage him while weakened by the withdrawal of a great part of his force—"it is Christ's cause that is at stake; the whole church is praying for me, and I know that I cannot be beaten". And it is told that a Cistercian, who prayed for him at the consecration of the Eucharist, was interrupted by a voice from heaven—"Why pray for him? there are so many praying for him that thy prayer is not needed". But with Simon's better qualities were combined some of the vices which not uncommonly seek their sanctification from high religious professions—a vast ambition, a daring unscrupulousness as to the means of pursuing his objects, a ruthless indifference to human suffering, and an unbounded and undisguised rapacity.

Raymond, through the exertions of his envoys at the papal court, had got a promise of absolution, if he could purge himself of the murder of Peter of Castelnaud, and would submit to certain conditions. Although he complained of the terms imposed on him, he made his submission to the legates at Valence; and on the 18th of June 1209 he did penance and received absolution at St. Gilles, in the presence of three archbishops and nineteen bishops. The legate Milo met him in the porch of the church where Peter of Castelnaud was buried, and, throwing a stole over his neck, led him by it into the building. There the count, after having been stripped to the waist, knelt down, submitted to flagellation, and swore obedience to the pope and the legate as to all the matters for which he had incurred ecclesiastical censure; to give up all interference in the appointment of bishops, to repair the wrongs which he had done to some bishops, to dismiss his mercenary soldiers, to expel all Jews from his dominions, to receive the crusaders, and to help them in their war against heresy. By way of security, he was to give up seven fortresses, with the county of Melgueil; and in case of his failing to fulfill his oath he was to fall under excommunication, and these pledges were to become forfeit to the Roman church. As the crowd blocked up the way by which he had entered, the count had to leave the church by a side door, and in order to reach this, he was obliged to pass close to the tomb of the man whose murder he was accused of having contrived.

Raymond Roger, viscount of Beziers, a gallant young man of twenty-four, and nephew of the count of Toulouse, waited on the legates at Montpellier, and endeavored to clear himself from suspicion of favoring the heretics by throwing the blame on some of his officers, who had acted without his orders. But his excuses were received with derision, and the viscount indignantly withdrew, to put his territories into a state of defense. The army of the crusaders speedily followed—a force which is very variously reckoned as to numbers, and composed of men from all parts of France, Normandy, and Flanders. At their head was Simon de Montfort, who had been chosen as general after solemn invocation of the Holy Ghost; with him was the legate Arnold of Citeaux, and Raymond of Toulouse had unwillingly joined the army with a few followers. When the crusaders appeared before Beziers, the viscount had gone onwards to Carcassonne. The bishop, who was in the army, was allowed by Arnold to offer his advice to his people, and recommended a surrender; but they relied on the strength of their city, and believed that the besiegers would speedily be driven by want of provisions to withdraw. Catholics joined with heretics in declaring that, rather than surrender, they would be drowned in the sea—they would eat their wives and children. "Then", said abbot Arnold, on hearing this answer, "there shall not be left one stone upon another; fire and sword shall

devour men, women, and children". On St. Mary Magdalene's day, a sally was made by the besieged and was repulsed. The besiegers found their way into the town, mixed up with the retreating inhabitants, and a butchery began, which was carried on to a literal fulfillment of the abbot's words. It was in vain that the canons of St. Mary Magdalene, habited in the vestments of the altar, attempted to stay the bloodshed; men, women, children, clergy, were indiscriminately slaughtered, while the bells of the cathedral were rung until the massacre was completed. It is said that, when abbot Arnold was asked how the soldiers might distinguish Catholics from heretics, he answered, "Kill them all! The Lord knoweth them that are His". The ordinary population of Beziers had been greatly increased by fugitives; but the number of victims is very variously estimated. Arnold himself reckons it at 20,000, while others make it as much as 60,000 or even 100,000. The city was given up to plunder, and was then set on fire.

The crusaders proceeded onwards to Carcassonne, where the viscount of Beziers commanded in person. The late terrible example had struck fear into all hearts; and as they advanced they found the country desolate—villages, and even strong castles, abandoned by their inhabitants, who had fled for refuge to the towns. Carcassonne stands on a steep and lofty hill, and was surrounded by a double line of outworks, each with its own wall and fosse; and the fortifications had lately been strengthened, partly with materials from ecclesiastical buildings which were pulled down. The crusaders speedily penetrated through the outermost walls, but the second enclosure was obstinately defended. Simon de Montfort was foremost in the assault; he was the first to plunge into the moat, and afterwards, at the risk of his own life, rescued a wounded soldier who was struggling in it. On the other side, the viscount Raymond-Roger was no less conspicuous, exposing himself everywhere at the head of the defenders, and animating their courage by words and example. The besiegers were repulsed with great loss, and retired after having set fire to the outer suburb. A second assault, eight days later, was also repulsed; and Peter, king of Aragon, then appeared to offer his mediation—a work for which it might have seemed that he was well fitted, by his connection with the princes of Languedoc on the one hand, and on the other, by his friendly relations with the pope, whose favor he had earned by expelling all heretics from his dominions. But the abbot of Citeaux would only allow that the viscount and eleven others might withdraw in safety; all the rest must surrender at discretion. On hearing this, the viscount declared that he would rather be flayed alive than desert his companions, and the king withdrew in disgust at the fruitlessness of his endeavors. The siege was closely pressed, and the inhabitants, crowded within the walls from a wide surrounding country, soon found themselves reduced to distress by excessive heat, by the scantiness of water, and by the stench which arose from the bodies of dead men and beasts. The viscount, having been decoyed into a conference by the assurance of a safe conduct, was committed to prison, under the plea, advanced by abbot Arnold, that no faith was to be kept with one who had been faithless to his God. The people, dismayed by the loss of their chief, were no longer in a condition to resist, and submitted to the terms imposed by the besiegers—that they should leave the city half-naked, carrying with them nothing but their sins. But for this extraordinary clemency the crusaders in some measure consoled themselves, by hanging or burning more than four hundred victims for the common offence of heresy.

The viscounty of Beziers was offered successively to the duke of Burgundy, to the count of Nevers, and to the count of St. Pol; but all refused to accept it in such circumstances; and the election of a viscount was committed to two bishops, four knights, and the abbot of Citeaux, who agreed in choosing Simon de Montfort. Simon, although free from any scruples as to the mode of acquisition, thought it necessary to make a show of refusal; but this was easily overcome, and he was hailed as viscount of Beziers and Carcassonne, promising to hold his dignities and territory on condition of a yearly payment to St. Peter. Within a few weeks, the deprived viscount, Raymond-Roger, died in his prison, and, although dysentery was alleged as the cause of his death, the guilt of it was popularly charged on Simon.

Simon soon found that his conquest was incomplete. On requesting the king of Aragon, as suzerain, to invest him in his new territories, he was met at first with delays, and afterwards with a refusal. Peter had taken up the cause of the late viscount's infant child, Raymond Trencavel, and was endeavoring to organize means for the expulsion of the invaders. The count of Nevers and the duke of Burgundy withdrew from the crusade, in disgust at the late proceedings of the dominant party; and the great mass of the troops, having served the forty days which were all that was required by feudal duty, and were sufficient to earn the crusading privileges, likewise withdrew, leaving Simon with a very small force to maintain his conquests through the winter. It was with difficulty that he was able to hold his ground at all; many fortresses and other places fell away from him, and an incessant war was carried on, marked by the fierce exasperation of the contending parties, and by relentless cruelty on both sides. The pope, while he confirmed the election of Simon, and wrote letters in his favor to the emperor Otho and other sovereigns, expressed regret that the claims of the eastern crusade prevented any more effectual aid to that against the heretics of the West. In the spring of 1210, however, Simon received large reinforcements, under the command of his countess; and, notwithstanding the resistance of the count of Foix and others, his arms made considerable progress.

Raymond of Toulouse, although he had given the required securities, and had taken part in the crusade, had received such treatment from Simon and his party that he resolved to carry his complaints to Rome; and he was recommended to the pope by letters from the king of France, the duke of Burgundy, and the count of Nevers. He found the pope disinclined to listen to him, yet eventually succeeded in making a favorable impression; he received a provisional absolution, and it was settled that he should be put to canonical purgation before the legates in his own country; that, if he went through this successfully, he should be acknowledged as orthodox, and as guiltless of the death of Peter of Castelnau; and the pope dismissed him with valuable presents. But on returning home, he found that the legates were determined to deal harshly with him. Milo had lately died, and had been succeeded in the commission by Theodisius, a canonist, who was deeply prejudiced against the count of Toulouse, and was resolved, if possible, to deprive him of the benefit of the pope's concession. When, therefore, Raymond appeared at St. Gilles, before the bishop of Riez and Theodisius, in order to the proposed purgation, Theodisius told him that, since he had forsworn himself by omitting to fulfill his former oaths as to lesser things, he could not be admitted to clear himself by oath from such crimes as heresy and murder. On this, Raymond began to weep, when Theodisius insultingly quoted the text—"In the great water-floods they shall not come nigh Him"; and, instead of absolving the count, he pronounced his excommunication afresh. Raymond was soon after cited to another council at Arles, where his cause was pleaded by a famous lawyer, Guy Cap de Porc. But the terms proposed—which it is said that the legates communicated in writing, out of fear lest the public reading of them should produce a tumult—were such as the count declared that all his territory could not satisfy. He laughed aloud on the announcement of them, and immediately, in defiance of the council's order, rode away, in company with the king of Aragon. At Toulouse he caused the document to be publicly read aloud, and it was received with shouts of indignant derision. From Toulouse he went on to other towns, everywhere proclaiming the intolerable terms which had been offered to him, and everywhere exciting a determination to resist the invaders. His allies, the counts of Foix and Comminges, with others, joined their forces, and much of the conquered territory was wrested from the crusaders. On the other hand, a force of Germans, Auvergnats, Lombards, and others arrived to reinforce the crusading army, and the war was actively carried on. The legates declared Raymond to be an apostate, and his lands to be free for anyone who could seize them; and the pope confirmed their proceedings. The capital, Toulouse, itself was divided between embittered factions—the "white band", formed by bishop Fulk for the extirpation of Jews, usurers, and heretics, and the "black band",

composed of members of the more tolerant party. At one time, the bishop excommunicated the citizens, and in obedience to his orders the whole body of the clergy, barefooted and carrying the consecrated host, went forth to the camp of the besiegers. Year by year Simon de Montfort made progress. The crusade was actively preached in Germany and northern France, and was joined by adventurers trained in the wars of Germany and of the East. William, archdeacon of Paris, was the chief engineer of the army, and by his mechanical skill contributed greatly to the success of sieges and other operations. Yet the fluctuating nature of Simon's force prevented him from improving his advantages to the full, and his successes were chequered by much of hardship, and by occasional reverses.

In 1210, Peter of Aragon consented to invest Simon in the viscounty of Beziers and Carcassonne, and even connected himself with him by marriage—perhaps in the hope of sheltering the count of Toulouse and his son, who were married to two of the king's sisters. But in this he was disappointed; and he endeavored to obtain from the pope redress for his kinsmen against the rapacity of Simon—who, he complained, took advantage of the king's being engaged in fighting the Saracens, to oppress his vassals. In consequence of this appeal, the pope wrote to his legates and to Simon; but the local influence was, as usual, too strongly against Raymond, and the intercessions of king Peter with a council at Pamiers, in 1212, were unavailing. In the following year, Peter found himself set at liberty by the great victory of Navas de Tolosa, to take more active measures for the assistance of his kinsmen and allies on the other side of the Pyrenees. His force was so much superior that Simon might well have endeavored to decline a combat. But the viscount, with that confidence in his mission which never deserted him, was not to be daunted either by unfavorable circumstances or by omens: "You have spoken like one of the foolish women", he said to his wife, on her telling him of an alarming dream; "for you fancy that we follow dreams and auguries, like the Spaniards". And when a priest expressed some apprehensions, Simon replied by drawing from his pocket a copy of a letter from king Peter to a married lady—most probably one of his sisters, although De Montfort assumed that it was a paramour—telling her that for the love of her he was coming to drive the French out of the country. "What do you say to this" he asked; "So God help me, I do not fear a king who comes against God's cause for the sake of a strumpet". On his way to the relief of Muret, which the king and his allies were besieging, he entered the chapel of a Cistercian monastery, and, laying his sword on the altar, declared that he took it back as from God, to fight His battles. Next morning, at daybreak, he confessed his sins and made his will. He then attended a solemn mass, at which all the bishops who were with him excommunicated the count of Toulouse and his son, the counts of Foix and Comminges, and all their partisans—among whom the king of Aragon was supposed to be included, although, out of regard for a privilege by which he had been exempted from excommunication by any one but the pope himself, he was not named. Negotiations were attempted, but in vain; and on the following day the armies engaged at Muret. When it was proposed to Simon that his force should be numbered— "There is no need", he replied; "we are enough, by God's help, to beat the enemy". During the fight, seven bishops, with other ecclesiastics, among whom was the preacher Dominic, were earnestly praying in a neighboring church. Peter of Aragon, after having done, prodigies of valour, was slain, with many of his nobles, and the greater part of his army perished on the field, or was driven into the Garonne. The gallant and chivalrous character of Peter excited a general lamentation over his untimely end; even De Montfort himself is said to have wept over him, "like another David over another Saul".

But of such generous feeling towards an enemy the instances were very few in this war, which was shamefully remarkable for the savage ferocity with which it was waged on both sides. The crusaders, wherever they went, spread desolation over the country; they destroyed vineyards and growing crops, burnt villages and farmhouses, slaughtered unarmed peasants, women and children. Their cruelty towards prisoners was sanctified and exasperated by the pretense of zeal for religion. Thus, when La Minerve, near Narbonne, yielded after an

obstinate defense, and it was proposed that the besieged should be allowed to retire, if they would recant their heresy, one of the crusaders protested that the terms were too easy. “We came to extirpate heretics”, he said, “not to show them favor”. “Be not afraid”, replied Arnold of Citeaux, “there will not be many converts”. And about a hundred and forty of the “perfect” of both sexes were burnt—some of them rushing into the flames with an appearance of exultation. At a castle called Bran, De Montfort cut off the noses and plucked out the eyes of more than a hundred of the defenders, leaving one of them a single eye that he might lead the rest—not, says Peter of Vaux-Cernay, that the count took pleasure in such things, “for of all men he was the mildest”, but because he wished to retaliate on the enemy. At Lavaur, where the commander Almeric and eighty nobles were led before Simon, he ordered that they should all be hanged. But as the highest gibbet, which had been erected for Almeric, fell down, the count ordered that the rest of the party should be put to the sword, and the crusaders, “with the greatest eagerness”, despatched them. Almeric’s sister, who, as being an obstinate heretic, was charged with complicated incest, was thrown into a deep well, and overwhelmed with stones. By the intervention of “a Frenchman, courteous and gay”, the other ladies of the castle were saved, but four hundred of the “perfect were burnt with immense joy”, according to the chaplain of the crusading army. The same phrase is used by the same writer in relating the burning of some Waldenses who were taken at Marcillac. Nor were such cruelties confined to one party. The heretics retaliated severely on such of the invaders as fell into their hands after a victory. They wounded and mutilated the fallen; they hanged prisoners, and afterwards mutilated their bodies; it is said that on one occasion, after having promised some soldiers safety for life and limb, they dragged them through the streets of Toulouse at the tails of horses, and at last hanged them. As a proof of the unnatural exasperation produced by such a war, it may be mentioned that Baldwin, brother of Raymond of Toulouse, having forsaken the count’s party and having afterwards fallen into his hands, was hanged by his brother’s orders or with his consent—the count of Foix and his son acting as executioners, and denying him the consolation of the last sacraments.

The clergy who took part in the crusade,—especially the Cistercians, who were deeply concerned in it,—excited general indignation by their bitterness, their cupidity, and sometimes by their treachery. Arnold of Citeaux was especially conspicuous for his frequent displays of all these forms of wickedness. Bishop Fulk of Toulouse is charged with having urged Simon de Montfort to extremities, in opposition to the advice of his lay allies. Cardinal Peter of Benevento, in 1214, affected to receive the counts of Foix and Comminges, with other dispossessed nobles, into the favor of the church that he might gain time for De Montfort’s movements; and this draws from the admiring historian who relates it an exclamation of “Oh the pious fraud of the legate! oh his fraudulent piety!”. The preachers of the crusade had provoked the ordinary clergy by inveighing against them as supine and indifferent; and they now caused great scandal by the eagerness which they showed to profit by the conquests of their associates. Thus, Arnold in 1212 became archbishop of Narbonne, and forthwith required De Montfort to do homage for the viscounty. On Simon’s refusal, he excommunicated him, and interdicted the churches of Narbonne. Simon treated this sentence with contempt, took away some castles from the archbishop, and set his soldiers to annoy him in various ways; and the quarrel was carried on into the pontificate of Honorius III. Innocent, when reports of the real state of things reached him, showed himself desirous to do right; but those who acted in his name were generally able to sway him by their representations, in which he acquiesced without attempting to ascertain the truth. The king of Aragon had induced him, in 1213, to reprove De Montfort and the legates for their ambition and rapacity, to order restitution of lands which they had unjustly seized, and to recall the crusading indulgences; but in the following year, under the influence of Theodisius and some bishops whom Simon had sent to the papal court, he again reversed his policy. In the same year, the legate Robert Curzon consented that the crusade against the heretics should take precedence

of that against the infidels; he preached it with zeal, and himself joined the army, which was now raised to the formidable number of 100,000 men. Toulouse, where the surviving heretics from other parts had found a refuge, was taken in 1215. The bishop, Fulk, was eager that it should be destroyed; but De Montfort was unwilling to lose so valuable a spoil, and contented himself with demolishing the fortifications. In this campaign Prince Lewis of France took a part, but only for the forty days' service which was required in order to the performance of a vow. The apprehensions of the older crusaders, that he might interfere with their conquests, proved to have been needless; but he and others carried back with them a feeling of disgust at the conduct of the warriors of the cross.

Raymond and his son had submitted in 1214, and were compelled to live privately at Toulouse, while bishop Fulk took possession of their palace. A council at Montpellier, in January 1215, ordered a strict inquisition after heretics, and chose Simon de Montfort as prince of the whole subjugated territory; but as the legate, Peter of Benevento, had no authority to invest him, a deputation was sent to the pope, who committed the lands to Simon's custody until the council of Lateran, which was about to meet, should decide as to the disposal of them. At that council the two Raymonds and the count of Foix appeared. The younger Raymond was recommended to the pope by John of England; the favor which the dispossessed princes met with at the hands of many members of the council was such as to raise the indignation of Simon's partisans; and the pope himself showed a disposition to befriend them. The bishop of Toulouse urged their punishment with great bitterness; to which the count of Foix replied in a vehement tone, telling Fulk that he was more like an antichrist than a Roman legate and charging him with having caused the death of ten thousand men. The precentor of Lyons spoke strongly in behalf of the counts, and in reprobation of the acts by which the crusaders had disgraced themselves; but the opposite party was too strong, and De Montfort was confirmed in all his conquests, with the exception of Provence and the Venaissin, which were reserved for the younger Raymond, if his conduct should appear to deserve them. The council enacted that heretics of all sorts should be made over to the secular power, which was bound, under pain of ecclesiastical censures, to do its part for the extermination of heresy; that the bishops should visit twice or thrice a year those parts of their dioceses which were suspected of heretical infection; and that certain persons in each neighborhood should be sworn to give information against heretics and their congregations.

In 1216 Simon de Montfort returned to northern France. In every town, as he went along, the champion of the faith was received with the greatest honor—the clergy and the people meeting him in procession, and welcoming him with shouts of “Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!”, and he was invested by Philip Augustus as suzerain in the territories of Toulouse and Narbonne, with his other recent conquests. Yet while he was thus triumphant, a wide and deep feeling of dissatisfaction had been produced by the misconduct of the crusaders of Languedoc, even among those who favored their cause. Thus, William of Puy-Laurens, one of the historians of the war, remarks that, so long as the catholic army aimed at the suppression of heresy, all went well with them; but that when Simon introduced new and selfish objects, and when those who shared his conquests fell into evil living, God made them to drink of the dregs of the cup of His anger.

The pontificate of Innocent is remarkable in monastic history for the rise of the great mendicant orders founded by Dominic and Francis. The especial object of these societies was to counterwork the influence which the heretics acquired over the poorer classes of people by familiarly mixing with them and by preaching. For preaching suitable for the humbler classes had been almost disused in the church. Sometimes, indeed, a preacher was found to devote

himself to the work of religious and moral reformation, like Eustace of Flai and Fulk of Neuilly; but more commonly the crusades were the only subject in behalf of which the clergy attempted to rouse the multitude by the power of eloquence, while almost the only means of religious instruction was the ritual, which, in so far as language was concerned, had long ceased to be intelligible. The heretics, on the other hand, had sedulously labored to spread their doctrines among the people. Their teachers had professed an apostolical poverty, while they, and such reformers as Arnold of Brescia, had denounced the wealth of the clergy and monks as an intolerable corruption. The new orders, therefore, brought to the support of the church a severity of life which had before been employed against it. They professed not only poverty, but beggary, forbidding the reception of endowments; and their object was not, as with older orders, to cultivate a contemplative piety apart from the world and its engagements, but to converse among men, and by teaching and example of life to draw them to salvation. Each of these orders had at the outset its distinctive character—the Dominicans, severely intellectual, rigidly orthodox, and tinged by the sternness and the gloom which had been impressed on the religion of the founder's native land; the Franciscans milder and more genial, addressing themselves less to the intellect than to the sentiments and the affections.

Dominic was born about 1170, at Calaruega, a village in the diocese of Osma. According to some writers (whose opinion, however, is gravely questioned), he was descended from the illustrious family of Guzman; and it is said that the effect of his eloquence was foreshown by his mother's dreaming that she gave birth to a whelp carrying in his mouth a blazing torch, with which he set the world on fire. At the university of Palencia, he distinguished himself by his ardor in study; and in consequence of his reputation he was invited by Diego de Azevedo, bishop of Osma, to become a canon of his cathedral, where he rose to the dignity of sub-prior. His nature was tender and gentle; at the university, during a famine, he sold his books, with his own comments, which made them more precious to him, in order to relieve the distressed—saying that he would not study on dead skins while the poor were dying of hunger. And at a later time he would have sold himself to obtain the means of support for a man who hesitated to avow his conversion from heresy lest he should forfeit the charity on which he lived. But religious zeal steeled Dominic against the impulses of his nature; and while, as we are told, he was amiable towards Jews and infidels, he was unrelenting towards heretics. His life was rigidly ascetic; he gave more of his hours to prayer than to sleep, and, although during the day-time he was cheerful in his conversation, his nights were for the most part spent in severe penitential exercises; he flogged himself nightly with an iron chain, once for his own sins, once for the sinners in this world, and once for those in purgatory.

Something has already been said of Dominic's labors in the Albigensian territory, where he spent ten years in endeavoring to root out heresy. The power of his preaching is described as marvelous; he was indefatigable in conferences and in private conversations; and a number of miracles are related as having been wrought by him in attestation of his doctrine. The amount of the part which he took in the Albigensian war, and in the establishment of the Inquisition, has been the subject of controversy, not so much between opposite parties, as between his earlier and his later admirers. For whereas in some ages it was supposed to be for his honor that the largest possible share in the persecution of heretics by the sword and by torture should be claimed for him—whereas Cistercians and Dominicans have quarreled for the honor of having furnished the first inquisitors, and a pope has thought to do Dominic honor by ascribing to him the origin of the Inquisition,—Dominic's eulogists of later days have been no less eager to clear him from the imputation of acts which are no longer regarded as a title to the admiration of mankind. It would seem in truth that during the Albigensian crusade Dominic confined himself to the office of preaching. But if he is not chargeable with any such atrocities as those which have made Arnold of Citeaux infamous, there is, on the other hand, no reason for supposing that he ever attempted to check the worst deeds of Simon

de Montfort and his followers. And, although it is certain that he did not found the Inquisition, it is yet possible that that institution may in some degree have originated in his preaching, as it certainly found among his brotherhood the most numerous and the most merciless of its officials.

The first foundation of the Spanish missionaries in Languedoc was a school at Prouille, intended for the daughters of the poorer nobles, who were often obliged by their necessities to commit their children to the free schools of the heretics for education. From this, Dominic went on to the formation of a brotherhood devoted to preaching and to the confutation of heresy. The new institution was patronized by bishop Fulk of Toulouse, who, on going to the Lateran council in 1215, took Dominic with him, and endeavored to recommend it to the pope. Innocent was at first disinclined to entertain the scheme; but it is said that he was warned by a vision in the night, and he then professed his willingness to give his sanction to it, if Dominic would comply with a canon by which the council, with a view to check the too great multiplication of religious orders, had enacted that persons who might wish to found a monastic society should place it under some one of the rules which had already been approved. Dominic, therefore, chose for his preaching fraternity the rule of the great preacher St. Augustine, to which some additional severities were annexed. On returning to Toulouse, Dominic received from the bishop a church in the city, with some churches in other places, and a proportion of the tithes of the diocese by way of endowment; he founded a convent, and began to send out his disciples into various countries. But in the beginning of the next pontificate he again went to Rome, where he eventually fixed the head-quarters of his order in the church of St. Sabina, on the Aventine, which was bestowed on him by Honorius III. From this pope the order received many charters, in one of which he speaks of them by the title of “friars preachers”, which afterwards became distinctive of them. On Dominic himself was conferred the mastership of the Sacred Palace—an office instituted with a view to the religious instruction of the households of the pope and cardinals, but to which later popes have attached more important functions, and among them the censorship of books. This office has always been retained by the order.

The new brotherhood made rapid progress. In England, they were patronized by archbishop Langton; at Paris (where they were known by the name of Jacobins, from a hospital of St. James, which was bestowed on them), they soon acquired an important influence in the university. In 1220, and again in the following year, Dominic held general chapters of his order at Bologna. At the first of these, he expressed a wish to resign the mastership; and, as the brethren would not consent to this, he insisted on the appointment of “diffinitors”, whose power should be supreme, even over the master himself. In Languedoc he had been willing to accept endowments; but he now adopted from the order lately established by Francis the principle of absolute poverty or mendicancy—whether from a belief in its soundness, or from perceiving that in it the Franciscans had a power against which his own order could not otherwise hope to make head. At the second chapter, the order was divided into eight provinces, each under a prior; and to these four others were added at a later time.

In addition to the friars (whose dress of white, with a black scapulary, was believed to have been shown to the founder by the blessed Virgin), the order included nuns, and also a grade of tertiaries—persons who continued to be engaged in the common occupations of the world, but who, by entering into a connection with the Dominican brotherhood, added greatly to its popularity and influence.

The death of Dominic, of which he had received supernatural intimations, took place at Bologna in 1221. It is said that a member of the order saw a golden ladder let down from heaven, and held at the top by the Saviour and the blessed Virgin, who drew it up until a friar who was at the bottom of it, and whose face was hidden by his cowl, had reached the bright opening above, while jubilant angels ascended and descended on either side; and it was afterwards found that the same hour in which this vision was seen, was that of Dominic’s

departure. He was buried with great pomp by the cardinal-legate, Ugolino, bishop of Ostia (afterwards pope Gregory IX); and, after the miracles which he had done in his life had been far surpassed by those which followed his death, he was canonized by Gregory in 1233.

The founder of the other great mendicant order, Francis, was born at Assisi in 1182. His father, a rich merchant, was then absent in France, and the mother gave the boy the name of John; but for this his father, on his return, substituted the name under which he has become famous. Francis, according to his biographers, had been foretold by the Erythraean Sibyl, and typified in the Old Testament. St. John, in the Apocalypse, had described him as an angel ascending from the east; he and Dominic were the two staves, Beauty and Bands, of Zechariah's prophecy; and, that the list of his conformities with the Saviour might begin with his birth, it is said that his mother, by the direction of an unknown visitor, repaired to a stable when about to bring him into the world.

Francis in his early years followed his father's occupation, and for a time he gave himself up to habits which are rather to be described as idle and extravagant than as profligate. But he was sobered by a captivity of a year at Perugia, with whose citizens those of Assisi had gone to war, and, in consequence of some visions which were afterwards vouchsafed to him, he resolved to change his course of life. The severity of his religious exercises, the visions and raptures by which he was encouraged, the eccentric manifestations of his awakened spirit, need not be here detailed. He resolved to fulfill literally the precept "Give to every one that asketh thee"; and when money failed him, he gave away his clothes. The condition of lepers struck him especially with pity. The misfortune of these sufferers, whose frightful disease was then very common, was aggravated by social disabilities which seem to have originated in the religious view of the leprosy as typical of sin. There was a solemn service for their seclusion from the world; they were shut out from intercourse with men, and were treated as if dead. Many houses had indeed been founded for their relief; but Francis resolved to show his charity in a different way. Overcoming the natural loathing which he very strongly felt, he tended and kissed the sores of the lepers, washed their feet, and consorted with them; and early in this course it is said that he was rewarded by finding that a leper on whom he had bestowed his compassion miraculously disappeared.

One day, as Francis was in the church of St. Damian, in devotion before a crucifix, a voice from it addressed him by name—"Repair my church, which is falling to ruin". The real meaning, as he is said to have afterwards discovered, related to the church of Christ; but Francis supposed the old building of St. Damian's to be meant, and resolved to find the means of restoring it. He sold a quantity of his father's cloth at Foligno, and, returning to Assisi, offered the price of it and of his horse to the priest of St. Damian's, who, however, was afraid to receive the money. Francis then began to beg in behalf of the restoration, but his "intoxication of Divine love" was taken for madness, and he was hooted and pelted by the mob. His father cited him before the magistrates for having stolen the price of the cloth which he had sold; but Francis refused to appear, on the ground that he was now the servant of God only; and the magistrates admitted that the case belonged to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The father was somewhat appeased by the recovery of his money, which Francis had thrown into a hole; but he summoned him before the bishop, that the young man might renounce his inheritance. Francis gladly obeyed; in the bishop's presence he stripped himself of all his clothing, except a shirt of hair which he was found to wear next his skin, and he declared that he owned no other father but Him who is in heaven. Francis now put on the dress of a hermit; he continued to sing and to beg round the neighborhood for the restoration of St. Damian's, and afterwards for that of two other churches; and his efforts were successful. His father, whenever he saw him, loaded him with curses; but Francis, by way of antidote, took for his companion a beggar whom he styled his father, and whose business it was at every curse to utter a blessing, and to make the sign of the cross.

Hearing in church the Saviour's charge to His apostles, that they should go forth without staff or scrip or shoes or changes of raiment, Francis exclaimed that this was what he had been seeking for; and, throwing away his staff, his shoes, and all his clothes except a single coarse frock, he girt himself with a rope, and set forth as a preacher of repentance. By degrees he gathered disciples, and when their number amounted to eleven, he drew up a rule for them, and resolved to seek the pope's approval. Innocent at first hesitated, apparently from an apprehension that the proposed discipline might be found too severe after the first enthusiasm of the brotherhood should have passed away. But cardinal John of St. Paul's strongly advocated the new institution, and the pope eventually sanctioned it, in consequence, it is said, of a dream, in which he saw the Lateran church in danger of falling, and Francis propping it up. He conferred on Francis and his brethren the clerical tonsure, and the authority to preach; and as they returned to Assisi their addresses were everywhere heard by enthusiastic crowds, who pressed around Francis and tore his dress to pieces in their eagerness to possess some relic of him. It is said also that he performed a multitude of miracles. The church of St. Mary in Portiuncula at Assisi—one of the three churches which Francis had restored, and the original cradle of the order—was given up to them, and the Franciscans speedily spread into all lands, their propagation being accelerated by the principle of mendicancy, which rendered endowments needless. Francis doubted for a time whether he should devote himself to prayer and contemplation or to preaching; but the question was decided by an intimation from heaven that it was his work to labor for the good of others. The brethren, therefore, addressed themselves especially to the work of preaching and teaching among the poorest classes; and thus they acquired an influence which made the order very powerful and important.

In 1212 a sisterhood was founded in connection with the order by Clara Sciffi, a noble maiden of Assisi, who left her father's house to place herself under the guidance of Francis. The life of these sisters, who are commonly styled after the name of their foundress, was very rigid; some of them, it is said, had become so accustomed to silence, that, when compelled to speak, they could hardly form the words. Clara herself, although she supported her excessive mortifications with continual cheerfulness, is said to have never raised her head so high that the color of her eyes could be seen, except on the single occasion of receiving the papal blessing. On her death-bed, in 1253, she was visited by Innocent IV, and in 1255 she was canonized by Alexander IV. To the friars and the sisters was added in 1221 the class of tertiaries, or "Brethren of Penitence",—persons who without forsaking secular life, or even the marriage-tie, connected themselves with the order by undertaking certain obligations, such as to dress plainly, to live soberly, to carry no weapon of offence, and to perform stated devotions. And, as in the case of the Dominicans, this link between the order and the world was found a powerful means of strength and influence.

Francis studied humility in its extremest form, and enjoined it on his disciples. When the multitude expressed admiration of his sanctity, he used to command one of the friars to load him with abuse. It was revealed in a vision to a member of the order that the seat from which an angel had fallen by pride was reserved as a reward for the humility of Francis. His followers were charged to court contempt, and to be uneasy when they met with usage of an opposite kind. They were not to be called *brethren*, but *little brethren* (*fraticelli*) they were to be *minorites*, as being less than all others. They were not to accept ecclesiastical dignities; there was to be no prior among them, but their superintendents were to be styled ministers, as being the servants of all. To the clergy they were to show profound reverence—if they met a priest riding, they were to kiss his horse's feet. They were to be content with the poorest dress; a coarse frock, patched and clouted again and again, if necessary, a cord round the waist, and a pair of drawers, were all that a friar ought to possess. Their food was to be of corresponding quality; Francis stinted himself even in his allowance of water, although, when he mixed in society, he conformed to the usages of those around him. Yet he forbade extreme austerity.

When a friar had almost starved himself to death, Francis encouraged him by his own example to take food, and, in speaking of the case to the rest of his companions, he told them to imitate not the abstinence but the love. When some of his followers had injured themselves by their severities, he forbade all “indiscreet inventions” by way of penance, such as the use of cuirasses, chains, or rings confining the flesh, and all endeavors of one to outstrip another in religion. Among the forms under which pride was to be combated, Francis greatly dreaded the pride of learning. His own education had been scanty, but it was supposed that the knowledge of Divine things came to him miraculously, and he seems to have expected his followers to learn in the same manner. When one of them expressed some difficulty as to parting with his books, he told him that his books must not be allowed to corrupt the gospel, by which the friars were bound to have nothing of their own. From another he took away even a psalter, telling him that, if that book were allowed him, he would next wish for a breviary, and then for other books, until he would become a great doctor of the chair, and would imperiously thunder out to his humble companion orders to fetch such books as he might require. He then astonished the novice by scattering ashes on his head, rubbing them on it with his hand, and telling him that he himself had been reclaimed from the temptation of wishing for learning by opening the Gospels at the text—“To you it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but to others in parables that the knowledge of Christ crucified was all in all”. To the sisters of St. Clare, if they could not read, the permission even to learn was not given without insisting on humility of mind as a condition. Yet when asked at a general chapter whether men of learning might be admitted into the order, Francis replied that they might, because learning was not without its uses.

Francis was remarkable for his love of animals, which he treated as reasonable creatures. He often bought off lambs which were on their way to the slaughter, and in the church of the Portiuncula he kept a sheep, which, without any training (as we are told), used to take part in the services by kneeling and bleating. He preached to attentive audiences of birds on the benefits for which it was their duty to thank their Creator. Once, as he was about to preach, and found that some swallows were making a noise, he addressed them—“Sisters, you have spoken enough for the present, and it is my turn; be silent, and listen to the word of God”. He spoke to the fishes, to the worms, and even to the flowers. His love of personification embraced all sorts of objects. His own body he spoke of as “Brother ass”, on account of the heavy burdens which it was to bear and the hard usage which it was to experience; when about to undergo an operation of cautery, he addressed the fire as his brother, and begged it to deal gently with him; and it is said that in his last moments he uttered the words, “Welcome, sister Death!”. He saw, says an early biographer, the Creator in all His creatures; and it has been conjectured that the pantheism with which the order was afterwards infected may perhaps be traced to the founder’s love of nature, and to his fondness for personifying it.

Francis was desirous to preach to the infidels, and, if possible, to finish his life by martyrdom. With this view he embarked for Syria in 1212, but was driven back by storms. In 1213 or the following year, he set out with a like design for Morocco; but when he had gone as far as Spain, a serious illness compelled him to give up the attempt. In 1219 he and twelve companions sailed for Egypt, and joined the crusading force, which had just taken Damietta. The sultan of Egypt treated him with much respect, but declined to let the question between Christianity and Islam be decided by an ordeal, in which Francis offered to go into a fire with some Mahometan teachers, or even alone; and Francis returned to Italy after having foretold to the crusaders the reverses which soon after came on them. About the same time when he went into the east, five of his followers were sent into Morocco, where they were cruelly tortured and put to death in the following year, and thus reflected on the new brotherhood the glory of their martyrdom.

In the meantime the order was growing rapidly. In 1216 the first general chapter was held; and in 1219, before the founder's departure for the east, another general chapter was assembled, at which as many as 5000 friars were presents. The devils, it is said, alarmed at the progress of the new enemy, held equally numerous chapters in opposition; but their machinations were revealed in visions, and were foiled by the devotion of Francis and his brethren. At the Lateran council, in 1215, Innocent had declared his full approbation of the order; but the first formal charter bestowed on it was given by Honorius III, who in 1223, at the request of the founder, confirmed a stricter rule which Francis had then drawn up, and appointed cardinal Ugolino (afterwards Pope Gregory IX) to be protector of the minorites.

In 1224 Francis is said to have received the stigmata (or marks of the crucifixion), by which his conformity to the Saviour was supposed to be completed. He had retired to a mountain called Alvernia, among the Apennines, near Bibbiena, to keep a fast of forty days in honor of the archangel Michael, when in an ecstasy of devotion he saw a seraph with six wings, either crucified, or bearing between two of his wings a figure of the crucified Saviour. The vision deeply affected him; and forthwith he began to feel in his own body the likeness of the wounds which he had seen. It is stated that in his hands and in his feet the flesh grew out into the form of the nails by which the Saviour was fixed to the cross—the heads appearing on one side, and the points, sharp and somewhat turned back, on the other; while his side seemed as if pierced by a lance, and blood issued from the wounds. We are told that, although he tried to conceal these marks, they were seen by many persons while he was yet alive, and that the miracles wrought by them after his death converted many who until then had doubted. Francis survived the reception of the stigmata two years, during which he suffered greatly from illness of various kinds. Finding his end approaching, he desired that he might be carried into the church of the Portiuncula, where he solemnly blessed his weeping brethren, and breathed his last, lying on a shirt of hair and sprinkled with penitential ashes. His soul was seen in the form of a star, more dazzling than the sun, which was conveyed on a luminous cloud over many waters to the "abyss of brightness". In 1228 he was canonized by Gregory IX; and both by that pope and by some of his successors, the story of the stigmata was affirmed as true. Alexander IV decreed that anyone who should speak against it was to be excommunicated, and that the power of absolving from the offence was reserved to the pope alone.

The later history of the Franciscans will come before us hereafter. A temperate historian has pronounced that at the time of the Reformation these were "perhaps the most profoundly corrupted of all the orders".

10

THE FOURTH LATERAL COUNCIL
A.D. 1215-16.

The fourth general council of the Lateran, to which Innocent had long looked forward, met in November 1215. There were present at it two claimants of the Latin patriarchate of Constantinople, the titular patriarch of Jerusalem, seventy-seven primates and metropolitans, four hundred and twelve bishops, and more than eight hundred abbots, with ambassadors from Christian powers, and a multitude of deputies for bishops, chapters, and monasteries: the whole number of persons entitled to attend the sittings is reckoned at 2283. The business began on St. Martin's day, when the pope preached on the text "With desire I have desired to eat the Passover with you before I suffer". But the work of this great assemblage was hardly equal to the expectations which had been raised by the laborious preparations for it, and by its unequalled numbers and splendor. The part which it took in the affairs of England and of southern France has been already mentioned. Arrangements were made for a crusade to the east, which was to be carried out in the following year; but, although Innocent himself

declared his intention of taking part in the enterprise, and wrote many letters in pursuance of this resolution, the execution of it was frustrated by his death.

But the fourth Lateran Council is chiefly memorable for two canons, relating to matters of doctrine and discipline respectively—the 1st, which for the first time laid down by the authority of the whole western church the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Eucharist; and the 21st, which prescribed for every catholic Christian the duty of confessing once a year at least to his own priest, and of yearly receiving the holy Eucharist at Easter.

The words which Innocent had chosen as the theme of his sermon before the council were speedily found to have had an undesigned prophetic meaning. In the following summer, he fell sick at Perugia, when on his way to reconcile the enmities of the Genoese and the Pisans. The seriousness of his ailment was not suspected, so that he indulged freely in eating fruit; and in consequence, as is supposed, of this imprudence, he died on the 16th of July 1216, at the age of fifty-five.

In this great pope the power of the Roman see had been carried to its utmost height; those who came after him, by endeavoring to advance it yet higher, provoked a reaction which proved disastrous to it. Innocent's pontificate began at the early age of thirty-seven, and to the end of it he enjoyed the full vigor of his powers. He was exempted from the rough personal collisions, from the necessity of fleeing to the compassion of foreign princes, and from the other humiliations which had befallen many of his predecessors; in every quarter he appeared to be successful and triumphant; and his character, in which generous and amiable dispositions mingled in an unusual degree with the sterner qualities which tended to secure an ecclesiastical despotism, was fitted to take off from the invidiousness of his success. "He was dreaded by all", says an English chronicler, "above all the popes who for many years had gone before him". Other writers express thankfulness to God that under Innocent the catholic church triumphed over three kinds of enemies—the schismatics of the east, the heretics of the west, and the Saracens of the south. And he had carried out with a high hand in every country of western Europe his policy of establishing the papal authority as paramount over that of secular princes. Yet his success was more apparent than real; it was chequered by important failures, and in some cases temporary success bore within it the seeds of future reverses. As to Germany and the empire of the west, his policy would have utterly failed but for the assassination of Philip of Swabia; the emperor of his own choice turned against him, so that Innocent was obliged to set up in rivalry to Otho the natural heir, whom he had before thrust aside, and to consent to that union of Sicily with Germany under the rule of the Hohenstaufen, which the papal policy had long labored to render impossible. And, although his guardianship of Frederick may not have been unfaithful, yet, as being in the interest of the papacy only, it left impressions on the young prince's mind which were amply shown in his later history, to the detriment of Innocent's successors. The eastern Crusade, which Innocent had labored to set on foot, was diverted from its proper object to one which he found himself bound to denounce; and, although the splendor of the immediate result prevailed over his feelings of indignation, the power which the Latins thus founded in the east was sickly from the first; it tended to increase, instead of healing, the division between the Greek and the Latin churches; and after a few years of wretched decay, it came to an end. The crusade against the Albigenses, although successful, was attended with so much of cruelty and injustice that Innocent's connection with it has left a deep stain on his reputation; and his eulogists find themselves driven to plead in his excuse that he whose eye watched over all Christendom knew no better than continually to choose unfit and untrustworthy agents; to be guided by their interested and untrue reports, and, when warned of their misdeeds, and stirred to some ineffectual attempts at redress, still to continue his reliance on them. His sanction of the mendicant orders was contrary to his own first judgment, and, notwithstanding the powerful help and support which the papacy derived from those orders, there was more than enough in their later history to justify the foresight of his original distrust. And in England, where the

pope's immediate triumph was most signal, it proved in the end disastrous to the papacy. He himself lived to find that the primate whom he had imposed against the will of the king, and in contempt of the right of election, took the lead in asserting the claims of the national church against the papal usurpations. And from the surrender of the crown by the despicable John, the English spirit took a more strongly anti-papal impulse, which, after continual provocation from the assumptions, the corruptions, and the outrageous exactions of Rome, prepared men's minds for revolt against the dominion of the papacy.

CHAPTER II.

FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE HONORIUS III. TO THE DEATH OF
INNOCENT IV.

A.D. 1216-1254

1

HONORIUS III AND FREDERICK II

THE successor of Innocent, Cencio Savelli, who was elected at Perugia on the 18th of July 1216, and took the name of Honorius III, was a man of mild and gentle character. He was bent on carrying out the project of a crusade, and within a few days after his election he issued a letter inviting the Christians of the west to take arms in the holy cause. No one who had bound himself by the crusading vow was allowed to excuse himself; but those who, being unable to undertake the expedition in person, should aid it by furnishing substitutes or money, were to share in the privileges of crusaders. The pope earnestly exhorted that all feuds and discords should be laid aside; and he strongly insisted on the necessity of concerted action as being more effective than isolated efforts. But it was found that a general apathy had succeeded to the enthusiasm with which such enterprises had once been hailed. The collection of money went on slowly, and not without suspicion as to the truth of the professed object; while the enlistment of men was yet slower. Many of the clergy refused to pay their contribution of a twentieth; the pope found it necessary to arm the collectors with additional powers, to repeat his exhortations again and again, to rebuke the supineness of his flock, and to threaten them with the censures of the church. In one of his letters he quotes by way of incitement an assurance from the grand-master of the templars that Mahometanism was in a state of unexampled weakness, that it was daily declining, and that now was the time to strike. The war against the heretics of southern France was still allowed to count in some degree as an equivalent for the war of the Holy Land; but Honorius refused to extend a like privilege to a crusade against the heathens of Prussia.

From the greater sovereigns of Europe no personal service was to be obtained for the projected holy war. Philip of France was not to be drawn into a second expedition to the east. Henry of England was a child; and the elect emperor Frederick, although he had taken the cross at Aix-la-Chapelle with an enthusiasm which at the time was probably sincere, was unable to leave Europe so long as his rival Otho yet lived, and as the state of his dominions on both sides of the Alps was in other respects unsettled. It was therefore in vain that Honorius urged him by repeated applications to the fulfillment of his crusading vow. The Latin empire of Constantinople was miserably weak. On the death of the second emperor, Henry, in 1216, Peter of Courtenay, count of Auxerre, was chosen as his successor, and on the 9th of April in the following year he was crowned by the pope in the basilica of St. Laurence, near Rome, as the Romans would not allow the ceremony to be performed within the walls, lest it should be construed as bestowing any sovereignty over their city. But, having been treacherously invited to take his way to Constantinople through Epirus, he was seized by the lord of that country, Theodore, and committed to prison, in which he died. The elder of his sons declined the Byzantine crown; the younger, Robert, who accepted it, degraded the empire by his stupidity and indolence, his cowardice and his dissolute life. The Greek and the Latin clergy continued to quarrel with unabated vehemence. The Frank laity refused to pay dues to their clergy, and resisted all attempts to enforce ecclesiastical discipline; the monastic communities boldly defied their bishops; while the patriarch, although unable to control his own flock, provoked

the pope by claiming not only independence of the Roman see but equality with it, and the territory of the empire was continually diminishing through the successes of the Greek princes who had established themselves on its borders, both in Asia and in Europe. From Constantinople, therefore, it was certain that no help was to be obtained for the recovery of the Holy Land.

In 1217 Andrew II, king of Hungary, made his way by Cyprus to Acre, where a large force, including many German princes and prelates, was already assembled. But there was much discord and disorder among the host; and King Andrew, alarmed by the sickness and death of many around him, hastened to return home, in defiance of the ecclesiastical censures which were threatened, and after his departure were pronounced, by the patriarch of Jerusalem. From Cologne and the lower Rhine an expedition set out in three hundred vessels—in consequence, it is said, of the appearance of fiery crosses and other portentous signs in the sky. Some of these crusaders, on landing at Lisbon, yielded to the request of Alfonso II of Portugal, that they would assist him against the Saracens; and, after having gained a victory for their ally, a part of them entreated the pope that they might be allowed to remain a year for further service of the same kind. But Honorius replied that they had done enough for Spain, and at his command they proceeded to Acre.

Agreeably to the design of the Lateran council, the chief force of the crusaders sailed for Egypt, under the command of John, a brother of Walter of Brienne, and, like him, a brave and skillful warrior. John had married in 1210 Iolanthe, the daughter of Sibylla by Conrad of Montferrat, and by her had become the father of a daughter of the same name. The elder Iolanthe had died in 1212; and in right of her and of her daughter John of Brienne claimed the kingdom of Jerusalem. Among the other chiefs were the duke of Austria, the patriarch of Jerusalem, cardinal Robert Curzon, and a Portuguese ecclesiastic named Pelagius, who bore the commission of papal legate. The first object of attack was Damietta, which, after a siege which detained them sixteen months, fell into the hands of the crusaders. The inhabitants had been so much reduced by famine, pestilence, and the sword, that out of 80,000 only 3000 wretches are said to have remained alive; the air was tainted by the smell of corpses—some of which were partly eaten by the miserable survivors; yet even in the midst of these horrors the captors could not restrain their cruelty and rapacity. The report of this conquest was received in Europe with exultation, and afforded the pope a fresh ground for exhorting to the crusade; but it was not followed by any further successes. The army became enervated and demoralized. King John and the legate quarrelled, and John for a time withdrew from the expedition to prosecute a claim in right of his second wife to the kingdom of Armenia. After his return, the crusaders, 1220. who had been reinforced by fresh arrivals, advanced towards Cairo, but found their way barred by an overwhelming force of infidels, and began to fall back towards Damietta. The legate by his obstinacy prevented the acceptance of favorable terms offered by the sultan, Malek al Kameel; and the crusaders were soon reduced to great distress. Many of them perished by pestilence, many by the sword, many were carried away by the opening of a sluice which let loose on them the waters of the Nile; their vessels were in great part destroyed by the enemy; and at length they were fain to accept a truce for eight years, by which Damietta was to be relinquished, unless in the meantime some sovereign of the west should take up the crusade. The prisoners on both sides were to be surrendered, and the sultan promised to give up the true cross, “not, however, that which had been lost at Tiberias”. The sultan behaved with great humanity to the crusaders, supplying provisions to those of them who were in want.

The pope was greatly distressed by the failure of this expedition, in which it is supposed that 35,000 Christians, and perhaps twice that number of Mussulmans had perished. He endeavored to stir up Frederick, who had contributed to it by sending some ships, which arrived too late, and were unable to ascend the Nile; he attributed to him the disastrous result,

and told him that all men blamed him for having caused it by his delay in the fulfillment of his vow.

Frederick had now been delivered from the fear of Otho, who died in May 1218, having, on his death-bed, expressed great contrition, and according to some writers having even submitted to flagellation, as a condition of absolution and of reconciliation with the church. But Frederick still had other causes to detain him from the crusade. He was bent on procuring the election of his son Henry as king of Germany, and for this purpose he endeavored to conciliate the princes, both lay and spiritual, by concessions which in the event rendered them independent of the imperial authority. He relinquished the *jus exuviarum*, with all claim to the income of vacant sees, pledged himself to allow freedom of canonical election, and promised that sentences of excommunication, if not relaxed within six weeks, should be enforced by secular outlawry. Under the influence of these grants, the election of Henry was carried at Frankfort; but Honorius objected to it as a step towards that union of the German with the Sicilian crown which Frederick had promised that he would never attempt. In answer to his remonstrances, Frederick declared that the election had been the spontaneous act of the Germans; that the object of it was not to unite the crowns, but to provide for good administration during his own intended absence; and that, if he were to die, he would rather bequeath the kingdom of Sicily to the papacy than to the empire. The value of these professions has been variously estimated by writers in later times; but it seems hardly possible to believe that the emperor was sincere.

In September 1220 Frederick again crossed the Alps into Italy. Eight years had elapsed since the last appearance of a German force in that country; and in the meantime the feuds of Lombardy had been carried on with their usual bitterness. The Milanese, in consequence of neglecting the pope's exhortations to peace, had been laid under an interdict, and had retaliated by measures which resembled the ecclesiastical censures as nearly as possible. The podestà had placed the archbishop under ban. At Parma and elsewhere the clergy were shut out from the benefits of the law; it was forbidden to do them any service, such as shaving them or baking for them; and it was decreed that any person who on his death-bed should be reconciled to the church should be buried in a dunghill. At length, a sort of peace was negotiated by cardinal Ugolino (afterwards Gregory IX), but discords still continued, and the authority both of the pope and of the emperor was unheeded.

Frederick wished to receive the iron crown of Italy at Monza; but the Milanese, in whose hands it was, refused to allow the use of it, and were therefore placed under the ban of the empire. Frederick, as he advanced towards Rome, held communications with Honorius, whom he endeavored to propitiate; and on St. Cecilia's day he received the imperial crown from the pope's hands in St. Peter's. The splendid ceremony was attended with great demonstrations of joy, and even the Romans appeared for the time to be content. Frederick again took the cross from Honorius or from the bishop of Ostia; and in all respects he appeared desirous to gratify the pontiff. The territories of the countess Matilda were made over to the holy see, under pain of outlawry for all who should detain any part of them. Laws were enacted for the liberty of the church and of ecclesiastical persons; for the exemption of the clergy from taxes and from secular jurisdiction; for the enforcement of ecclesiastical censures by civil penalties; for the severe punishment of heretics, and of any who should show them favor or indulgence.

From Rome the emperor proceeded into southern Italy. The guardianship of Innocent had not been favorable to the crown, and during the civil distractions of Frederick's minority, and in the years which had passed since he left his native kingdom at eighteen, pretensions had been set up which, if admitted, must have reduced the sovereign to utter impotence. Frederick set to work with vigor for the recovery and assertion of his rights. He compelled many persons who had got into their hands castles and lands belonging to the crown—among them, some relations of the late pope—to surrender these possessions. He claimed a share in

the appointment of bishops; and he taxed all orders of the hierarchy for the maintenance of his armies. In consequence of these measures a correspondence with Rome began, and soon assumed an angry tone on both sides.

Again and again the pope urged the emperor to fulfill his crusading vow; but Frederick, although he sent forth letters in behalf of the enterprise, continually advanced excuses grounded on the difficulties with which he had to contend at home. The two met at Veroli and at Ferentino in the following March. At Ferentino, where John of Brienne, the patriarch of Jerusalem, and the grand-master of the templars, were also present, it was resolved that Frederick, who had lately become a widower, should marry Iolanthe, the beautiful daughter of John and heiress of the kingdom of Jerusalem—a match which was intended to bind the emperor more closely to the cause of the crusade. All agreed that it would be useless and mischievous to attempt the holy war without sufficient means, and it was resolved that the expedition should be deferred for two years, during which Frederick was to employ himself in the settlement of his dominions, while king John, with the grand-masters of the Temple and of the Teutonic order, was to visit the chief kingdoms of the west for the purpose of exciting them to the crusade. But although the titular king was received with honor, he and his associates found that in France, in England, and in Germany their cause was regarded with coolness; and John was obliged to report to the pope that the publication of the crusade was unsuccessful—a result which he mainly ascribed to the faults of the friars and others who preached it. Philip Augustus, who died in 1223, bequeathed 100,000 livres for the holy war; but it appears that this sum was never fully paid, and his successor, Lewis VIII, instead of prolonging his truce with England, plunged afresh into war, which called forth remonstrances from the pope. In no long time differences arose between John of Brienne and his imperial son-in-law. Frederick, immediately after his marriage, which was celebrated in November 1225, assumed the title of king of Jerusalem, declaring that it no longer belonged to John, who had held it only as husband of the elder Iolanthe, and afterwards as guardian of her daughter; to which John replied by calling Frederick the son of a butcher, and by charges of infidelity and neglect towards his bride.

The pope and the emperor met again at San Germano in July 1225, and a new compact was concluded. Frederick was released from the vow which he had made at Veroli, and he now bound himself to go on the crusade within two years from the following August, to furnish a certain number of ships and of soldiers, and to advance certain sums of money, which were to be repaid on his setting out for the East. He consented that, if he should fail in any respect, the Roman church should have full leave to pronounce its censures on him; but it was stipulated that he should be absolved immediately on redressing any wrong which he might have done. But, although there is no reason for supposing that Frederick wished to evade his engagements, the circumstances of his dominions continued to prevent the fulfillment of them. Engelbert, archbishop of Cologne, whom he had left as regent of Germany and guardian of his son Henry, was assassinated in June 1225 by one of his own kinsmen, whom he had deprived of the advocateship of a monastery on account of misconduct in the exercise of it. In 1226, when the emperor was expected in northern Italy, the Lombards at a great meeting renewed their league. His summons to a council at Cremona was unheeded, and, while he claimed the rights which had been secured for the empire by the treaty of Constance, the Lombards refused to supply him with provisions, and guarded the Alpine passes so as to prevent his son Henry from joining him in Italy. For these offences they were placed under the ban of the empire, and a numerous assembly of prelates at Parma, headed by the patriarch of Jerusalem, urged the bishop of Hildesheim, as the pope's representative, to excommunicate them. The matter was referred by both parties to the pope's arbitration; but, although Frederick had attempted to conciliate Honorius by yielding to him in a question as to some Apulian bishops, whom the pope had taken it on himself to nominate on the ground that the emperor had forfeited his patronage by delay, Frederick had just reason to complain that

the decision in his controversy with the Lombards was substantially unfair to him. An angry correspondence, which had already taken place, was renewed with greater bitterness; and an open breach appeared to be at hand, when Honorius died on the 18th of March 1227.

The anti-imperialist party wished to raise to the papacy count Conrad of Urach, cardinal of Porto, a hereditary enemy of the Swabian house; but Conrad declined the dignity, and Ugolino Conti, a near relation of Innocent III, became pope under the name of Gregory IX. Ugolino had been made a cardinal by Innocent, and had been employed in many weighty affairs, in which he had shown great ability. Frederick himself had characterized him as a man of spotless reputation, eminent for religion and purity of life, for eloquence and learning. He was especially skilled in the canon law, to which (as will be noticed hereafter) he made important additions. His temper was warm and vehement; although he is said to have been already more than eighty years of age, his mental faculties were unimpaired, and he retained even his bodily vigor to an extraordinary degree. Both the papacy and the empire were now represented by able and resolute champions of their respective claims—each inclined to assert to the full the prerogatives which he supposed to belong to his office; and the struggle between the two powers was no longer limited to one or two points, but extended over the whole of their mutual relations.

Frederick's character had now had time to develop itself, and displayed a remarkable mixture of good and evil qualities, which historians have amused themselves by tracing respectively to his ancestors on both sides. He was at once selfish and generous, placable and cruel, courageous and faithless. While growing up under the tutelage of the Roman see, he had learnt to dislike and to distrust it; he thought that Innocent, as his guardian, had allowed his rights to be invaded, not only by the church, but, for the church's sake, by others, and in his dealings with Rome he employed a craft which he had learnt from Rome itself. His justice is celebrated for the fact that in matters of law the sovereign had no advantage over the subject. Of his religious opinions, it will be enough to say here that, having spent his youth in an island where a mixture of creeds existed side by side under a system of toleration, he had imbibed a spirit of latitude, which tended to render him indifferent to threats of papal censure; indeed it was always a charge against him that he showed undue favor to his Mussulman subjects, and was addicted to oriental habits of life. His personal accomplishments were remarkable; he could speak fluently the languages of all the nations which were reckoned among his subjects—Greek, Latin, Italian, German, French, and Arabic. He was curious in natural history, and delighted in using his friendly relations with eastern princes to form a collection of animals rarely seen in Europe—among them, the elephant, the camel, and the camelopard. A Latin treatise on falconry composed by him, or under his superintendence, is still extant. He cultivated the science of the Arabs, and among the learned men whom his patronage drew to his court was the famous Michael Scott, whom he employed in translating some of Aristotle's works. He patronized astrology, and it is said that he at once mocked the predictions of his astrologers and entertained a superstitious belief in them. He was distinguished for his love and encouragement of literature; his court was the earliest home of Italian poetry, in which Frederick himself and his chancellor, Peter delle Vigne, were eminent. By birth and early training, the emperor was inclined to prefer the south to the ruder north; his court was the most brilliant in Europe, and its tone was probably determined by the notorious and excessive laxity of morals in which Frederick himself indulged. It is not to be wondered at that Gregory, soon after his election, addressed to the emperor a letter in which, after endeavoring to conciliate him by compliments, he remonstrates with him on the luxury and dissoluteness which prevailed around him, and adds serious warnings, such as a pope might without undue assumption have held himself entitled to address to the lay chief of Christendom, who had grown up under the guardianship of the apostolic see.

With Honorius, the advancement of the crusade had really been his chief purpose; but with Gregory it was subordinate to the exaltation of the papacy, so that the likelihood of a

serious collision with the emperor was greatly increased. The pope sent forth a summons to Christendom; but the backwardness and apathy with which his predecessor's exhortations had been received were still manifested on all sides. Frederick, although for political reasons he was unwilling to leave his dominions, collected men and ships, and on the 8th of September embarked from Brindisi. But a pestilence broke out which carried off many of his soldiers; many in alarm forsook the expedition; and the emperor himself, after having been three days at sea, withdrew at Otranto, under the plea of sickness, and repaired to the baths of Puzzuoli. On hearing of this, the pope was violently indignant. On St. Michael's day, at Anagni, he solemnly denounced Frederick excommunicate, in terms of the treaty of San Germano) he recounted the emperor's dealings with the Roman court—charging him with ingratitude, with having endeavored by a long series of delays to evade his crusading vows, with having by his negligence caused the failure of the Damietta expedition, with having protracted the later expedition until the heat of the season brought on the pestilence which had wasted the army, with having deserted the holy enterprise under a nugatory pretense of sickness, to return to his habitual indulgence in luxury. It was in vain that Frederick sent some bishops to plead his cause; the pope renewed the excommunication again and again, and required all bishops to publish it. Frederick, by way of reply, sent forth a letter addressed to all who had engaged themselves to the crusade. In this he appealed to God as a witness to his sincerity in desiring to carry out his vow, and to the reality of the sickness which had prevented the fulfillment of his design. The pope, he said, had hindered him by stirring up his enemies, and had spent in maintaining troops against him the money which ought to have been employed in the crusade; he repelled the charges of ingratitude—if Innocent had taken up his cause, it was as a means of opposing Otho. He declared himself to be still resolved on going to the east, and desired his subjects to help him with men and money for the expedition. The emperor's justification was publicly read in the Capitol at Rome by a famous jurist, Roffrid of Benevento.

On Maundy Thursday the pope again pronounced Frederick excommunicate, declared him to have forfeited the Apulian kingdom, and added an interdict on all places where he might be; but on Easter Monday, as Gregory was engaged in the celebration of mass, the Romans, among whom Frederick had formed a strong party, broke into the church, and, almost with personal violence, drove him from the city to seek a refuge at Perugia. But Gregory, by the help of the mendicant friars, who penetrated into every class of society, had means of spreading his charges and denunciations far more widely than the emperor's vindication could reach.

Frederick, however, was resolved to prove that he was sincere in his professions as to the crusade. In the end of June 1228, he again sailed from Brindisi, and, after having visited Cyprus, he landed on the 7th of September at Acre, where he was received with great demonstrations of joy, although the clergy significantly refrained from offering the kiss of peace. To Gregory, this expedition, undertaken by an excommunicated prince, in defiance of ecclesiastical censures and prohibitions, was more offensive than anything that Frederick had yet done; and, instead of aiding the emperor, he determined to thwart him to the utmost of his power. Frederick's ideas as to the objects which might be effected by a crusade were largely modified by the circumstances of his time from those which had been entertained by earlier crusaders. The vast armaments by which it had formerly been attempted to overwhelm the infidel power were no longer to be raised; nor was the emperor himself, although brave and active, fitted by nature to rival the fame which Richard of England had won by his personal prowess. He felt nothing of the deadly and irreconcilable hostility against the followers of Mahomet which had animated the older crusaders; he had already exchanged presents with the sultan; it seemed to him enough if the main objects of the holy war could be secured by treaty, instead of insisting on the extermination of the enemy. On the other side, too, there was a disposition to treat. Kameel had been alarmed by the reports which reached him from Europe as to formidable preparations, which were, doubtless, exaggerated by fame; he was pressed by

rivalries and discords among the professors of his own creed, so that at one time he had even invited Frederick's assistance; and he believed that, if the emperor could be brought to an accommodation, no fear need be entertained as to the other western powers. Negotiations, therefore, were opened; and on the 18th of February 1229 a treaty was concluded, by which Jerusalem was to be made over to the Christians, with the exception of the Temple, which although open to them, was to remain under the care of the Moslem, who professed to regard it with no less veneration. Nazareth, Bethlehem, Sidon, and other places were also to be given up; prisoners were to be surrendered on both sides; and it was stipulated that the emperor should aid in enforcing the articles in favor of the sultan, if any Frank should attempt to violate them. By this treaty the Christians had gained more than they had for many years ventured to expect as possible. Even the compromise as to the Temple was vindicated by Herman of Salza, master of the Teutonic order, a man whose character was respected by all, as expedient in the circumstances of the case. Kameel was accused by his own people of having yielded too much, and Frederick, in a letter to the pope, took credit for having done important service to the church.

When, however, the emperor had entered Jerusalem in triumph, with the intention of being crowned as king in the right of his late wife (who had died in childbirth while the expedition was preparing to set out), he found that the papal denunciations had stirred up serious difficulties against him. The claim of right, without election, was in itself obnoxious to the clergy. The patriarch, the templars, and the knights of St. John, were prepared to oppose him in all ways; and, although some persons held that, by having done that for the delay of which he had been excommunicated, he had entitled himself to be regarded as absolved, his more discreet friends, such as Herman of Salza, advised him to respect the censures. Instead, therefore, of receiving the crown from the patriarch with the usual Sunday, solemnities, Frederick took it with his own hands from the altar, and wore it until he reached his throne, from which he addressed the assembled multitude, relating the course of his dealings with the pope, whom, however, he did not charge with any worse fault than that of having misunderstood him. His speech was received with loud applause; but next day the archbishop of Caesarea, in the name of the patriarch Gerold, interdicted the city and the holy places—even the Saviour's sepulchre—on account of the pollution which they had contracted from the emperor's presence. An order was received from the pope, that all Christians should refuse to obey him, and in consequence of this the Genoese and the Pisans held aloof; but Frederick overcame the difficulty by issuing his orders in the name of God and of Christendom. The patriarch industriously supplied the pope with unfavourable reports of the emperor's behaviour at Jerusalem; he had outraged the clergy and religious orders, he had held friendly intercourse with the infidels; he had received presents of singing and dancing girls from the sultan, and lived like a Mussulman rather than like a Christian; he had used language which showed a disbelief of the Christian faith, and an inclination to the falsehoods of Mahomet. A plot was laid by some templars for surprising him on an expedition to bathe in the Jordan; but he was informed of it by the sultan, and after this and other displays of hostility, he took stringent measures for controlling the religious orders. Again and again the pope renewed his denunciations of Frederick, publishing them everywhere by the agency of the friars, together with the gravest imputations against the emperor's faith and morals. And the papal forces, headed by John of Brienne and cardinal John of Colonna, invaded the Apulian kingdom.

Frederick, recalled by the tidings of these movements, suddenly returned from the east, and surprised his enemies by landing near Brindisi. The general feeling in his favor was speedily manifested by large desertions from the hostile army; and those who remained true to the pope were reduced by want of pay to plunder churches for the means of support. Herman of Salza and two bishops were sent to the pope, with the offer of advantageous terms of peace; but Gregory obstinately held out, and renewed his anathemas. He attempted to raise all Europe, to collect money from France, England, and against the emperor, and to set up a rival

king in Germany; but these attempts met with little response. The general unwillingness to pay money for crusades was exasperated by the object of the crusade which was now proposed; and an opinion was very commonly expressed that Frederick had effected in the east as much as was in his power; that he was not deserving of anathema and deposition for having imitated Richard of England and Philip of France in treating with the infidels. The vindications of his conduct which he himself sent forth made a strong impression on the minds of men in general, and the progress of his arms was such as to affect even the stubborn resolution of Gregory. On the other hand, Frederick was willing to pay dearly for reconciliation with the church; and in August 1230 an agreement was effected at Ceperano, by which he was released from ecclesiastical censures, on condition of submitting to the church as to all the matters for which he had incurred his excommunication, and of paying a large sum to the pope by way of compensation for his expenses. Immediately after his absolution, Frederick visited the pope at Anagni, and both parties in their letters express great satisfaction as to their intercourse on this occasion.

An interval of peace between the papacy and the empire followed. In November 1230, the Romans, alarmed by a great inundation of the Tiber, and by a pestilence which followed on it, entreated Gregory to return from Perugia. In 1232, however, he found himself obliged to request the emperor's assistance against his subjects, when Frederick excused himself on the ground that he was engrossed by the affairs of Sicily; and in answer to the pope's repeated urgency that the crusade should be renewed, he declared that, so long as heresy was rampant among the Italians, especially among the Milanese (the pope's own allies)—it would be absurd to go in search of mote distant enemies of Christ. But, notwithstanding these and other differences, the relations of the two powers were on the whole peaceable; and when the pope, after having been recalled in 1233, had been again expelled by the Romans in 1234, he was restored by the arms of Fredericks

During this time of peace both Frederick and Gregory engaged in the work of legislation. The code which the emperor promulgated for Sicily was intended to harmonize and to supersede the various systems of law which had been introduced into that island by its successive masters—Greeks, Romans, Goths, Lombards, Normans, and Germans—and the chief author of it was Peter delle Vigne (or de Vineis), a native of Capua, who had raised himself from the condition of a mendicant scholar to the chief place in Frederick's confidence and in the administration of his government. In this code, which was published at Melfi in 1231, the temporalities of the church were secured to it, although Frederick in his later days did not always respect them; but care was taken to control the pretensions of the hierarchy. They were subject to taxation and to the judgment of secular courts, nor had they any exclusive jurisdiction except in matrimonial causes. Appeals to the pope were not allowed except in matters purely spiritual, and were altogether forbidden if the sovereign and the pope should be at variance. The sale of land to the clergy was prohibited, on the ground that they declined the feudal duties attached to the possession of it; and it was enacted that, if land were bestowed on them, they should either sell it or provide for the discharge of the feudal services. It was declared that the king might legitimize the children of a clergyman—a remarkable proof of the extent to which marriage prevailed among the clergy. Gregory vehemently remonstrated against the principles embodied in this code as to the relations of church and state; but the emperor replied that his power of legislation was independent of any other authority, and the difference would have been carried further, but that at that very time the pope was driven from Rome by his people.

On his own side, and in remarkable contrast with the imperial legislation, Gregory, who had been noted for his skill in canon law, put forth a body of Decretals, in which the principles of Hildebrand and Innocent III were carried to their greatest height. According to this code, the clergy were to be wholly exempt from taxes and from secular judgment; all secular law was to be subordinate to the law of the church; and the secular power was bound

to carry out obediently the church's judgments. There was, however, one subject as to which the rival systems of law were in accordance with each other. While Gregory was severe in his enactments against heresy, Frederick was no less so—declaring heresy to be worse than treason, and in this and his other legislation condemning heretics to be burnt, or, at least, to have their tongues cut out, while he denounced heavy penalties against all who should harbor or encourage them. In explanation of such laws, it has been supposed that the emperor wished to benefit his own reputation for orthodoxy at the expense of others; and that, as they were chiefly directed against the sectaries of Lombardy, he regarded the religious errors of these as connected with the political disaffection which prevailed in the same province.

While Frederick, induced alike by natural inclination and by the political expediency of remaining on the scene where the contest with his chief opponent was to be waged, continued to reside in his southern kingdom, his son Henry, whom he had left in Germany, was persuaded to listen to counselors who dwelt on the grievances of his dependent and subordinate condition, and on the dishonor done to Germany by the emperor's preference of Apulia and Sicily. In the end of 1234, Frederick was startled by intelligence that Henry had allied himself with the cities of Lombardy, and had set up the standard of rebellion. At Easter 1235, after having restored the pope to Rome, he set out for Germany, where he put down the rebellion without difficulty, and, on Henry's submission, admitted him to forgiveness. It has been supposed that the pope was concerned in instigating this rebellion; but, as Frederick, in the most unmeasured of the manifestoes which he issued in their later quarrels, never taxed him with any share in it, there can be no reasonable doubt that the strong disapproval which Gregory pronounced against Henry's courses—even authorizing bishops to excommunicate him if he should not surrender—was sincere. During this visit to Germany, the emperor strengthened his family alliances by marrying, July 15, at Worms, Isabella, the beautiful sister of the king of England—a match which appears to have been suggested by the pope; and he took part in the translation of the body of St. Elizabeth, widow of the landgrave of Thuringia, which was performed with great solemnity at Marburg in the presence of a vast concourse of people.

The reconciliation with Henry did not last long; the prince, by breaking his engagements, provoked his father to severer measures, and, after having been confined successively in several fortresses of southern Italy, threw himself from his horse, while on his way from one prison to another, and died in consequence of the fall.

For some years the emperor's relations with the Lombards had been uneasy. On his summoning a diet to Ravenna in 1231, they repeated their conduct as to the diet of Cremona—absenting themselves from the meeting, and preventing Henry (who was yet faithful to his father) from joining him with the princes of Germany. Gregory, like his predecessor Honorius, had been accepted by both parties as arbiter of their differences; but, while his decision was not satisfactory to the Lombards, Frederick, not without reason, complained of it as too favorable to them. The Lombards, although divided among themselves by furious enmities of city against city, and of faction against faction within the cities, renewed their league in 1235, advancing claims beyond those which had been conceded by the treaty of Constance; and in the following year Frederick resolved on war, for which he adroitly assigned as a motive the desire to put down the heresy which was rife in Milan and throughout the north of Italy. While engaged in the siege of Mantua, he addressed to the pope a long letter in refutation of the charges which were brought against him; but Gregory continued to insist on them, blaming him for his cruel treatment of monks and friars, for his invasions of the church's property, and his aggressions on her rights, and holding up, by way of contrast, the devout submission of Constantine, Charlemagne, and other pious emperors.

Frederick's arms were everywhere triumphant. In the midst of his successes against the Lombards, he was recalled to Germany in the winter of 1236, by the tidings that duke Frederick of Austria had attacked and defeated an imperial army; but the duke was speedily

put down; his capital, Vienna, gladly received the conqueror; and in that city the emperor was able to procure from the assembled princes the election of Conrad, his son by the daughter of John of Brienne, as king of the Romans in the room of Henry. The choice was soon after confirmed at Spire; and in November 1237 Frederick's prosperity was crowned, at the battle of Corte Nuova, by a victory so signal that it seemed to compensate the imperial power for the loss of Legnano in a former generation. The Lombards, after having obstinately defended until nightfall the *carroccio* which bore the standard of Milan, withdrew from the field with heavy loss, and the car itself fell into the hands of Frederick, who, after having paraded it triumphantly at Cremona, with the podestà of Milan exhibited on it as a captive, sent it to Rome for the ornament of the Capitol. In Rome itself the emperor's interest was maintained by partisans who made the pope's position uneasy, and for a time expelled him. But by the execution of his prisoner, the podestà of Milan, Peter Tiepolo, son of the doge of Venice—although the act had been provoked by some attacks on the part of the Venetians—Frederick drew on himself the especial enmity of the great maritime republic, which was bitterly shown in the sequel.

After having attempted without success to bring Frederick to submission by a mission of some bishops, who were charged to represent to him his offences against the church, and having assured himself of the support of the Genoese and the Venetians, the pope proceeded on Palm Sunday 1239 to pronounce a sentence which was more publicly proclaimed on the following Thursday. In this sentence the emperor's misdeeds were recited—that, in breach of his solemn oaths, he had plotted seditions at Rome against the pope, and had attempted to assail his power; that he had hindered the journeys of papal emissaries and the access of persons who were on their way to the papal court; that he had kept many bishoprics and abbacies vacant, to the great injury of religion; that he had seized, imprisoned, and slain members of the clerical order; that he had occupied territories belonging to the apostolic see; that he had plundered churches and had oppressed the Cistercians, the Templars, and the Hospitallers; that he had prevented the recovery of the Holy Land. For these and other offences he was declared to be excommunicated and anathematized; he was “delivered to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord”; his subjects were released from their allegiance, a curse was laid on every place in which he should be, and all ecclesiastics who should officiate in his presence or hold intercourse with him were deposed. And the pope issued letters by which it was ordered that this sentence should be generally published on Sundays and festivals, with ringing of bells and lighting of candles.

Frederick was keeping Easter with great pomp at Pavia when the news of his excommunication reached him; and he resolved to publish it himself, together with his solemn protest against it. He appeared in the fullest splendor of the imperial attire before a vast multitude, and, after the papal sentence had been read aloud, the chancellor, Peter delle Vigne, made a speech in vindication of his master from all the charges contained in it. The emperor himself then rose and addressed the assembly, declaring that, if the sentence had been pronounced on just grounds, he would have submitted; but that, as it was without any such foundation, he repelled it as a grievance and an insult. He addressed letters to the cardinals, to all Christian princes, and to the people of Rome, recounting the whole history of his dealings with the popes, professing a deep respect for their office, but denouncing Gregory as having wronged him, and offering to justify himself before a general council. He also issued severe orders against such of the clergy and monks as were likely to take part against him. All friars who were “of the land of the unbelievers of Lombardy” were to be expelled from the Sicilian kingdom, and security was to be taken of other friars that they would not offend the emperor. The monks and clergy were heavily taxed. Such of Frederick's clerical subjects as were in the papal court were required to return by a certain day under severe penalties, and it was forbidden under pain of death to introduce any letters from the pope against the emperor. In

the following year all Dominicans and Franciscans were compelled to leave the kingdom, except that two, of native birth, were allowed to remain in each of their convents.

The pope met Frederick's protests by a letter of extraordinary violence, in which he spoke of the emperor as a man utterly false and untrustworthy. He reproaches him with ingratitude to the Roman church, declares the pretext of illness in his first attempt at a crusade to have been untrue, and reflects severely on his administration. But the most remarkable part of this letter was that in which, after having compared Frederick to the apocalyptic beast which rose out of the sea with the name of blasphemy on his forehead, he charged him with having said that the world had been deluded by three impostors, of whom two had died in honor, but the other had been hanged on a tree; and with having ridiculed the idea that the Almighty Creator of the world could have been born of a virgin. The truth of these charges has been vehemently debated. Frederick, educated in Sicily, had grown up in a laxity of religious opinion, which naturally resulted from the extraordinary mixture of races and creeds around him; his views as to many subjects were, no doubt, different from those which were sanctioned by the authority of Rome; and very possibly the stories as to his levity of speech on sacred or serious matters, may have at least some foundation of truth, while it is probable that his constant hostilities with popes, and his keen sense of the injustice which he supposed himself to have met with at their hands, may have affected unfavorably his belief in the doctrines which they taught. But that he had come to deny the great verities of the Christian faith, is an accusation advanced by his bitter and unscrupulous enemies, hardly credible in itself, and one which he himself strongly and steadily repelled. In answer to Gregory's letter, he sent forth one in which he denies the imputations on his faith, and strongly asserts his orthodoxy. He allows the pope's power of binding and loosing, but says that it has its limits, and if wrongly exercised is null; and he distinguishes between the church and the person of Gregory, whom he attacks with unmeasured vehemence, retorting on him the imagery of the Apocalypse by styling him the great dragon, and that Antichrist of whom the pope had pronounced Frederick himself to be the forerunner. He declared the real cause of the pope's enmity to be his refusal to sanction the marriage of his illegitimate son Henry or Enzo, king of Sardinia, with one of Gregory's nieces.

The charge of infidelity, advanced by the successor of St. Peter, would perhaps in other circumstances have been fatal to his opponent. But at this time the minds of men were so violently exasperated by the rapacity of the popes, that they were not disposed to receive with implicit belief such an accusation from such a quarter. This rapacity had been carried far beyond all precedent. In England, the exactions for the crusades, although sanctioned by the feeble Henry III, had caused deep and general disgust, not only among the laity but among the clergy. It was complained that the money collected for the Holy Land disappeared without any result; that the efforts which ought to have been limited to the original sacred purpose of the crusade were prostituted by being turned against the emperor; that although the pope, after having gathered funds for his crusade against the emperor, speedily made peace with him, no part of the contributions had been repaid; that the mendicant friars, who had been the chief agents in raising this money, took state on them, in violation of their professions of evangelical poverty and humility, and spent it freely on themselves. Italians occupied the benefices of the church in vast numbers, and sucked the wealth of the land, while they disregarded all the duties of residence, hospitality, and charity. And in the discontent produced by these grievances, men were struck by the inconsistency of the charge as to placing the three chief religions of the world on the same level of imposture, with that other charge of inclination to the religion of Mahomet which had formerly been brought against Frederick, and was still repeated. The emperor's manifestoes made a deep impression, and the accusation of infidelity was generally disbelieved.

In France, too, even under the reign of the saintly Lewis IX, the clergy had been provoked by the Roman exactions, and there was a feeling that the pope had proceeded too

rashly. It was said that the greatest prince in Christendom ought not to have been excommunicated without a general council; Frederick's services in the holy war were remembered as a ground for discrediting the imputations against his faith; it was resolved that a mission should be sent to inquire of him directly as to the truth of the matter: and he was believed, when, with tears of anger, he thanked the envoys for having referred the question to himself, and met the charge by an indignant denial.

It was in vain that Gregory endeavored to stir up opposition in Germany by desiring the electors to choose another king instead of the excommunicated and deposed Frederick; they answered that it was for them to elect, and that the pope had no other part in the matter than to crown the prince whom they had chosen. In Germany, too, the assumption of the papal agents—among whom Albert of Beham, archdeacon of Passau, was the most conspicuous—excited a general spirit of revolt against the authority of Rome, so that even bishops were found to declare that the Roman pontiff had no jurisdiction in Germany except by their consent; to protest loudly against the spirit of aggression and usurpation by which the policy of Rome was directed, and to proclaim their adhesion to Frederick, as the best hope of deliverance from the Roman oppression. The duke of Bavaria wrote to the pope, in April 1241, that the greater part of the German prelates and princes might be expected in autumn to appear in Lombardy for the assistance of Frederick; and about the same time Gregory received other letters from Germany, as well as from France and Denmark, entreating him to make peace.

Although the pope exerted himself to the utmost to raise up opposition to the emperor in Italy—even inciting monks and clergy to fight against him as if he were a Saracen—Frederick's arms made continual progress. In 1240, he had taken Viterbo, and approached the walls of Rome, when the pope, in the extremity of danger, had recourse to extraordinary measures. He held a solemn procession, in which a part of the true cross and the heads of St. Peter and St. Paul were displayed; and, taking the crown from his own head, he placed it on the relics of the apostles, to whom he addressed a prayer that they would defend the city, since the men of Rome hung back from its defense. The people, moved by this and by the force with which Gregory dilated on the emperor's offences, took the cross with an unanimity which had long been unknown; and Frederick thought it well to pass on into southern Italy, without attempting an assault on Rome. The success of his arms, however, was continued, and among his allies appear some whose names would not have been expected to occur in such a connection. Thus Elias, minister-general of the Franciscan friars—the most effective agents of the papacy—joined the emperor, although it was soon found that the deposition and excommunication with which this step was visited destroyed all his influence in the order. And John Colonna, the pope's ablest general, and the most important member of the college of cardinals, on being desired by Gregory to break off a truce which he had negotiated, refused. "If you will not obey me", said Gregory, "I no longer acknowledge you as cardinal". "Nor do I acknowledge you as pope", replied Colonna; and he carried over his troops to the emperor.

Gregory had summoned a general council to meet at Easter 1241. At an earlier time, the expedient of a general council had been much in favor with Frederick; but he saw that such a council as was now proposed—an assembly packed by his enemy with persons who had already declared themselves against him—was not likely to do him justice. He protested that popes had no right to summon general councils without the imperial sanction—especially such a pope as Gregory, who was leagued with the heretical and rebellious Milanese, and used the prelates who were at his beck to overrule the rights of princes who were subject to no earthly judgment. And he also dwelt on other objections—such as that the notice was too short for those who, on account of their distance from the scene of contention, were most likely to be unprejudiced in the quarrel. He endeavored to persuade sovereigns to restrain their bishops from attending; while the bishops themselves were plied with alarming arguments

from the difficulties of the journey, from the emperor's power, which rendered it unsafe to travel without his passport, and from the notorious greed of the Roman court. On hearing, however, that a number of bishops were assembled at Genoa, Frederick offered them a safe passage by land, with the intention of meeting them on their way to Rome, and of setting before them a vindication of his conduct. But the pope's representatives prevented the acceptance of this offer, and the members of the intended council embarked on board a fleet hired from the republic of Genoa. Off Meloria, a rocky island nearly opposite Leghorn, they were unexpectedly attacked by a combined fleet from Sicily and Pisa, under the command of Frederick's son, king Enzo, which sank three galleys, and took twenty-two, with many smaller vessels. The number of prisoners amounted to about 3,000, among whom were three papal legates,—one of them, cardinal Otho, laden with the spoils of England—many archbishops and bishops, the abbots of Cluny and Citeaux, and the deputies of the Lombard cities. These were all carried to Naples, and were distributed among the fortresses of Apulia, from which after a time the French bishops were released at the intercession of their sovereign.

Gregory on hearing of this disaster was greatly exasperated, and sent forth letters in which he vehemently denounced Frederick for having captured the ecclesiastics who were on their way to a general council, after having himself often expressed a wish for such an assembly. The emperor now advanced into the neighborhood of Rome, and was laying waste all around him, when in his camp at Grotta Ferrata he received the tidings that Gregory had died on the 21st of August—partly, it would seem, from mental agitation, partly in consequence of being confined within the walls of his city during the excessive heats of summer. Frederick professed to see a fitness in the circumstance that August had proved fatal to the enemy of the Augustus, and expressed a hope that a successor of more peaceful character might be found. With some difficulty eight cardinals were brought together in the Septisolium at Rome—some of them having been allowed by Frederick to leave their prison for a time in order to choose a pope. But their votes were divided, and a second election was necessary before they could agree in choosing Gregory Castiglione, bishop of Ostia, a nephew of Urban III. The new pope took the name of Celestine IV; but within eighteen days the papacy was again vacant by his death, and the vacancy was prolonged almost two years by the dissensions of the cardinals among themselves.

THE TARTARS IN EUROPE

Frederick now felt himself at liberty to turn his attention to an enemy of a different character from the popes with whom he had been long contending. The Mongols or Tartars, after the death of Genghis, the founder of their empire, in 1237, had continued to push their conquests in all directions. In 1226 a vast horde of them, which was believed to extend twenty days' journey in length, and fifteen in breadth, had overwhelmed Russia; and Europe was alarmed by the reports of their prodigious numbers and of their savage character. They overran Poland without difficulty; but in Silesia they were encountered, near Liegnitz, by a force of Germans under the duke of the country, Henry the Pious. The inequality of numbers—30,000 against 450,000—and the death of the German leader gave the victory to the invaders; but by this resistance western Europe was saved, and the Tartars, instead of advancing further, turned their course into Hungary, where they overcame king Bela IV, and displayed great barbarity and cruelty. While the emperor's enemies, with the usual extravagance of party-hatred, charged him with having brought this terrible scourge on Christendom, Frederick, in answer to all cries for aid to repel them, had alleged the danger of giving the pope an advantage against him, and the pope had been loudly blamed for detaining him in Italy. But it would seem that the emperor now dispatched Enzo, with such forces as he

could spare, to the aid of Conrad in Germany, and thus contributed to the repulse of the barbarians, who, after having been defeated with great slaughter, retreated towards the Volga.

The long vacancy of the papal see was popularly charged on Frederick, who may, indeed, be fairly supposed to have been very willing to see it protracted. The English clergy sent to him a mission of remonstrance on the subject, and the French threatened that, unless a new pope were speedily chosen by the cardinals, they themselves would set up a pope of their own, by virtue of a privilege which the apostolical pope Clement was said to have bestowed on St. Denys the Areopagite. Thus urged from various quarters, the emperor wrote to the cardinals, reproving them for their corruption, ambition, and other faults, complaining that he was defamed on their account, and urging them to proceed to an election. With a view to this, they were released from prison, and were allowed to meet at Anagni; but their factious divisions still continued, and it was not until after Frederick had let his soldiery loose to ravage their estates that they agreed in choosing Sinibald Fiesco, cardinal of St. Laurence in 1243. Sinibald, a noble Genoese of the family of the counts of Lavagna, and eminent for his legal and theological learning, had hitherto adhered to the imperialist politics of his family; but Frederick, when he was congratulated on the result of the election, answered that, instead of having gained a friendly pope, he had lost a friendly cardinal—that no pope could be a Ghibelline. By styling himself Innocent IV, Sinibald seemed to announce a design of following the policy of the great pope who had last borne the name of Innocent; and this design he steadily carried out. In some respects his pretensions exceeded those of any among his predecessors; he aimed at a power over the church more despotic than anything before claimed; and the vast host of the mendicant friars, who were wholly devoted to the papacy, enabled him to overawe any members of the hierarchy who might have been disposed to withstand his usurpations. Yet, although he was less violent than Gregory IX, his pride, his rapacity, and the bitterness of his animosity against those who opposed him, excited wide dissatisfaction, and many who were well affected to the papacy were forced to declare that the pope's quarrels were not necessarily the quarrels of all Christendom.

Frederick, notwithstanding the misgivings which are imputed to him, sent his congratulations to the new pope, and asked for absolution from the censures which, as he said, had been wrongfully pronounced by Gregory; and in a public document he expressed a belief in Innocent's fitness for his office, and in his zeal for peace and justice. Innocent, on the other hand, from the beginning of his pontificate, encouraged the spreading of rumors discreditable to the emperor, which were busily carried about by the mendicant friars—that he neglected the exercises of religion, that he was unsound in the faith, that he lived with Saracen mistresses, who were guarded in eastern fashion by eunuchs, that he favored Mahometanism and its professors in all possible ways. These rumors produced no small impression, and about this time events seemed to tend in favor of the pope. Viterbo drove out its imperialist garrison, and Frederick's attempts to retake it were baffled by the desperate valor which the inhabitants of all ages and of both sexes displayed in the defense; other defections from the imperial party followed, and Innocent was received into Rome with great demonstrations of joy. Negotiations were opened between the emperor and the pope, and were protracted until the holy week of 1244, when a treaty very disadvantageous to Frederick was agreed on. But as to the fulfillment of this, serious difficulties arose. As sacrifices and concessions were required on both sides, which party was to begin,—the pope by absolving Frederick, or the emperor by giving up the cities which he had promised to surrender? Each was inclined to charge the other with bad faith. With a view to a conference, the emperor had advanced to Civita Castellana, and the pope to Sutri; but on the 28th of June, Innocent suddenly disappeared. On hearing of his flight, Frederick exclaimed, "The wicked fleeth when no man pursueth", and sent 300 Tuscan cavalry after him; but the pope, who was attired in a military disguise, reached Civita Vecchia by outriding all his train, and was received on board a fleet, which he had arranged that his Genoese countrymen should dispatch for his deliverance in

case of need. After some danger at sea, he reached his native city, where he was received with great magnificence and with general enthusiasm. The air was filled with the chant “Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!” and with the response, “My soul is escaped, even as a bird from the snare of the fowler”. The fugitive was visited by the marquis of Montferrat, by deputies from the Lombard cities, and by envoys of Frederick who urged him to return; but to these last he answered that it was useless to listen to the offers and promises of one who had been guilty of so many deceptions as their master.

Genoa, however, was only to be a temporary resting-place, and, notwithstanding a severe illness which added to the difficulties of the way, the pope crossed the Alps, and continued his journey to Lyons. At Lyons—a city nominally belonging to the imperial kingdom of Burgundy but practically independent under its archbishop, who was his zealous adherent—Innocent found himself safe. But when he made overtures to be invited into other kingdoms, he met with no welcome. Before leaving Genoa, he had been informed of the failure of an attempt on France—that when king Lewis, who was a confrater of the Cistercian order, visited Cîteaux at the time of a general chapter, he was implored with great solemnity to allow the Michaelmas pope to settle at Reims, but that by the 1244. advice of the French estates he declined the request. When some cardinals wrote to Henry of England that the pope was desirous to see “the delights of Westminster and the riches of London”, and suggested that the king should invite him, the English cried out that they had been sufficiently pillaged by Rome without entertaining the pope in person; and from Aragon the answer was not more encouraging. About the same time a papal collector was driven from England by the general indignation at his rapacity—the king not daring to protect him; and on his reporting his adventures to the pope, Innocent, smarting at the recollection of the late refusals, exclaimed, that it would be well to make peace with the emperor, “for when the great dragon is crushed or quieted, the little serpents will soon be trodden down”. But although he attempted to open negotiations with Frederick, it soon became apparent that they were hopeless.

From Lyons, in January 1245, Innocent issued citations to a general council, to be held in that city at the feast of St. John the Baptist ensuing, for the consideration of the discord between the emperor and the church, of the danger from the Tartars, and of the differences between the Greek and Latin churches. Frederick was invited to attend, or to send representatives; but in the meantime the pope—in consequence, as he asserted, of fresh offences—renewed his excommunication. This sentence was received with very various feelings; we are told, for instance, of a priest at Paris, who in publishing it declared to his congregation that he did not know the right of the matter, but that one of the parties must have greatly wronged the other; and therefore that he, as far as he had power, excommunicated the guilty person, and absolved him who had suffered wrong. After a preliminary meeting in the monastic church of St. Just, the council assembled in the Cathedral on St. Peter’s eve. It was attended by the Latin emperor of Constantinople, by the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Aquileia, and by a hundred and forty archbishops and bishops, of whom the archbishop of Palermo was almost the only prelate from the emperor’s dominions. But Frederick, although he considered the synod to be unfairly composed, felt that, as he had often expressed a desire for a general council, he ought not to be unrepresented in it, and, in addition to the archbishop, had sent some envoys, headed by Thaddeus of Sessa, a doctor of laws and judge of the sacred palace—a man of eloquence, prudence, and courage, eminent both in council and in war. At the outset, a disturbance was caused by the attempt of the patriarch of Aquileia to seat himself as an equal with the eastern patriarchs; but at their remonstrance his seat was thrown down, although the pope afterwards allowed it to be re-erected.

After the council had been opened with the usual solemnities, the patriarch of Constantinople brought forward the dangers and difficulties which beset his church and the Latin power in the east. The English bishops next urged the canonization of their late primate

Edmund; but the pope allowed both these subjects to pass without any satisfactory reply. Thaddeus of Sessa then rose, and, after apologizing for the emperor's absence on the ground of sickness, offered in his name peace with the church, restoration of the Latin empire in the east, aid against the Mongols, deliverance of the Holy Land, and satisfaction for all offences and aggressions against the church. The pope admitted that these promises sounded fairly, but asked who would be sureties for the performance of them. "The kings of France and England", answered Thaddeus. "Then", rejoined the pope, "if he fail, I shall have three enemies instead of one"

The second session, four days later, was opened by the pope with a speech in which he allegorized the Saviour's five wounds as figuring the present dangers of the church—the Tartars, the schism of the Greeks, the heresies of the patarines and others, the state of the Holy Land, and the enmity of the emperor. The falsehood of Frederick's pretense that his quarrel was not with the papacy but with individual holders of it, was (he said) sufficiently proved by his proceedings during the vacancy of the see. He enlarged on Frederick's misdeeds—the favor which he showed to Saracens, his entertainment of Saracen mistresses with their attendant eunuchs, the bestowal of his daughter on the heretical Greek Vatatzes, and the like; yet amid all this invective it is remarkable that there was no mention of the old charge as to the "three impostors". Again Thaddeus of Sessa stood forward, and defended his master at all points, meeting some of the accusations by the evidence of papal letters which he produced. But the pope declared that for his innumerable offences Frederick deserved an ignominious deposition. The intercession of the English envoys was disregarded; but those of France were able to obtain a short delay, and the emperor was invited to appear in person within twelve days—a time hardly sufficient to allow of his compliance. Instead of this, he dispatched Herman of Salza, grand-master of the Teutonic order, the bishop of Freising, and the chancellor Peter delle Vigne to reinforce his representatives who were already at Lyons; but the pope refused to wait even three days for their arrival, and on the 17th of July proceeded to hold the third and last session of the council. At this session the appeal of Thaddeus to a future pope and to a more general and more impartial synod was unheeded. The representatives of England, who interposed by presenting a long list of grievances as to the oppression of their national church by Rome, were put aside by being told that the matter required deliberation. Innocent again vehemently dilated on the emperor's offences—his aggressions on the church, his suspected heresy, his seizure of prelates on their way to a general council, his relapse after a relaxation of former censures, his Saracen connections and habits; and to these charges it was added that he had caused the assassination of his own kinsman the duke of Bavaria. For these crimes, it was declared that Frederick was deposed; his subjects were released from their allegiance, and the German princes were desired to choose another king, while the pope reserved the disposal of the Sicilian kingdom for consideration with his cardinals. Again Thaddeus implored that the sentence might be deferred, and the representatives of the English and French kings, with the patriarch of Aquileia, joined their intercessions; while on the other hand Frederick's enemies urged the pope to proceed, and the sentence was solemnly pronounced, with the extinction of candles, and the other symbolical forms provided by the ritual, while the general awe was heightened by the appearance of a meteor which, as the words were uttered, shot across the sky. On hearing the judgment, Thaddeus of Sessa burst out into sighs and tears. "This is a day of wrath!" he exclaimed; "truly the Tartars, the Chorasians, and the heretics have cause to triumph and exult in what is done". In the name of their master, he and his companions protested against it, appealing to a future pope, to a general council, to the princes of Germany, and to all sovereigns, and declaring Frederick's willingness to refer the whole question between himself and the church to the arbitration of king Lewis of France.

Frederick was at Turin when he received the news of his deposition. "Where are my caskets?" he indignantly exclaimed; "let us see whether I have lost my crowns". Then, taking

one of the crowns from its case, he placed it on his head, and, with an air of intense defiance, declared that neither pope nor council should deprive him of his crown except at the cost of a bloody struggle; that he now felt himself released from all obedience, reverence, love, or other duty towards the pope. He issued, accordingly, a protest against the sentence, as being null for many reasons : as contrary to the facts of the case, as pronounced in the absence of the accused, and by a person who had no competent authority, forasmuch as the emperor was the source of all law, and was subject to God alone. And with this protest were combined a vindication of his own orthodoxy, and a vehement attack on the pope for his wealth and luxury, for neglect of pastoral duty, for blood-guiltiness, for his extravagance in building a sumptuous palace at Anagni, while he allowed Jerusalem to be “a bondmaid to dogs and tributary to Saracens”. The pope replied by a letter in which Frederick’s behavior was compared to that of a sick man who complains that, after having refused milder means of cure, he is subjected to the knife and to cautery, and it was enounced that the Saviour bestowed on St. Peter the kingly as well as the priestly power. The violence of Frederick’s language startled and shocked his contemporaries, who interpreted it as an avowal of an intention to destroy the church; and the effect of the pope’s sentence was partly seen in the refusal of the duke of Austria’s daughter to marry an excommunicated emperor. The imperial theory had, indeed, been of late shaken by many things,—among them, by the papal deposition of Otho and by the choice of Frederick in his stead,—nor did the princes of Christendom understand that it was their interest to make common cause with the empire.

In the north of Italy, Frederick began a war which was carried on with extreme bitterness and with a neglect of the ordinary humanities. An eye-witness, Salimbene, tells us that during these hostilities beasts and birds of prey were allowed to multiply unchecked—that wolves howled around the walls of cities, and sometimes were able to find an entrance, when they killed and ate those whom they found asleep under porticoes. In Sicily a revolt was stirred up by papal emissaries, who were authorized to offer the privileges of crusaders to all who should take arms against their sovereign.

Frederick, instead of attempting to strengthen himself by alienating a portion of the clergy from the pope, was tempted by his anger to the unjust and impolitic course of attacking the whole clerical order. He charged them with fattening on the alms which were intended for the relief of the poor, inveighed against them as luxurious, and declared an intention to relieve them of their superfluous wealth. His officials were ordered to exact a third of all their revenues for the support of the imperial cause; and to punish by deprivation and banishment any ecclesiastics who should comply with the pope’s orders by refraining from the celebration of religious offices. He declared that there were too many bishoprics and canonries, and among the impieties which the pope charged against him it is stated (probably not without exaggeration) that he kept fifty sees and innumerable parish churches vacant. The mendicant orders, whom he styles the pope’s “evil angels”, were let loose against him, to inflame the people, down to the very lowest, by their unscrupulous denunciations; and he ordered that not only such of them as should be caught in spreading the letters of excommunication and interdict, but any other persons who should carry or receive such letters, should be burnt. On both sides there were charges of intended treachery—that Innocent had employed some members of the emperor’s household to poison him; that Frederick had hired ruffians to assassinate the pope. The accusations against Frederick were strongly denied by him, and are utterly improbable; and although it is very possible that some fanatical monk may have conceived the idea of ridding the world of an excommunicated emperor, it is not to be supposed that the head of the church himself was privy to any such atrocious design. In order to meet the imputations of heresy or unbelief, which he found to be the most dangerous weapons against him, Frederick desired the archbishop of Palermo, with two Dominican friars and some abbots, to examine him as to his religious opinions, and, when they had satisfied themselves of his orthodoxy, to state the result in a paper, which they were to present to the

pope. But Innocent, instead of receiving their testimony, rebuked them for having held intercourse with an excommunicate person, and for speaking of him as emperor after his solemn deposition by apostolical authority. He objected to them as partial judges in the matter, and, with reflections on Frederick as untrustworthy, he gave but little encouragement to his offer to appear in person for the purpose of clearing his orthodoxy. The intercession of King Lewis, and the offers which Frederick made through him—to devote the remainder of his days to the war in the Holy Land, if he might secure absolution for himself and the succession to the empire for his son—were also fruitless, and Lewis made no secret of his indignation and disgust at finding this implacable hardness and pride in one whose business it should have been to unite all Christian princes for the defense of their common faith.

In Germany, the pope had great difficulty in finding any one who would allow himself to be set up as king in rivalry to the Hohenstaufen. At length, however, the offer of the crown was accepted, with much unwillingness, by Henry Raspe, landgrave of Thuringia, a brave warrior, but one whose harshness towards his widowed sister-in-law, the saintly Elizabeth of Hungary, had not prepared men to see him chosen as the special champion of the church. The election was May 22, made almost entirely by the great prelates 1246. of the Rhine, while the lay electors in general held aloof, and Henry was derided as the “clergy’s king”. Supported in part by money from the pope, Henry carried on war with Conrad the son of Frederick, whom he defeated near Frankfort in August 1246. But at a later battle near Ulm, in February 1247, the result was reversed; and Henry withdrew to the Wartburg, where he died of shame and grief. The difficulty of finding an opponent to the Hohenstaufen emperor was now even greater than before. After various attempts in other quarters, William count of Holland, a youth of twenty, was chosen by the Rhenish archbishops and some other electors; but the want of support from the princes made his royalty little more than a shadow, although the pope exerted himself to the utmost in his behalf, and commuted the vow of crusaders for the engagement to fight against Frederick. Aix-la-Chapelle refused to admit the new pretender within its walls, and, although laid under interdict by a cardinal, did not yield until after Frederick’s death, when William at length received the German crown in Charlemagne’s minster; but he was still engaged, as before, in a struggle with Frederick’s son and successor Conrad.

In Italy, the war between the emperor and his enemies was carried on with unrelenting ferocity. Early in 1247, king Enzo hanged one of the pope’s relations who had fallen into his hands; and partly in consequence of this provocation, the pope on Good Friday renewed his excommunication of the emperor in a manner which impressed those who were present with more than the ordinary awe. In order to raise money for the expenses of the struggle, Innocent now openly practiced abuses which at another time would have incurred the heaviest reprobation of the church—excessive taxation of ecclesiastical property, sale of indulgences, relaxation of deserved censures, bestowal of sees without canonical election, and the diversion of money intended for the Holy Land to the purposes of his quarrel with the first prince of Christendom.

Frederick was still desirous of peace, and renewed his offers of terms. He had received the submission of the Milanese, whose city he had vowed to destroy, as his grandfather had done, and was on his way to seek a conference with Innocent at Lyons, when he was recalled by the tidings that an insurrection had broken out at Parma. With a view of reducing the place, he built and fortified a town over against it, which, in the confident anticipation of success, he gave the name of Victoria; and it is said that, in order to strike terror into the besieged, he every day beheaded some of his prisoners in their sight. The siege lasted nearly seven months, and the Parmesans were reduced to great distress; but their spirit was unbroken, and after solemn prayers, in which all classes and ages joined, a sally was made against Victoria on Frederick’s birthday. The buildings, mainly composed of wood, were set on fire; and the emperor, who had been engaged in hawking at some distance, found on his return that

Victoria was destroyed, that 1500 of his men were slain, and that the Parmesans had carried off 3000 prisoners, with booty of immense value, including crowns, precious jewels, and his imperial seal. But above all he had to lament the deaths of two of his most valuable adherents, the marquis Lancia and Thaddeus of Sessa; Thaddeus, after having lost both his hands in the fight, was taken prisoner, and, in revenge for the supposed crime of having advised his master to measures of severity, was barbarously hacked to pieces,

To the loss of these faithful adherents was soon added the treachery of Frederick's minister and confidant Peter delle Vigne. Peter had not been able to bear his elevation without provoking complaints of his pride, assumption, and rapacity; and it would seem that his sudden and miserable downfall excited more of terror than of pity. The history which is given of this is mysterious and romantic; yet if we hesitate on this account to accept it, we are left without any explanation of his fate. It is said that Peter had been suspected of treachery in holding intercourse with the pope at the council of Lyons, where he had arrived after the sentence of deposition against his master had been pronounced; yet for three years after that council he retained, outwardly at least, the imperial favour. At last, according to the chroniclers, he caught at an opportunity of carrying out his treacherous designs by recommending a physician to the emperor when sick. Frederick, suspecting evil, desired the physician to taste a potion which he had prescribed for him. The physician affected to stumble, and spilt the greater part of the draught; but the remainder was enough to kill a condemned criminal to whom it was administered. The chancellor was arrested at Cremona, where his life was with difficulty saved from the violence of the exasperated people; his eyes were torn out, and in this miserable state he was, by the emperor's order, paraded through several Italian towns. At length it was announced to him that he was to be given up to the Pisans, whom he regarded as his especial enemies; and on hearing this doom, he prevented the execution of it by dashing out his brains against a pillar to which he was chained. Frederick also charged the pope with having instigated his physician to poison him; and in a letter addressed to all princes, he exhorted them to check the ambition of priests who, not content with spiritual power, aimed at engrossing temporal dominion by unscrupulous means.

But of all the calamities which at this time were accumulated on the emperor, that which touched him most deeply was the capture of his illegitimate son Enzo, a handsome, brave, and accomplished youth, to whose valor he had been greatly indebted in the contests of the last years. Enzo fell into the hands of the Bolognese, who refused to yield him up either to threats or to offers of ransom. From the age of twenty-four to that of forty-seven he was kept in the palace of the podestà, in a captivity which, although not severe, was strictly guarded and hopeless; and on his death in 1272, he was buried with honor by the Bolognese in the church which contained the body of St. Dominic.

The emperor was sick both in body and in mind. He suspected all men; his temper became more violent than before; and the cruelty which he may be said to have inherited from his father, was more and more displayed in the treatment of such enemies as fell into his hands. His illness was aggravated by a stroke of palsy, and on the thirteenth of December 1250 he died at Castel Fiorentino, in the Capitanata, having directed by his last testament that all the rights of the church should be restored, on condition that the church should restore the rights of the empire. On his death-bed he was reconciled to the church, and received the last sacraments from the hands of the archbishop of Palermo; and, agreeably to the directions of his will, his body was laid beside those of his parents in the cathedral of that city, to which he had left a large bequest.

Of Frederick's character something has been already said, and little need be here added. The writers in the papal interest have painted him, as its resolute and persevering enemy, in the darkest colors; yet even they are obliged to admit that he was a man of high talents, of many graces and accomplishments, endowed with an irresistible charm of manner, a patron of learning and of all liberal arts, and that "if he had been a good catholic he would

have had few equals among sovereigns". On the other hand, although there can be little doubt that his religious opinions have been misrepresented by his enemies, it seems certain that he indulged in a dangerous laxity of belief and levity of expression; and the facts of his life bear out in great measure the charges which are made against him, of excessive licentiousness, of cruelty, cunning, treachery, and falsehood. It is said that his favor could not be relied on, but was rather a token of eventual ruin, and that in such cases he did not scruple to employ feigned accusations against his victims; but, if this may seem to be countenanced by the fate of Peter delle Vigne, we must remember that the emperor retained to the last the warm affection and the zealous service of men so highly respected by their contemporaries as Thaddeus of Sessa, Herman of Salza, and Berardo, arch bishop of Palermo.

In his great struggle with the papacy, Frederick, notwithstanding the calamities of his last days, had not to undergo any such humiliation as the appearance of Henry IV before Gregory VII at Canossa, or the submission of his own grandfather Barbarossa to Alexander III; he was not guilty of any such acts of violence as that which Henry V committed in the seizure of pope Paschal; and he avoided the error of setting up an antipope in opposition to the popes who ineffectually declared him to be deposed and charged all Christians to avoid him. He regarded the struggle as one of principle, as involving the rights of all Christian princes and in this he was justified by the extravagant language and by the violent acts of Gregory IX and Innocent IV. In taking up the cause of "the boy of Sicily" as a claimant of the German kingdom and of the empire, Innocent III committed a mistake like that which Henry V of Germany had made as to Adalbert of Mayence, or that which Henry II of England had made in the promotion of Becket. Instead of a pliant tool, the pope and his successors found in Frederick a man who was strongly convinced of the imperial rights and believed them to be incompatible with the pretensions of the papacy. When the knowledge of their mistake had been forced on them, they attempted to hold him to the fulfillment of his crusading vow, in disregard of all his political and personal interests. They throughout treated his excuses, however reasonable, as mere pretenses; they thwarted him in his expedition to the Holy Land, misrepresented his proceedings there, invaded his territories while he was engaged in the cause of the cross, employed the most unmeasured calumnies against him, and circulated these by the agency of the friars, which penetrated to all places and to every class of society; and they had recourse to the extreme measures of declaring him excommunicate and deposed, of releasing his subjects from allegiance, and of setting up pretenders to his throne. Whatever, therefore, the faults of Frederick's character may have been—however he may have erred in some of his measures of resistance to the papal policy—we can hardly refuse him, in the main, our sympathy in his contest with Rome, unless we be prepared to admit a theory which would make all power, both religious and secular, centre in the papacy alone.

Frederick by his will appointed Conrad, his son by Iolanthe, heir both of the empire and of the Sicilian kingdom, and directed that Manfred, the child of a connection with a daughter of the marquis Lancia, should in Conrad's absence be governor of Sicily and Italy. Innocent wrote to the Germans that, although Herod was dead, Archelaus his son reigned in his stead. He renewed the excommunication of Conrad, and, not content with supporting William of Holland in his pretensions to the crown, endeavored even to deprive Conrad of the hereditary dukedom of Swabia by declaring that any one was at liberty to seize his lands. A frightful scene of confusion followed, every one being intent on his own selfish objects, with an entire disregard of all patriotic feeling. The primate, Christian of Mayence, was deposed by a legate for refusing to take part in the crusade against the Hohenstaufen, and it was in vain that he appealed to those canons of the church by which ecclesiastics were forbidden to fight.

The pope was bent on setting up a rival to Conrad in the southern kingdom as well as in Germany. After an unsuccessful attempt to make use of Henry, the son of Frederick by his English wife, Isabella, overtures were made to Charles of Anjou, brother of king Lewis

of France. But at this time the pope was unpopular with the French, who attributed in part to his implacable enmity against Frederick the disasters which had made their king a captive in the East. The friars who were commissioned to preach a crusade against Conrad were forbidden to exercise their office in France, and the queen-mother, Blanche, is reported to have said that those who served the pope in war ought to be maintained by the pope. Charles of Anjou, therefore, was not as yet ready to accept the offered crown, and Innocent next applied to Richard, earl of Cornwall, brother of Henry III, a prince who had won fame as a crusader and was reputed to be very wealthy. But Richard was not to be dazzled by an offer which he declared to be much as if the pope should profess to give him the moon, with leave to climb up and get possession of it for himself. The weak Henry, however, was captivated by the idea of acquiring a new crown for his family, and eagerly closed with, if he did not even solicit, an offer of the Sicilian kingdom for his son Edmund, then only nine years old. He gave the boy the royal title, displayed him before the assembled parliament and elsewhere as king of Sicily, laid heavy taxes on his subjects in order to defray the expenses of the war against Conrad, borrowed money from his brother Richard and from the Jews, and authorized the pope to raise a loan on the security of the English crown.

The pope, on hearing of Frederick's death, had resolved to return to Italy. He left Lyons on the 16th of April 1251, in company with William of Holland, who had visited him there and, after passing through Genoa and Milan, arrived at Perugia, from whence, after a stay of some months, he removed to Assisi in the spring of 1252. The Romans, in somewhat rude terms, reminded him that he was pope of Rome, not of any provincial town; and in consequence of a second invitation, even less courteous than the first, he returned, apparently in the beginning of 1254, to his own city. But, although he was received with honor, he found much difficulty in appeasing the clamors of his people, who demanded compensation for the losses which they had sustained through the long absence of their sovereign pastor.

Conrad in the meantime crossed the Alps, and made his way by the Adriatic to Siponto, where he was received by Manfred. It was in vain that he offered to make peace with the church by giving up to it all that it had ever possessed, and that he attempted to clear himself from the charges which the pope accumulated in reckless profusion against him. His arms, however, had considerable success, and after a siege of four months he was able to reduce the city of Naples, where he treated his vanquished enemies with a severity which recalled the memory of his father and of his grandfather. But his career was cut short by death, at the age of twenty-six, on the 20th of May 1254; and as the papal party ascribed the death of his brother Henry, in the preceding year, to Conrad, and that of Conrad to Manfred, so the opposite party attributed both to the machinations of the pope.

Conrad left no other child than a boy of two years old, who bore his father's name, but is more commonly known by the diminutive Conradin. The guardianship of the young prince had been given to Berthold, marquis of Hohenburg; but Berthold soon found himself in such difficulties that he was fain to request the assistance of Manfred, who reluctantly accepted the regency. On hearing of this, the pope denounced both Berthold and Manfred; he declared the Sicilian kingdom to have lapsed to the Roman church, and would not allow Conradin any other titles than the dukedom of Swabia and the shadowy royalty of Jerusalem. After a time, Manfred appeared to have made a somewhat more favorable impression, so that he was not only released from his excommunication, and allowed to hold the pope's bridle as he crossed the Garigliano, which formed the boundary of the Apulian territory; but Innocent, notwithstanding his own engagements to England, gave him the principality of Taranto, and appointed him lieutenant over some part of the kingdom. But soon after this a nobleman named Borello, who had always been troublesome and insolent to Manfred, was slain through mistake by the prince's soldiers, and Manfred felt himself in the greatest danger, as being held accountable for the act. He offered to undergo an investigation before the pope, on condition of receiving a safe conduct; but no satisfactory answer was returned. Berthold, whether from

faithlessness or from timidity, had turned against him, and Manfred's condition appeared to be desperate if he remained within reach of his enemies. He therefore resolved to save himself by flight, and, after many adventures and dangers, he reached Luceria, which was garrisoned by Saracens and Germans. By these adherents of his family he was received with enthusiasm; the treasures which his predecessors had laid up within the strong fortress supplied him with money, and he soon found himself in a condition to cope with and to overthrow the forces of Berthold and the pope.

Innocent continued his progress towards the south, meeting with a welcome from the people, who were tired of Saracen and German rule, until on the 27th of October he entered Naples. Thus far his policy had been almost everywhere triumphant; but the tidings of Manfred's victory at Foggia, on the 2nd of December, proved fatal to him, and five days after that battle he died. It is said by a Guelfic chronicler that in his last hours he often repeated the penitential words, "Thou, Lord, with rebukes hast chastened man for sin". A story of different character is told by Matthew Paris—that, as the pope lay on his death-bed, surrounded by his weeping relations, he roused himself to rebuke them by asking "Why do you cry, wretches? Have I not made you all rich?"

At Rome the pope had not been able to establish his temporal government. In 1252 the citizens chose as their senator for three years a Bolognese nobleman of Ghibelline family, named Brancaleone degli Andolò, who by his severe justice, and by the vigor which he showed in demolishing the strongholds of the nobles within the city, reduced it to quietness and order. But his impartiality and strictness gave offence to the great families, by whom he was seized and imprisoned at the expiration of the term for which he had stipulated that his office should last; and he owed his life to the foresight with which he had required, before accepting the senatorship, that thirty noble Roman youths should be delivered to the Bolognese as hostages. On his arrest, his wife hurried to Bologna, where the hostages were committed to prison by way of retaliation; and when the pope interdicted Bologna, the citizens, instead of surrendering the hostages, replied by imprisoning two of his near relations. After a time Brancaleone was released, and was recalled to Rome, where he resumed the stern policy of his earlier days. It seemed as if the Roman republic were restored in its independence; Brancaleone entered into friendly relations with Manfred, and his strong remonstrances compelled Innocent's successor, Alexander, who had retired to Anagni, to return to the capital. A second overthrow of Brancaleone was followed by a second restoration; and on his death, in 1258, of an illness caught at the siege of Corneto, the Romans showed their veneration for him by enclosing his head in a precious vase, which was placed on the top of a column, and by electing one of his kinsmen in his room.

2

ENGLAND—PAPAL EXACTIONS.

Henry III of England had been left by his father to the guardianship of the pope and the Roman church; and in his early years the legate, Gualo, although not unmindful of his own interest, discharged this office well, until, in 1218, he was succeeded by Pandulf, then bishop of Norwich. But the kingdom was to pay dearly for the benefits which the papacy had conferred on its sovereign. The exactions of Rome in this age far exceeded anything that had before been known, and England was the country on which they lay heaviest. In addition to the Peter's pence of former times, and to the tribute promised by the late king, demands of money to a large amount were continually made under pretense of crusades; and monks and clergy joined with the laity in complaining that the sums thus wrung from them were often spent, not on any attempt to deliver the Holy Land from the infidels, but in the quarrels of popes with Christian princes at home. The system of provisions was carried to a great length

by Gregory IX, and still further by Innocent IV. It was complained by the English that the benefices possessed by foreigners amounted to 70,000 marks yearly—more than thrice the revenue of the crown; and that these foreign incumbents performed no duties of residence, hospitality, or pastoral care. The legates and other emissaries of the pope very commonly added to the dislike which necessarily attached to their office by their arrogance, ostentation, and personal rapacity; and the people were fleeced yet more through the arts of the Caursins or money-lenders, who, although their trade was in direct defiance of the church's canons, now settled in England under the title of "papal merchants".

The English were not passive under these oppressions, which produced a general disaffection to the papacy. The clergy and the national parliaments often remonstrated; an English deputation, as we have seen, presented a representation of grievances to Innocent at the council of Lyons; and in the following year the bishops of the province of Canterbury sent him an entreaty that he would abstain from continuing a system which the English declared to be more intolerable than death itself. Sometimes the resistance took a more violent form. Messengers from the pope were beaten or killed; foreign ecclesiastics were attacked when travelling, or their houses and granaries were set on fire; and such deeds were traced to an association formed for the purpose, whose proceedings were supposed to be even connived at by persons in authority. The chief of this association, who styled himself William Wither, on finding himself hardly pressed, avowed himself to the king as Robert of Twenge, a Yorkshire knight. He was sent by Henry to Rome, with a representation of the church's complaints, but was obliged to content himself with the redress of his own especial grievance, the invasion of a parish in his gift by a papal nominee.

The king sometimes took part with his subjects in resisting the oppressions from which they suffered; more commonly he stood helpless between the two parties, or weakly succumbed to the fear of Rome. The popes were indifferent to all the misgovernment of England, whether in church or in state, provided that they could extort money from the people.

The old evil of long vacancies in sees was unabated, and the contests as to the appointment of prelates were frequently renewed. Royal nomination clashed with capitular election, and both were in many cases forced to give way to the papal despotism which conferred the disputed see on a nominee of its own. Thus, when the primacy of Canterbury was vacant in 1231, Gregory IX set aside three persons who had been elected to it in succession, and at last desired the Canterbury monks who had been sent to him as representatives of their brethren, to elect Edmund Rich, treasurer of Sarum. The archbishop thus appointed was an honest and single-minded man, greatly revered for his sanctity and learning; but he soon found himself involved in troubles with the court, with the legate, who overruled his sentences, with the monks of his own cathedral, and with those of Rochester, which rendered his position intolerable. He therefore resolved to carry his difficulties to the pope; but Gregory, although he heard him favorably, was afraid to give him any substantial aid, and Edmund, finding on his return to England that his opponents were too strong for him, withdrew to Pontigny, where his predecessors Thomas Becket and Stephen Langton had formerly found a refuge. After his death, which took place in 1240 pope was requested to canonize him on account of his sanctity, and many miracles were alleged in support of the petition. Some delay was occasioned by the influence of those who had opposed the archbishop during his lifetime; but he was enrolled in the catalogue of saints by Innocent IV in 1246.

The successor of Edmund, chosen by the monks in accordance with the king's wishes, was Boniface, a young prince of Savoy and uncle of the queen. Boniface, finding his church in debt, made this a pretext for spending the first six years of his archiepiscopate abroad, impoverishing his see while he enriched himself by cutting down the woods on the estates, and, although the pope allowed him to add to the primacy of England the administration of the bishopric of Valence, devoting himself chiefly to warlike occupations. When he reappeared in

England, his arrogance, assumption and violent temper, which were especially displayed in a visitation of his province, produced a general feeling of indignation; and at length, after having gathered all the money that he could collect by dilapidating his see and exhausting its tenants, he withdrew to his native country, where the revenues of the English primacy were spent in maintaining the political interests of his family.

Among the English prelates of this time, Robert Grossetete was especially distinguished both for his learning and for his pastoral labors. Grossetete was born in Suffolk about the year 1175, and, after having studied at Oxford and Paris, became bishop of Lincoln in 1235. His acquaintance with the ancient tongues is said to have included not only Greek (which he studied under a native Greek named Nicolas), but Hebrew; and, as in other cases, his learning drew on him from some of his contemporaries the suspicion of magic. In his episcopal office, Grossetete displayed an indefatigable activity, with an earnest and somewhat intolerant zeal for the reformation of his own flock and of the church at large. In him the new orders found a hearty patron; he employed them in his vast diocese, as instruments for reaching those classes which were neglected by the secular clergy; and in the university of Oxford, of which he was chancellor, his favor encouraged them as teachers. Yet the especial principle of these orders was not unreservedly approved by him; for we are told that, after having cried up mendicancy as the highest step of the ladder which leads to heaven, he added privately that there is one step yet higher—namely, to live by the labor of one's own hands. And it is said that in his last days he strongly reprobated the change by which the friars, instead of being censors of the great, had become their flatterers.

Among the evils against which Grossetete struggled were the rapacity of the Roman court, the abuse of indulgences, the bestowal of patronage on unfit and undeserving persons, the employment of ecclesiastics in secular business; the subjection of the clergy to secular tribunals (for as to this he held the principles of Becket), the admission of persons who were not priests to benefices, the marriage and concubinage of the clergy. He remonstrated very strongly against the presentation of one of the pope's near relations, a boy who knew nothing of English, to a canonry of Lincoln; and when archbishop Boniface had insisted on testing the fitness of Robert de Passelewe, a favorite of the king, whom the chapter of Chichester had been persuaded to elect as bishop, Grossetete undertook the part of examiner, and set him aside on the ground of ignorance. That a man so impetuous and even imprudent, so zealous, active, fearless and unsparing, should have made many enemies, was natural. He was deeply involved in quarrels with the dean and chapter of his cathedral, who questioned his right of visitation; with monks and clergy, with Templars and Hospitallers, with some of the laity, whose morals he searched into with a scrutiny which Matthew Paris censures as inexpedient, and which was checked by a prohibition from the king. In political affairs, he allied himself with the party opposed to the foreign influence which prevailed at court; he was tutor to the sons of the younger Simon de Montfort, and is said to have counseled the earl that the English church could not be saved except by the material sword. By his opposition to the abuses of the papal system he excited the strong dislike of Innocent, who treated him with slight on his going to Lyons in 1250, and, although miracles were reported in connection with the bishop's death, is said to have intended that his body should be cast out of the cathedral, in which it was buried. But Grossetete appeared to the pope by night, arrayed in full pontificals, and, driving his pastoral staff into Innocent's side, so that he cried out for pain, declared himself to be exempt from his power. After that terrible vision, it is added, the pope never was well again. Yet Grossetete, notwithstanding his violent collisions with the papacy, was not a reformer in the sense of the sixteenth century. He adhered to the strictest orthodoxy of his time; his views of reformation extended only to the discipline and administration of the church; and, while he did not hesitate to speak of an individual pope as antichrist on account of his blamable actions, he very strongly held a high view of the papacy, from which and

through which he considered that all bishops must derive their commission and their spiritual power.

3

ALBIGENSIAN WAR.

Although the Lateran council had decided against the counts of Toulouse, the younger Raymond was determined to regain, if possible, the territories of which his father had been deprived. On returning from the council, he was received with great enthusiasm at Avignon. A general abhorrence had been excited by the severities of the crusaders; nobles, knights, soldiers, flocked to his standard; even Marseilles, which had never acknowledged the lordship of his family, now offered him its keys. It was in vain that pope Honorius endeavored to discountenance the enterprise; war was again commenced, and Raymond gained some successes, even against Simon de Montfort himself. Simon, although hardly pressed, resolved to attempt the capture of Toulouse before abandoning the country; and, after having for some time besieged it, he reduced the inhabitants to sue for mercy, which his brother Guy and others advised him to grant. The bishop, Fulk, entered the city, and persuaded the people to go out to the besieger's camp in the hope of appeasing his anger; but one party after another, as they reached the camp, were seized and hanged. Reports of this treachery were speedily carried into the city by fugitives, and an immediate rising took place. Fulk was driven to save himself by flight, there was long and furious fighting in the streets, and at length Simon gave orders that the houses should be set on fire. The bishop afterwards proposed that the defenders should place themselves at De Montfort's mercy, on receiving a solemn guarantee by oath for the safety of their persons and property. But when this promise had served its purpose, it was broken; the churches were spared, but the fortified houses and other chief buildings were demolished, and the inhabitants had to pay excessive taxation as the price of what was left to them. Soon after this the citizens, taking advantage of Simon's absence, again rose in revolt, in concert with count Raymond, and endeavored to restore their fortifications. The news of this insurrection reached Simon on the east of the Rhone, and he immediately set off on horseback, swearing by the holy chrism of his baptism that he would keep up the siege until he should either be victorious or perish. He himself remained before Toulouse throughout the winter, while bishop Fulk and others were actively recruiting for him in northern France, and the besieged were strengthened by assistance from Provence and from Spain. The campaign of 1218 was opened with increased vigor on both sides, and on the 25th of June a grand assault was made on the city. As Simon was at mass, he was informed that an engine, on which he had greatly relied, had been attacked by a sallying party of the besieged; but he refused to go forth until the end of the sacred office. In the fight which ensued, his brother Guy's horse was pierced by an arrow, and Guy himself, as he fell, was severely wounded by another arrow. On seeing this, Simon dismounted, and rushed to his brother; and, while bending over him, and endeavoring to utter words of comfort, he was slain by a stone from a mangonel. The crusaders, disheartened by the fall of their great leader, immediately raised the siege, and withdrew from the country, pursued by the exasperated people.

Pope Honorius, notwithstanding the younger Raymond's professions of orthodoxy, and his offer to give satisfaction on all points, felt himself bound to carry out the policy of Innocent as to southern France. He took up the cause of Amaury de Montfort, the son of Simon, encouraged the raising of troops by the offer of indulgences for crimes to those who should take part in the expedition, allowed a part of the funds raised for the Holy Land to be applied to the Albigensian war, and founded in 1221 a military order "of the Holy Faith" for the purpose of fighting against the heretics. In the meantime the cathari, who had been driven from the country, took encouragement from the death of Simon to return, and the war, from having for some time been a national struggle, took again the character of a crusade for the

suppression of heresy. The elder Raymond died in 1222. Although his son offered ample evidence that he had died in the orthodox faith, the legate, to whom the pope referred the question of his Christian burial, decided against him; and for three hundred years his body was kept unburied in the house of the knights Hospitallers at Toulouse.

Attempts were made to draw Philip Augustus into the war of the south. But although Honorius urged him repeatedly, and Amaury de Montfort was willing to make over to the king the rights which he himself was not strong enough to assert the decay of Philip's health withheld him from sharing in such an enterprise. At his death, however, which took place in July 1223, he bequeathed a sum of money for the extirpation of heresy in the south, as well as for the holy war in Palestine; and his son, Lewis VIII, took up the cause with zeal. In February 1224, Amaury de Montfort, who had just been driven from Languedoc with the scanty remains of his army, ceded to the king of France the privileges which had been bestowed on his father Simon, and received a promise of the office of constable of France. The attempts of Raymond to save himself from the threatened danger by offering, before a council held by a legate at Bourges in 1225, to submit to the church in everything and to devote himself to the extirpation of heresy, were fruitless. The crusade was actively preached, and in the spring of 1226, Lewis at the head of a vast force set out for the south. Avignon, which had been faithful to the counts of Toulouse, and for ten years had shared their excommunication, offered him a passage across its bridge, on condition that he should pass on without entering the town; but he angrily rejected this offer, and swore that he would not advance further until he should have reduced the place. A siege was therefore commenced, which lasted from the early part of June to September; and during this time a sickness broke out in the army, which carried off many, and fatally shattered the health of Lewis himself. Avignon was taken, and was condemned to lose its walls, with forty of the best houses; but the king's further progress was unattended with any considerable triumphs. The siege of Toulouse was deferred until a future campaign, and on his return Lewis died at Montpensier, leaving his crown to a son only twelve years old.

The war was continued; Raymond, according to one chronicler, disgraced himself by the barbarities which he committed after a success gained over the invaders in 1228; and perhaps the indignation excited by this impolitic cruelty may have tended to swell the ranks of the crusaders. In 1229, Raymond was glad to conclude a treaty by which a part of his territories was given up at once to France, and provision was made that the rest should eventually devolve to the crown—a treaty which proved that in the estimation of the crusaders the question of territory was more important than that of heresy. Raymond himself was allowed to appear in the dress of a penitent, and received absolution from a legate in the cathedral of Paris on Good Friday. The cession of Amaury de Montfort's claims was renewed, and in the following year he was rewarded with the promised constableness, which had then become vacant by the death of its holder.

But measures were taken for the suppression of heresy. It was a condition of the treaty with count Raymond that an university should be founded at Toulouse, in order to the counteraction of heretical teaching; and thus the spirit of southern literature was put down by the scholasticism of the north. At a council held at Toulouse in the same year, canons of excessive strictness were enacted—that no one should read the Scriptures in the vernacular tongue (a prohibition of which there had been no earlier example); that no one suspected of heresy should be allowed to practice as a physician, or to have access to the dying; that all male persons from the age of fourteen, and females from the age of twelve, should be required to abjure heresy; that all persons should communicate thrice a year, under pain of being suspected as heretics. Severe disabilities were inflicted on all who should in any way favor heretics; and it was ordered that in every parish two, three, or more laymen of good repute should be sworn to search out all suspicious persons, and to denounce them to the bishop, or to the lord of the place. But this machinery, which was subject to the bishop in each diocese,

was shortly after superseded by the Inquisition, which the pope committed into the hands of the Dominicans. In the proceedings of this tribunal, the ordinary rules of judicial fairness were utterly set aside. The names of witnesses were not disclosed; all manner of persons, however criminal or infamous, and even although partakers in the same guilt, were admitted to give evidence, and their evidence was believed against the denials of the accused. The accused were not allowed to benefit by the assistance of advocates or notaries; ensnaring questions were put, and torture was employed to wring out not only avowals of heresy from the accused, but testimony from unwilling witnesses. The dead as well as the living were brought to trial, and were sentenced to be burnt. The iniquitous proceedings and cruelties of the inquisitors soon produced a general exasperation. At Toulouse, Narbonne, Albi, Avignonnet, and other places, the inquisitors were driven out, or even murdered, by the infuriated people. In order to mitigate this feeling, the pope in 1237 ordered that the less stern Franciscans should be associated with the Dominicans, and from that year to 1241 the inquisition was suspended. The disturbances of Languedoc long continued to break out afresh from time to time, councils renewed their enactments for the detection of heresy, and Raymond in 1234 issued a code of regulations for the same purpose. In the hope of preserving his credit for orthodoxy, the count often found himself compelled to share in acts which he abhorred, while his position was made uneasy by the watchfulness of bishop Fulk and his successor, who were always ready to tax him with lukewarmness in the cause of the church. A fresh insurrection in 1242 ended in his being obliged to throw himself on the mercy of Lewis IX, by whom he was generously treated. The pope, Gregory IX, released him from a crusading vow which he had been compelled to make, and bestowed on him the marquisate of Provence; and in his last years he was much employed in attempts to reconcile Innocent IV with Fredericks Raymond VII died in 1249, having a short time before signalized his orthodoxy by presiding at the execution of eighty "perfect" cathari at Agen.

4

CRUSADE OF LEWIS IX.

In the meantime, Lewis IX of France grew up under the careful guardianship of his mother, Blanche of Castile, who administered the affairs of the kingdom through a time of no ordinary difficulties with signal ability and energy. The strong and stern character of Blanche—in which the love of influence and domination put on the appearance of religious strictness, although even this was not enough to exempt her from the assaults of scandal—maintained its mastery over her son to the end of her life; and her tyranny was remorselessly exercised towards his queen, Margaret of Provence, to whom she married him in 1234. The contrast between Lewis and his contemporary Frederick was very remarkable. While the emperor was skeptical in his opinions and lax in his morals, Lewis was rigorously strict in everything that was regarded as belonging to the saintly character. He daily heard mass, twice at least, on some days three or four times; he attended the canonical hours, and, when informed that his nobles found fault with this, he defended himself by saying that no one would have blamed him if he had spent twice as much time in dicing or hunting. His private devotions were frequent and fervent; every day he read, or caused to be read to him, some portion of the Scriptures with a commentary, and some part of the writings of St. Augustine; every Friday he confessed his sins, and received the discipline from his confessor. He was rigidly ascetic as to food and drink; he refrained from all worldly sports and pastimes, and, as far as was possible, from the outward pomp of royalty; he was careful as to his language, avoiding all oaths, and enacting severe penalties against the use of them; he diligently exercised himself in acts of charity and pious bounty, and in personal ministrations to the sick, the needy, and the afflicted. He treated the clergy, and especially the new orders of friars, with reverence; he was connected with the Franciscan order as a tertiary, and is reported to have

said that, if he could divide himself into two, he would give one half to the Dominicans and the other to the Franciscans. He devoted some of his children to the monastic life, and it is said that he was at one time desirous of entering one of the mendicant orders, when he was dissuaded by his queen's representation that he would better fulfill his duty by striving as a king to keep his realm in peace, and to benefit the church. His justice was such, that of his own accord he gave up to the English king some territories which had once belonged to England; and from a like motive he caused an inquiry to be made as to the possessions acquired by the crown during the last three reigns, and restored those which had been unjustly obtained. The reputation of this virtue induced Henry III and the insurgent barons of England to choose him as arbiter of their differences. Among the popular superstitions of the age, the reverence for relics was that to which Lewis was especially addicted, and the capture of Constantinople by the Latins enabled him to gratify his taste by acquiring many objects of very high pretensions. To this we are indebted for the beautiful "Holy Chapel" of Paris, which was built by Peter of Montreuil at his expense, and richly endowed by him, for the reception of the crown of thorns, a piece of the true cross, and other memorials of the Saviour's passion. But when, on his setting out for the crusade, the monks of Pontigny offered to give him a portion of the body of St. Edmund of Canterbury, he replied with characteristic self-denial, "Christ forbid that that which God hath so long preserved in its entireness, should in any way be mutilated by a sinner like me!"

Yet although the religion of Lewis had much in it that must appear to us weak, he was not a slave of the clergy. High as was his regard for the papacy, he had learnt from Scripture lessons of right which enabled him to look above the will of popes. That principle of the equality of clergy and laity before the law of the land, by the assertion of which Henry II of England had provoked the indignation of the hierarchy, and in opposition to which Becket had endured exile and death, was firmly established in France by the saintly king, whose very reverence for the clergy induced him to refuse them immunity from the punishment of crime. He was careful to guard his prerogative against ecclesiastical encroachments; and by his "Pragmatic Sanction", which will be more particularly noticed hereafter, he laid the foundation of those "liberties" which for centuries were the distinctive privilege of the Gallican church. And while Frederick was engaged in a deadly struggle with the popes, the saintly character and high reputation of Lewis enabled him to assert the royal and the national rights without exciting the opposition of Rome. At home these qualities tended greatly to increase the influence of the crown, and under Lewis the royal territory was extended by important additions, while the example of such a character was more powerful than anything else to win back for religion that respect of mankind which was endangered alike by the skepticism of Frederick and by the gross worldly ambition of his papal opponents.

Lewis held religious error in abhorrence, and believed the use of the sword to be lawful as a means of suppressing it. "No one", he said, "ought to dispute with Jews unless he be a very good clerk; but the layman, when he heareth the Christian law spoken against, ought not to defend it save with the sword, which he should thrust as far as it will go into the unbeliever's belly". Yet while Frederick, by way of vindicating his own orthodoxy, exercised cruel severities against his heretical subjects, it does not appear that Lewis, although he invited the establishment of the Inquisition throughout France, took any part in directing its operations. The persecutions which in the earlier part of his reign were carried on in Languedoc were done without his consent, and it was not in his territory, but in that of his vassal Theobald of Champagne, that one hundred and eighty-three cathari (of whom only one belonged to the class of perfect) were burnt at Montvimer, in 1239, under the authority of Henry, archbishop of Reims.

The popes had always endeavored to keep the idea of a crusade before the eyes of the western nations, but with little effect; indeed, the chief hindrance, to a general armament for the recovery of the Holy Land was to be found in that policy by which they gave the character

of a crusade to the wars against the heretics of Languedoc and the pagans of northern Europe, and to their own wars against the Hohenstaufen princes, so that these nearer and less formidable enterprises diverted and dispersed the forces which might otherwise have been combined in the cause of Palestine. From time to time small expeditions were made—as that of Richard of Cornwall, in 1240; but, if the Mussulmans had been united among themselves, they might easily have driven the Christians out of the land. The sultans of Damascus and of Egypt, however, were in bitter hostility to each other, and, while the one allied himself with the Templars, the other entered into a connection with the knights of the hospital. The Templars, in 1243, besieged the Hospitallers in their house at Acre, and, in order to insult the emperor Frederick, they turned the Teutonic order out of their possessions, to the weakening of the Christian cause and to the encouragement of the infidels.

Soon after this, however, a new power appeared on the scene. The Chorasmiens, who had gained possession of Persia, were driven from that country by the advance of the Mongols, and their barbarous hordes poured into Syria and the Holy Land. In September 1244, Jerusalem fell into their hands. A great slaughter of the inhabitants took place; the churches were robbed of their ornaments, the holy sepulchre and the royal tombs were violated; places and things which the Saracens had respected, either from a common feeling of their sanctity or in observance of conventions with the Christians, were now exposed to brutal profanation. The Christians, when it was too late, allied themselves with the Moslems against this new enemy, but their joint forces were defeated with great loss in October and urgent requests for help, such as had been only too frequent on former occasions, were sent to the west, and the subject of a crusade was discussed at the council of Lyons. But in answer to the proposal of a contribution, it was said that the misappropriation of money collected under the pretext of a crusade had produced a general distrust; and when preachers were sent to stir up the western nations for the holy cause, they met in many quarters with no favorable response. The Christians of Spain were, as at other times, engaged with their own Moorish neighbours; Germany and Italy were distracted by the disputes between the emperor and the pope; and when the bishop of Beyrout visited England, he was told by king Henry that, after having been so often deceived in such matters, the English would not join in the undertaking. “The king of France may go”, said Henry; “for his people will follow him; but I am uneasy as to the French, the Scots, and the Welsh, and the pope protects those who rise against me”

In the autumn of 1244, while Innocent IV was on his way from Sutri to Lyons, Lewis fell dangerously ill at Pontoise. The most urgent means of intercession were used in his behalf; sacred relics were exposed, in the hope of adding fervency to the prayers of the faithful; but recovery seemed to be hopeless. At length, after the king had been long speechless, and was even supposed by some of his attendants to be already dead, he sent for the bishop of Paris, and asked that the cross might be given to him. From that hour he recovered; but when he spoke of the engagement which he had contracted to the crusade, his wife and mother, with other advisers both secular and spiritual—even the bishop himself, the famous schoolman William of Auvergne—endeavored to dissuade him from the enterprise by urging that his duties to his kingdom required him to stay at home: that the promise, made when he was not fully master of himself, was not to be regarded as binding; and that he might help the holy war as effectually by sending troops to the east as by going in person. Lewis, however, adhered to his resolution, nor was it shaken by the discovery that he must expect but little cooperation from other countries, and that even among his own subjects his zeal met with little sympathy.

It was the custom of sovereigns at high festivals to bestow dresses on their courtiers; and on Christmas-day, when a solemn service was to be held at the “holy chapel” before daybreak, Lewis caused a number of garments to be distributed among the nobles who were in attendance on him. On passing from the dimness without into the fully-lighted chapel, the receivers were astonished to find that these garments were marked with the cross, so that,

according to the ideas of that time, they had unwittingly bound themselves to the holy war, and it was impossible to draw back. The preparations for a crusade were therefore actively carried on, and on the 12th of June 1248, the king, having settled a regency, of which his mother was the head, took the oriflamme from the altar of St. Denys, and set out on the expedition. From that time he laid aside all the ensigns of royalty, and all luxury of dress; and, as he went along, he visited the chief monasteries which lay in his way, edifying the inmates by his piety and self-denial, and entreating the assistance of their prayers. At Lyons he had interviews with the pope, whose quarrel with the emperor he had found to be the great obstacle to the crusade; and he was deeply grieved and disgusted at finding that he was unable to produce any effect by exhorting him to peace for the general sake of Christendom. But, notwithstanding these feelings as to Innocent, he showed his reverence for the papal office by confessing his sins to him very minutely, and devoutly receiving his absolution.

From Aigues Mortes—his only Mediterranean port, which he had done much to improve—Lewis sailed to Cyprus, which had been chosen as the place of meeting for the expedition; and from the irregularity with which his recruits arrived, it was found necessary to remain there for the winter. During this time many of the crusaders sickened and died, and the army would have been in great distress for provisions, had it not been largely relieved by the friendship or policy of the excommunicated emperor. The empress of Constantinople, a daughter of John of Brienne, arrived to solicit the king's aid for the sinking power of the Latins; but Lewis, although he expressed a hearty sympathy with her misfortunes, would not be diverted from the proper object of his expedition. An embassy also appeared in the name of the khan of the Mongols, who was represented as offering his alliance, and as professing to have derived a favorable disposition towards Christianity from a Christian mother. Lewis received the ambassadors with courtesy, and dismissed them with gifts for their master; but in the event it appeared as if they had acted without authority, and the communication with the khan led to no result.

On the 19th of May 1249, the crusading force set sail for Damietta, where it effected a landing on June 5th. The city was taken with ease, as the defenders deserted it by night; but this was almost the only success which the crusaders had to boast. The remembrance of the misfortunes endured by the former expedition to Egypt, and the necessity of waiting for their companions, who had been scattered by a violent storm, and for other expected accessions, delayed their advance until the rising of the Nile should have subsided; and thus the enemy had time to recover from the first alarm produced by the invasion, while the inaction of the army resulted in a general demoralization, so that the camp of the saintly king became full of gross and open profligacy. At length, on the 20th of November, the advance towards Cairo was commenced; but it proved to be a series of disasters. In a battle near Mansurah Lewis was victorious; but he had to mourn the loss of his brother Robert of Artois, of the earl of Salisbury with almost all his English followers, and of a great number of other soldiers, including many knights of the religious-military orders. Pestilence and famine began to do their work on the Franks, and it soon became evident that the conquest of Egypt was hopeless. The sultan's offer of Palestine in exchange for Damietta had before been refused; but when it was now proposed by the Christians to exchange Damietta for Jerusalem alone, the sultan declared that Lewis must become a hostage for the performance of the bargain. The distress increased; the Christians found themselves reduced to eat their horses, disregarding the prohibitions of Lent; their fleet was destroyed; the Saracens surrounded the army in vast numbers; the sluices of the river were opened with fatal effect; many crusaders apostatized; and Lewis himself was so ill that his life was in danger. Against such difficulties and perils he found it impossible to struggle any longer, and on the 8th of April he surrendered to the mercy of the Saracens.

But even in captivity his dignified and saintly bearing, and the constancy with which he performed his devotions, impressed the Mussulmans with reverence. The sultan, Turan-

shah, to whom he had become prisoner, was assassinated, in revenge for some slights by which he had provoked his Turkish Mamelukes, and the murderers, rushing into the presence of Lewis with their bloody weapons in their hands, asked what he would give them for having delivered him from an enemy who had intended to put him to death. Their leader is said to have demanded of him the degree of knighthood, to which the king answered that it could not be conferred, unless on condition of his becoming a Christian. Finding that he was unmoved by their threats, it is said that the infidels thought of choosing the king himself to fill the vacant throne.

The dealings for ransom were difficult, and the collection of the money was slow; and in the meantime the Saracens got rid of many of their prisoners, especially the sick, by killing them in cold blood and throwing their bodies into the Nile. Lewis, with characteristic integrity, refused to enter into any arrangement for his own liberation, unless it should include all his companions he refused to leave his captivity until the covenanted sum was made up, although the means of doing so were offered to him; and when some of his followers boasted that in paying the ransom they had put a trick on the enemy, he indignantly ordered that the deceit should be amended. The new sultan, struck with his behavior, voluntarily remitted a large portion of the ransom; but Damietta, the sole conquest which the Christians had made, was to be given up. The Saracens stipulated that, if they should fail in performing their part of the treaty, they would abjure the religion of Islam, and wished the king to bind himself by a similar oath, that in case of failure as to his engagements he should be disgraced as a renegade, "as one who spits and tramples on the cross"; but he refused with horror to admit such words even by way of supposition.

On recovering his liberty, Lewis sailed for Acre, and there rejoined his queen, who had left Damietta after having given birth to a son, to whom she gave the ominous name of Tristan. The king resolved to remain in the Holy Land in order to watch over the execution of the treaty by the Saracens; he repaired the fortifications of Acre, Sidon, Caesarea, and other places which were still in possession of the Christians, and endeavored to reconcile their divisions. But although he ardently desired to see Jerusalem, and although the sultan of Damascus was willing to permit him, he refrained out of deference to the suggestion of his counselors, that, if the first of Christian kings were to visit the holy city without delivering it from the infidels, the desire to deliver it would die away among Christians. The only gratification, therefore, which he allowed himself was a pilgrimage to Nazareth, which he performed with deep devotion.

Innocent IV wrote from Lyons a letter of consolation to the king, and ordered that prayers should be put up throughout France for his deliverance. But the pope's conduct in stirring up war at home, while the champion of the cross was in captivity—in diverting to a crusade against Frederick and Conrad the money which should have served for the ransom of Lewis, and the forces which might have delivered him—produced a strong feeling of indignation, which became more vehement as it penetrated deeper into the lower ranks of society. And out of this feeling grew a strange movement, beginning in the north of France among some shepherds and others of the poorest class, who styled themselves Pastoureaux. These professed to have for their object the deliverance of the king, and to believe that that which other means had failed to effect would be granted to their simplicity. As they went along, their numbers swelled, and among the recruits were many lawless ruffians, who were bent on profiting by the enthusiasm of the time. At their head was a mysterious personage about sixty years of age, who spoke French, German, and Latin. This personage was styled the Master of Hungary—a title which would seem to indicate a connection with the Manicheans about the Danube; but wonderful stories were told of him—that he possessed a charm which irresistibly drew all men to follow him that he was an apostate Cistercian monk; that he was the same who forty years before had been the leader of the children's crusade; that he was a

Mahometan and a sorcerer, who had engaged for a certain price to deliver a multitude of Christians into the hands of the sultan of Babylon.

On reaching the capital, the Pastoureaux were favorably treated by the queen-mother, who admitted their chief to an interview with her, and bestowed presents on them; but even at Paris they began to display the real character of the movement, and as they proceeded further towards the south it became more and more manifest. They abused, assaulted, and even killed clergy and especially friars; they vented wild and blasphemous doctrines, and usurped priestly functions—the master of Hungary appearing with a mitre on his head. At Orleans, as the master was preaching, he was interrupted by a student of the university, who told him that he was a heretic and a deceiver. The student's skull was immediately cleft by one of the fanatics; a general attack was made on the clergy; and a tumult arose which was attended with much slaughter on both sides. The bishop interdicted the city, and the queen-mother, on being informed of these scenes, withdrew her protection from the pastoureaux. At Bourges they pillaged the synagogue and the houses of the Jews, and committed great outrages of other kinds, which provoked the inhabitants to rise against them and drive them out of the town. The master of Hungary was pursued and slain, and many of his followers were hanged. Some of the party straggled on to Bordeaux, but Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, who commanded there for the king of England, refused to admit them into the town, and compelled them by threats to withdraw from the neighborhood. Many of them were drowned in the Gironde. Another division made for Marseilles, where they arrived with numbers greatly reduced. Some of them were hanged and the rest dispersed, and thus this movement came to an end.

Blanche had often urged her son to return from the East, on the ground that a man was needed for the conduct of the government. A war broke out with Flanders, in which the French suffered severely; and on the 1st of March 1252, the queen-mother died, leaving the regency in the hands of her sons Charles, count of Anjou, and Alphonsus. Lewis was deeply affected by the news of her death; and, after having consulted his advisers, he resolved to return home. A few days after Easter 1254 he embarked at Acre. His vessel was furnished with a chapel in which the canonical hours were regularly performed; there were three sermons weekly, and a course of religious instruction was established for the sailors, whose lack of opportunities for learning had excited the king's compassion. After a stormy voyage of ten weeks, Lewis landed at Hyeres, and on the 7th of September he reached Paris, after an absence of more than six years. All who saw him were struck with the appearance of profound grief and dejection which he wore. He had lost much, while he had gained nothing for Christendom; he had failed in a manner which would have been ignominious but for the saintly virtue and the patient courage which he had displayed throughout his reverses and sufferings. He ascribed to his own sinfulness the disasters which had befallen the Christian force; and he did not consider his crusading vow to have been fulfilled by the expedition which had cost him so dear.

CHAPTER III

FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE ALEXANDER IV TO THE DEATH OF LEWIS IX OF FRANCE. A.D. 1254-1270.

The successor of Innocent IV was Reginald, bishop of Ostia, a member of the Franciscan order, and nephew of Gregory IX. He took the name of Alexander IV, and began his pontificate by issuing a circular letter to all bishops, in which he requested the benefit of their prayers; but the favorable expectations which this produced were somewhat disappointed by the sequel of his pontificate. Alexander, although he wished to follow the same policy as his predecessor, was far inferior to Innocent in ability, and without his strength of character; and while he is praised for his piety and for his kindly disposition, he is said to have been a dupe of flatterers, and a tool of those who made the Roman court odious by their rapacity and extortion.

Manfred, a prince of great talents and brilliant accomplishments, was able, by his political skill and by the popular graces of his character, to extend his influence, and in this he was the more readily successful, because, unlike his Hohenstaufen ancestors, he did not rely on the arms of the Germans, who were more hated by the Italians than even the infidel Saracens. Within two years he regained for his nephew Conradin the kingdom of Apulia and Sicily, having been urged on to make himself master of the whole by the pope's refusal to ratify a treaty which proposed a division of the territory. A cry arose that he should be king, and about the same time a report was spread that Conradin had died in Germany. Manfred, without closely inquiring into the truth of this report (of which, indeed, his enemies suppose him to have been the inventor), resolved to accept the dignity which was pressed on him, and on the 9th of August 1258 he was crowned at Palermo. In answer to a remonstrance from Conradin's mother, he told her envoys that he held the kingdom by a personal title—by the success of his arms and the choice of his people; that it would be inexpedient to endanger the Hohenstaufen interest by leaving it in the hands of women and children; but that, as he himself had no other heir, he would gladly make Conradin his successor: and he invited him to the Sicilian court, in order that he might prepare himself for the duties of royalty by acquiring the manners of his future subjects and by gaining their affection. In the meantime, he took strong measures against all who professed to adhere to the cause of Conradin.

The pope endeavored to carry out his predecessor's scheme for establishing the English prince Edmund on the throne of Sicily, and in 1255 the boy was formally invested in the kingdom by a bishop who had been sent to England for the purpose. But the English were shocked at finding that a crusade was preached against Manfred with the offer of the same indulgences and immunities as the enterprise of delivering the Holy Land from the Saracens, while the Holy Land itself was neglected in its urgent need; nay, that the money which was so largely extorted from them under the pretense of a crusade, was not even spent for Edmund's interest, but was diverted to the pope's own secular purposes. A strong opposition arose, both in parliament and throughout the country, to the exactions of the papal collector, Rostand; and the pope, on making complaints of Henry's supineness in the affair, and of his backwardness in supplying money found that the source on which he had mainly relied for the supply of his exigencies was likely to dry up. In alarm at this prospect, he made overtures to Manfred, whom he had before excommunicated and declared to be deprived not only of the Sicilian

kingdom but of the principality of Taranto; but the negotiation was ended by Manfred's refusing to dismiss his Saracen soldiery, and declaring, in answer to the proposal, that he would fetch as many more from Africa. Manfred had taken into his own hands the appointment of archbishops and bishops. The goodness of his administration won for him a strength which enabled him to defy the papal censures; and in order to counteract the money which the pope extorted from the English clergy, he held himself at liberty to supply his needs by invading the property of churches and monasteries.

In Germany, William of Holland became lawful king by the death of Conrad, nor during the short remainder of his life was he opposed by any rival; although, when invited by the pope to repair to Rome for coronation as emperor, he found himself neither strong enough nor rich enough to undertake the expedition. By his death in a battle against the Frisians, in 1256, the kingdom was again vacant. The claims of Conradin were peremptorily set aside by the pope, who wrote to the ecclesiastical electors, dilating on the misdeeds of the Swabian family, and forbidding them under pain of excommunication to choose the boy, whose age he also represented as a personal disqualification. The idea of a real kingship had died out among the princes of Germany, so that each of them was intent on promoting his own interests by weakening the power of the crown. A foreigner, therefore, appeared preferable to a native prince; and while one party, headed by the archbishops of Mayence and Cologne, chose Richard of Cornwall, another, under the archbishop of Treves, set up Alfonso "the Wise", of Castile, a grandson of Philip of Swabia. Richard was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, on Ascension-day 1257, and by large gifts to his chief supporters gained a stronger influence than Alfonso, who never showed himself in Germany; but neither of the rivals was able to acquire the reality of power. Pope Alexander and his successors contrived to hold the balance skillfully between the two, acknowledging the title of each, and professing to reserve the decision between them for a further inquiry; and thus, without committing themselves to the cause of either claimant, they were able to impress on the Germans a belief that the decision of such questions belonged to the Roman see.

In northern Italy there were great commotions. The city of Florence was distracted by the furious enmities of its Guelf and Ghibelline factions; and at one time, when the Ghibellines were triumphant, it would have been destroyed by their allies of Pisa and Siena, but for the patriotic resistance of the Ghibelline chief, Farinata degli Uberti. The proud independence of the republican cities was giving way to the ascendancy of lords who succeeded in establishing their domination over them. Among these lords (or tyrants), Eccelino da Romano, of Padua, a zealous partisan of the imperial interest, has earned a remembrance above the rest by a career of unequalled atrocity. After twenty years of triumphant cruelty and oppression, he was overcome and taken prisoner in September 1259 by a crusading force under a papal legate, Philip, archbishop of Ravenna. His behavior in prison was sullenly ferocious; on being asked to confess his sins, he answered that he had nothing to repent of, except that he had not destroyed more of his enemies, and that he had led his troops badly. He refused food and drink, tore the bandages from his wounds, and was found dead on the eleventh day after his capture. Among the chief leaders of the crusade, under archbishop Philip, was John of Vicenza, a Dominican friar, who a quarter of a century earlier had distinguished himself as a preacher of universal peace, and had at one time acquired a sort of despotic power in his native city and at Verona, being supposed, in addition to his power of eloquence, to possess the gift of miracles, so as even to raise the dead.

In 1260—a year which had a peculiar significance according to the systems of abbot Joachim and other apocalyptic teachers—a strange fanaticism burst out at Perugia, and spread both southward to Rome, and in the opposite direction to northern Italy, and even beyond the Alps to France and the Rhine, to Hungary, Silesia and Poland. This movement was said to have been begun in obedience to visions, or to the counsel of a blind and mysterious hermit, and is not apparently traceable to the influence of any preacher. In every city, vast

multitudes—men, women, and children down to the age of five—paraded the streets, with their faces covered, but their bodies naked to the waist, gesticulating wildly, and pitilessly scourging themselves with whips, while they shouted the invocation, “Holy lady Mary, receive us sinners, and pray Jesus Christ to spare us!”. Some of them, wrought up to a pitch of frenzy, dashed themselves on the ground, in mud or in snow, and screamed out, “Mercy! Mercy! Peace! Peace!”. At first this spectacle excited ridicule; but gradually the feeling of sin impelled many to join the penitents; and, with clergy or monks at their head, bands of them moved from city to city, everywhere communicating their enthusiasm. Any one who held out against the contagion was noted by his neighbors as a “man of the devil”, and it was believed that the impiety of such persons was punished by judgments of heaven. The chroniclers tell us that the movement produced good effects in the reconciliation of enemies and of political factions; that usurers abandoned their practices, that unjust gains were restored, that prisoners were set free, and that for the time there was a general reformation of morals. But in the progress of the movement, circumstances appeared which suggested doubts as to its religious tendency—such as a contempt of the ordinary means of grace, and a proneness to denounce the clergy. The pope declined to encourage it; Manfred refused to admit the flagellants into his kingdom; some of the authorities of northern Italy erected gibbets on their frontiers, as an indication of the fate which awaited any flagellant who should attempt to enter their territories; and in Germany the duke of Bavaria and the bishops were strong in their opposition. Under these discouragements from both temporal and spiritual authorities, and probably also through the natural decay of such enthusiasm, the flagellant revival (as it would now be styled) in no long time died utterly away.

Alexander had been much disquieted in Rome by the partisans of Manfred, and in 1257 had been driven by Brancalone, on his escape from his second imprisonment, to take refuge at Viterbo. His hopes of restoration on the death of Brancalone were disappointed; the parties of Rome continued their discords, and the pope, after having resided for some time at Anagni, returned to Viterbo, where he died on the 25th of May 1261.

About the same time the Latin empire of Constantinople came to an end. Almost from its foundation, this unfortunate power had been continually sinking. Its limits had shrunk until it was confined to the city; the emperor, Baldwin II, was reduced to the most pitiable expedients for the means of maintaining his position—selling the lead from the roofs of churches, and even giving his own son as a pledge to the Venetians for the repayment of a loan; and the Latin patriarch was supported by the alms of the pope. While the Venetians were in league with the Latin emperor, their rivals of Genoa allied themselves with the Greeks, and their force contributed to the victory of Alexius Strategopulus, who in 1261 wrested Constantinople from the Latins for the emperor Michael Palaeologus of Nicaea. The dispossessed Baldwin spent the remainder of his days in vainly soliciting assistance from the sovereigns of the west. But the Greek reconquest, instead of bringing fresh vigor to the empire, did little else than restore it to the same condition of decrepitude which had prepared it to fall a prey to the western crusaders fifty-seven years before.

Alexander had allowed the number of cardinals to dwindle down to eighteen, and these were for three months unable to agree in the choice of a successor, until James Pantaleon, patriarch of Jerusalem, arrived at Viterbo, where they were assembled, and was raised by them to the papacy under the name of Urban IV. The new pope, who was the son of a cobbler at Troyes, had chiefly owed his success in life to his skill as a negotiator, which had been shown in many important missions; and he carried on the traditional policy of the papacy with greater vigor than his predecessor. But as he was prosecuting the contest with Manfred, he had the mortification of finding that he was unable to prevent a marriage between the heir of Aragon and one of Manfred’s daughters; nay, that even the saintly Lewis of France, although restrained for a time by scruples, allowed one of his sons to marry into the family which had been thus contaminated by a connection with one whom the Roman church

regarded as a bastard, an usurper, and an excommunicate. The pope cited Manfred to appear before him, personally or by proxy, on Maundy Thursday 1263, and answer for his heavy crimes against God and man—his connections with Saracens, whom he was accused of preferring to Christians, the celebration of Divine offices in interdicted places, the murder of some of his subjects, and other grievous offences. But a difference arose as to the terms of the safe conduct which Manfred required, and, as he did not obey the summons, the pope, without heeding his excuses, renewed his excommunication.

As no further supplies of money were to be expected from England, Urban resolved to set aside the claim of prince Edmund to the Sicilian crown, which he offered to Lewis of France for one of his sons. But Lewis, on account of the claims of Conradin and of Edmund, felt scruples which were not to be overcome by the pope's assurance that they were groundless, and the offer was transferred to the king's brother, Charles of Anjou. Charles, who was then forty-two years of age, was of a character utterly unlike that of Lewis. He was stern, ambitious, rapacious, and unscrupulous. His valor had been shown in the late disastrous crusade, from which he had returned before his brother to take the chief share in the regency of France; he was urged on to accept the offer of Sicily by the pride of his wife, the youngest daughter of Raymond Berenger, who had brought him the county of Provence as her dowry, and was discontented at being inferior in rank to her sisters, the queens of France, England and Germany. As Lewis still hesitated to sanction the acceptance of the Sicilian crown by a prince of his house, the archbishop of Cosenza was sent to negotiate with Henry III for the cession of Edmund's pretensions. Henry represented the vast amount of treasure which he had spent for the object which he was now desired to forego; but he was in the middle of his great struggle with the barons under Simon de Montfort, and in such circumstances he could not afford to alienate the pope by a refusal. The claim of Edmund to Sicily, therefore, was formally relinquished; and by way of recompense the censures of the Roman church were dealt forth against the earl of Leicester and his partisans. The crusade against Manfred was preached in France under the pope's authority, and the French clergy were exhorted to aid it with a tenth of their income.

At Rome a contest arose in August 1263 as to the election of a senator. The citizens were divided between Charles of Anjou and Manfred; but the partisans of Charles prevailed. The pope, afraid that a secular prince established in Rome might have greater power than himself, required Charles to bind himself by oath to certain conditions—that he would not accept the senatorship for more than five years, and if within that time he should get possession of the Sicilian kingdom, he would, if required by the pope, absolutely resign the senatorship. To these proposals Charles acceded; but he used the opportunity to make better terms than before as to the Sicilian kingdom;—that he was to enjoy those parts of it which the pope had wished to reserve for himself, with the exception of the city of Benevento; that his yearly tribute should be lessened; that the succession should be extended beyond the four heirs to whom it had been limited in the earlier scheme; and that females as well as males should be admitted to inherit.

The pope was the more willing to concede because Manfred still continued to make progress, and gained possession of the greater part of the papal territory. Urban, finding himself threatened in his capital, withdrew to Perugia, and there died on the day after his arrival, the 2nd of October 1264.

Urban had been careful to recruit the college of cardinals with men favorable to his own policy; and their choice fell on Guy Fulcodi, who took the name of Clement IV. The new pope, who was of a noble family in Languedoc, had in early life borne arms, but afterwards became eminent for his learning both in civil and in canon law, and had assisted Lewis IX in his legislation. He had been married, and had two daughters, but after his wife's death he entered into holy orders, and became successively bishop of Le Puy, archbishop of Narbonne, and cardinal-bishop of Sabina. As pope, he was especially careful to discourage his near

relations from conceiving ambitious hopes on account of their connection with him; he refused to let his daughters or his niece marry above his own original rank, and warned his nephews not to come to the papal court, or to expect anything from his favor. At the time of his election, he was engaged in a legation to England; and he was obliged, from fear of the Ghibellines, to make his way to Rome in the disguise of a simple monk.

Clement, as a native of southern France, was naturally disposed to favor the interest of Charles of Provence, who sailed from Marseilles about Easter 1265, and proceeded, chiefly by sea, to Rome, where he was received with great pomp, and was invested in the office of senator. But the pope, who was then at Viterbo, found great cause to be uneasy and displeased. Charles had brought with him but few men and no money; he was distressed even for food and clothing, which the Romans refused to supply without payment; and he wished to borrow on the pope's security, while Clement had pledged his credit so deeply that he could not raise money for his own necessities, and throughout his whole pontificate was unable to venture to Rome on account of the debts which he owed. The pope declared that he could do nothing for Charles except by a miracle, and that his merits were not sufficient to work a miracle. Charles's violence, also, in taking possession of the Lateran palace drew forth strong remonstrances from Clement, who told him that he could not give up either of his palaces to him, and that in a city where large houses were so plentiful the senator could not be at a loss for a suitable lodging. As the pope's support was too valuable to be thrown away for such an object, Charles removed from the Lateran; but Clement was still obliged to complain of the exactions which were made in his name. The pope, however, declared Edmund of England to have forfeited the Sicilian crown by neglecting to perform the conditions annexed to the offer of it; he granted it to Charles, who was formally invested in it; and a new agreement was drawn up as to the terms on which it should be held. In default of lawful issue of Charles or of his successors, the kingdom was to revert to the papacy. It was not to be held with the empire, with Germany, Lombardy, or Tuscany. On getting possession of it, Charles was to pay the pope 50,000 ounces of gold. A tribute of 8000 ounces was to be paid every year, and a white palfrey every third year. And the king bound himself to respect all ecclesiastical and monastic property.

The crusade against Manfred was actively preached, with the offer of indulgence for crimes to all who should join it; and thus a host of ruffians was gathered, in addition to the troops which Charles had enlisted in France, and whose acts of violence, as they proceeded on the way to join him at Rome—extortion, plunder, arson, sacrilege, murder—drew forth fresh complaints and reproofs from Clement. By this increase of strength Charles was enabled to press more effectually than before his suit for the coronation of himself and his wife as king and queen of Sicily; and the ceremony—the first coronation of any one below the imperial dignity that had ever taken place in St. Peter's—was performed by a commission of cardinals on the festival of the Epiphany 1266.

About the middle of January, as the necessities of his army urged him to proceed without delay, Charles set out from Rome for the south. Manfred had attempted to negotiate with him by means of envoys; but they were repelled with the answer, "Tell the *sultan* of Nocera, that either I shall send him to hell or he shall send me to heaven." Yet even at this time it would seem that the pope, in his disgust at the disorders of the French, was inclined to relent towards Manfred. Manfred, reduced to stand on his defense, exerted himself with energy to meet the invaders, whose advance into his territory was favored by a season of unusual mildness; but his counsel and valor were displayed in vain. Surprised and deserted through treachery, he fell in the thickest of the fight at the battle of Benevento, on the 26th of February 1266. His body, which was not recognized until two days later, was excluded from Christian burial, as that of an excommunicate person, and was interred by the victor's command near the bridge of Benevento, where the French, in a generous feeling of respect for a brave and unfortunate enemy, heaped up a cairn over it, each casting a stone. But the

archbishop of Cosenza, by command of the pope, afterwards caused the corpse to be cast out of this resting-place, as being unworthy to find sepulture within the territory of the church, and it was again committed, without any religious rites, to a grave in a remote valley of the Abruzzi. The ruffians whom the pope had invested with the character of crusaders again excited his indignation, by plundering his city of Benevento with circumstances of atrocious outrage and excess.

The whole of the south now submitted to Charles, and throughout Italy the overthrow of Manfred struck terror into the Ghibellines, so that many who had until then held out submitted to the church. The widowed queen, a princess of the Comnenian family, fell into the victor's hands, with her children, who spent many years—and some of them the whole remainder of their lives—in strict and hopeless captivity. Manfred's adherents were cruelly punished, and the country was subjected to a grinding taxation and to oppressions of all sorts by the new officials who took the place of those employed under the late reign. The pope remonstrated vehemently, both as to Charles's treatment of his new subjects, and as to his neglect of the conditions by which he had bound himself to the Roman see. Yet when the king visited Rome in 1267, Clement on Palm Sunday bestowed on him the golden rose, and to this gift he added the titles of Vicar of the Empire and Pacificator of Tuscany.

Even those of Charles's subjects who had been opposed to Manfred now learnt to regret the change of rulers, and a general feeling arose in favor of Conradin, who was invited to attempt the recovery of the Sicilian throne. The heir of the Hohenstaufen, who had been left fatherless at the age of two, was now fifteen, and had grown up into a handsome, spirited, and accomplished youth. When the Sicilian enterprise was proposed, his mother and the more cautious of his counselors endeavored to dissuade him, but Conradin was filled with the thought of the great things which had been achieved by his grandfather Frederick, to whose earlier history his own seemed thus far to bear a likeness. Despising the threats by which the pope endeavored to deter him, he crossed the Alps in the autumn of 1267, with a force of about 10,000 men, which, notwithstanding some desertions occasioned by his want of money, continually increased as he went on. At Pisa and Siena he was welcomed with much splendor; and, as he passed Viterbo, where the pope was, he displayed his forces before the walls, but disdained to make any attack on him. Clement had from the beginning spoken of the young prince's expedition with contemptuous denunciations, foretelling that he would pass away like a smoke, and on Maundy Thursday 1268 he anathematized him, with his partisans, and summoned him to submit to penance. But when Conradin entered Rome, having been invited by an embassy of the citizens, the streets were hung with garlands, and the general magnificence of his reception put to shame that which under the papal auspices had greeted Charles of Anjou. Henry, the brother of Alfonso of Castile, after many adventures in Africa and Sicily, had been chosen senator, partly through the influence of Charles, who was his nephew; but the two had now quarrelled, and both at Rome and in Sicily Henry supported the young Hohenstaufen with all his power. He unscrupulously laid the treasures of churches under contribution for his service, and incurred a share of the pope's denunciation for his sake. Conradin advanced into Apulia; the fleet of Pisa, which was in his interest, had defeated the Provençal fleet; Sicily was won by his partisans, and the Saracens of Nocera rose in his behalf. On the 23rd of August, the young adventurer's army encountered that of Charles at Scurcola, near Tagliacozzo. For a time success appeared to be with Conradin; but by too readily believing that his opponent was defeated and slain, he exposed himself to Charles, who surprised him by breaking from an ambush, and inflicted on him a total overthrow. Conradin fled to Rome, but was refused admittance into the Capitol by Guy of Montefeltro, who commanded for the senator Henry. He then attempted to escape by sea to Sicily, but was arrested near Astura by one of the Frangipani—a family which had been loaded with benefits by the Swabian princes, but had lately been won to the papal side by large concessions—and, after having been imprisoned for a time at Palestrina, he was carried by Charles to Naples.

Although a promise of safety had been given in the name of Charles—whether without authority or treacherously—Conradin was brought to trial; and, although one only of his judges could be brought to pronounce for death that sentence was approved by Charles, and the last heir of the great Hohenstaufen family, with ten of his chief companions in his enterprise, perished on the scaffold. His fate excited throughout Christendom a general feeling of pity and horror. The pope had exhorted Charles to mercy, but in vain; and Clement himself survived only a month the execution of Conradin—dying at Viterbo on the 29th of November, 1268.

The reign of Lewis IX of France, after his return from the Holy Land, had been distinguished by the display of high kingly qualities, of personal sanctity, and of that strong sense of the rights of royalty and law, as opposed to the assumptions of Rome, which is the more remarkable on account of the devout and ascetic piety with which it was combined. Warned, perhaps, by the history of Henry II of England, he did not attempt to interfere by his own authority with the immunities to which the clergy pretended; but he gained the substantial acknowledgment of the rights of the state by prevailing on Alexander IV, in 1260, to allow that the king's officials should not be liable to excommunication for arresting criminal clerks in flagrant delict, provided that they held them at the disposal of the ecclesiastical courts. The national rights were still further asserted in the "Pragmatic Sanction" of the year 1269. The only article, indeed, of this document which is in direct opposition to Rome, is one which forbids the exaction of money by the Roman court except with the sanction of the king and the church of France. But the whole tone of it is anti-papal, and accords with the declaration in the king's "Establishments" that the king of France "holdeth of no one save God and himself." In a like spirit was the answer of Lewis, when the bishop of Auxerre, in the name of the clergy, represented to him that excommunication was despised (as was indeed natural, from the frequency with which it was pronounced for all manner of trifling causes), and that many excommunicate persons died without seeking absolution. For these reasons the bishop desired that the spiritual sentence might be enforced by civil penalties. The king replied that he would consent, if it were certain that the excommunicates were in the wrong. The clergy objected that it was not for secular courts to determine such a question; but Lewis adhered to his declaration, and the clergy did not venture to renew their proposal. Thus the saintly reputation of the king enabled him to assert with success, and almost without question, principles which would have drawn on any ordinary sovereign charges of impiety and of hostility to the church; and to him is chiefly due the foundation of those liberties by which the Gallican church was for centuries distinguished.

Amidst the labors of government at home, Lewis had never forgotten his crusading vow. While the popes, although they affected to keep the cause of the holy war before men's eyes, were bestowing all their energies and all the treasures that they could collect on the destruction of the Hohenstaufen, the disasters which were continually reported from the east filled the pious king with sorrow. In May 1267 he appeared at an assembly of his nobles, holding in his hand the relic which was revered as the crown of thorns, and in pathetic terms exhorted them to the holy war. After a cardinal-legate had addressed the assembly, Lewis set the example of taking the cross, and in this he was followed by his three sons, by the king of Navarre, and by many others, whose motive was rather attachment to their sovereign than any religious enthusiasm. Yet many hung back—among them the biographer Joinville, who remembered the oppressions which the officers of the kings of France and Navarre had inflicted on his people during his absence on the former crusade, and reflects severely on those counselors who advised the king to undertake the new expedition, without regard either to the interests of his kingdom or to his own enfeebled health. The pope granted for the enterprise a tenth of the income of the French clergy for three years, and, although they cried out that the impost was sacrilegious, and that they would rather be excommunicated than pay, it was rigidly exacted of them. The crusade was preached in other countries with some

success. Edward, the heir of England, pledged Gascony to the French king in order to raise the means of joining it. The king of Aragon also offered to go; but the pope had already reproved him for adultery, had indignantly disallowed the plea that his lawful wife was a leper, and now told him that he must forsake his sinful life before taking part in the holy work. In the meantime tidings reached the west that Antioch had fallen into the hands of the infidels, with a vast loss of Christians slain or taken prisoners.

On the 14th of March 1270, Lewis, although so weak that he could neither bear armor nor endure to sit long on horseback, took the oriflamme from the altar of St. Denys, and set out on his second crusade. He celebrated Easter at Cluny, and thence made his way to Aigues Mortes, where the expedition was to embark. But there the troops were obliged to wait for the arrival of the Genoese vessels which were engaged to transport them; and this delay was unfortunate, both from the effect of the pestilential air, and because it gave time for the old jealousy between the northern and the southern French to break out into bloody quarrels. At length, on the 1st of July, the expedition sailed, and, after some dangers at sea, a meeting took place off the Sardinian coast, where a descent on Tunis was resolved on. It is supposed that this resolution had been suggested by the king's brother Charles in order to punish the sultan of Tunis for refusing to continue the tribute which he had paid to former kings of Sicily. Lewis had already corresponded on friendly terms with the sultan, Muley Montanza, and had hoped to act as sponsor at his baptism—for the sight of which he declared that he would gladly endure captivity in a Saracen dungeon for the remainder of his days. But on landing in Africa, these sanguine visions were dissipated. The sultan's troops attacked and harassed the crusaders, and speedily the baleful climate, the want of water and of wholesome food, began to produce their effects. Among those who were early carried off was the pope's legate. John Tristan, count of Nevers, the son who had been born during the captivity of Lewis on his former crusade, sank, and died on the 3rd of August; and the king himself, from whose already weakened constitution the disease met with no resistance, died on the 25th of the same month, after having signally displayed in his last hours the piety which had throughout marked his life.

The new king, Philip, was himself so ill at the time of his father's death that he gave up all hope of recovery, and appointed a regency for the expected minority of his son. Charles of Sicily, on whose co-operation the crusaders had relied, arrived too late to find his brother alive, but undertook the military conduct of the expedition; and, after two bloody engagements, forced from the sultan a peace, which included liberty of religion, permission to preach Christianity, compensation for the cost of the war, release of captives, and a yearly tribute to the Sicilian crown. Having secured these advantages, the survivors of the crusade left the African coast, professing that, after having recruited their strength in France, they would resume the expedition to the East; but a storm in which many of them perished was very generally regarded as a judgment on them for having "sold the holy war for money". King Philip recovered his health; but as he returned through Italy, he had to carry with him the remains of his father, of his brother, of his queen, who died at Cosenza, of one of his own children, and of his brother-in-law, king Theobald of Navarre. At Viterbo he found the cardinals assembled for the election of a pope, and witnessed the murder of Henry, son of Richard of Germany. Henry March 13, had accompanied his cousin prince Edward on the crusade, but had been sent back by him with the intention that he should act as his representative at home; and at Viterbo he unhappily fell in the way of Guy and Simon de Montfort, the sons of the late earl of Leicester, who, to avenge their father's death on the family by whose partisans he had been slain, stabbed the unsuspecting prince in the cathedral at the moment of the elevation of the Host. Philip, after having made the passage of Mont Cenis with difficulty, celebrated the obsequies of his father at St. Denys, carrying on his own shoulders the coffin which contained the bones of the saintly king.

Edward of England had been delayed so that he was unable to join the crusade at Aigues Mortes, and did not reach Tunis until after the departure of Philip and his companions. On learning the result of the expedition, he made for Sicily, where Charles was unable to persuade him to relinquish his intention of proceeding to the east, or to share in the money which had been got from the Saracens. After spending the winter in Sicily, he sailed for Acre, and displayed his valor in the defense of that city—now the only remaining possession of the Latins in Syria—and in several encounters with the infidels. But the smallness of his force prevented any considerable achievements, and the object of the crusades appeared to be as distant as it had been before St. Lewis took arms in the sacred cause.

CHAPTER IV

FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE GREGORY X TO THE DEATH OF NICOLAS
IV.

A.D. 1271-1292

After the death of Clement IV, the papacy was vacant for nearly three years, as the cardinals, eighteen in number, who were assembled at Viterbo, were divided into two parties, and could not be brought to agree in the choice of a successor. At last it was resolved, by the system which was afterwards styled *compromise*, to delegate the power of election to three members of each party; and these, on the 1st of September 1271, chose Theobald, formerly archdeacon of Liége. Theobald, although a member of the family of Visconti of Piacenza, had been preserved from the spirit of Italian faction by spending the greater part of his life in foreign countries. He had been deprived of his archdeaconry through the envy of the bishop of Liége, and received the news of his election at Acre, where he was engaged in the crusade under Edward of England. The pope took leave of the east with the words of the Psalmist, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning!" and returned to Europe with the resolution to stir up its warriors once more for the recovery of the Holy Land. After having been consecrated and crowned at Rome, on the 27th of March 1272, by the name of Gregory X, he followed the example of his predecessor by taking up his residence at Viterbo. Edward, finding his force insufficient for any great undertakings, concluded a truce with the Saracens for ten years, ten months, and ten days, and set sail for Europe. On landing at Trapani, he was informed of his father's death; and as he proceeded by land to take possession of his kingdom, he was received with great honour by the pope at Orvieto.

While the papacy was vacant, Charles of Sicily, who had used his influence to prolong the interregnum, had so much increased his power as to become the arbiter of Italy. Gregory could not but see that his predecessors had seriously hampered the Roman see by connecting it with such a champion, and that the objects which Charles now aimed at were very different from his own. While Charles was wholly intent on his private interests; while he grounded his hopes of power in Italy and Sicily on the policy of encouraging the native factions to mutual fury; while his ambition suggested schemes for gaining possession of the empire of Constantinople, to which he had acquired for his family a nominal title by marrying one of his sons to the daughter of the dispossessed Baldwin II—Gregory desired to unite all Christendom—the Italian states and their factions, the nations of western Europe, and the Christians of the east—in a grand common effort for the recovery of the Holy Land. As no hope of this could be entertained so long as Europe was unsettled, the pope resolved to provide some counterpoise to the exorbitant influence of Charles, who, through the weakness of his nephew Philip, had come to be regarded as the virtual head of his powerful family; and the time seemed to have arrived for the revival of the imperial dignity from the long abeyance into which it had fallen. The late popes had continued the equivocal policy of Alexander IV as to the claims of Richard and Alfonso; and while the English prince's influence had been lessened by the exhaustion of his treasures, and by his long absence from Germany in consequence of having been made prisoner at the battle of Lewes (may 14, 1264), Alfonso had never taken any active measures to assert his pretensions to the German crown. On the death of Richard, in 1272, Alfonso applied to the pope, and desired that a time might be appointed for his coronation as emperor; but Gregory told him in reply that he had not acquired any fresh rights by his rival's death. A new king of Germany was to be elected, and

the part which Gregory took in the affair significantly shows the extent to which the papal power had grown. He urged the Germans to choose a king from among themselves; he discouraged the pretensions of Ottocar of Bohemia, who, although the most powerful prince in Germany, was liable to the objection that he belonged to the Slavonic race; he even threatened that, if the Germans should neglect to do their duty, he would, with the consent of his cardinals, take order for the filling of the vacant throne. The cities of Germany resolved that, if the princes should agree in the choice of a king, they would obey him, but that, in case of a double election, they would not acknowledge either claimant. On the 29th of September 1273, Rudolf, count of Hapsburg, was chosen at Frankfort, not only by the seven electors, but by an assembly of all the princes; and it was in vain that the king of Bohemia, whose representatives had been shut out from the election, attempted to question the result of it. Rudolf was a petty independent prince, fifty-five years of age, who had been recommended by his valour, his frankness, affability, honesty, and other popular qualities, while he was not so powerful as to give cause for apprehension that he might revive the authority which emperors in former days had exercised. Attempts were afterwards made to trace his pedigree to Charlemagne, to the Merovingians, and even to connect him with the Anicii of ancient Rome through the strange channel of the Jewish Pierleoni; but to these genealogies no credit is to be given. The new king was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle on the 24th of October, by Engelbert, archbishop of Cologne; and, when a sceptre could not be found for the investiture of the feudatories, and some of them were on this account inclined to refuse the oath of fealty, Rudolf produced a strong and general impression by using the crucifix as a substitute.

With a view to the enterprise which he had so much at heart, Gregory, on the 1st of April in his first year, issued a summons to a general council, which was to meet in the next year but one; and, as there could be little hope of raising the nations beyond the Alps except by holding it on their side of the great mountain barrier, a later citation fixed on Lyons as the place of assembly.

In order to forward his designs as to the east, Gregory attempted to effect a reconciliation between the Greek church and his own. The old religious enmity between the Greeks and the Latins had naturally been embittered by the Latin conquest of Constantinople. Reproaches of heresy had been bandied on both sides, and, although political interest had often tended to draw the Greeks and the papacy together, the questions of doctrine had continued to prevent a reconciliation. Missions had been sent to mediate between the two communions; but their labours had always been abortive. Each party threw the blame of the schism on the other, and the Latins insisted that all concessions should come from the opposite side, or at the utmost would only allow some nugatory indulgences, such as that the Greeks should not be compelled to pronounce the article of the double procession in their public service, provided that they all believed it, and that all books which maintained the opposite opinion were burnt. But for these difficulties, Vatatzes—who in a reign of thirty-three years gradually extended his sway from the Turkish frontier on the east to the Adriatic on the west, while Constantinople alone remained isolated in the hands of the Latins—would probably have been able to get himself acknowledged by Rome; and he was the more inclined to seek reconciliation with the western church, because he had incurred the censure of the Greek clergy by his infidelity to a contract of marriage with a natural daughter of the emperor Fredericks. But it was in vain that Vatatzes proposed a compromise founded on the analogy of secular negotiations—that the Latins should give up their creed if the Greeks would consent to respect their sacrament.

Theodore Lascaris II, the son and successor of Vatatzes, died in 1258, leaving the empire to a boy eight years of age, named John, whom he placed under the guardianship of the patriarch Arsenius and of the protovestiary George Muzalon. On the death of Muzalon, who was slain in a tumult, three days after the late emperor's funeral, his place was filled by Michael Palaeologus, the most eminent of the Greek nobles as to birth and reputation; but

Palaeologus, not content with the position of a guardian, a regent, or even of a colleague in the empire, procured himself to be crowned without admitting John to a share of the honour, and, after having achieved the reconquest of Constantinople, received the crown afresh in St. Sophia's, (Dec. 25, 1261) while John was blinded and imprisoned. For this Michael was excommunicated by Arsenius, although his name was still retained in the public prayers; and his entreaties for absolution, although supported by ecclesiastics of high authority whom he had drawn into his interest, were sternly declared by the patriarch to be unavailing unless he would make a satisfaction equal to the greatness of the offence. "Do you require that I should abdicate the throne?" asked the emperor, kneeling in penitential form at the feet of Arsenius; and, as he spoke, he began to unbuckle his sword, the ensign of secular power. But the eagerness with which the patriarch caught at it alarmed him; he declared that he had only intended to try the spirit of Arsenius, who, instead of aiding a sinner in his repentance, as the canons prescribed, had wished to dethrone him; and charges of irregularity were brought against the patriarch—among other things, that he had allowed the sultan of Iconium and some companions to bathe in the laver of the church. Arsenius—whose character may be inferred from his boast that he possessed nothing but a cloak, a pyx, and three pieces of gold, which he had earned by transcribing the Psalms—refused to appear before the tribunal which was appointed to try him; he was deposed by a synod, and banished to the island of Proconnesus, where he died without having relented towards Palaeologus. For forty-six years the deprived patriarch's followers—a party which, unlike such parties in general, increased in numbers—held aloof from the communion of the emperors, defying both threats and attempts at conciliation.

The pope was very desirous to gain the cooperation of Michael for the crusade, while the eastern emperor was equally desirous to protect himself by an alliance with the pope against the disaffected clergy of his own church, against his Bulgarian neighbours, and most especially against the designs of Charles of Sicily, which he had already tried to avert by an embassy to St. Lewis. Letters were therefore interchanged in a friendly tone, and a mission of Franciscans, headed by Jerome of Ascoli, who were sent by Gregory to Constantinople, found the task of negotiation easy. The venerated names of the confessor Maximus, of Cyril of Alexandria, and even of Athanasius, were alleged to prove that the differences were merely verbal. The Greek clergy, although for the most part strongly averse from union with the Latins, were coerced by the imperial power, which regarded all opposition as treason; one of the most eminent among them, John Veccus, after having declared that there were heretics who were not so styled, and that among these were the Italians, was converted by imprisonment and study to admit their soundness in the faith. The patriarch Joseph (whose intrigues had persuaded Germanus, the successor of Arsenius, to resign), was opposed to union; but, by an understanding with the emperor, he withdrew into a monastery, to await the event of the negotiations, and a Greek embassy, headed by the ex-patriarch Germanus, was sent to the council of Lyons, with splendid gifts for St. Peter. They carried also a letter from the emperor, in which he owned the primacy of Rome, and professed the Latin creed, but requested that the Greeks might be allowed to use their creed as before the separation of the churches, and to retain such usages as were not contrary to the authority of Scripture, councils, and fathers, or to the Roman faith.

The second council of Lyons—the fourteenth general council, according to the Roman account—met in the cathedral church of St. John on the 7th of May 1274. In respect of numbers, no such imposing assembly had yet been seen; the Latin patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch were present, with upwards of five hundred bishops, and more than a thousand inferior dignitaries; while the laity were represented by King James of Aragon, and by ambassadors from all the principal states of the west. But, if these numbers greatly exceeded those of the former council which had been held at the same place, the contrast in the purpose and spirit of the two assemblies was yet more remarkable. Under

Innocent IV, the great object of the council was to excommunicate the foremost sovereign of Christendom; under Gregory X it was to establish between all Christians a general reconciliation and peace.

In order to avoid any recurrence of the quarrels as to precedence which had disturbed the former council, the pope ordered that the members should take their seats promiscuously; and at the first session, in a sermon from the same text which Innocent III had chosen at the Lateran council of 1215, he proposed as the three great subjects of deliberation, a subsidy for the Holy Land, the union of the Greeks, and the reformation of morals. The subsidy was carried, although the pope found but little response to his own enthusiasm, and was obliged to have recourse to private conferences with archbishops and other prelates in order to secure this object. Edward of England had resisted his urgent entreaties that he would attend the council before returning to his own dominions, and throughout his whole reign was too much engrossed by his interests at home to renew the attempt for the recovery of the Holy Land. But, although the dean of Lincoln brought forward at the council a representation of the exhausted state of the kingdom, he did not venture on any decided opposition to the proposed measure; and the clergy of England joined with those of other countries in promising a tithe of their revenues for six years towards the holy war.

The Greek ambassadors appeared, and were received with great marks of honour. The controversial skill of the two great theologians Bonaventura and Thomas of Aquino, who had been invited to appear at the council as champions of the western faith, was found needless; for the Greeks admitted everything—the Latin doctrines and usages, and the primacy of the Roman see. Five days after their arrival, the pope celebrated mass on the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, in the presence of all the prelates; and, after the Nicene creed had been chanted in Latin, it was repeated in Greek by the Greek and Calabrian bishops, who, when they came to the article of the double procession, sang it thrice “with solemnity and devotion.” The reconciliation of the two churches was formally ratified at the fourth session of the council, when the long-disputed article was again chanted twice, and the great logothete, George Acropolita, professed, in the name of the emperor and of the empire, a firm and unalterable adherence to the faith of the Roman church. At the same session, the survivor of two ambassadors who had been sent by a khan of the Mongols appeared, and at the next session, ten days later, he and his companions were baptized. There were, however, some who regarded the professed mission of these Tartars with suspicion, and their baptism led to no such results as the more sanguine of the Latins had expected.

Envoys from Rudolf of Hapsburg appeared at the council, and requested the pope to confirm his election. They bound their master by solemn engagements to all that had been promised by Frederick II or by any other emperor—that he renounced the *jus exuviarum*, that he allowed freedom of elections and appeals to Rome, that he would not attack the property of the church, or take any office or dignity in the Roman state—more especially in the city of Rome—without the pope’s permissions. In reply to this application, Gregory in the following September confirmed the election of Rudolf, in words which by their ambiguity were intended to insinuate a claim to the right of nominating the king of the Romans.

At the sixth and last session of the council, on the 17th of July, the pope inveighed strongly against the vices of prelates, and earnestly exhorted them to reform themselves.

Among thirty-one canons which this assembly produced, was one as to the election of popes—intended to prevent a recurrence of any such delay as that which had taken place on the last vacancy. This canon, after professing to follow the rules of earlier date, and especially the decree of Alexander III, in the third Lateran council, orders that the cardinals, without waiting more than ten days for the absent members of their body, shall meet for the choice of a successor, each of them attended by one clerk or lay domestic only, and shall be shut up in one “conclave,” which shall not be divided by any walls or curtains; that they shall hold no communication with the world outside, and that anyone who shall withdraw shall not be

readmitted, unless his withdrawal were caused by manifest sickness; that their food shall be supplied through a window; that, if the election be not made within three days, their provisions shall be limited to one dish at dinner and one at supper for the next five days; and after that time, to bread, wine, and water. This canon, not unnaturally, was very unacceptable to the cardinals, who endeavoured to draw the bishops into opposition to it; but the pope succeeded in gaining the bishops, and by their votes the new regulation was carried.

Rudolf wrote to thank the pope for the favour which had been shown to him, and expressed his intention of going on a crusade, more especially because his father had died in the Holy Land. Gregory, by a threat of excommunication, and by the offer of a tenth of ecclesiastical income for the war against the Moors, prevailed on Alfonso to give up his pretensions to the German crown; and on his return to Italy, the pope had an interview with Rudolf at Lausanne. The king confirmed all that had been done by his representatives at Lyons; he took the cross, with his wife and children, and made arrangements for receiving the imperial crown in St. Peter's at Whitsuntide following. He engaged to help the pope towards the recovery of all his territory, including Corsica and Sardinia; to respect the privileges which Lewis the Pious and Otho I were supposed to have granted to the Roman church; to aid in retaining the kingdom of Sicily for the Roman see, and to give up all claim to the exarchate of Ravenna, the Pentapolis, the territories of Ancona and Spoleto, and the inheritance of the countess Matilda. Thus Gregory had gained from the empire more than any of his predecessors. By his forcing one claimant to withdraw his pretensions, and by the part which he took in the election and confirmation of the other, it seemed as if the choice of an emperor were virtually in the hands of the pope. All the forged or doubtful privileges in favour of the papal see, from the time of Lewis the Pious downwards, were acknowledged as valid and binding; and the pope was owned as temporal lord of all the territories which had formerly been subjects of contention.

In addition to these important gains, Gregory had accomplished, as it seemed, the pacification of the west, the reconciliation of the Greek church and empire to Rome, and the combination of all Christian nations for a new crusade. But in the midst of his triumphs, he was arrested by sudden death at Arezzo, on the 10th of January 1276, and the effect of his labours was in great measure lost. The crusading spirit had long been declining, and the loss and suffering which had attended the late attempts of the saintly Lewis had tended yet further to damp the ardour for the holy war. The author of a treatise drawn up with a view to the council of Lyons, mentions seven causes why Christians were lukewarm as to the crusade, and finds it necessary to combat seven classes of persons who spoke against such enterprises. And a troubadour of the time, after lamenting the death of king Lewis, curses the crusades, and the clergy for promoting them; he even reproaches the Almighty for their ill success, and, after much invective against the pope and the priests, he expresses a wish that the emperor and the French would lead a crusade against the clergy, to whom he ascribes the destruction of the Christian chivalry.

Nor was the agreement with the Greeks more successful than the project of a crusade. Michael Palaeologus, indeed, endeavoured to enforce it: the patriarch Joseph was superseded by the Latinizing John Veccus; the Gospels were read in Latin as well as in Greek at the religious services of the court; the western patriarch was prayed for as "supreme high-priest of the apostolical church, and ecumenical pope"; and the emperor, although he secretly complained of the pride of the Latins, employed the most violent and cruel measures for enforcing conformity—violence and cruelty the less excusable because his motives for the course which he took were merely political. Ambassadors were sent to assure the pope that all was well, and, on being admitted to his presence, they found Charles of Sicily on his knees before him, entreating his permission to attack the Greeks, and gnawing his ivory-headed staff in rage at Gregory's refusal. But Michael found that the truce with Sicily, which he had procured through the pope's mediation, was dearly bought at the price of the disaffection of

his own subjects, who execrated him as a heretic and an apostate, and threatened the stability of his throne.

Within a year after the death of Gregory, three popes in succession were raised to the chair. The first of these, Peter of Tarentaise, bishop of Ostia, and a Dominican, had distinguished himself by writing a commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, although not without incurring suspicions of heterodoxy. After a pontificate of five months, under the name of Innocent V, he was succeeded by a nephew of Innocent IV, Ottobuoni Fiesco, cardinal-deacon of St. Adrian, who had been engaged as legate in England during the war of the barons, and had rendered his legation memorable by a set of canons passed at a council held under him in 1168. From the name of his titular church, Ottobuoni styled himself Adrian V; but he did not live to be consecrated, or even to be ordained to the priesthood, and it is said that, when congratulated on his election, he answered, "Would that you came to a cardinal in health, rather than to a dying pope!". The chief act of his pontificate, which lasted only five weeks, was to release his countrymen the Genoese from an excommunication which had been inflicted on them at his own desire by Gregory.

Adrian was succeeded by a Portuguese named Peter, who had formerly been archbishop of Braga, but having been deprived of the revenues of his see by king Sancho II, had been preferred to the bishopric of Frascati by Gregory X. John XXI (for this was the name which he assumed) was eminent for his scientific knowledge, which procured him the reputation of an astrologer. A writer of the time tells us that he was hasty in speech and careless of appearances, and that his affability served to render his indiscretions the more notorious. His dislike of monks was undisguised; and the monastic writers regard the manner of his death as a judgment on him for this offence. He had, it is said, persuaded himself by astrological calculations that he was to live long; but within little more than eight months after his election, as he was surveying with pride and joy a lofty building which he had raised at Viterbo—according to some, an observatory for the cultivation of his favourite science—it suddenly fell and crushed him, so that, although he was extricated from the ruins, and was able to receive the last sacraments, he died on the sixth day.

In all the late elections, the cardinals had found the severe regulation of the council of Lyons an inconvenience. Adrian had intended to modify it, and on his death the cardinals announced that it was suspended by his authority. John XXI had revoked the decree, or suspended it afresh; but the people of Viterbo—who regarded it as a wholesome safeguard against intrigues and long delays—after six months had passed from the death of John, shut the cardinals up in the town-hall of their city until they should agree on the election of a successor.

The choice of the cardinals, who were only seven in number, fell at length on John Gaetano, cardinal of S. Nicolas, a member of the great Roman family of Orsini, who took the name of Nicolas III. The new pope was the son of a tertiary of the Franciscan order, to which he had been devoted from infancy, and as a member of the order he had been employed as an inquisitor into heresy. From his union of personal graces with great abilities and various acquirements, he had got the title of *Il Composto*—the accomplished; but he cared more for the interests of the papacy than for those of the church; his patronage was distributed among his own family, with an utter disregard of public spirit; and the corruption which he encouraged in his court has drawn on him the reprobation of Dante. From Viterbo, where the late popes had lived, Nicolas transferred the papal residence back to Rome, where, besides executing important works at the Lateran and St. Peter's, he began the vast structure of the Vatican palace.

Nicolas was resolved to check the power of Charles of Anjou, who is said to have provoked him by refusing the proposal of a family connection, with the insulting remark—"Does he think that, because he has red stockings, his blood is fit to mix with ours?", and for the means of humbling the dangerous neighbour whom the papacy had raised up for itself, he

looked to the new king of the Romans, Rudolf of Hapsburg. Rudolf since his election had greatly increased in strength. The activity of his movements had made his power felt in every quarter of Germany; he had recovered fiefs which had been alienated from the crown, had destroyed many of the castles which bristled throughout the land, and had done away with the terror of the predatory little tyrants who occupied them. His most formidable opponent, Ottocar of Bohemia, had gradually sunk before him, and at last had been killed in battle in August 1278. It was well for Rudolf that the successors of Gregory X did not inherit that pope's interest in the crusade, and that he was consequently at liberty to employ himself in the works which were necessary for the consolidation of his power and the suppression of anarchy at home. He had put off from time to time the expedition to Rome for the purpose of receiving the imperial crown, and he had required that Charles should resign the vicariate of Tuscany, with which he had been invested during the abeyance of the empire. Charles, however, declared that he would not resign either this dignity or the senatorship of Rome except to the pope; and Nicolas requested that Rudolf would not come into Italy until the difficulty should have been settled. Nicolas skillfully took advantage of his position to play Rudolf and Charles against each other. From Rudolf he obtained an acknowledgment of his sovereignty over the territories mentioned in the compact with Gregory X, with some which were not included in that document. The old spurious privileges were all admitted by the emperor-elect as binding; and when one of his officials had exacted an act of homage to him from the inhabitants of some Italian towns—including the great city of Bologna—Rudolf, on receiving a complaint from Nicolas, withdrew his claim and allowed a new oath to be taken to the pope. The condition of these cities, indeed, was substantially one of republican independence, while in some cases the emperor still retained power over them; but Rudolf's cession fell in with the papal policy, which aimed at gaining a nominal sovereignty in the hope that this might at some future time become real.

Having gained so much from Rudolf, and procured through him a confirmation of the act by the princes of Germany, the pope required Charles to resign the vicariate of Tuscany, and also the senatorship of Rome, as the ten years for which they had been granted were at an end. It was evident that by compliance Charles would be reduced from the position which he had occupied as great arbiter of Italy; yet, with a readiness which surprised Nicolas himself, he acquiesced, partly (as it would seem) out of fear lest he should throw the pope into Rudolf's interest, and partly in order that, by ceding something in Italy, he might forward his designs on the eastern empire. Nicolas on this got himself chosen senator for life, and decreed that no one should be appointed to that office for more than a year, except with the pope's sanction. With a like view to curbing the power of Charles, Nicolas laboured to reconcile the factions of the Italian cities. He established the sovereignty of the papal power over Rome, and succeeded in acquiring a greater amount of political influence than any of his predecessors had for many years enjoyed. But in the midst of his prosperity, his career was cut short by a stroke of palsy at Soriano, in the diocese of Viterbo, on the 22nd of August 1280.

His death was the signal for violent tumults in Rome, which ended in the appointment of two senators, chosen from the rival houses of Orsini and Anibaldi. Charles of Sicily was bent on procuring the election of a pope who would reverse the policy of the last. There were long and fierce debates among the cardinals; and, as the Lyons decree was not put in force (although it had been re-enacted by Nicolas), it became known how the individual members of the college were affected. The people of Viterbo, gained by Charles, imprisoned the chiefs of the Orsini party; and, after a vacancy of six months, Feb. 22, the election was declared in favour of Simon of Brie, a Frenchman of humble origin, who from a canonry of Tours had been promoted to the cardinalate of St. Cecilia. In honour of the great saint of Tours, the new pope took the name of Martin IV. Martin showed himself an undisguised and unqualified partisan.

His hatred of the Germans was expressed in a wish that they might be frogs in a marsh, and that he himself might be a stork, or that they might be fish in a pond, and that he might be a pike; and, on the other hand, he was an abject tool of Charles of Sicily. When, after having excommunicated the people of Viterbo for their late disobedience, he removed to Orvieto, the king also took up his abode there, that he might have the pope under his eye and at his command. The college of cardinals was increased by six nominees of Charles, and when Martin had procured himself to be chosen senator of Rome, although with an express declaration that the dignity was bestowed on him for his personal merits, and although Nicolas III had expressly decreed that it should not be held by any sovereign prince, or other person of considerable independent power, he transferred it to the king of Sicily as his deputy.

Charles' designs on the East were now far advanced, and were favoured by the circumstances of the Byzantine empire. While Michael Palaeologus made himself hateful to his own subjects and drove them into schism by the violent means which he employed to enforce the union with the Latin church, the popes complained that he was too slow in performing his engagements. John XXI, in 1277, sent ambassadors to urge that the Greeks should give a substantial proof of their agreement by reciting the creed like the Latins. Michael showed them two of his own near relations who were in prison for opposing the agreement; he gave up to them two other men of high rank, whom he had imprisoned for the same offence; and he returned a letter agreeable to the pope's wishes, which was rendered more imposing in appearance by a number of fictitious signatures. But the pope restored the two prisoners, saying that they had been wrongfully accused; and the relations of the churches were not improved by the result of the mission. The Latinizing patriarch Veccus was able to effect but little in the work of reconciliation, and after a time was compelled to withdraw into a cloister in consequence of having incurred the emperor's displeasure. Under Nicolas, Michael had been in favour at Rome, on account of the common enmity to Charles; but Martin, the devoted slave of Charles, excommunicated and anathematized the eastern emperor, under the pretext that he had failed to fulfill his promises to the church, although the sentence was really dictated by the political interest of the king of Sicily. To this the emperor replied by excluding the pope's name from the offices of the Greek church; and on his death, which took place in the same year, the disagreement between the east and the west became more flagrant than before. The new emperor, Andronicus, declared that in consenting to his father's measures he had acted under constraints. He bestowed on Michael a funeral of the humblest kind, unaccompanied by any religious rites, and the widowed empress, Theodora, was required to subscribe a promise that she would never ask for such rites in behalf of her husband. Churches which had been infected by the Latinizing worship were subjected to a solemn purification; councils were held, which deposed and banished the patriarch Veccus, chiefly on the ground of his opinion as to the procession of the Holy Spirit, restored his predecessor Joseph, and condemned to the flames all books which favoured the union of the churches. In these circumstances, it became important to conciliate the party of the Arsenites, which still kept up its separation; and, after much negotiation, they proposed that the question between them and the church should be decided by an ordeal. After an attempt to obtain a judgment by enclosing the books of the Arsenites with the body of St. John Damascene had been frustrated by the emperor's precautions against fraud, it was agreed that the books which contained the arguments in favour of each party were to be cast into a fire; if one book escaped, its partisans were to be acknowledged as in the right; if both should be burnt, the parties were to be reconciled on equal terms. Contrary to the expectation of the Arsenites, the fire impartially consumed their book as well as the other; and thereupon the emperor, accompanied by the chief members of the schism, hastened on foot, through stormy weather, to the residence of the patriarch Gregory, at whose hands they all received the holy eucharist. But next day the Arsenites regretted that they had allowed themselves to be hurried into this reconciliation; and the schism was not healed until, in the year 1312, the body of the inflexible

patriarch was translated with honour to Constantinople, and the people after having submitted to penance, were absolved from the sins of their forefathers.

While Michael was yet alive, Charles employed himself in active preparations for a new conquest of Constantinople. He had engaged the pope in his interest, had formed alliances with the Venetians and with his nephew Philip of France, and was collecting ships and soldiers, when an unexpected event compelled him to direct all his energies to objects nearer home.

From the time of the French conquest, the Sicilians had suffered oppressions of the most grievous kind. They were ground down by exorbitant taxes, their lands and property were confiscated without a pretence of justice, they were compelled to accept a debased coinage instead of their genuine money, they were subjected to the arts of corrupt officials, they were plundered and insulted by the dominant race, and their wives and daughters were dishonoured. So crying were the evils of Charles' government that they had drawn on him earnest remonstrances, and even threats of ecclesiastical censure, from Clement IV and Gregory X; and the sufferings of his subjects had lately been aggravated by his preparations for war with the Byzantine empire—a war, moreover, for which the Sicilians had no inclination, as their relations with the Greeks were of a friendly character.

JOHN OF PROCIDA.

It is said that Conradin on the scaffold, in the marketplace of Naples, threw down his glove among the crowd, and requested that it might be carried to Peter, king of Aragon, whose wife Constance, the daughter of Manfred, was regarded as the last representative of the Hohenstaufen line. To Peter and his queen the oppressed Sicilians looked with hope, while Constance was unremitting in her endeavours to stir her husband to some enterprise for the recovery of the inheritance of her family, and many of those who had been dispossessed by the French conquest found a welcome at the court of Aragon. Among these was John, a nobleman of Salerno and lord of the island of Procida, who by his skill in medicine (of which Salerno was the chief school), and by his other gifts, had acquired the confidence of Frederick II and of Manfred. By taking arms for Conradin he had incurred the forfeiture of all his property, and it is said (although this appears very doubtful), that his wife and daughter had been outraged by the conquerors. Burning with the desire of revenge for these wrongs, John of Procida devoted himself for years to the work of secret agitation. He sold all that he had received from the bounty of the king of Aragon, and, sometimes in the habit of a monk or friar, sometimes in a secular disguise, he repeatedly passed through Sicily, whispering to eager ears the hope of vengeance and of liberty. He made his way to Constantinople, where he engaged the emperor Michael in his projects, and obtained from him a supply of money, with which he assured the doubtful resolution of Nicolas III. In Spain, he found Alfonso of Castile disposed to take part against Charles for refusing to release his brother Henry, formerly the senator of Rome, who had been taken prisoner for his connection with Conradin. Peter of Aragon readily entered into his plans, but took alarm in consequence of the sudden death of Nicolas, so that John had again to visit Constantinople, from which he returned with a large subsidy for the king. Peter then began to make preparations, but when questioned as to them, at the instance of Charles, by an emissary of the pope, he replied that if he thought that one of his hands could tell the other his design, he would cut it off. The ostensible destination of the armament was against the infidels of Africa, and in the beginning of June 1282 Peter sailed for the African coast.

1268-82. THE SICILIAN VESPERS.

In the meantime, the revolution for which preparation had so industriously been made, took place suddenly and as if by accident. On Easter Tuesday 1282, as the inhabitants of Palermo were sauntering in great numbers to celebrate vespers at a Cistercian church, a short distance from the city, while others were dancing under the shade of trees near the road, an insult offered by a French soldier to a high-born and beautiful maiden provoked her betrothed, who accompanied her, to seize the assailant's sword and kill him on the spot. A cry of "Death to the French!" arose on every side. The fury which had long been gathering intensity from suppression burst forth without restraint. All the Frenchmen who were near the spot were massacred, and the Sicilians, rushing into the city, slaughtered without remorse all who belonged to the detested race—men, women, and children. Churches and monasteries were invaded; monks and friars, as being the allies of the French, were especially chosen for slaughter. Even Sicilian women who were pregnant by French husbands were ripped up, in order to exterminate the race of tyrants; and it is said that some Sicilians drank the blood of their enemies. The movement spread to Messina and throughout the island; everywhere the natives rose in fury against their oppressors, and in a short time no Frenchman remained alive in Sicily.

Having established a provisional government, the citizens of Palermo sent a mission to the pope, entreating him in the humblest manner to mediate with Charles. But Martin, enraged at the slaughter of his countrymen, repulsed the envoys with scorn and with words of violent reproach. Charles, on receiving the tidings of the "Sicilian Vespers", is said to have uttered aloud a prayer that, if it were God's pleasure that fortune should turn against him, his decline might be gradual and gentle. But after this expression of pious resignation, he resumed his usual severity. The fleet which he had prepared for the expedition against Constantinople was recalled for the chastisement of Sicily; and the people of Messina, on entreating him to make terms, were told that they must submit their lives and persons to his will. On receiving this answer, the Messinese resolved to stand on their defence, protesting that they would rather die with their families in their home than languish in foreign prisons; even the women, in the general enthusiasm, carried stones, wood, and other materials to help in the fortification of the city. The people of Palermo, on the return of their envoys from the papal court, declared that, since St. Peter refused to protect them, they would seek the aid of another Peter; and an embassy was despatched to the king of Aragon, with the offer of the Sicilian crown. Peter, whose arms had not achieved any great successes in Africa, was delighted to find himself thus summoned to the island on which his eyes had long been fixed, and, in disregard of all the monitions which the pope interposed by letters or by the mouth of a legate, he was crowned at Monreale by the bishop of Cefalu.

Peter formally announced his arrival to Charles, and desired him to withdraw from Sicily; to which Charles replied by defying him as a traitor. But the approach of the Aragonese force compelled Charles to raise the siege of Messina, after he had carried it on for two months, and had almost reduced the inhabitants to despair; and Roger de Loria, a Calabrian who had entered into the service of Aragon, and was regarded as the greatest naval commander of the age, soon after inflicted a total defeat on the Provençal fleet. The firmness of Charles' mind appeared to be unnerved by his late calamities; he gnawed his ivory headed staff in impotent rage, and his ancient prudence gave way to wildness and extravagance in forming schemes for the recovery of his power. The pope had anathematized the people of Palermo on Ascension-day 1282; and by later documents he included Peter in the sentence, declared him to be deprived of his hereditary dominions, which he affected to bestow on Charles of Valois, a son of the king of France, and proclaimed a crusade for the recovery of Sicily. The tenths which had been collected from several kingdoms for the holy war of the East were to be made over to Charles as a loan; and many French knights, animated by a desire to avenge the blood of their countrymen, took arms and crossed the Alps. But a more summary method of deciding the quarrel was proposed—that it should be referred to the

judgment of God by a combat to be fought between the rival kings, each with a hundred companions. The place named for this combat was Bordeaux, in the territory of the king of England, who was to be invited to preside, either in person or by proxy. The challenge was accepted, and although Edward declined to take any part in the affair, while the pope strongly denounced and forbade it, the chiefs on either side enlisted knights of renown to share with them in the intended fight. But the expectations which had been raised were disappointed by the result. Peter, who is said to have made his way to Bordeaux in disguise, as his rival had treacherous designs against him, appeared in the lists, and, after having ridden up and down, obtained from the English king's seneschal a certificate of his appearance, and that Charles had failed to meet him. Charles on another day went through a somewhat similar farce, and each declared the other a dastard and dishonoured.

Charles on his return to Italy had the mortification of hearing that his son Charles the Lame, prince of Salerno, having allowed himself to be enticed into a sea-fight by Roger de Loria, in neglect of his father's injunction, and in defiance of the papal legate's warnings, had been defeated and taken; that two hundred of his companions had been put to death, and that there were cries for the blood of the prince himself, in revenge for the death of Conradin. The king in his anger affected to make light of the loss, and, leaving his son a prisoner, to make over the succession to his grandson, in whose honour he celebrated a tournament. At Naples, where he had reason to suspect that many were disaffected to his government, he allowed his soldiers to commit much slaughter, and hanged upwards of a hundred and fifty of the principal citizens, as partisans of the king of Aragon. The agitations which he had lately undergone produced a serious illness; and on the 7th of January 1285 he died at the age of sixty-seven, having seen the successes of many prosperous years almost cancelled by a just retribution for his grievous offences against humanity. On the 29th of March in the same year, pope Martin died at Perugia, to which he had been driven from Orvieto, and the Sicilian crusade which he had organized with the king came to nothing.

After a vacancy of only four days, the papal chair was filled by Honorius IV, of the family of Savelli, an old man, who, although he retained the full possession of his mental faculties, and is described as very eloquent and persuasive in speech, was crippled by gout to such a degree that in his great public functions he was obliged to make use of a machine which raised and turned him as was required. Between the Guelf and Ghibelline factions of Italy Honorius endeavoured to hold the balance evenly; in other respects his policy was the same as that of his predecessors.

Philip of France carried the holy war which had been proclaimed by pope Martin into the territories of Aragon. A legate had preached the sacred cause in France with offers of indulgences even more ample than usual; and the crusaders exhibited their confidence in their privileges by excesses of cruelty, profanity, and lust. At Elne they slew all who had taken refuge in the cathedral, without regard to age or sex or to the holiness of the place. Girona was besieged until the defenders were compelled by hunger to surrender; but within a week it was recovered by Peter, and the French had suffered so severely from scarcity of provisions and from excessive heat that Philip felt it necessary to begin his retreat. The French king died at Perpignan on the 3rd of October; and on the 11th of November the king of Aragon also died—whether from a wound or in consequence of a chill is uncertain.

Philip the Bold—an epithet for which historians have in vain endeavoured to find a reason—was succeeded by his son Philip the Fair, a youth of seventeen. Aragon fell to Alfonso, the eldest son of the late king, and Sicily to his second son, James, against whom and his mother Constance Honorius denounced his excommunication, while Alfonso was only able to escape a like sentence by frequent missions to deprecate the papal displeasure.

On the death of Honorius, which took place on the 3rd of April 1287, there was great difficulty as to the choice of a successor. Sixteen of the nineteen cardinals were shut up in St. Sabina's on the Aventine, which had been the late pope's usual residence, and there six of

them died, while Jerome of Ascoli, general of the Franciscans and cardinal of Palestrina, warded off the malaria which was fatal to his brethren by keeping up fires through the hottest weather in all the rooms which he used. The vacancy was ended by the election of Jerome as pope on the 22nd of February 1288, and in remembrance of the pope to whom he owed his cardinalate he took the name of Nicolas IV.

Edward of England, who was connected with the royal families both of France and of Aragon, had attempted to mediate between them, and to procure the liberation of Charles the Lame, by proposing that the Spaniards should renounce their pretensions to Sicily on condition of being left in unmolested possession of Aragon; and, although Honorius had objected to this compromise, as derogatory to the church, which had unreservedly espoused the French interest, the English king had renewed his mediation during the vacancy of the papal chair. In consequence of his intervention, Charles was at length set free on condition that he should return to captivity unless he fulfilled certain stipulations, and his three sons were given up as hostages for the performance of this engagement. Nicolas declared his oath to be null, on the ground that his captivity had originally been unjust—a pretext which would have allowed the pope to release men from all the obligations of faith and honour he declared that the kingdom of Sicily, having been conferred by the holy see, could not be alienated in exchange for the sovereign's personal freedom: and on Whitsunday 1289 he crowned Charles as king of all that the house of Anjou had acquired. He granted a tithe of ecclesiastical revenues to Charles for the recovery of Sicily, and to Philip of France for the conquest of Aragon; he denounced Alfonso for the hard terms which he had exacted, and even threatened Edward if, as guardian of the treaty, he should attempt to enforce it. On the other hand, Charles, in return for the favours of Rome, granted all that was required of him as to the relations of the church with the state, and acknowledged that he held his kingdom solely through the pope's gift. It would seem, however, that he scrupled to avail himself of the release from his oath; but he had recourse to an evasion which, while it was without the pretext of a religious sanction, was in nowise more respectable than that which the pope had approved. He appeared on the frontier of Aragon, announcing his readiness to give himself up on account of the non-fulfillment of his engagement; and, as no one attempted to arrest him, he caused his appearance and his offer to be recorded, professed to consider himself discharged from his obligations, and demanded the restoration of his hostages. The war of Sicily continued. Charles was not strong enough to recover the island, while James, though his fleet, under Roger de Loria, held the mastery of the sea, was not strong enough to expel the Aragonese from their possessions on the Italian mainland. Alfonso died in 1291, having made his peace with the pope; and James succeeded to the kingdom of Aragon, while the government of Sicily devolved on a younger brother, Frederick.

ACRE TAKEN BY THE SARACENS.

From time to time the popes, although chiefly engrossed by the affairs of the West, had urged the sovereigns of Europe to take the cross for the recovery of the Holy Land. Edward of England, especially, had met with indulgence in many things which might have brought him into collision with the church, because it was hoped that his renowned and experienced valour would again be displayed on the soil of Palestine. But both Edward and Philip the Bold regarded the crusade rather as a pretext for getting into their own hands the tithes which the clergy contributed for it than in any other light. The possessions of the Franks in the East had been continually diminishing. Tripoli was wrested from them in 1289, and, partly in revenge for the treacherous execution of some Arab merchants, Acre, the last remnant of the Frankish kingdom, was again besieged in 1291, and fell into the hands of the infidels. The grand-master of the templars was killed, the patriarch of Jerusalem and the grand-master of the hospitallers were drowned in the attempt to embark on board ship, and the

total loss in slain and wounded is reckoned at 60,000. Nicolas endeavoured by earnest exhortations to stir up the West to a new crusade but the day for such enterprises was over. Even the clergy showed no zeal in the cause; those of France and England declared that peace must be made between the princes of Christendom before a crusade could be preached with any hope of success. The association of nations was at an end, and the spell which for two hundred years had given the popes so great a power of control over them had lost its efficacy.

Rudolf had continued to administer the affairs of Germany with an honesty of purpose and a vigour which amply justified the hopes of those who had chosen him; but he had never found leisure or inclination to seek the imperial crown at Rome. At a diet held at Frankfort in 1291, he expressed a desire that his son Albert might be elected as king of the Romans. But, although this had usually been granted to reigning sovereigns of Germany, the electors were plied with representations that by a compliance with Rudolf's desire they would admit the principle of hereditary succession, and forego their electoral rights. These representations, although really made in the interest of the papacy by decretalists who were imbued with the doctrines of Gregory IX, had their effect July 15, for the time; and on Rudolf's death, which followed within two months, although Albert was acceptable to most of the electors, he was set aside, chiefly through the influence of his own brother-in-law, Wenceslaus of Bohemia, and Adolphus of Nassau was chosen king. The electors, after the example which the popes had given in their compacts with the emperors, encumbered the election with a number of stipulations which greatly weakened the crown.

Nicolas had incurred a charge of Ghibellinism, partly on account of having made peace with the house of Aragon, but more truly on account of his close alliance with the family of Colonna, for which he had deserted the rival party of the Orsini. In 1290 a member of this family was chosen lord of Rome, and was carried about the city in an imperial chariot, while the people hailed him as Caesar. Under the protection of the Colonnas, Nicolas ventured to remove from Rieti, where he had at first lived, to Rome; and his devotion to the family was symbolized by a caricature, in which he was represented as imprisoned in a column, so that only his mitred head could be seen above it, and with two other columns before him, denoting the two Colonnas who had been admitted into the college of cardinals. Nicolas died in April 1292. He had, it is said, confirmed the letters of John XXI by which the Lyons canon as to the election of popes was revoked; and, whether thus formally abrogated or not, the decree was treated as of no force in the vacancy which ensued.

CHAPTER V.

CELESTINE V AND BONIFACE VIII.

A.D. 1292-1303.

AT the death of Nicolas IV, the college of cardinals consisted of twelve members, who were divided into two parties—the French or Neapolitan and the Italian. These met in a palace which the late pope had built on the Esquiline; but the heats of June compelled them to separate without coming to any agreement in the choice of a successor. The attempt at an election was vainly renewed in one place after another; and in the meantime the factions of the Colonnas and Orsinis fought in the streets for the senatorship, until at length it was arranged that each party should nominate a senator of its own.

The papacy had been vacant two years and three months, when the cardinals met at Perugia in the beginning of July 1294. The most eminent among them were Latino Malebranca, bishop of Ostia, a member of the Dominican order, who stood in high repute for piety, and Benedict Gaetani, cardinal of SS. Sylvester and Martin. Gaetani was a native of Anagni, which within a century had given to the papal chair Innocent III, Gregory IX, and Alexander IV, and he was great-nephew of the last of these. He had probably studied in youth at the university of Paris, and is described as very learned in the Scriptures; he was regarded as unequalled in the knowledge of ecclesiastical law and in experience of affairs, and had been employed on important missions to England, France, Germany, and Portugal. It is said that the consciousness of his abilities and acquirements affected his manners and bearing—that he was arrogant, assuming, and scornful; and to these faults of character it is added that he was very rapacious as to money, “making no conscience of gain.” His labours in the service of successive popes had been rewarded with valuable preferments, and Martin IV had promoted him to the dignity of cardinal. When Charles II of Naples ventured to intrude on the deliberations of the cardinals at Perugia, and to exhort them to a speedy choice, Gaetani boldly rebuked him for interfering with the office of the Holy Spirit.

One day, as the cardinals were assembled, Latino spoke to his brethren of a hermit named Peter of Murrone, whose sanctity was the object of unbounded popular reverence. It was believed that he had been born in a monastic frock, and that every night he was roused for prayer by a celestial bell in tones of incomparable sweetness. Peter had formerly been a Benedictine monk, but had adopted the life of a hermit, and had founded an austere brotherhood of hermits, for which he obtained the sanction of Gregory X, after having travelled on foot from Apulia to Lyons in order to solicit it at the general council of 1274. His dwelling was a narrow cell on the rock of Murrone, near Sulmona, in the Abruzzi. He kept six Lents in the year, and imposed the same observance on his hermits, although to them he allowed mitigations as to diet which he denied himself. A few days later, Latino announced to the cardinals that a holy man had had a vision, threatening heavy judgments unless a pope were elected within a certain time. “I suppose” said Gaetani, “that this is some vision of your Peter of Murrone.” Latino answered that it was even so; the idea of choosing the hermit himself was suddenly suggested, was caught up as offering an escape from the difficulties occasioned by the party connexions of other candidates, and was acted on as if proceeding from inspiration.

The cardinals, however, appear to have soon felt some misgivings as to their choice; for they devolved the duty of announcing it to the new pope on some prelates who were not members of the sacred college. These, as they toiled up the rock of Fumone, were joined by

cardinal Peter Colonna, who had undertaken the journey on his own account; and they found the elect pope, an old man of seventy-two, roughly dressed, with a long white beard, and emaciated by austerities. When they produced the act of election, and threw themselves at his feet, the astonished hermit knelt to them in return; he said that, before answering, he must consult God by prayer; but, as the result of this was favourable, he accepted the dignity which was offered to him.

Almost from the moment of his acceptance, it was clear that the new pope was utterly unfit for his office. He knew nothing of men or of affairs; he could speak no language but the vulgar tongue; his only qualification was an ascetic piety, if indeed a piety of so very narrow a character were not rather to be regarded as disqualifying him. Charles of Naples speedily discovered that, by professing humble obedience to the successor of St. Peter, he might be able to use him as a tool. When requested by the cardinals to join them at Perugia, Peter wrote to them, under the influence of Charles, excusing himself on account of his age and of the heat, and summoned them to Aquila, within the Neapolitan territory. There a vast multitude—it is said 200,000 persons— assembled to witness the consecration and coronation of the famous hermit, who took the name of Celestine V. He entered the town riding on an ass, whose reins were held by the king of Naples and his son, Charles, titular king of Hungary; and it is said that, after he had dismounted from the animal, a lame boy was healed by being placed on it. The king's influence soon became visible in many ways. Celestine released him from an oath which the cardinals had exacted at Perugia, that, if the pope should die in the Neapolitan territory, Charles would not force them to hold their conclave for a fresh election within his dominions. At his instance, thirteen new cardinals were created—a number sufficient to overpower the older members of the college; and of these seven were Frenchmen, while all were devoted to Charles with the exception of John Gaetani, whose promotion was intended to conciliate his uncle, cardinal Benedict. And, when the cardinals urged Celestine to take up his abode at Rome, he preferred to comply with the king's suggestion by settling at Naples, which under the Angevine sovereigns had superseded Palermo as the capital of the Sicilian kingdom.

But Celestine was also subject to other mischievous influences. He listened to the hermits of the brotherhood which he had founded, and, not content with bestowing privileges on their order, he preferred some of them to offices for which their rudeness and ignorance made them altogether unfit. He was a passive tool of the curialists and canonists. His patronage was badly bestowed, and his secretaries took advantage of his weakness to practise shameless tricks, so that he was induced to put his name to blank bulls, and in some cases to sign several presentations to the same benefice, while these officials pocketed the fees. He endeavoured to keep up his old manner of life by causing a cell like that on the rock of Murrone to be built in his palace; and into this he sometimes withdrew for days, leaving all business in the hands of some cardinals who had gained his confidence. He wished to make the cardinals imitate his own fashion of sanctity by riding on asses, and to force the peculiar garb of the Celestines on the whole Benedictine order. The pope longed for his old seclusion, while it daily became more and more evident that his tenure of the papacy was likely to produce serious disasters.

Cardinal Benedict Gaetani was supposed to have withstood the election of Celestine, and remained behind the other cardinals at Perugia. But after a time he waited on the pope at Aquila, and speedily established a sway over his feeble mind. It is said that he even practised on Celestine's credulity by counterfeiting through a pipe a heavenly voice, which charged the pope to resign his office on peril of losing his soul; and, although this tale seems incredible, there can be little doubt that Gaetani was active and subtle in recommending the idea of a resignation. Urged by him and by others, the pope eagerly listened to counsels which opened the hope of a return to his hermitage. He found, from a collection of canons which was placed in his way, that an ecclesiastic might resign with the permission of his superior; but how could

this principle be applied to the head of Christendom? The question was proposed to Gaetani, who replied that there was a precedent for resignation in the case of the apostolical father St. Clement; for Clement, he said, after having been appointed to the papacy by St. Peter, resigned it, lest it might seem that a pope might nominate his successor. Suspicions of the pope's intention began to circulate, and a mob of Neapolitans, stirred up by the fanatical Celestine hermits, appeared under the windows of his palace, loudly clamouring that he should retain his office. For the time he pacified them with equivocal promises; but preparations were made for carrying out his intention, and, at the suggestion of the cardinals, prayers were put up for the discovery of the will of heaven in the matter.

On the 13th of December, the pope, attired in his robes of office, appeared before the consistory of cardinals, and produced an act of resignation, which he read aloud, professing himself unequal to the burden of his office from age and weakness, and desirous to return to the contemplative life to which he had been accustomed. At the suggestion of a cardinal, a decree sanctioning the resignation of popes was drawn up, which Celestine confirmed by his authority. The pope then put off his robes, resumed the rough attire which he had worn as a hermit, and withdrew, while the cardinals entreated his prayers for the church which his act had left without a shepherd. Those who were devoted to Celestine—the members of his hermit brotherhood, and the Franciscan “fraticelli” with whom they had become connected—while they strongly regretted the resignation, viewed it as an act of transcendent humility, which enhanced the glory of his saintly character. But the more general opinion of his time is probably expressed in the terrible scorn of Dante, who places Celestine immediately within the portals of hell, among those who had lived without either praise or infamy, and whom the poet's guide desires him to pass without bestowing on them the notice of a word.

Ten days after the vacancy of the see, the cardinals held their conclave in the “New Castle” of Naples, and on the same day their choice fell on cardinal Benedict Gaetani, who took the name of Boniface VIII. By what means this result was brought about is not known; but rumour charged the new pope with having made use of much artifice for the purpose. It is said that he secured Charles' influence over the cardinals of the French party by going to him at night, and telling him that Celestine had been unable to serve him in the Sicilian war for want of knowledge; but that he himself, if the king would help him to the papacy, would serve him with understanding, and to the uttermost of his power.

In so far as regarded Sicily, this promise was amply fulfilled; for to Boniface it was due that the struggle there was kept up when Charles must, but for the pope's support, have yielded. But in other things Boniface was determined to be his own master, and in opposition to the king's wishes he set out for Rome. His progress was a triumph, and the most remarkable scene in it was at his native Anagni, where he was received with enthusiasm. On the 23rd of January, his coronation was celebrated with a magnificence beyond all examples. To the crown with which Alexander III is supposed to have enriched the tiara, a second crown was now added, in token of the union of secular with spiritual power; and the kings of Naples and of Hungary held the reins of the pope's white horse, and stood behind his chair at the coronation banquets.

Boniface, although five years older than the effete pope whom he had superseded, was in full possession of his mental vigour. He was strong of will, crafty, rapacious, and filled with the highest ideas of hierarchical domination—with a resolution to recover for the papacy all that it had lost under any of his predecessors, and to exalt it more than ever. But in thinking to renew the triumphs of Gregory VII and Innocent III, he overlooked the adverse circumstances which had arisen since their time—the increase of the royal power in France, the English impatience of Roman rule and aspirations after civil and spiritual liberty, the growth of independent thought in the universities; above all, the great influence of the civil lawyers, who had been trained in the principles of the old imperial jurisprudence of Rome,

and opposed to the pretensions of the hierarchy a rival system, supported by a rival learning, and grounded on a rival authority.

Boniface began his pontificate by revoking the privileges—provisions, dispensations, commendams, and the like—which Celestine had granted, “not in the plenitude of power,” says a contemporary, “but in the plenitude of simplicity.” But as to Celestine himself there was a difficulty. Men were shocked that a choice which was supposed to have been specially directed by the Holy Spirit should be unceremoniously set aside as mistaken. There were many who questioned the validity of his resignation—the fraticelli, the Celestines, and others who, although free from the fanaticism of these, might be disposed, from whatever motives, to set up the hermit afresh as a claimant of the papal chair; and it was very possible that he might be weak enough to become the tool of such malcontents. Boniface at first committed him to the care of the abbot of Monte Cassino; but Peter soon contrived to escape from the abbot’s custody, and made for his old abode on the Majella. The pope heard with uneasiness that at Sulmona he had been received as a worker of miracles, and that a general enthusiasm in his favour was aroused among the multitudes. An order was therefore issued for his arrest; and Peter, after having attempted to escape by embarking on the Adriatic, was seized by some Neapolitan soldiers, and was carried into the presence of his successor. Boniface received him sternly, and ordered him to be conveyed to a castle on the rock of Fumone, where the antipope Burdinus had once been imprisoned; and there a cell was constructed for him like that which he had occupied in earlier days. The treatment which he received in this place is variously reported, according to the prepossessions of the narrators; by some it is said to have been respectful, by others, harsh and strict. The tales which were circulated of his sufferings and of his voluntary mortifications increased the reputation for sanctity which he already possessed, while Boniface was regarded as his oppressor; and when, after ten months of seclusion, Peter died, it was popularly believed that the pope had caused a nail to be driven into his head. Immediately after the hermit’s death, a disciple saw his soul borne up to heaven. His body was carried off by the people of Aquila from its burial-place at Ferentino; and it was only by the assurance that his heart was still among them that the men of Ferentino could be restrained from entering into a deadly feud with their neighbours.

Now that Boniface had gained possession of the highest dignity in Christendom, his imperious pride appeared to get the mastery over the prudence and address for which he had before been noted, and his measures were carried on with a violence which could not fail to exasperate those with whom he was brought into collision. Like most of his family, he had hitherto been a Ghibelline; but he now espoused the Guelf interest as being bound up with that of the papacy. He mixed in the envenomed feuds of the Italian cities with the design of crushing the Ghibellines; and by calling in Charles of Valois as pacificator of Tuscany he has earned the denunciation of the great Florentine poet, whose exile, with that of his party, was among the results of the French prince’s intervention.

Boniface required Charles of Naples to renew the oath of homage to the papal see which his father had taken for Sicily, and he devised a plan by which he hoped to secure that kingdom for the Anjou family. According to this scheme, Charles of Valois was to withdraw the pretension to Aragon and Valencia which was founded on the grant of pope Martin; the pope, assuming a right to dispose of these territories, was to regrant them to the hereditary sovereign, James; and in consideration of this favour, the princes of Aragon were to give up all claim to Sicily. But, although James was willing to agree to the arrangement, his brother Frederick, who was the actual governor of Sicily, was implored by the people to save them from a renewal of the French tyranny, and, in company with John of Procida and Roger de Loria, he waited on the pope at Velletri, in order to represent the wishes of the Sicilians. “Art thou” said Boniface to Roger, “that enemy of the church who has made such slaughter of my people?” “Father,” answered the admiral sternly, “the popes would have me so”. Frederick was tempted with brilliant but shadowy offers, such as a marriage with a daughter of the

dispossessed emperor of Constantinople, which would give him a title to the throne of the East. But his companions persuaded him to defer his answer until after he should have returned to Sicily; and, finding that the islanders were determined not to submit to French rule, he was crowned king at Palermo on Easter-day 1296. It was in vain that the pope denounced him, and aided his rival with money. Frederick's fleets, under Roger de Loria, were victorious over the naval forces of Charles, and part of the mainland was wrested from the French. In 1299, however, the fortune of war was changed. James of Aragon had been appointed standard-bearer of the church and admiral of the papal fleets, and had been invested in Corsica and Sardinia, on undertaking to reduce his former subjects. Roger de Loria, provoked by an unjust suspicion of treason, turned against Frederick, and for a time the Sicilian king had great difficulty in holding his ground. But it would seem that James at length became ashamed of the part which he had taken; and on his leaving Sicily, Frederick's fortunes began to recover. In 1302, Charles of Valois, leaving the Florentine factions more embittered against each other than when he had undertaken to appease them, passed into Sicily; but Frederick wore him out in an irregular warfare, and compelled him to sue for peace. The misfortunes which had attended the French arms in Flanders induced Charles to submit to terms which he might otherwise have refused, and in 1303 the pope was obliged to agree to a treaty by which Frederick was to be released from all ecclesiastical censures to marry a daughter of his rival, and to hold the kingdom of "Trinacria" for life, with the provision that at his death it should fall, not to Naples, but to Aragon.

A contest which touched Boniface more nearly than the affairs of Sicily, was his feud with the Colonnas. This family, which was connected with the ancient counts of Tusculum, appears for the first time in history about the beginning of the twelfth century, when one of them was master of Columna among the Alban hills, with other places in the neighbourhood. On the extinction of the Tusculan family, the Colonnas had succeeded to a part of its possessions, and they now held many fortresses in the neighbourhood of Rome, and exercised a powerful influence in public affairs. The devotion of Nicolas IV to this family has been already mentioned, and it may well be supposed that they were not disposed to acquiesce in changes which tended to destroy their influence. Two of the Colonnas, James and his nephew Peter, were cardinals; they had opposed the resignation of Celestine, and, although they had been tricked into consenting to the election of Boniface, it is said that they had opposed his coronation. Various petty causes occurred to increase the differences between the pope and this powerful family, but it is hardly necessary to look for such motives. To Boniface's new politics the Ghibellinism of the Colonnas made them obnoxious; and it was perhaps the apprehension of consequences from his political conversion that led them to ally themselves with the Aragonese party in Sicily. Boniface, in great exasperation on this account, summoned them to answer, and six days later launched against them a bull in which the whole family were denounced with extraordinary vehemence as enemies of the holy church. The two cardinals were declared to be deposed and excommunicated. Their benefices were taken from them; any ecclesiastic who should acknowledge them in their dignity was to be deprived of all his preferments; any castles or towns which should admit them were to be interdicted; and their nephews to the fourth generation were to be excluded from holy orders.

On the same day when this bull was issued, the cardinals caused a document to be posted on the doors of churches and laid on the high altar of St. Peter's, denying the validity of Celestine's resignation, arguing that, even if that resignation were valid, the election of Boniface was irregular, and appealing against the pope to a general council. This daring protest drew forth from Boniface a bull even more violent than the former. The penalties denounced against the cardinals were extended to the whole Colonna family. Their palace at Rome was demolished; all their property was confiscated; they were required to give up all their fortresses, and, on their refusal to do so, a papal army, under the command of cardinal Matthew of Acquasparta, took the field against them with the character of crusaders and the

promise of the indulgences granted for a holy war. One after another their castles were reduced, until Palestrina alone held out. As its strength seemed likely to defy all assault, the pope summoned to his counsel count Guy of Montefeltro, who, after a long life of warfare as a Ghibelline commander, during which he had often incurred and defied the heaviest censures of the church, had lately made his peace with it, and had withdrawn into a Franciscan cloister at Ancona. The old warrior, after having surveyed the walls of Palestrina, declared that he could not suggest any means of taking it save by the commission of a great sin. The pope eagerly promised absolution for any sin that he might commit by giving his advice; whereupon Guy told him to “promise much, but perform little.” Boniface, it is said, acted without scruple on this hint. The Colonnas were deluded by a promise that mercy should be shown to them if they would submit. The two cardinals, with two of their kinsmen, Agapetus and James, commonly called Sciarra, waited on the pope at Rieti, arrayed in penitential garb, threw themselves at his feet, implored his pardon, and received an assurance of forgiveness; but when the impregnable fortress had been surrendered into his hands, Boniface ordered that it should be razed to the ground, that the site should be ploughed up and sown with salt, and that, in order to maintain unimpaired the number of the cardinal-bishopricks, a new “papal city” should be built in the neighbourhood. And, while the pope thus gratified his love of vengeance, the spoils of the dispossessed Colonnas enabled him to carry out his plans for the aggrandizement of his family by establishing his nephews as princes, and endowing them largely with territories.

The Colonnas dispersed, some to Sicily, some to France, where king Philip was already embroiled with Boniface, and had entered into communication with them. The two cardinals of the family found a refuge at Genoa; and it is said that, when the archbishop of that city appeared at Rome during the solemnities of Ash Wednesday, the pope expressed his indignation on account of the shelter given to them by throwing ashes into his eyes, and by addressing him in words altered from the form of the church—“Remember, Ghibelline, that thou art ashes, and that with the other Ghibellines to ashes thou shalt return!”

Towards princes beyond the Alps Boniface displayed the same imperious temper which had been shown in the affairs of Italy and Sicily. When Adolphus of Nassau, king of the Romans, in consequence of wrongs done to him by Philip of France with regard to the imperial kingdom of Arles, had allied himself with England against France, and had received a subsidy of English money, the pope reprovved him for having degraded the imperial dignity by lightly engaging in war. Adolphus had never been able to make good his position. The ecclesiastical electors, headed by Gerard of Mayence, were dissatisfied with him for having failed to fulfill the promises extorted at his election; and in June 1297, when a great number of princes were assembled at Prague for the coronation of Wenceslaus of Bohemia, Albert of Austria, the son of Rudolf, was able by large promises to win over Gerard and other electors to his interest. A meeting of electors was held at Mayence on the eve of St. John the Baptist 1298, when Adolphus was declared to be deposed for various misdeeds, and Albert was chosen in his stead. Adolphus, after having disregarded three citations to appear before this assembly, was pronounced contumacious; and on the 2nd of July he lost his life at the battle of Gellheim. A more formal election of Albert was then carried at Frankfort, in a more numerous July 27, assembly of princes; and on the 24th of 1298. August he received the German crown at Aix-la-Chapelle from the hands of the archbishop of Cologne. Both the secular and the ecclesiastical electors took the opportunity to make the new king pay for their support, by grants of lands, privileges, and royalties, in diminution of the rights of the crown. The archbishops of Mayence and Cologne got for their own vassals and for the clergy exemptions from the secular courts, similar to those exemptions which Becket had asserted in England and St. Lewis had denied in France; and Albert was afterwards involved in a quarrel with these archbishops on account of the tolls of the Rhine, which had been granted to them, but were so exacted as to be an intolerable burden to the people.

The electors, in notifying their choice to the pope, stated that Albert had been chosen to the vacancy caused by the death of Adolphus. But although the precedent of deposing a king of Germany had been sanctioned, and even suggested, by Gregory VII, this was the first time that the German princes had taken it upon themselves to act in such a matter without the papal authority; and Boniface, who had already denounced Albert, and was especially bitter against him for having connected himself by marriage with the detested Hohenstaufens, now rejected all his overtures, styled him usurper of the kingdom and murderer of his sovereign, and required him to send envoys to clear his innocence, if they could, before the papal tribunal. But, as we shall see hereafter, a more violent enmity in another quarter soon produced a change of tone towards the king of the Romans.

England and France were now matched against each other under able, vigorous, and ambitious sovereigns—Edward I and Philip IV, who, on account of his personal beauty, is distinguished by the epithet of “the Fair.” But Edward, although often involved in continental wars, gradually concentrated his ambition more and more on the object of making all Britain his own by the acquisition of Wales and Scotland. The English clergy were disposed to second their king in this enterprise, and did not remonstrate against any acts either of injustice or of cruelty which he committed in order to accomplish it. But whereas in the late reign the clergy had incessantly complained of the oppressions which they suffered from the Roman court, while the king had usually endeavoured to use the influence of Rome as a counterbalance to the power and pretensions of his own ecclesiastical subjects, the position of things was now changed. The rapid succession of popes had told unfavourably for Rome; and, now that the papacy was less formidable, the English clergy were reconciled with it, so that in any struggle they were likely to take part with the pope against the king.

In France, on the other hand, an antipapal spirit had been growing, even among the clergy. While the influence of the English crown had been sinking throughout the reigns of John and Henry III.—a period of more than seventy years—the royalty of France, under Philip Augustus and St. Lewis, had greatly increased in strength. And Philip the Fair—a man singularly hard, cold, unscrupulous and selfish, thoroughly imbued with the principles of the civil lawyers as to the absolute rights of sovereignty, although without any wider or more generous feeling of care for the general good of his people—was determined to carry the power of the crown yet further, by asserting its claims both over the great feudatories who interfered with the completeness of his despotism at home, and against any pretensions of the hierarchy which might conflict with it. His hostility to the clergy had, indeed, been manifested early in his reign by an ordinance which excluded them from all share in the administration of the laws, and forbade them to appear in courts as advocates, except for chapters and convents. Although many canons of the church might have been produced to the same effect, it was an alarming circumstance that the prohibition now came from the side of the secular power.

Both Edward and Philip were reduced to great difficulties for the means of paying the expenses of their wars. Edward had appropriated to his own use the tenths collected for a crusade. In 1290 he had expelled all Jews from England, and, in consideration of this harshness against a detested people, had got a large subsidy from both laity and clergy. In the following year, when a new levy of a tenth for the Holy Land had been sanctioned by Nicolas IV, the king had taken the opportunity of making a fresh assessment of property at a higher rate than before; and he seized the money collected in cathedrals and monasteries, under pretence of a loan, although much of it was never restored. After this, he demanded of the clergy one-half of their income. It was in vain that they offered a double tenth, or that, in yielding to his full demand, they begged for a repeal of the statute which had been passed early in the reign for the purpose of checking bequests to the church; the king replied that he could not repeal a law which had been enacted by the consent of his parliament, and the clergy were obliged to be content with a redress of some minor grievances. Moreover, to the great

annoyance of the Roman court, he had always disowned the obligation to pay the ignominious tribute which had been exacted from his grandfather, John.

In matters of finance Philip relied greatly on two Florentine bankers who were settled in France, Musciatto and Biccio dei Francesi, and by their advice he had recourse to various arts for raising money. He tampered with the coinage; he got the plate belonging to his nobles into his hands under colour of a sumptuary law. In 1291 he imprisoned all foreign traders, and compelled them to pay for ransom. He expelled the Jews in 1301; but in five years they had returned, and had become so wealthy as to draw on themselves a fresh confiscation and expulsion. But more money was still wanted, and Philip resolved to lay heavy taxes on the clergy, whose wealth had long been increasing in proportion to the increased security of property which had been a result of the late reigns. In requiring the clergy to pay taxes, Philip could plead the example of popes, who had always taxed them for their own purposes, and had often allowed princes engaging in crusades to levy ecclesiastical tenths. But the impost required by Philip, which bore the name of *maltôte*, was new in form, as well as excessive in amount—at first a hundredth, and then a fiftieth, part of the whole property.

By these exactions of the French and English kings Boniface was roused to issue, on the 25th of February 1296, a bull which from its first words is known by the name of *Clericis laicos*—not naming the sovereigns against whom it was directed, but indicating them in a manner which could not be mistaken. In this document—which was indeed founded on a canon of the fourth Lateran council, but in which Boniface carried his prohibitions out more rigidly than Innocent III had ventured to attempt—it is complained that the laity are apt to encroach on the church, and that some prelates pusillanimously acquiesce in their encroachments without having obtained the license of the apostolic see. The pope, therefore, decrees that all who without such license shall have paid or promised any portion of their revenues to laymen, under whatever name or pretext, and all sovereigns who shall have imposed or received such payments, or shall have seized the money deposited in churches, shall *ipso facto incur excommunication, from which they shall not be released except on their death-beds without the special authority and license of the apostolic see.*

Neither in England nor in France was the sovereign disposed to submit tamely to this. Edward held a parliament at Bury St. Edmund's in the end of November, when the laity contributed a subsidy of a twelfth towards the Scottish war, but the clergy, on being asked for a tenth, pleaded that they were exhausted by the taxation of the preceding year, and produced the pope's late bull as exempting them. In this they were headed by the primate, Robert Winchelsey, a man of high ecclesiastical reputation, of strong hierarchical principles, and of very resolute character, who had been on his journey to Rome for the pall when the exaction of one-half was enforced in the preceding year. The parliament was adjourned until the middle of January, when the clergy met in St. Paul's, London. There the tenth was again demanded, with the addition of a fine for the late contumacy; and when the bull *Clericis laicos* was produced on the part of the clergy, it was met by a letter from the king, charging them to refrain from doing anything to the prejudice of the crown. The primate proposed to refer the question to Rome; and Edward, on being informed of this, burst into fury. The chief justice, Roger le Brabazon, told the clergy that, by refusing to contribute towards the expenses of the government, they excluded themselves from its protection and from civil privileges. After some further but useless negotiation, all lay fees of ecclesiastics were ordered to be confiscated. The property of Christchurch, Canterbury, and even the archbishop's riding-horses, were seized; and the monks of the cathedral were reduced to submission by want of the necessaries of life. At this crisis two lawyers and two Dominicans excited some attention by offering, at a council held in St. Paul's, to maintain that the clergy were entitled to aid the crown with money in time of war notwithstanding the pope's prohibition. The archbishop of York and others offered to compound by paying a fourth of their income, in order to pacify the king; most of the clergy followed the example, and the bishop of Lincoln, although he

refused to pay, acquiesced in allowing some of his friends to pay for him. The primate Winchelsey alone continued to hold out; he declared his brethren excommunicate, and withdrew to the parish of Chartham, near Canterbury, where he lived in the simplest fashion with the attendance of a single chaplain.

But at this time the Scots not only repelled the English invaders of their country, but in their turn carried fire and sword into the northern counties of England, while the king was obliged by the threatening aspect of France to resolve on going in person to the war in Flanders. By these common dangers all orders of the English were drawn together, and the stubborn spirit of the primate was brought to accept a compromise. He attended a parliament at Westminster, where a reconciliation was effected between Edward and the various orders of his subjects. But in consideration of this, the king had to make important concessions; the Magna Charta and the Forest charter were confirmed with new securities; and the privilege was secured both for the clergy and for the laity that they should not be taxed except with their own consent. In the following year the archbishop denounced an excommunication against all who should invade ecclesiastical property, infringe the great charter, lay violent hands on clerks or imprison them, and against the Scots who should invade England, or commit acts of waste and violence, with all who should abet them.

In France the king met the papal bull by publishing an ordinance (August 17, 1296) which forbade the exportation of all gold and silver, jewels, arms, horses, or other munitions of war from the realm. By this ordinance, not only were many Italian ecclesiastics deprived of their revenues from benefices which they held in France, but the pope himself was cut off from the sources of income which he had enjoyed in that country. Boniface replied to this measure by a bull (Sep. 21) known by the title of *Ineffabilis*, in which the full assertion of papal and priestly authority is remarkably blended with professions of meekness, and of fatherly care for the king. Blandishments and threats, arguments from spiritual and from temporal considerations, are mixed in a style which, if it may strike us as incongruous, faithfully reflects the various influences of Boniface's position and of his personal character, of the secular and the spiritual pretensions which were now combined in the papacy. He affects to doubt the reports which had reached him as to the king's late edict and the intention of it; if it aimed at an invasion of the church's rights, it was to be described as nothing less than insane, and as having brought the author within the sentence of excommunication. He attributes it to the influence of evil counsellors. He tells Philip that by his oppressive taxation he has chilled the affection of his subjects; that by his aggressions he has provoked the hostility of his neighbours the kings of the Romans, of England, and of Spain; what, then, could be expected, if, when already beset by such perils, he should make the apostolic see also his enemy? The pope dwells pathetically on his long, anxious, watchful care for Philip—his arduous labours before he had attained the papacy, the sleepless nights which he had spent in thinking for the king's good; he speaks of the process which was then going on for the canonization of Lewis IX, and of the melancholy degeneracy of that saintly prince's grandson. If the ordinance was meant as a retaliation for the *Clericis laicos*, that document had been quite misunderstood. It was only a re-enactment of former canons, with the specification of a penalty; it did not forbid ecclesiastics to contribute towards the public service, but merely ordered that this should not be done without the pope's special permission—a provision justified by the late exorbitant taxation of France. To say that the clergy were not now at liberty to give anything to the king was a quibbling misinterpretation of it. The pope declares that he and his brethren were prepared to suffer any extremities for the cause of the church; but that, rather than see the kingdom of France, so dear (yea, so exceedingly dear) to the holy see, in danger, he would not only allow the king to raise money from the clergy, but would give up the crucifixes and sacred vessels of churches. And he concludes by saying that he sends the bishop of Viviers to treat with Philip as his representative.

The king replied in a document which strongly betrays the hand of his legist advisers, and enunciates doctrines which clash violently against those laid down by Boniface as to the relations of the spiritual and the secular powers. Before there were any clergy, he ventures to assert, the kings of France possessed the guardianship of their kingdom and the right of legislation. The church consists, not of clergy alone, but of laity also; and all those whom the Saviour by his death has freed are alike entitled to liberty. The pontiffs of Rome enjoy many special liberties; but this is through the grant of secular princes, and such liberties cannot do away with the rights of sovereigns, forasmuch as the things which are Caesar's are by Divine command to be rendered unto Caesar. No member of a commonwealth may refuse to contribute its share for the government and defence of the whole; and since the property of the clergy is liable to be attacked, it is astounding that the vicar of Christ should contradict the Saviour's words by forbidding clerks, under pain of anathema, to give their fair proportion, while they are freely allowed to spend their money on luxury and revelry. The justice of the national cause is asserted as against the sovereigns whom the pope had spoken of; and the explanation which Boniface had given of his prohibition to pay taxes is retorted on him by a similar explanation of the prohibition to export money and other valuable things from France.

The pope was now in the heat of his struggle with the Colonnas, and was therefore not disposed to provoke the French king. In February 1297 he wrote both to Philip and to the clergy of France, declaring afresh that his bull had been perverted by malicious misinterpretation, and that he allowed the clergy to help their king by their contributions. And in another letter to the king, after laying down the principle that the legislator is the best interpreter of his own law, he declares that ecclesiastics may pay taxes, if they do so without compulsion; that a requisition on the part of the government does not interfere with the freedom of the payment, and that in case of necessity the king may at once levy taxes without asking the papal permission; nor did the pope pretend to interfere with the feudal obligations of the clergy. But at the same time he ordered his legates to denounce the king's officials, or even the king himself, as excommunicate, if he or they should interfere with the transmission of the papal revenue from France. The pope became aware that he could not reckon on the French clergy as his allies; for the archbishop of Reims and his suffragans addressed to him a supplication that he would not continue an interference which disturbed the peace between them and their sovereign. A good understanding appeared to be again established. The pope felt the importance of retaining as his ally that power which had always been the chief supporter of the papacy. He granted Philip the ecclesiastical tenth for three years; he promised to help the king's brother, Charles of Valois, to the throne of Germany and to the imperial crown; and he published a bull for the canonization of the king's grandfather, Lewis IX, which the kings of France had for twenty years been endeavouring to obtain, but which had been hitherto prevented by the frequent vacancies in the papacy. It is remarkable that Boniface, in his later references to this canonization, always speaks of it as if it were not so much a tribute due to the merits of Lewis, as a favour by which the holy see had entitled itself to the gratitude of the saintly king's descendants.

Boniface, in the beginning of his pontificate, had assumed the power of arbitrating between the kings of France and England by sending two cardinals, who were authorized to treat with them, and to release them from any oaths or engagements. But the kings had not been willing to admit such a claim—more especially Philip, who, before the papal letters were read, required the legates to acknowledge his exclusive sovereignty over France; and the legation was without any effect. The pope now again urged his mediation on the kings through the generals of the two great mendicant orders; but although Edward, hard pressed in the Flemish war, welcomed, and even solicited, his interference, Philip would only admit it on condition that the arbiter should not act as pope, but as a private person. Boniface accepted the condition, and on the 30th of June 1298 he issued his award—"as a private person, and Master Benedict Gaetani." But notwithstanding this profession, the document was in the form of a

bull, which was promulgated in a public consistory, and it ordered that the territories which were to be given up on either side should be committed to the keeping of the pope's officers. Philip was very indignant, both because the substance of the judgment was in his opinion too favourable to Edward, and because Boniface had foisted into it that official character which had been expressly excluded by the terms of the arbitration. When the bull was read by a bishop before the king and his council, Count Robert of Artois, Philip's brother, snatched it from the reader's hand, and threw it into the fire, swearing that he would not allow the pope to treat the king and the kingdom so ill; and such was the general feeling of the French nobles.

Philip saw that a severe contest with Boniface was at hand, and began to make preparations for it. He entered into close relations with the banished Colonnas, and entertained in his court two members of the family—Stephen, a nephew of the elder cardinal, and James, who was known by the name of Sciarra—a man who carried to an extreme the rude lawlessness for which the race was noted, and whom it is said that Philip had redeemed from captivity among pirates. The king also concluded a formal alliance with Albert of Austria, whom the pope had steadily refused to acknowledge as king of the Romans. This alliance was “against every man”—a phrase which clearly included the pope, if it was not even intended expressly to point at him; and the announcement of it which Philip sent to Boniface—stating that the treaty set him at liberty for a crusade (which Boniface well knew that he did not seriously intend to undertake)—was rather alarming than assuring.

But at this time Boniface was engaged in a celebration which in great measure diverted his thoughts from other affairs, and which displayed the papacy in its greatest splendour. In the beginning of the year 1299, expectations began to be vaguely current at Rome that the last year of the century would be distinguished by extraordinary spiritual privileges; and on Christmas-day St. Peter's was filled by crowds, all eagerly expecting something, although not knowing what this was to be. How these expectations were suggested, does not appear; for the assertion on which they rested, that every previous centenary year had been distinguished in like manner, was utterly fabulous. But the craving for indulgences, which had been excited by the crusades, was as strong as ever, although the crusades were at an end; and it turned not unnaturally towards Rome for that satisfaction which was no longer to be sought in the Holy Land. At length, it is said, the report of the general agitation reached the ears of the pope, who thereupon caused an inquiry to be made; and, although the written documents did not give such testimony as was desired, the defect was readily accounted for by ascribing it to the supposed loss of records, and to the troubles of former times. Boniface, easily satisfied on this point, took up the matter with an energetic zeal which has led some writers to suppose that the first suggestion of the jubilee was his own; and after a time living evidence was produced in favour of the general belief. One very aged man declared that, as a boy of seven, he had attended the jubilee a hundred years before, and gave testimony as to the indulgences then bestowed. Another old impostor, a Savoyard of respectable station, appeared at Rome carried by his two sons, and told a similar story; and it was said that other survivors of the last jubilee were still to be found in France.

On the 22nd of February a bull was issued, promising indulgences of extraordinary fullness to all who, within the current year, should with due penitence and devotion visit the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul—Romans for thirty successive days, and strangers for fifteen—and directing that the jubilee should in future be celebrated every hundredth year. But from the benefits of this indulgence the enemies of the church were to be excluded; and among these were expressly named Frederick of Sicily, the Colonnas, and those who should receive them—a description which included Philip of France. From every part of Latin Christendom crowds of persons of all ranks began to pour towards Rome. The chronicler John Villani, who was present, says that there were always 200,000 strangers in the city; another chronicler tells us that it seemed as if an army were marching each way at all hours along a certain street; and a more illustrious eye-witness, Dante, who visited Rome at this time as an

envoy from the republic of Florence, draws a simile from the multitudes who passed to and from St. Peter's along the bridge of St. Angelo, which, in order to avoid confusion, was divided by a partition. The poet was not conciliated either towards the papacy or towards the pope by the scenes which he witnessed at the jubilee.

The measures taken for the sustenance of the vast multitude were so successful that Boniface's eulogists find in them a parallel to the multiplication of the loaves and fishes in the Gospel story. Rents were indeed high, and, in consequence of the great number of horses which were brought together, the price of fodder was increased; but by taking timely advantage of an unusually copious harvest, the pope was able to provide such stores of food that the pilgrims found it both plentiful and cheap. At Christmas, when the year of jubilee naturally ended, the time of indulgence was extended by a papal letter to the following Easter, and a share of its privileges was declared to be bestowed on such pilgrims as died on their journey. The wealth which flowed into the papal coffers from the jubilee was enormous. Offerings were heaped up on the altars of the basilicas which contained the tombs of St., Peter and St. Paul. A chronicler tells us that at St. Paul's he saw two of the clergy with rakes in their hands, employed day and night in "raking together infinite money"; and, although Boniface bestowed a portion of the receipts in adding to the property of two great churches, there can be no reasonable doubt that much remained in his own hands.

It is said that Boniface, after having appeared in pontifical robes at the opening of the jubilee, showed himself next day in the attire of an emperor, with a sword in his hand, quoting the text "Behold here are two swords"; and that when ambassadors from Albert appeared for the purpose of entreating that he would relent towards their master, and bestow on him the imperial crown, he received them sitting on his throne with a sword at his side, and the "crown of Constantine" on his head, and, laying his hand on the hilt of the sword, answered that he himself was Caesar and emperor, as well as successor of St Peter. The pope was now at the height of his greatness. Although some of his pretensions had not passed without question, he had never yet been foiled in any considerable matter; and, while the enthusiasm of the jubilee filled his treasury, the veneration of the congregated multitudes waited on him as uniting the highest spiritual and temporal dominion.

AFFAIRS OF SCOTLAND

It would be out of place to relate here in detail the course of affairs in Scotland after the death of Alexander III;—how Edward, acting as arbiter between the rival claimants of the crown, had set up the weak John Balliol, who, at his coronation, did homage to the king of England as his suzerain; how Balliol, on displaying some feeling of the independent rights of his kingdom, was ignominiously compelled by his patron to resign, and, while Edward proceeded to treat Scotland as a fief which had become vacant, and so was at the disposal of the over-lord, a national resistance was organized under William Wallace, a private gentleman, who, although the great nobles of the country in general stood aloof from him, for a time heroically made head against the English, and even carried the war into the enemy's land. But the overthrow of the Scots at the battle of Falkirk had compelled Wallace to seek a refuge in France, and Edward required the Scots to do homage to him as suzerain. On this, the Scottish regency, acting in Balliol's name, appealed to Boniface, claiming the pope as the immediate suzerain of the kingdom—a connection of which traces had not been wanting in earlier times, and which may indeed have naturally arisen out of a wish to provide against the encroachments of a powerful neighbour, by admitting a subjection which other nations also acknowledged, and in which there was not necessarily anything degrading. To such an appeal Boniface was not likely to turn a deaf ear; and, having been in England with cardinal Ottobuoni in his legation, thirty years before, he was able to discuss the matter with some knowledge of the circumstances. wrote to Edward that Scotland, as an ancient catholic

country, had always been immediately subject to the holy see; that her kings had owned no feudal subjection to the English crown except for such lands as they held within the English border; that the independence of Scotland appeared from the fact that a legate commissioned to England could not without a fresh commission enter the more northern kingdom. The king was desired to release the Scottish bishops and ecclesiastics whom he held in prison, and, if he still supposed himself to have any title to Scotland, he was required to send representatives, with evidence in behalf of his claim, within six months to the papal court, to which Boniface professed to reserve all such questions.

This document was entrusted to the archbishop of Canterbury, who, not without some serious peril, conveyed it to Edward, whom he found besieging Caerlaverock castle. On hearing the contents of the bull, with some words of the archbishop about Jerusalem and Sion protecting their people, the king is said to have burst out, "By God's blood, for Sion's sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest, so long as breath is in my nostrils, from defending with all my might what all the world knows to be my right!". He deferred his formal answer; but he practically showed his regard for the papal mandate by proceeding to require the homage of a new bishop of Glasgow, and he took measures for putting his pretensions into the most imposing shape. Letters were addressed to abbots and deans, desiring them to search the archives of their churches for evidence on the subject, and to send it to a parliament which was to be held at Lincoln; and with a like object each of the universities was desired to send some of its learned men to the same parliaments. The parliament met accordingly; five representatives from Oxford and five from Cambridge asserted the legality of the king's claims over Scotland, a hundred and four nobles, headed by Bigod earl of Norfolk and Bohun earl of Hereford (usually opponents of the crown), subscribed a document in which it was declared that the pope's claim was a novelty; that England had always held the superiority over Scotland, without being responsible to any one; that, even if the king were disposed to argue the question before the pope, they would not allow him to stoop so low; and they beg the pope to leave him undisturbed in the enjoyment of his rights. Edward himself wrote to request that Boniface would not be misled by false information; and (in order, as he professed, to explain the truth of the case, not as acknowledging the pope's jurisdiction) he entered into a statement of his claims, in which the suzerainty of England was deduced from the fabulous history of Geoffrey of Monmouth. Boniface was too deeply engaged in his quarrel with France to reply to these representations. But he put the English case into the hands of the Scottish ambassador, Baldred Bisset, and in due time the English claim, derived from Brute the Trojan and other such legendary worthies, was confronted by one which rested on the equally authentic history of the princess Scota, daughter of king Pharaoh of Egypt, while the papal suzerainty was deduced from Constantine's donation, which bestowed all islands on pope Sylvester and his successors.

The differences with Philip had become more complicated and more serious. In 1299 the pope had suspended two bishops in the south of France, and Philip had attempted to exercise the *regale* by seizing the incomes of their sees as in a case of vacancy. But the pope objected on the ground that suspension did not vacate a see, and, with a view to this and other affairs, he sent as legate into France Bernard de Saisset, bishop of Pamiers. The see of Pamiers—a city which was formerly subject to the counts of Foix, and, in consequence of the Albigensian war, had passed first to the elder Simon de Montfort, and afterwards to the crown—had been created by Boniface in 1296, without asking the king's consent; and it had been bestowed on Bernard, who was abbot of a monastery which became the cathedral, and who, as abbot, was lord of the city—an arrogant, violent, and turbulent man. The choice of such an envoy seems to indicate an intention to irritate the king; and when Bernard remonstrated as to the treatment of the count of Flanders, whom Philip had treacherously imprisoned, with his wife and daughter, the king reminded the legate that he was his subject. The legate replied that, although Pamiers was in France, he acknowledged no lord but the

pope; whereupon the king in anger dismissed him, and sent him back to Rome. Boniface, however, took no other notice of his offence than by sending him home to his diocese.

Philip, provoked by this, caused information to be collected against Bernard—some of it, it is said, by torturing his servants—and the bishop was brought to trial before a parliament at Senlis, where Peter Flotte, one of the ablest of the king's legal counsellors, brought forward a monstrous set of charges against him—that he had spoken in gross disparagement of the king, both as to his descent and as to his personal character; that he had abused the French nation as compared with the men of the South; that he had entered into treacherous correspondence with the king of England; that he had denied that Pamiers was in the kingdom of France, and had attempted to stir up the count of Foix and others to revolt; that he had declared, on the authority of a pretended prophecy of St. Lewis, that the kingdom of France was to come to an end under the reigning sovereign. Of these charges some are utterly incredible, and their character throws suspicion over the rest. But the bishop, notwithstanding his denials, was condemned, and the king made him over to his metropolitan, the archbishop of Narbonne, for degradation. The archbishop, however, who was under special obligations to the pope for having supported him against Philip on a former occasion, insisted that the bishop should not be treated as a prisoner, although he ordered him to be watched; and the pope required that he should be sent to Rome for judgment. The chancellor, Peter Flotte, was sent to urge the king's suit against the bishop, and with him was William of Nogaret, a lawyer of acute mind and daring spirit, who is said to have been animated by the remembrance that his grandfather had been burnt at Toulouse as a heretic. These envoys were instructed to charge the bishop, among other things, with having spoken violently, not only against the king, but against the pope himself.

The mission served only to bring out more distinctly the irreconcilable difference between the parties. At the last interview, it is said that Boniface angrily declared that he possessed the temporal power as well as the spiritual; to which Peter Flotte replied, "Your power is only in words; but ours is real."

The pope, greatly incensed, issued four documents which bear date on the same day. In one of these, he desired Philip to release the bishop of Pamiers, to allow him to go freely to Rome, and to give up his confiscated property. By another, he summoned the prelates and other representatives of the French clergy to a council which was to be held at Rome in the following November, with a view to the redress of the French church's grievances—a daring and unprecedented assumption of power over a prince's ecclesiastical subjects. A third document, known by the title of *Salvator mundi*, suspended all privileges which had been granted to Philip or to his predecessors. But the most noted of the four was a long letter addressed to Philip, and beginning with the words *Ausculta, fili*. In this, affecting a tone of parental solicitude, Boniface solemnly reminds the king of his Christian profession. He lays down that God had set the pope over kings and kingdoms, "to pluck down, destroy, scatter, rebuild, and plant." He reproves Philip for the faults of his government—that he had oppressed his people, falsified the coinage, invaded the patronage of ecclesiastical dignities, seized the income of vacant sees, prevented intercourse with the Roman court, interfered with the immunities of the clergy, both as to taxation and as to jurisdiction; and that, although already often admonished as to these faults, he had not corrected them. The pope contrasts Philip's apathy as to the cause of the Holy Land with the zeal of his crusading ancestors; he warns him against the deceits of evil counsellors, who "like false prophets" lead him astray; and he invites him to appear in person or by proxy before the council which was about to assemble at Rome.

Philip, instead of allowing this manifesto to provoke him to any rash action, proceeded to meet it with a calculating coolness. After deep consideration with his counsellors, he resolved to drop the affair of the bishop of Pamiers, lest other bishops of his kingdom should be alienated from him, and to concentrate all his energies on a direct opposition to the pope.

Bernard de Saisset was allowed to accompany the envoy who had brought the papal letters on his return to Rome. The bull *Ausculda* was read before a crowd of nobles and knights assembled in the royal court, when the king declared that he would not acknowledge his own sons for his heirs if they admitted any authority over the kingdom of France, save that of God alone; and a general feeling of indignation was aroused among the hearers.

About the same time another document was circulated, which is known by the name of the *Short Letter* or *Lesser Bull*. In substance, this contained nothing but what was in the *Ausculda fili*; but it is a question whether it really proceeded from the pope, or whether—with its peremptory shortness, its neglect of the usual greetings, its abrupt and rude manner of stating the most offensive Roman claims, its omission of those charges which, as stated in the *Ausculda*, might have excited Philip's subjects against him—it ought not to be considered as an abridgment, drawn up by some of the king's legal counsellors for the purpose of rendering the pope odious to the commonalty of France. And with this letter was circulated an answer, in the king's name, of equal brevity, meeting the pope's assertions with direct contradiction in a tone of coarse and even vulgar insolence. From these short documents the popular opinion as to the contents of the larger bull, and as to the merits of the quarrel between the pope and the king, was derived; and, trusting to the impression thus produced, Philip, a fortnight after the reading of the *Ausculda* before his nobles, caused it to be burnt in his own presence, and the burning to be proclaimed with the sound of the trumpet through the streets of Paris.

Philip had now assured himself that, notwithstanding all the reasons for dissatisfaction which he might have given his subjects, he could rely on them in a contest with the pope; and on the 10th of April 1302 an assembly of the estates of the realm met in the cathedral of Paris. It was the first time that the representatives of the towns—the *third estate*—had been summoned to sit with the clergy and nobles; and it has been remarked that, whereas in England the representation of the commons had been instituted by the barons in their contest with the crown, in France it was the most despotic of her mediaeval sovereigns that called them in as allies in a struggle for national independence against the pope. But Philip was safe in reckoning that, in their delight and surprise at finding themselves acknowledged as a part of the national legislature, the commons would be ready to lend themselves as passive instruments of his will.

The proceedings were opened by the chancellor, Peter Flotte, in a speech which was intended to conciliate all the orders by enlarging on the encroachments which each of them had suffered at the hands of the papacy. To the clergy he pointed out that the pope bestowed French churches on foreigners who did not reside on their preferments; that he deprived the bishops of their patronage, interfered with the exercise of their duties, preyed on them by making it necessary that they should continually offer presents, and taxed the church enormously by exactions of all sorts. He asked the assembled representatives of France whether the kingdom was to stand immediately under God, or to be subject to the pope. The impetuous count Robert of Artois declared that, if the king were disposed to submit to the pope, the nobles would not submit; and Peter du Bose, a Norman lawyer, brought a written charge of heresy against Boniface, for having attempted to deprive the king of that which he held from God. The clergy yielded to the general feeling—perhaps the more readily because the overwhelming force of the lay orders furnished an excuse which might be pleaded to the pope; but they asked leave to attend the proposed council at Rome, and met with a refusal. Each of the orders drew up a letter—that of the clergy addressed to the pope; the others, to the cardinals. The clergy, while they approach the pope with a tone of deep respect, are careful to inform him of the hard things which had been said against him by the king and the nobles; they speak clearly of the many late encroachments of Rome on France; and they explain that they had been driven by the difficulties of their position to declare themselves bound by feudal duty to the king. The barons and the third estate wrote in their native language. The

nobles dwell on the violent and wrongful acts of the existing pope, which, they say, had disturbed the ancient friendship between the Roman church and the kingdom of France, and they declare that nothing could induce them to seek redress of any grievances which they might have from the pope, or from any other authority than their king. The letter of the third estate is unfortunately lost.

To the letters of the lay orders the cardinals replied by denying the truth of some charges which had been brought against the pope, and by justifying his proceedings as to other points. "We wish you", they told the nobles, "to be assured that our lord, the chief pontiff, never wrote to the king that he was temporally subject to him in respect of his kingdom, and ought to hold it from him... Wherefore, the proposition which Peter Flotte has advanced, had a sandy and false foundation, and, therefore, the superstructure must of necessity fall." The pope's answer to the clergy (*Verba delirantis*) was in a more violent strain. The words of a daughter who is beside herself, he says, however monstrous they may be, cannot stain the purity of her mother, or change the mother's love into hatred. Yet, while vehemently rebuking the French clergy for their weakness in yielding to secular force, and allowing themselves to be misled by "that Belial, Peter Flotte, half-seeing in body, and wholly blind in mind," he, like the cardinals, declares that his former statement as to the relations of the papacy and the French kingdom had been misunderstood; that he had never claimed temporal suzerainty over France, as over some other kingdoms. But, he said, no one could deny that the king was subject to him "in respect of sin"; the temporal power must be under the spiritual; for to hold otherwise would be the error of believing in the existence of two independent principles.

Soon after the date of this letter, a consistory was held at Rome at which the same line was taken by the speakers. The cardinal of Porto, Matthew Acquasparta, denied that the pope had ever said that the king ought to consider himself as holding his crown under the church. There are, he said, two jurisdictions—the spiritual, which belongs to the pope as chief, and the temporal, which belongs to kings and emperors. The pope may take cognizance of all temporal matters, and may judge of them in respect of sin : and thus temporal jurisdiction belongs to him of right, as vicar of Christ and of St. Peter. But it does not belong to him as to use and actual execution; wherefore, it was said to St. Peter, "Put up thy sword into the sheath".

The cardinal's speech was followed by one from the pope, who began in a conciliatory tone—setting out with the text "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder," and professing an earnest regard for the welfare of the king of France. But by degrees Boniface's passion broke out. He spoke vehemently of the king's offences against the church; of his evil counsellors, especially Peter Flotte, "that Ahithophel, that man of the devil, whom God hath already punished in part—partly blind in body, wholly blind in mind—that man of vinegar and gall, a man to be accounted and condemned as an heretic," who had falsified his letter, or had given the king a false idea of it. He disavowed, as before, all intention of encroaching on the king's rights, and repeated the distinction as to a jurisdiction "in respect of sin"; he invidiously pointed out the dangers which threatened Philip from his neighbours, and applied to the French the words which St. Bernard had used of the Romans—"As you love no one, so no one loves you." And he ended with a declaration that, as his predecessors had already deposed three kings of France, so now, in case of obstinacy, he would depose Philip "like a groom." The ambassadors of France had been invited to the consistory, and heard the pope's language against their sovereigns.

The difficulties to which the pope had referred as encompassing Philip were now very serious. At Bruges, which he had reduced to subjection, there had been an outbreak against the French; the spirit of insurrection spread rapidly among the Flemings, and at the battle of Courtray, on the 11th of July 1302, a great defeat was inflicted by the despised burghers on the army of France—Robert of Artois and Peter Flotte, two of the most conspicuous enemies of the papacy, being among the slain. The pope had encouraged the Flemings, and had even

supplied them with money, while Philip had renewed, in more stringent terms than before, his order against the exportation of gold and silver from France.

Encouraged by the sight of Philip's difficulties, forty-five prelates of various classes, and headed by the archbishop of Tours, defied the king's authority by setting out for the council which had been summoned to meet at Rome in November. Philip, in great indignation, summoned them to return. At the council, excommunication was denounced against any one—even if he were a king or an emperor—who should hinder or molest persons going to or returning from the papal court and a constitution, known by the name of *Unam sanctam*, was issued, in which Boniface, while adhering to the limitations of his power which he had before laid down, declared very strongly its superiority over all temporal authority. When, he says, the apostles said, "Behold, here are two swords," the Lord did not answer "It is too much," but "It is enough"; therefore, the temporal as well as the spiritual power is in the church, and any one who denies that St. Peter has the temporal sword, misunderstands the words "Put up thy sword into the sheath." The spiritual sword is to be exercised by the church, the material sword for the church; the one, by the hands of priests, the other, by the hands of kings and soldiers. The temporal must be subject to the spiritual power as the lower to the higher; the spiritual power has the right to judge the other, according to the prophecy of Jeremiah (I. 10)— "See, I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." Earthly power is accountable to the spiritual power; but no spiritual power is accountable, except to a higher power of the same kind, and the highest is accountable to God alone.

CARDINAL LE MOINE.

There was still on both sides an unwillingness to proceed to extremities. Philip declared himself ready to submit to the arbitration of the dukes of Burgundy and Brittany, while the pope sent as legate John le Moine, cardinal of SS. Marcellinus and Peter, a Frenchman by birth, and highly regarded by the king. The legate was charged to restrain Philip from his evil courses, especially from his oppression of the church, and to summon him to appear by proxy before the court of Rome in order to answer for having burnt the papal bull; but there was reason to suspect that the real object of his mission was to obtain information for the pope, and to tamper with the clergy who adhered to the king. Philip's answers were vague and unsatisfactory. He affected to suppose that the charge of having destroyed a bull referred to a document which concerned the church of Laon; and he declared that he had torn up that bull as being useless—not out of any disrespect to the pope. The mission of Cardinal le Moine, therefore, came to nothing; and Boniface complained of the manner in which his charge had been met, and of the treatment which his legate had experienced.

Each party now looked forward to a struggle for the sake of which all lesser differences must be sacrificed. Philip was fain to make peace with England, by ceding Aquitaine to Edward, and by abandoning his allies the Scots. Boniface, after all the indignation which he had expressed against Frederick of Sicily, and although he had lately refused to confirm a peace which Charles of Valois had made with his rival, acknowledged the Aragonese prince as king of Trinacria, and admitted him to fealty. And now the pope was even glad to overlook all the defects on which he had before insisted in Albert's title as king of the Romans. He invited him to send ambassadors to the papal court; he dwelt on the merits of his father Rudolf towards the apostolic see; he annulled by a formal document all irregularities which might affect his claims; he extolled the imperial dignity as a sort of secular papacy, to which all other princes ought to be subject, and through the abeyance of which it was that the king of France had presumed, with the characteristic pride of his nation, to claim independence of any superior. The princes of the empire were charged to pay

allegiance to Albert; and Albert, glad to obtain such countenance on any terms, subscribed to all that his father had conceded in favour of Rome. He acknowledged that Charlemagne had received the empire from the holy see, nay, that the electors derived their power from the papacy; and he promised to defend the pope against all injury.

On the 13th of April, Boniface, having received from the cardinal-legate a report of his unsatisfactory negotiations with Philip, sent forth a brief by which it was declared that the king had incurred the penalty of excommunication by preventing the attendance of bishops at the late Roman council. Any ecclesiastic who might minister in his presence was likewise to be excommunicate; and the sentence was to be proclaimed throughout the kingdom.

But a month before this Philip had held a great assembly of nobles, with two archbishops and three bishops, at the Louvre, where William of Nogaret, who had succeeded Peter Flotte in the chancellorship, stood forward to charge Boniface with invasion of the holy see, with being a heretic and a simoniac, “such as no one ever was from the beginning of the world”, and with other grievous crimes. For these he required that the pope should be tried before a general council, which he maintained that the king was entitled to summon; and that in the meantime Benedict Gaetani should be kept in safe custody, while a vicar should be appointed for the performance of the papal functions.

The messengers who conveyed the excommunication of Philip into France had probably allowed the nature of their errand to become known. They were seized and imprisoned. It was in vain that the legate desired that their papers should be given up to him; and he had to bear the insult of seeing on the door of his own lodging, in the convent of St. Martin at Tours, the proclamation by which the king summoned a second meeting of the national estates for the consideration of the pope’s offences. The property of the prelates who had attended the Roman council was confiscated. The Inquisition was denounced as inhuman by the king in a letter to the bishop of Toulouse. And, with a view to win all orders to his side, Philip set forth an ordinance of March 23, reformation, offering redress of grievances to every class of his subjects, and especially to the clergy, whose support he was desirous to secure in the struggle with Rome.

On the 13th of June the second assembly of the estates-general met at the Louvre. William of Nogaret had set out for Italy two months before, but his place as accuser was taken by William of Plasian, a knight and counsellor of the parliament of Paris, with whom were associated the count of Evreux, brother of the king, and the counts of St. Pol and Dreux. Plasian professed that he was not moved by any malice against Boniface, but solely by anxiety for the church; and he brought forward twenty-nine articles of accusation, to the truth of which he swore. Of these charges some related to the alleged irregularity of Boniface’s promotion to the holy see; some, to faults of administration; some were imputations of the worst offences—heresy, unbelief, denial of the soul’s immortality, cruelty, lust of the most execrable kinds, sorcery, murder; while some were intended to exasperate the hearers by representing him as an enemy of the French nation. He was said to have declared, before his elevation, that, if he were pope, he would rather upset all Christendom and the world than refrain from destroying “the pride of France”; it was alleged that his political intrigues had been directed to this object, which he had avowed by allying himself with Albert of Germany, after having denounced him in unmeasured terms; and the king was requested, as champion of the church and defender of the faith, to procure the assembling of a general council. Philip, after professing that he would rather cover the faults of his spiritual father with his own mantle than display them, declared that he appealed against any sentence of excommunication and interdict to a general council and to a pope lawfully chosen; and he desired those who were present to join in this appeal. The bishops and abbots complied, although they expressed a hope that Boniface would be able to clear himself of the charges against him. The archbishop of Narbonne, however, distinguished himself from his brethren by bringing forward ten articles against the pope : among others, that he denied the immortality of the

soul, that he had aided the king of England against France, had instigated the Saracens to invade Sicily, and had become the father of children by two of his own married nieces. It would appear that these and other charges had long been circulated in France, through the influence of cardinals, and even, in some cases, by Boniface's own representatives. In consequence of the proceedings of the states-general, about seven hundred memorials were drawn up, all desiring a general council, but guarding their respect for the Roman see by joining with that object a lawfully-elected pope. Among the subscribers of these memorials were archbishops and bishops, nobles of all grades, the abbots of Cluny, Citeaux, Fontevraud, and Prémontré, representatives of universities, members of religious orders, and even nine cardinals. It is said, however, that among the signatures some were forged—among them, that of the abbot of Citeaux. The clergy also signed an agreement for mutual defence with the king and the barons, against whatsoever person might be disposed to attack them, and even against Boniface by name. William of Nogaret, who was already in Italy, was commissioned to present these documents to the pope, and all ecclesiastics were forbidden more strictly than before to leave the kingdom without permission.

Boniface, partly from fear of the heats of summer, partly, perhaps, from apprehension of some danger, had withdrawn from Rome to his native Anagni, where on the 15th of August he held a consistory. Passing over (as he probably was entitled to do) the personal charges against him, as unworthy of his notice, he purged himself by oath of the charge of heresy, and declared that he had provoked it only by endeavouring to heal the king's sins. He spoke with indignation of Philip's having received Stephen Colonna at his court. He asserted with his usual vehemence the superiority of the papacy over all earthly power, and he concluded his speech by announcing his intention of issuing a bull of deposition against Philip. Immediately after this, four bulls were despatched into France; by one of these the ecclesiastical bodies were forbidden to elect to any dignity or benefice, so long as the king should be at variance with the church; by another, the universities were suspended, during the continuance of the same circumstances, from teaching, and from conferring degrees in Divinity, canon law and civil law.

The bull of deposition was prepared. In this the pope began by declaring his authority, and setting forth his course of gentle dealing with Philip. The king had committed many offences, especially by hindering access to the apostolic see, by his proceedings as to the bishop of Pamiers, by seizing some papal envoys, by receiving the excommunicated Stephen Colonna and other members of the same family; and, as he had refused the pope's messengers, and at last his son, the cardinal of SS. Marcellinus and Peter, there was reason to dread that the vineyard might be let out to others. The pope, therefore, declares him to be deposed, absolves his subjects from their allegiance, and forbids all communion with him. It was intended that this bull should be published at the cathedral of Anagni on Sunday the 8th of September, the Nativity of the blessed Virgin; but before that day the pope's enemies took effectual means to prevent the execution of his design.

William of Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna, both so deeply committed against Boniface that their only hope of safety lay in his ruin, had appeared in Italy, and had taken up their abode with the king's Florentine banker, Musciatto dei Francesi, at Stoggia, a castle belonging to him, between Florence and Siena. They were authorized to draw money from Philip's bankers at Florence, and by means of this they were able to secure to their interest many of the petty nobles of the Campagna, who were embittered against Boniface by the aggrandizement of his family at their expense, and to enlist a force of men who either were hostile to Boniface or were ready to serve in any cause for pay. On the morning of the 7th of September this force, three hundred horsemen, with a considerable number of infantry, suddenly appeared at Anagni. The citizens, roused by the sound of the alarm-bell, assembled, and chose a nobleman of the Campagna, Adenulf, as their captain; but Adenulf, who entertained an old enmity against the pope, proved treacherous, and aided the assailants. These soon forced an entrance

into the town, and beset the pope's palace, displaying French banners, and shouting "Death to Boniface! Long live the king of France!" with the national battle-cry of "Montjoie!". A truce of some hours was agreed on, and the pope (who had neglected all warnings of the design against him) sent to ask the leaders of the party with what terms they would be satisfied. The reply was, that he should resign his office, restore the Colonnas to their property and dignities, and should place himself in the hands of Sciarra. This proposal was necessarily refused, and on the expiration of the truce the assault was renewed. The assailants set fire to the doors of a church which adjoined the palace, and made their way through the flames. They overpowered and seized Boniface's nephew, the marquis Gaetani; and the doors which separated them from the pope himself were one after another forced. Boniface, hearing the successive crashes, and finding himself deserted, resolved to end his life with dignity,—to "die like a pope." Putting on the papal mantle, and the imperial "crown of Constantine," holding his pastoral cross in one hand and the symbolical keys of St. Peter in the other, he took his seat on the throne, and with stem resolution awaited the approach of his enemies. As they entered, they were awed for a moment at the sight of the high-hearted old man, whom religion had invested with so venerable a character; but speedily angry words were exchanged. Sciarra Colonna peremptorily required the pope to resign. "Behold," he answered, "my neck and my head! If I have been betrayed like Christ, I am ready to die like Christ's vicar". Sciarra dragged him from his throne; according to some accounts, he struck him on the face with his gauntleted hand, so as to draw blood; and he would probably have killed him, had not Nogaret interposed. Nogaret, it is said, called the pope a most vile heretic, and told him that he must appear before a general council—that, if he would not go voluntarily, he should be carried by force to Lyons; whereupon Boniface, reckless of the effect, exclaimed that he was no heretic, but was content to suffer at the hands of a patarine, whose father and mother had been burnt as patarines.

Boniface was put under a guard, and, after having been paraded through the town on a vicious horse, with his face towards the tail, was committed to prison, while the captors plundered the palaces and churches of Anagni of immense wealth which was contained in them. But, whether from the want of a plan or from hesitation to carry it out, they took no further steps for the disposal of the prisoner until, on the morning of the second day, the people of Anagni with some of their neighbours, under cardinal Luke Fiesco, rose on them, surprised and killed the soldiers who had the care of the pope's person, and drove the rest of the force from the town. Boniface was brought forth into the market-place, where a multitude crowded to see him. Since his capture, he had not tasted any food—perhaps he had refused it from fear of poison. After having thanked those around him, with a profusion of tears, he entreated that some good woman would charitably save him from dying of hunger, promising absolution from all sins to any one who should bring anything for his relief. The multitude responded by a shout of "Life to you, holy father!". Women dispersed in all directions, to return with large supplies of bread, wine, and water; and, after having recruited himself with some refreshment, the pope talked familiarly with all who chose to approach him. He pronounced a general absolution of all but the plunderers of the church; he declared himself willing to restore the Colonnas; and he announced an intention of going to Rome and summoning a general council. The Romans, alarmed by the reports which had reached them, sent some soldiers, who served as an escort, and by them he was conducted to Rome, although not without encountering an attack by the Colonna party on the way.

On reaching the city, Boniface was placed under the care of the Orsini—the hereditary enemies of the Colonnas. But his late sufferings, both of body and of mind, had told strongly on a man of eighty-six; and he appears to have fallen into a frenzy fever, which made it necessary to place him under restraint. On the 11th of October the pope was found dead in his chamber. By some writers his death is attributed to grief; by some, to poison; while others tell the story with horrible details—that he refused food, and, like a mad dog, bit

his own flesh that he was found lying in bed, as if he had suffocated himself with the bed-clothes,—his staff gnawed by him in his rage, his head wounded by having been dashed against the wall, and his white hair encrusted with blood.

“He entered like a fox, reigned like a lion, and went out like a dog.” Such was a description of Boniface’s career, uttered, no doubt, after the event, but soon popularly changed into the form of a prophecy, which Celestine was supposed to have spoken when visited in his confinement at Fumone by his supplanter and persecutor. The circumstances of his death produced a general horror, which was felt even by those who abhorred the man, while they revered the office which had been so atrociously outraged in him and tales of judgments denounced by him on his enemies, and of terrible fulfillments of his curses, were eagerly circulated and believed. But the end of Boniface involved far more than his own ruin. He had attempted to strain the papal power too far, and after his failure it never recovered the ascendancy which he had rashly hazarded in the endeavour to gain a yet more absolute dominion.

CHAPTER VI

PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL.

1

THE TARTARS

WE have seen that the Christian kingdom of which the sovereign was known in Europe as Prester John, was overthrown in 1202 by the Tartars under Genghis Khan, who reigned till 1226. Yet it is said that the conqueror added to the number of his wives a daughter of the king whom he had dethroned, and that through her favour Christianity was still in some measure kept up in north-eastern Asia, although in connexion with the Nestorians. The kingdom of Prester John, as it disappeared from the knowledge of the western Christians, became more and more a theme for fable; it was said in romances that the holy grail—the cup which the Saviour had consecrated at the last supper, and in which Joseph of Arimathea had caught the blood which flowed from His wounds on the cross—had been withdrawn to that mysterious land. And vague rumours from time to time reached Europe—some representing the ancient line of the priestly kings as still in power; others, that the sovereigns of the nation by which they had been overthrown had been converted, and were eager for the propagation of the gospel among their subjects. In some cases, the persons who spread these stories were roving impostors, who wished to practise for their private advantage on the credulity of the western Christians, and perhaps on that of the orientals in their turn; in other cases, they were really commissioned by Tartar princes, who, in their desire to gain the alliance of the West against the Mussulmans, were fain to represent themselves as more favourable to the gospel than they really were. The Mongol system of doctrine appears to have been a vague monotheism, which, while admitting only one supreme God, left room for a popular religion consisting mainly in the worship of idols and other inferior objects. This indifference to definite religion was found politically useful, as the Mongol sovereigns were thus enabled to conciliate their subjects of different creeds; and the sight of the toleration so enjoyed by Christians under the Tartar yoke was enough to convince sanguine and uncritical monkish observers that the rulers must have embraced the true faith.

The invasion of Europe by the Tartars, about the year 1240, appeared to the emperor Frederick to call for a league of all Christian nations against them, and, in a letter addressed to the princes of the West, he forcibly complained that the popes, instead of preaching a crusade against these enemies of Christianity and civilization, directed all their efforts against the emperor himself. Innocent IV, however, preferred sending three parties of Dominican and Franciscan friars as missionaries respectively to the leader of the Tartars who had invaded Europe, to any chief of the nation whom they might first meet in Asia, and to the great khan himself. The first of these parties found the invaders in Russia, but were unable to effect anything towards their conversion; nor were those who proceeded to the court of the Mongol sovereign more successful, although they were received and treated with courtesy. The other party, which was under a Dominican named Anselm or Ascelin, appears by his own report to have failed chiefly through his assumption and want of tact. On reaching the camp of a Tartar general named Baiothnoi, in Persia, Ascelin required him to submit to the pope, as the highest in dignity among Christians, and revered by all as their father and lord. “Does the pope know,” asked the Tartars, “that the khan is the son of God, and that Baiothnoi and Batho are his princes, whose names are everywhere spread abroad?”. To which Ascelin replied that the

pope knew nothing of the khan or his princes, and had never heard their names, but, having been informed that a barbarous people called Tartars were everywhere committing cruelties, had sent him and his companions to them. A discussion afterwards arose as to the ceremonies which should be observed at an audience of the general, when Ascelin refused to kneel, although one of his own brethren, who had already been in Asia, assured him that such was the custom of all ambassadors, and that no religious adoration was implied in it. This contumacy brought the missionaries into danger of their lives; but at last they were dismissed with letters from the general, as extravagant, at least, in their pretensions as those of the pope himself; and after an absence of three years and seven months, they returned to Europe without having effected anything.

In 1248, Lewis IX of France, while in Cyprus, was visited by two persons who professed to be ambassadors from a general of the great khan, and reported that both the general and his master had been baptized. In consequence of this, the pious king sent envoys and missionaries, charged with valuable gifts, into Asia; but they could nowhere discover the general, and found that the khan was already dead. In 1253, the missionaries returned to Lewis, who was then in Palestine, with a report which led him to request that the pope, Innocent IV, would send Christian teachers into Asia; and among those who were sent in consequence of this was William of Ruysbroek, or Rubruquis, a Franciscan, who seems to have been a sensible and observant man, and has left an account of his travels. Rubruquis found that the reports which had been brought to the West as to the progress of Christianity among the Tartars were greatly exaggerated, and, on the other hand, that pretended missionaries from the West had endeavoured to secure their own objects by representing the pope and the sovereigns of Europe as ready to submit to the khan, if he would conform to their religion. After many hardships, he reached the camp of Mangu Khan, the grandson of Genghis, who received him and his companions well, and afterwards took them in his company to his capital, Karakorum. In many external respects, the religion of the Tartars bore so close a resemblance to the Christianity of the West as at first to impose on the missionaries. The principle of toleration was remarkably displayed at some festivals, where the ministers of Nestorian Christianity, of Mahometanism, and of Buddhist idolatry successively pronounced their benedictions, and the Tartar chiefs performed with impartial devotion the rites of each religion. The khan desired to hear the claims of the three religions argued before him; but when a disputation had been held, it was not followed by any conversions. Rubruquis found that the Nestorian clergy had great influence at court; but he reports that they were illiterate, avaricious, and drunken, and in some cases imitated the barbarians around them by marrying several wives. Christians, at confession, entreated that they might be excused in the practice of theft, on the ground that otherwise they could not live. After having spent half a year at the court of Mangu, who had repeatedly told them that it was time for them to depart, the missionaries set out on their return. At a parting audience, the khan gave Rubruquis a letter for the king of France, but would not invite him to revisit the country. "If I had had power to do wonders, as Moses did," says the candid friar, "peradventure he had humbled himself".

In 1256 Mangu's general overthrew the caliphate of Bagdad, and the conquerors favoured the Nestorians whom they found there above other Christians. There were frequent overtures to the Christians of the West, with a view to a joint opposition to the Saracens in the Holy Land; and, as we have seen, some envoys from the great khan appeared at the council of Lyons in 1274, soliciting an alliance, and were baptized. But in 1303, after various fortunes, the apostasy to Islam of a khan who had been brought up as a Christian put an end to such favour as the Tartar princes had until then showed to Christians, and to the hopes of converting his people.

After the death of Mangu, the Tartars divided into two great bodies, and, while Kublai Khan gave up the West to Hulaku, he himself pushed his conquests as far as China. Kublai reigned in great splendour at Cambalu (Pekin) from 1280 to 1294. Among those who visited

his court were two noble Venetians, Matthew and Nicolas Polo, who returned to Europe in 1269, with a charge to bring back to the great khan some oil from the holy sepulchre, and bearing a letter in which he requested the pope to send him a hundred learned men for the instruction of his people in Christianity. In consequence of the death of Clement IV, and the long delay in the election of a successor, it was not till 1271 that this request was very imperfectly answered by a mission of two Dominicans from Gregory X. With them were the brothers Polo, and Mark, the son of Nicolas, at that time in his seventeenth year. The party reached Cambalu in the spring of 1275, and Mark Polo, the most famous of mediaeval travellers, resided there many years. But from his narrative it would seem that Kublai, in inviting Christian missionaries, had intended rather to obtain assistance towards civilizing his people, and to improve his old religion by a mixture with the Christian system, than to adopt the gospel exclusively; and, although the khan treated the missionaries with kindness and respect, he did not (as was fondly believed in the West) himself receive baptism.

Among those who followed in the track of this mission was a Franciscan, John, who was styled after his native place, Monte Corvino, near Salerno. John laboured with zeal, judgment, and success. He converted the king of Kerait, a descendant of the family of Prester John, conferred minor orders upon him, and was assisted by him in the services of the church. It was even believed that the royal convert performed miracles after death. John of Monte Corvino proved that he was not satisfied with such achievements as the conversion of barbaric princes to a nominal Christianity, by translating the New Testament and the Psalms into the language of the country, and by instructing the younger native converts in Latin and Greek. For a time his labours were hindered by the arts of some Nestorians, who had established a patriarch of their sect at Cambalu; but he succeeded in exposing the calumnies by which these rivals had endeavoured to raise a prejudice against him, so that the khan expelled many of them from the country, while others affected for a time to embrace the orthodoxy of Rome. In 1307, John was appointed by Clement V archbishop of Cambalu, with seven suffragans under him; and he continued his labours until 1330, when he died at the age of eighty-three, and was succeeded by a Franciscan named Nicolas. During the same period many other members of the mendicant orders laboured in central and north-eastern Asia; indeed, those regions have never been so open as in that age to European visitors, and it is said that the grace of miracles, in which William of Rubruquis had lamented that he was wanting, was abundantly bestowed on his more favoured or less honest successors.

2

NESTORIANS. JACOBITES

During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, there were frequent communications between the Nestorians and Jacobites of the East and the Latin Christians, with a view to union, which their common opposition to the Mussulmans pointed out as a desirable object. But although in some cases these communications produced an approximation, or even a seeming union, they had no lasting result. The Latins, as was natural, were too ready to suppose the other parties more inclined than they really were to agree with them. Thus, they were ready to estimate any hyperbolic expressions of courtesy at far more than their real value; and on finding that the eastern sectaries stated their opinions in a manner different from the ordinary western representations of them, they were ready to believe that all heterodoxy and all differences had vanished. So, too, when the orientals allowed the pope of Rome a primacy among bishops, the Latins eagerly interpreted the words as admitting a supremacy to the fullest extent of the Roman claims. From such misunderstandings it is evident that no real reconciliation could be expected to follow.

3

ARMENIA.

The same causes which led the Nestorians to desire the alliance of the western church extended to the Armenians also. Intermarriages took place between the royal family of Armenia and those of the crusading princes or leaders. In the end of the twelfth century, Leo, king of Armenia, received a new royal title from the emperor Henry VI, and was crowned by the archbishop of Mayence, when he acknowledged the papal claims in their fullness, and promised that the catholic (or primate) of Armenia should submit to Rome. In 1239, Gregory IX sent the pall to the catholic but both before and after this time the Armenians are found corresponding with the Greek church, although without any success in the attempt at union. In 1292, under king Haithon II, the Armenian church was formally reconciled with that of Rome; but the movements which resulted in this appear to have proceeded throughout from a court party, whose acts, directed by political interests, were not supported by the general feeling of the nation.

4

LIVONIA. ESTHONIA.—LITHUANIA.

During this time, the conversion of the people on the south-east of the Baltic was effected, although as much by force as by persuasion. Some merchants of Bremen had formed a settlement on the Dwina in 1158, and in 1186 Meinhard, an Augustinian canon of Segeberg, in Holstein, undertook the conversion of the Livonians, a rude and idolatrous nation, whose language he did not understand. Through the favour of Wladimir, the Russian prince to whom Livonia was subject, he was allowed to build a church at Ykeskola (Yxküll or Uexküll on the Dwina), and he soon made some converts. He also taught the people to fortify themselves against the attacks of their neighbours, and brought workmen from Gothland to aid in the labour. But he found that he had to do with a faithless race of men, who, after having professed an eager desire for his continuance among them at times when any advantage was to be gained by it, turned on him with mockery and insult when their objects had been secured, and tried to wash off their baptism in the waters of the Dwina. Dietrich, a Cistercian, who was his companion, was often in great danger. During an eclipse, his life was threatened because he was charged with having swallowed the sun. At another time, he ran the risk of being sacrificed because his fields were in better condition than those of the natives. His fate was to be decided by the ordeal of the horse, which, as we have seen, was also practised in Pomerania. The horse at first put forward the foot which would have saved the missionary's life; but the diviners objected that the God of Christians was sitting on the animal's back, and guiding his motions. The back was therefore rubbed, in order to get rid of this influence; but the horse again stepped as before, and Dietrich was saved. In 1170 Meinhard was consecrated as bishop by Hartwig of Bremen, who had taken no part in his original mission. His labours were approved by Celestine III, who conferred a grant of privileges on him in 1193, and he died in 1196.

The next bishop, Berthold, formerly abbot of Loccum, a Cistercian monastery on the Weser, tried with some success the effects of hospitality as a means of conversion. But after a time the Livonians turned against him, and expelled him from their country. Berthold returned with a large force of soldiers, which he had gathered by the offer of crusading privileges from Celestine III, and a victory was gained over the natives; but the bishop, having been carried into the midst of the enemy by the impetuosity of his horse, was pierced by a lance, and was torn to pieces on his fall. By a pretence of submission to baptism, the Livonians persuaded the invading army to withdraw, leaving the clergy behind; but hardly had the last ship left the

shore when they threw the crucifix into the sea, again washed off their baptism in the river, and persecuted the Christians cruelly, in some cases even to death.

Albert of Apeldern, a man of sense, energy, and perseverance, succeeded Berthold as bishop. He obtained feudal rights over Livonia from Philip of Swabia, and was authorized by Innocent III to associate any monks or clergy in his labours, and to raise an army for the northern crusade, which was allowed to reckon as a fulfillment of the vow for the holy war in the East; and by means of his high connections he was able to enlist a large force. In 1199 or 1200, the crusaders founded the city of Riga, to which the bishoprick was transferred from Yxküll. In 1202, Albert established a military order, to which pope Innocent gave the statutes of the templars, and by the help of these “Brethren of the Sword”, with the crusaders whom Albert enlisted in Germany for each annual campaign, he carried on for many years the more forcible part of his mission. As another means of conveying scriptural knowledge to the Livonians, the bishop in 1204 got up a “prophetic play,” which had among its personages Gideon, David, and Herod. Heathens as well as converts were invited to the performance, and the scenes were explained by an interpreter. But when Gideon and his warriors began to fight the Midianites on the stage, the heathen spectators, supposing that some treachery was designed against them, ran off in alarm, and were not easily persuaded to return. During the following two years, most of the Livonians were baptized; but from time to time they treacherously rose in insurrection whenever the force of the settlers appeared to be weaker than usual.

Among the missionaries themselves, too, differences and jealousies broke out. The brethren of the sword quarrelled with the bishop as to the division of the conquered lands; and something like the old enmities between the templars and the patriarchs of Jerusalem was re-enacted by knights and prelates on the shores of the Baltic. In consequence of these disputes, bishop Albert, and Folcwin the second master of the order, went to Rome in 1210. The pope, according to the usual Roman policy, was more favourable to the order than to the bishop; but he refused in the following year to allow them a bishop of their own, and in 1212 he exempted Riga from all metropolitanical jurisdiction, although it was not until 1246 that it was promoted to the dignity of an archbishopric, which was confirmed to it in 1255 by Alexander IV.

The labours of the military and of the ecclesiastical missionaries spread into Esthonia, where, at a somewhat earlier time, a bishop named Fulk, formerly a monk of La Celle, had preached. Dietrich, who has been mentioned as a companion of Meinhard in Livonia, became bishop of Esthonia; but after he had been killed, in 1218, a conflict as to jurisdiction arose between the archbishop of Lund and the bishop of Riga, as the Danes claimed a share in the conversion and its results. At length Reval was established by the pope as the seat of the Danish bishoprick, and the Germans had their see at Leal, from which it was afterwards transferred to Dorpat.

In Lithuania also the gospel made progress. Its advance was aided by the circumstance that a priest named Aldobrand was asked to arbitrate in a question of property, as those who had been robbed before their conversion felt themselves forbidden by their new religion to use violence for the recovery of what they had lost. The equity of his decision made a great impression on the heathens, who until then had known no other principle than the law of force; and for a time the clergy were overwhelmed with such business. But unhappily some laymen, who had a view only to their own interest, undertook the office of arbitration, and the popular confidence in the justice of Christians was destroyed. In one Livonian province, the people, being disposed to embrace the gospel, casts lots in order to decide whether they should join the Latin church, like their neighbours in the West, or the Greek church, like the Russians; and the result was in favour of the Latin form of Christianity.

Albert of Apeldern died in 1229. In 1236 a junction took place between the brethren of the sword and the Teutonic order, who had many points in common with them—an origin from Bremen, a constitution on the model of the templars, the patronage of the blessed Virgin,

the protection of the emperors, opposition to the Danish interest, and the duty of fighting for the cross in countries which bordered on each other. The union was brought about partly through the agency of William, formerly bishop of Modena, who, after having been employed as a legate in those regions, resigned his see in 1134, and received a fresh legatine commission from Gregory IX. The countries in which the two orders were employed were thus placed under a common authority, and the union was approved by Gregory IX in 1227. The order carried on the work of subjugation, and among the effects of the manner of conversion was the establishment of serfdom, which continued until our own time.

5

PRUSSIA.

The early attempts at the conversion of the Prussians by Adalbert of Prague and Bruno have been already noticed. In the course of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, some Polish kings, after having gained victories over their neighbours of Prussia, endeavoured to impose Christianity on them, but without any substantial or lasting success. But in 1207 an attempt of a different kind was made by Godfrey, abbot of Lukna, a Cistercian monastery in Poland, who was accompanied by a monk named Philip. These missionaries converted the duke Phiolet, and his brother king Sodrech; but their labours were checked by the opposition of the Cistercian communities in the neighbourhood, who were inclined to treat them as irregular adventurers, and hence Innocent III was induced to write to the archbishop of Gnesen and to the Cistercians in 1212, desiring them to be on their guard against real “acephali,” but to show kindness and cooperation to Godfrey and his associates. He also desired the king of Poland and the duke of Pomerania to refrain from imposing servile labours on the converts, as this was found a hindrance to the gospel. In 1215 a Cistercian monk of Oliva, near Danzig, named Christian, was consecrated as bishop, and the work of conversion was then actively carried on. But the oppression of the king and the duke provoked an insurrection, in which there was a general massacre of Christians, accompanied by the destruction of some monasteries and of two hundred and fifty churches. In order to guard against the recurrence of such disasters, the duke, by the bishop’s advice, endeavoured to form a military order, and Honorius III in 1218 allowed crusaders to serve against the heathens of Prussia instead of going to the Holy Land. At the same time the pope endeavoured to forward the work of conversion by other means—such as the purchase of female children, whom the custom of the country would have doomed to death, and the institution of schools for boys. It was, however, found that the effect of the crusade lasted only so long as the soldiers remained in the country. In 1226 it was resolved to call in the aid of the Teutonic order, and terms were made with the grand master, the famous Herman of Salza. In 1230 a hundred of the knights appeared in Prussia under Herman of Balka. Gregory IX and Innocent IV invested them with the privileges of crusaders, and the emperor bestowed on them the sovereignty of such territories as they had acquired by gift, or might conquer by their swords. The knights carried on the war with steady perseverance, recruiting their numbers and gathering followers from Germany, where the northern crusade now took the place of the longer and more perilous expeditions to Palestine. They founded fortresses which afterwards grew into towns—as Elbing, Thorn, and Konigsberg—the last of these being so called in honour of king Ottocar of Bohemia, who in 1254 took part in one of their campaigns. Like other military orders, they had serious differences with the bishops and clergy, to whom pope Gregory had assigned one-third of the conquered land. They were also involved in contests with their neighbours, the dukes of Poland and Pomerania; and in 1245 William of Modena, then cardinal-bishop of Sabina, was once more sent into the north with a commission to settle these quarrels. In 1249 an agreement was made, through the legate’s mediation, by which important liberties were secured for the converts. They were to enjoy the Polish law, with the exception of its sanction of ordeals. They were not to burn their dead, or

to bury men or horses with them, and were to give up all other heathenish customs. Those who had not yet been baptized were to receive baptism within a certain time, under pain of being driven out of the country with only a single garment on them. Churches were to be built and endowed. Meat and milk were forbidden on Fridays and in Lent; and confession and communion were required once at least in the year.

But the severe rule of the knights produced a dangerous insurrection in 1260, and it was not until 1283 after a warfare which, with some intervals, had lasted fifty-three years, that their sovereignty was fully established. Baptism was enforced on the Prussians as a necessary condition of liberty and in this late conversion of a barbarous Slavonic people originated a kingdom which in later days has borne a very important part in the affairs of the world.

6

RUSSIA.

During the same time when the gospel was propagated by the sword in some neighbouring countries, its progress in Russia was advanced by gentler means. The attempt to bring over the Russians to the Latin church was renewed by the legate William of Modena, but with no better success than before. Russia suffered very severely from the great Mongol invasion. It is said that the barbarians, on reaching Kiev, were struck with astonishment by the beauty of the holy city, and offered to spare it if the inhabitants would submit to them. But the Russians were resolved to hold out, and fortified the cathedral and other churches, which were taken one by one after a long and obstinate resistance. The buildings were destroyed, their treasures plundered, the monks and clergy were slaughtered or driven to flight. It is supposed that the metropolitan, a Greek named Joseph, perished in the siege; and after the office had been ten years vacant, Innocent IV, thinking to take advantage of the Russian church's distress, and of the removal of the Byzantine patriarch to Nicaea, sent ambassadors into Russia, with the offer of kingly crowns and titles for the princes, and with proposals for union with the Latin church. The prince of Novogorod, Alexander Newsky, one of the royal saints and heroes of Russia, refused to treat with the ambassadors; but David, prince of Galicia, took advantage of the proposals by accepting the crown and the royal title, while he deferred the question of reconciliation with Rome until a general council should meet. Finding, however, that his application for a crusade against the Tartars did not meet with immediate attention from Alexander IV, David broke off all communication with Rome, and he soon after obtained consecration for a metropolitan named Cyril from the patriarch at Nicaea.

Cyril (the second patriarch of that name) held his dignity for thirty years, and laboured indefatigably for the restoration of the Russian church. After his death, in 1280, another vacancy of two years occurred, in consequence of the unwillingness of the Russians to connect themselves with the Latinizing patriarch Veccus, who then occupied the see of Constantinople. The next metropolitan, a Greek named Maximus, removed his see from Kiev to Vladimir in 1299; and in the earlier part of the following century, it was again transferred to Moscow, which has since continued to be the seat of the primate of Russia.

7

JEWS AND MAHOMETANS. RAYMOND LULL.

While the conversion of rude pagan nations employed the energies of zealous missionaries, attempts were also made to bring over converts from Judaism and Mahometanism, and many controversial treatises were written for this purpose. In each case there was the difficulty that the champions of the rival religion possessed an elaborate learning of their own, which had too little in common with Christian learning to be assailable on principles which both parties would have consented to knowledge. The most famous treatise

produced in this time against the Jews and Mahometans is the ‘Pugio Fidei’ of Raymond Martini, a Spanish Dominican, which even in our own day is consulted as a storehouse of rabbinical learning.

The preaching of St. Francis and his followers in Egypt and Morocco has been already noticed. The characters of literary controversialist and of missionary preacher were united in Raymond Lull, who was born in the island of Majorca about 1235. In his early years he frequented the court of his sovereign, James of Aragon; and his life was free and licentious until a change was suddenly produced in him by some circumstance of which various accounts are given. For a time Raymond meditated anxiously on the best way of devoting himself to the service of Christ; but it would seem that his zeal had begun to cool, when a sermon which he heard on the festival of St. Francis made him resolve to give up all. He sold his property, except so much as was enough for the maintenance of his wife and children, and resolved to employ himself in the conversion of the Mussulmans, both by written argument and by preaching. With a view to this, he bought a Saracen slave, from whom he learnt Arabic; and we are told that his knowledge of languages was increased by supernatural gift. He withdrew for some months into a solitude, and there, it is said, received by revelation his “art of arts” or “general art”—a method which would seem to have promised the acquisition of universal knowledge without the ordinary labour of study. Through Raymond’s influence, king James was persuaded to establish in Majorca a monastery where thirteen Franciscans were to be trained for the work of preaching to the Mussulmans in their own language; but his attempts to procure from Honorius IV and other popes a decree that such study should be general in monasteries were unsuccessful.

In the winter of 1291-2, Raymond crossed the sea to Tunis, for the work to which he had devoted himself, taking with him an Arabic translation of his “Great Art,” which he had executed at Genoa. He invited the Mussulman teachers to dispute with him; but his daring endangered his life, and he was put on board a ship bound for Naples, with threats of death if he should ever return to Africa. For some years after this, he wandered about Italy and France, teaching his new art (although it was forbidden at Rome) and endeavouring to stir up popes, kings, and other persons of power and influence, to the general establishment of monastic schools for the study of eastern languages. Raymond also made his way to Cyprus, and even to Armenia, everywhere disputing with such opponents of the orthodox faith as he met—Mussulmans, Jacobites, and Nestorians. In 1306 or the following year, he made a second expedition to Africa, where he attempted to preach at Bougiah, and to confute the Mahometan doctors in disputation; but he was imprisoned and sentenced to death. This punishment, however, was commuted for expulsion from the country, but in his return to Europe he was shipwrecked on the Tuscan coast.

The hopes which Raymond had conceived for his project of oriental schools from the election of Celestine V were disappointed by Boniface, who regarded such objects with indifference. But at the council of Vienne, in 1311, he obtained from Clement V the concession that such schools should be established in the place of the papal residence, wherever it might be, and in the universities of Paris, Oxford, Bologna, and Salamanca. The professors were not only to teach Hebrew, Chaldee, and Arabic, but were to translate books from those tongues into Latin.

In 1314, Raymond (who throughout his life remained a layman) separated from his wife, became a tertiary of the Franciscan order, and sailed once more for Africa, with the resolution of enduring martyrdom. Again he reached Bougiah, and his preaching was heard with attention, until he declared the circumstances of his former visit and banishment, and threatened his hearers with the vengeance of heaven unless they would forsake their misbelief. On this a furious tumult arose; stones were thrown at the old man, he was dragged out of the town, and, although he was able to reach a Genoese vessel, the injuries which he had received were so serious that he died when in sight of his native island.

CHAPTER VII
SECTARIES.

1
THE INQUISITION

THE persecutions which were continually carried on against the Albigenses, Waldenses, and others, were not followed by the conversion which was desired and expected, but appeared rather to strengthen in the sectaries their dislike of the ecclesiastical doctrine and system. Thus, the Waldenses, who at their outset had varied so little from the church that they might probably have been reconciled to it by moderate treatment, ran into new developments which had been foreign to the thoughts of the founders. Everywhere we find the heretical parties spreading—the old sects gaining converts, and new sects arising, although the variety of names under which they were known considerably exceeds the varieties of opinion which existed among them. We read of cathari, not only in southern France and in Lombardy, but at Rimini, Florence, and Viterbo, at Rome itself, and at Naples, in Sicily, Spain, Germany, Flanders and various parts of northern and eastern France and those who were discovered were burnt or otherwise severely dealt with. Frederick II taunted the popes with allowing all sorts of heresy among their Milanese allies; and, in consequence of their political connection with Rome, the authorities of Milan found it necessary to vindicate their character for orthodoxy. “The Milanese,” says a chronicler, under the date of 1233, “began to burn heretics in the third year of the lord archbishop William of Ruzolo”; and in 1233 a podestà of Milan recorded, in a verse which may still be read on a public palace of that city, the fact that he had not only erected the building, but, “as he ought,” had burnt the cathari.

Such a view of duty, the clergy—who in the preceding century had themselves been usually opposed to the execution of heretics, but had now changed their system—zealously tried to impress on the laity, in order that persons convicted of heresy might be dealt with by the “secular arm.” The principle of persecution for religious error was very decidedly laid down, and was justified by argument from the punishment of other offences. “He that taketh away the faith,” says Innocent III, “stealeth the life; for the just shall live by faith.” So, the great theologian of the Dominican order argues that, if false coiners be punished with death, much more is such a doom deserved by heretics, forasmuch as a corruption of faith, whereby the soul has its life, is far worse than a falsification of money; and as to this he distinguishes the case of heretics and apostates from that of Jews or others who have never been members of the church, and therefore are not to be forcibly brought into it. In like manner another eminent Dominican, Humbert de Romanis, inculcates the duty of punishing heretics, and declares that “even if the pope were a heretic”, (a supposition which in that age was not supposed to be impossible) “he should be punished”. The especial manner of death for heresy was supposed to be indicated by the Saviour’s declaration that those who abide not in Him are cast into the fire, as withered branches, “and they are burned.”

Even Frederick II, as we have seen, felt himself obliged to do something for his own reputation by publishing severe edicts against sectaries; and these laws were gladly accepted by the popes, and at a later time were renewed by Rudolf of Hapsburg. In France, St. Lewis, and in Hungary, king Ladislaus, seconded the wishes of the popes by allowing their orders for the extirpation of heresy to be carried out. The inquisition, which had been established in Languedoc by the council of Toulouse, in 1229, was, with the consent of the pious king,

committed to the Dominicans and Franciscans throughout France. In 1232, the Inquisition was introduced into Aragon, and in 1248 it was fully established throughout Christian Spain.

Frederick's persecuting laws were intended rather for Italy and Sicily than for his northern dominions. But in 1232 a priest named Conrad of Marburg—a man of coarse and uncultivated mind, but of much power as a preacher—appeared under papal sanction as inquisitor in Germany. By some, he is described as a Dominican; by others, as a Franciscan; but in truth it would seem that no monastic order can claim the credit or the infamy of reckoning him among its members. His cruelty had been execrably displayed in the sway which he exercised over the saintly Elizabeth, daughter of the king of Hungary, and widow of Lewis, landgrave of Thuringia, who had died at Brindisi on his way to the crusade. The devout and submissive character of her mind provoked Conrad to indulge in outrageous excesses of tyranny. Having secured her compliance by a vow of obedience, he persuaded her, under the name of religion, to renounce her children and relations, and to withdraw into a hospital where she devoted herself to the practice of ascetic exercises and of ministering to the most loathsome forms of disease. He cut off from her the society of all whom she had known or loved—even of her nurse; he compelled her to live as a servant among her servants; he even carried his prohibition of all that could gratify her so far as to forbid an indulgence in almsgiving; he would allow her no other companion than some “austere” women, who treated her tyrannically, and told tales against her; whereupon he flogged her, and gave her blows on the face, “which, however,” says a biographer, “she had wished and longed to bear, in remembrance of the Lord's sufferings”. Under this system the princess died in 1231, before she had completed her twenty-fourth year; and the savage bigotry and cruelty which Conrad had shown as a spiritual director found an ampler field for their exercise in his new character of inquisitor. Beginning with the lowest classes, he gradually included persons of better station in his inquiries, until at length counts and marquises were marked out as victims; and a chronicler tells us that a king or a bishop was of no greater account with him than a poor layman. Those who were accused were required to choose between two courses: they were either to confess and be burnt (or, at least, to be shorn and shut up for life), or they were to be burnt for denial of the charges against them, although with the consolation of being assured by the inquisitor that any who might be put to death innocently would be rewarded with the bliss and glory of martyrs. To speak in mitigation of the sentence, was to become a partner of heresy, and liable to the same punishment as the accused. The proceedings of the inquisitor's court were very summary: the accusation, the sentence, and the execution of it were often the work of a single day. Many in despair confessed offences of which they were guiltless, while others endured death rather than disavow their innocence. False accusations of heresy were prompted by private revenge, or by quarrels as to property, and soon became common. All along the Rhine, the proceedings of Conrad spread terror, and aroused general execration. The archbishops of Mayence, Treves, and Cologne assembled diets to consider the matter, and, in accordance with the decision of these assemblies, reported his proceedings to Gregory IX; and even Gregory expressed regret that he had intrusted the inquisitor with so much power, and astonishment that the Germans had endured so long. But before an act of deprivation could be prepared, Conrad, while on a journey, was waylaid, and fell a victim to the vengeance which his tyranny had provoked. Gregory, although he eulogized the murdered inquisitor, did not exact severe punishment from those who had shared in his death. And it is perhaps to the indignation excited by Conrad that Germany owed its exemption from a permanent inquisition.

In other cases, also, the severity of inquisitors was avenged by lawless means. Thus, three Dominican inquisitors were murdered at Avignonnet, in Languedoc, in 1239; and a more celebrated instance of this kind is the assassination of the Dominican Peter of Verona, which has furnished a theme for the genius of Titian and of Guido.

Among the causes of difference which arose between Philip the Fair and the papacy, one was connected with the proceedings of the Dominican inquisitors of Toulouse, who were said to imprison persons of all classes under frivolous pretexts, and to release those who submitted to bribe them. In consequence of these reports, one of the king's officers inquired into the matter, and set at liberty many persons, whom the inquisitors had committed to prison. For this invasion of the church's privileges, he was excommunicated at Paris and elsewhere. He appealed to the pope against this sentence; but before any judgment could be obtained, he died at Perugia, during the vacancy which followed after the death of Benedict XI.

It is said that some of the sectaries endeavoured to protect themselves against the questions of inquisitors by a remarkable system of equivocation. Thus we are told that at Treves, and at Montvimer (their head-quarters in northern France), the cathari had a pope and a bishop corresponding in names to the reigning pope of Rome and to the bishop of the diocese; while certain old women of the sect were spoken of as St. Mary, the Church, Baptism, the Eucharist, Marriage, and the like; so that the sectaries, when asked whether they acknowledged pope Gregory or the blessed Virgin, holy Church or the sacrament of marriage, might reply in the affirmative, with a mental reference to the persons who were designated by these names in their own communion.

The crusades had had the effect of making the cathari of the West and those of the East mutually known, and of bringing them into intercourse and correspondence with each other. In consequence of the intercourse thus established, the doctrine of the bogomiles made its way into the West, and with some of the cathari of North Italy superseded the system of pure dualism, which was still retained in the south of France.

The general use of the Scriptures, and the translation of them into the vernacular languages, had been discouraged by Gregory VII, and the circumstance that the Waldensian and other sectaries professed to ground their opposition to Rome on a free and unprejudiced study of Scripture, tended to make the authorities of the church more unwilling to allow such study. We have already seen how the Waldensians of Metz were dealt with by Innocent III, who interprets the command "If a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned", as meant to discourage presumptuous study of Scripture by persons who were not duly qualified as to ability or knowledge. But the council of Toulouse in 1229 went further, by forbidding lay persons to have the books of the Old or New Testament, "unless perchance one may of devotion wish to have a Psalter or a Breviary for Divine offices, or the Hours of the blessed Mary"; and even these it was "most strictly forbidden" to have in the vulgar tongue. So a council at Tarragona in 1234 prohibits the Scriptures "in the Romance tongue," and orders such translations to be burnt; and a council at Beziers in 1246 forbade laymen to have any theological books, even in Latin, while clergy and laity were alike forbidden to have them in the vernacular. The popular knowledge of Scripture history, of which the sources were thus interdicted, was now derived from the compendium of Peter Comestor.

2

THE STEDINGERS.

In the middle of the century, a whole people was destined to furnish an instance of the readiness with which charges of heresy were brought against persons who had offended their accusers in some other way. The Stedingers, a simple and hardy tribe of Frisian origin, occupied a country to the east of the Weser in its lower part, and appear to have acknowledged the counts of Oldenburg as their liege-lords, but were immediately subject to the archbishops of Bremen, with whose officials, from about the year 1187, they were embroiled about questions of ecclesiastical dues. They would seem, also, to have complained of the insolence and immorality of their priests, and thus their differences with the clergy came to be

misrepresented as originating in heresy. Strange fables—partly new, and partly borrowed from the traditional charges against Manichaeans and other sectaries—were circulated. It was said that the Stedingers had relapsed into heathenism and that they practised magic; that in their initiation they kissed the hinder parts of a toad, and allowed the reptile to spit into their mouths; that a man, tall, fleshless, and of ghastly paleness, with piercing dark eyes, appeared among them; and that in the moment when they kissed him, and felt the icy chill of his touch, all remembrance of the catholic faith vanished from their minds. To these charges were added the old tales of obscene reverence to a black cat, darkened rooms, and licentious orgies.

In 1232, Gregory IX wrote to king Henry, the son of the emperor Frederick, to the bishop of Minden and other prelates of the neighbourhood, and to the inquisitor Conrad of Marburg, stating these and other abominations which were imputed to the Stedingers, and urging that they should be punished. A crusade against them was proclaimed, and a large army, under the duke of Brabant and the counts of Holland and Cleves, overwhelmed the unfortunate people, of whom, in a second campaign, 6000—men, women, and children—are said to have been slain. After this calamity, even the pope appears to have found reason to doubt the truth of the information on the strength of which the Stedingers had been butchered as enemies to the faith; and he issued a decree which gave the strongest possible condemnation to his late policy, by omitting all mention of heresy among the charges against them, and by authorizing their absolution on condition that they should promise to give no offence in time to come.

3

BEGHARDS AND BEGUINES.

Among the sectaries of this age the names of Beghards and Beguines often occur, while the same terms are also used to designate persons whose orthodoxy was unimpeachable according to the standard of the time. The derivation of the words has been much questioned. Some refer it to the old Saxon *beggen* or *begheren*, which means either to *beg* or to *pray*, but must here be understood in the second of these senses, as mendicancy was no part of the system. Others trace it to the epithet *bègue* (or stammerer), attached to the name of one Lambert, a priest of Liège, who, about 1180, founded a society of beguines there. A third etymology is from the name of Begga, duchess of Brabant, and mother of Pipin of Heristal; but this, although it has in later times naturally found favour with the Flemish beguines, is quite without foundations.

The beguines seem to have been originally women who lived in a society which had somewhat of a monastic character, although without vows or any special rule—retaining the liberty to marry, and being allowed to enjoy such property as they might possess, while they earned money by weaving or similar works, and gave all that they could spare to the poor, the sick, and the strangers, for whom in some cases they provided hospitals. It has been supposed that these communities originated in the excess of the female sex which resulted from the vast consumption of men in the crusades; but the system was soon taken up by men, who were styled beghards; and from Liege the institution speedily made its way into other parts. Matthew Paris says that about 1243 there were 2000 beghards and beguines in and about Cologne—the women being more numerous than the men; and about the same time a man who has already been mentioned as having passed himself off for a catharist in various countries, speaks of *beguini* as a kind of “new religious,” whom he saw at Neustadt, in Austria. The female societies were under the government of “mistresses”, of whom in the larger houses there were two or more; and the beghards had in like manner their heads, who were sometimes called masters, but more commonly ministers (or servants). The names of beghards and beguines came not unnaturally to be used for devotees who, without being members of any regular monastic society, made a profession of religious strictness; and thus

the application of the names to some kinds of sectaries was easy—more especially as many of these found it convenient to assume the outward appearance of beghards, in the hope of disguising their differences from the church. But on the other hand, this drew on the orthodox beghards frequent persecutions, and many of them, for the sake of safety, were glad to connect themselves as tertiaries with the great mendicant orders. And between the orthodox and the sectaries who were confounded under these common names, they served also to designate persons whose opinions might perhaps be tinged with unconscious sectarianism, but who were chiefly noticeable for eccentricity in dress and manners, or for a religious zeal too little accompanied by knowledge or discretion. In the fourteenth century the popes dealt hardly with the beghards; yet orthodox societies under this name still remained in Germany; and in Belgium, the country of their origin, sisterhoods of beguines flourish to the present day.

4

SECT OF THE FREE SPIRIT.

Among those who were confounded with the beghards—partly because, like them, they abounded along the Rhine—were the brethren and sisters of the Free Spirit. These appear in various places under various names, and in many points the system attributed to them reminds us of other sects, such as the followers of Amalric of Bena, although it is very doubtful whether they were directly connected with any of these. Their doctrines and their practical system were of a highly enthusiastic kind. They wore a peculiarly simple dress, professed to give themselves to contemplation, and, holding that labour is a hindrance to contemplation and to the elevation of the soul to God, they lived by beggary. Their doctrines were mystical and almost pantheistic—that all things come from God, and will be absorbed into Him; that the soul is part of the Godhead, and may by contemplation become united with it in such wise that a man shall be Son of God in the same sense as the Saviour was; that when this perfection is attained, he is freed from all carnal appetites, and rises above all laws, as being independent of them, so that he may look down on prayers, sacraments, and other rites as elements fit only for children. These principles naturally led to fanaticism in practice. The brethren and sisters are said to have slept together; for modesty and shame were regarded as proofs that the soul had not yet overcome its evil desires; and the statement may be believed, as the enemies of the sect allow that breaches of chastity were rare among them, and account for this by supposing that the devil produced in the sectaries a coldness which rendered them insensible to the temptations of the senses.

The brethren and sisters of the Free Spirit were much persecuted, and probably formed a large proportion of those who were burnt under the name of beghards. To this sect also perhaps belonged a woman of the name of Wilhelmina, who was revered at Milan as a saint for twenty years after her death in 1251, until an inquiry into her merits resulted in the demolition of her gorgeous tomb, and the burning of her bones as those of a heretic.

5

THE “APOSTLES”.

The idea of evangelical poverty, which had given rise to the two great mendicant orders, was widely spread in this age, and influenced most of the new sects in a greater or less degree. Among the most remarkable of these was the party which claimed the title of *Apostles*, founded by Gerard Segarello, of Parma, a layman of humble birth, weak understanding, and scanty education, about the year 1249. Segarello attempted to gain admission into a society of Franciscans, as being the order nearest to his ideas of apostolical poverty, and, having been refused, continued to hang about the convent, until a picture of the apostles in the cloister gave him the idea of adopting the dress in which they were

represented—with long hair and beard, a long white coat of coarse cloth, and a rope by way of girdle—and of establishing a new brotherhoods He sold his property, threw away the price in the market-place, and is said to have gone through a strange imitation of the Saviour's early life—submitting to circumcision, lying swathed in a cradle, and receiving nourishment like an infant. In 1260, the year on which abbot Joachim had fixed for the beginning of the last age of the church, and in which the frenzy of the flagellants broke out, Segarello became more conspicuous by gathering about thirty disciples round him; and strange stories are told of the insane fanaticism which he displayed. For nearly twenty years the party was allowed to spread without being molested; but in 1279, two of Segarello's female adherents were burnt at Parma as catharists; whereupon the people plundered the convent of the Dominican inquisitors, killed some of the friars, and banished the rest. The bishop, Obizzo Sanvitale, although no friend to the inquisitors, arrested Segarello, but after a time, being convinced that he was a simple and harmless man, kept him as a sort of domestic jester, until in 1286 he felt himself bound to dismiss and to banish him, in consequence of a decree by which Honorius IV, grounding his act on a canon of the second council of Lyons against any new religious orders but such as were approved by the holy see, prohibited the peculiarities of the apostolics as to dress and other matters, and ordered that no one should bestow alms on them, or otherwise encourage them. Notwithstanding a repetition of this decree by Nicolas IV in 1290, Segarello ventured to return to Parma, but in the year of jubilee, 1300, the Dominicans, who had been received back with honour, brought him to trial, and, although July 18, he recanted the errors which were imputed to him, he was made over to the secular arm, and burnt as a relapsed heretic.

In the meantime the sect had acquired a member who by abilities and education was better fitted for the office of leader, which, indeed, Segarello had always declined. Dolcino was the son of a priest in the diocese of Novara, and was educated at Vercelli, where he is described as having been quick and diligent in study, and generally popular, until he was obliged to withdraw in consequence of having robbed a priest who had been his tutor. His next appearance was in the Tyrol, where he addressed himself with powerful and effective eloquence to the spirit which had prevailed in that region from the days of Arnold of Brescia, denouncing the luxury of the clergy, and recommending a community of goods, and even, it is said, of women. But he was dislodged by the bishop of Trent, and was expelled from Milan, Como, and other cities of Lombardy. On the death of Segarello, Dolcino assumed the post of chief of the sect, and brought into prominence its opposition to the Roman church. He sent forth three letters, in the first of which he describes as his enemies all the secular clergy, many of the great and powerful, and the whole of the religious orders, especially the preachers and the minorites. Before these he intimates his intention of retiring, until in due time he should reappear for their destruction; and it has been supposed that he resided for a time in Dalmatia, and thence issued his later epistles.

The apostolics professed that they agreed with the church in doctrine and desired nothing more than a thorough reform of its corruptions—a restoration of the primitive simplicity and poverty. They affected an air of mystery in imparting the peculiarities of the party to converts. The doctrine of Dolcino was founded on that of Joachim, although greatly varying from it. He taught that there were four states of the church, each rising above that which had gone before it, and each declining before the following state came in as a remedy. First, the state of patriarchs, prophets, and righteous men—when it was right that mankind should multiply. Next, the state under Christ and His apostles, in which virginity was to be preferred to marriage, and poverty to wealth. Then, the age from Constantine and Sylvester, which was subdivided by the appearance of St. Benedict, and again by that of St. Dominic and St. Francis; and lastly, the age which began with Gerard of Parma, and was to continue and fructify until the day of judgment. The difference between the older mendicant orders and the apostolics was declared to be, that, whereas the former had houses to which they might carry the spoils of their begging, the newer and more perfect party had no houses, and were not

allowed to carry away what was given to them. The church of Rome was identified with the apocalyptic harlot, and was said to have lost all spiritual power through the vices of her rulers; all popes since Sylvester had been deceivers, with the exception of Celestine V; their excommunications were naught, nor could any pope really absolve unless he were utterly poor, and equal in holiness to St. Peter. The religious orders were declared to be mischievous; for it was better to live without than under a vow, and the apostolicals were not constrained by any outward rule, but by the free spirit of love. They claimed an understanding of the Scriptures which was not derived from man, and held that except by joining their body, of which every member was perfect as the apostles, there could be no salvation. Although oaths were forbidden in general, it was held to be lawful to save their lives even by forswearing their opinions; and this Dolcino acknowledged that he had thrice done when he fell into the hands of inquisitors; but if death were inevitable, it was their duty to avow their doctrines boldly.

Dolcino announced that Frederick of Sicily, on whom the antipapalists were fond of resting their hopes, was to enter Rome on Christmas-day 1305, was to be chosen as emperor, and to set up ten kings who were to reign three years and a half—evidently the ten horns of the apocalyptic beast, which was thus turned to the antipapal interest. The emperor was to slay pope Boniface with his cardinals, the prelates, clergy, monks, and friars, and was to restore the church to its apostolical poverty. After the destruction of Boniface, a new pope, specially sanctified by the Holy Spirit, and equal in perfection to St. Peter, was to be appointed by supernatural means (for there would be no cardinals to elect). Perhaps this pope might prove to be Dolcino himself, if then alive; perhaps Segarello restored to life. After preaching three years and a half, the holy pope and his associates were to be caught up to paradise, while Enoch and Elias were to descend, to preach of antichrist, and to be slain by him; and when the time of antichrist should have passed away, the pope and his followers were to return, and to convert all men to the true faith, with a marvellous effusion of the Holy Ghost. The seven angels of the apocalyptic churches were interpreted to mean respectively Benedict, Sylvester, Francis, Dominic, Gerard Segarello, Dolcino himself, and the future holy pope. If at any time the course of events did not agree with Dolcino's predictions, he was ready to alter these, or in some other manner to get over the difficulty.

The apostolicals are described by a contemporary as spending their time in idleness, neither working nor praying. They kissed the feet of Dolcino, as being the holiest of men, while the orthodox shuddered at his profanity in eating flesh during Lent and on fast days. The sectaries regarded marriage as purely spiritual. The men led about sisters, and with these they renewed the fanatical trials which have been mentioned in connexion with other parties. Dolcino's companion was a beautiful maiden of Trent, named Margaret, whom he extolled as perfect. After a time, it was rumoured (apparently without ground) that she was pregnant. "If so" said Dolcino, "it must be of the Holy Ghost."

In 1304, Dolcino, at the invitation of a wealthy landowner, established himself in the Val Sesia, and disciples gathered rapidly around him from both sides of the Alps. The clergy were alarmed, and an army of crusaders took the field against the apostolicals, under the command of Rainier, bishop of Vercelli, and under the patronage of the great local saint, Eusebius. Although the principles of the sect forbade the use of force, even in self-defence, Dolcino now displayed an instinctive genius for war; he disappeared by night from the Val Sesia, and, with more than fourteen hundred companions, took up a strong position on the impregnable "Mountain of the Bare Wall," near Varallo. But after they had here defied their enemies for a time, the dread of famine began to be felt. They were compelled to eat horses, dogs, rats, and even the flesh of their own dead companions. In Lent they endeavoured to support themselves on roots, leaves, and hay. In their desperation they made sallies into the neighbouring country, plundered and profaned churches, burnt, ravaged, carried off captives, whom they put to heavy ransom, and reduced many of the peaceable inhabitants to beggary.

Leaving their sick and infirm behind them, about 1000 of the sectaries made their way through fearful difficulties, over mountains covered with deep snow and ice, to the still wilder March 10, height of Mount Zebello, near Ivrea, where they fortified themselves in their new position, and dug a deep well. But here many of them fell victims to cold, and the distress of the survivors became more terrible than ever; for their money, of which they had accumulated a large store by plunder, was unable to procure them any provisions. A holy war was proclaimed against them by Clement V, and many enlisted under bishop Rainier for the enterprise. Yet in this dreadful extremity of hunger the sectaries kept up the sternness of their resolution, until, after having held out somewhat more than a year on the mountain, and after successes which they abused by cruelty and plunder, their strength was utterly exhausted. On Maundy Thursday 1307, after a fierce and desperate resistance, they were overpowered and almost exterminated by the crusading force. Dolcino, Margaret, and one of the leaders named Longino, were reserved for a more terrible death. They were tried before a mixed tribunal of clergy and lawyers, and pope Clement, on being consulted, answered that they should be punished in the same places which had witnessed their misdeeds. Dolcino and his "sister," therefore, suffered at Vercelli. It is said that, when Margaret was led out for punishment, her beauty so captivated the beholders that many nobles offered her marriage if she would consent to save her life by renouncing her errors; but she persevered, and without flinching endured the torture of a slow fire, while Dolcino was compelled to look on, and calmly exhorted her to endurance. Dolcino himself bore with equal constancy the tearing of his flesh with red-hot pincers, and Longino suffered death with the same circumstances of atrocious cruelty at Biella. Thus the sect of the apostolicals was extinguished in blood, and, although slight traces of it may be discovered somewhat later, its name and even its influence speedily disappear.

CHAPTER VIII.

SUPPLEMENTARY.

The Hierarchy.

(1). Innocent III declared that to St. Peter had been committed the government, not only of the whole church, but of the whole world. He set forth more strongly Gregory VII's comparison of the spiritual and the secular powers to the sun and moon respectively. As the moon, he said, borrows from the sun a light which is inferior both in amount and in quality, in position and in effect, so does the regal power borrow from the pontifical; as the light which rules over the day—*i.e.* over spiritual things—is the greater, and as that which rules over the night—*i.e.* over carnal things—is the lesser, so is the difference between pontiffs and kings like that between the sun and the moon. Throughout the century which began with Innocent's pontificate, the great pope's principles were triumphant. As the imperial dignity, according to him, had been transferred from the Greeks to the west by papal authority, and for the benefit of the papal see, so the popes claimed the right to dispose of kingdoms and of the empire, and enforced the claim, although not with unvarying success; whenever, indeed, they saw a likelihood of vigorous resistance, they were careful to put such an interpretation on their pretensions as might enable them to recede without loss of dignity. They steadily pursued the policy of exacting large concessions for the church, and especially for their own see, from those whom they supported as candidates for the empire, from Otho IV to Albert of Austria. And thus Rudolf of Hapsburg, in addition to the substantial concessions which have been mentioned elsewhere, admitted the comparison of the greater and lesser lights, and also that use of the word *beneficia*, which had excited the indignation of Frederick Barbarossa. The papal inferences from Constantine's pretended donation became more extravagant than before. Thus, Gregory IX laid it down that the first Christian emperor had made over to the popes, not only Rome and the ensigns of imperial dignity, but the empire itself; and that the empire of the Germans in later times was held only by delegation from the Roman see. And Innocent IV, in pronouncing the deposition of Frederick II, went still further by declaring that Christ bestowed on St. Peter and his successors not only pontifical but regal power, earthly as well as heavenly and spiritual government; and therefore that Constantine did nothing more than give up to the church a part of that which had before rightfully belonged to it. With a view to controversy with the Greek church, spurious sentences were brought forward as citations from Greek fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, in order to claim their authority for the late developments of the papal pretensions. The feudal principles were so applied as to constitute the pope a lord paramount, not only over the hierarchy, but over states and kingdoms; and this pretension was embodied in the display which Boniface VIII is said to have made at the Roman jubilee. From having styled themselves vicars of St. Peter, the popes now styled themselves vicars of Christ or of God, and their persons were surrounded with a pomp before unknown.

The popes now not only claimed the right of summoning general councils, but aimed at superseding the voice of councils by their own authority—allowing even to councils which were styled general a power of advising only, and not of deciding by vote. Thus it was in the Lateran council of 1215, and in great measure in the first council of Lyons, in 1245. And now the papal pretension to infallibility was for the first time plainly asserted by the great Dominican doctor, Thomas Aquinas.

But on the other hand the increased pretensions of the papacy began to awaken inquiry into the sources of the papal power. Even where the genuineness of Constantine's donation was unquestioned, it was denied by jurists that the emperor was competent to grant such a donation; and the papal inferences were met by a story that, when the gift had been made to pope Sylvester, a voice was heard in the air, exclaiming, "This day is poison poured forth into the church." And such practical facts as the Pragmatic Sanction of St. Lewis, the ecclesiastical policy of Edward I of England, and the conflict between Boniface and Philip the Fair, were serious warnings to the papacy that its pretensions were not to pass undisputed.

In their great contest with the empire, the popes asserted the principle of free election to bishoprics and abbeys; but, when they had succeeded in excluding the secular power, they endeavoured to usurp the patronage of such appointments for themselves. Thus we find that, in five out of seven vacancies which took place in the see of Canterbury during the century, the popes, under one pretext or another, set aside the claimants who had been elected, and, either by their assumed "plenitude of power" or otherwise, filled the English primacy with their own nominees. Yet this attempt was not as yet successful except in particular cases—as when it was said that the electors had forfeited their privilege by choosing badly, and that therefore the appointment fell to the pope "by right of devolution", or when the vacancy was caused by the death of a prelate on a visit to the papal court,—a case which occurred the more frequently, on account of the dangerous climate of Rome.

The same policy of grasping at patronage was practised as to other classes of preferment. Boniface VIII extended to benefices of all kinds the claims arising from the death of an incumbent at the Roman court. The system of *precistae*, was carried further than before, and the prayers were changed into commands. Innocent III was not content to send foreign ecclesiastics into England, with requests that the bishops would provide for them, but took it on himself to make out instruments of collation, without giving any other notice to the bishops whose patronage he thus usurped. Honorius addressed letters to the clergy of France and England, stating that the exactions of the Roman court, which were a common subject of complaint, were caused by the scantiness of its income from other sources; and proposing by way of remedy that the income of certain prebends in every cathedral and collegiate or monastic church should be set apart for the expenses of the curia. But in both countries the proposal was received with such an outburst of indignant derision that the legates who were charged with it refrained from pressing the matter. Innocent IV at the first council of Lyons renewed the attempt to get possession of English prebends; but the representatives of the English church were firm in their refusal. The system of *precistae*, however, went on. Thus Gregory IX, in 1240, desired archbishop Edmund and two other English bishops to provide for three hundred Italians; and although the intrusion of foreign incumbents into the English church was among the chief causes of the "Barons' War," the legate, Guy Fulcodi, who was sent to England in the heat of that great contest, was authorized by Urban IV to bestow canonries and other benefices by way of provision. The documents by which patronage was thus usurped were from the time of Innocent IV rendered more peremptory by the introduction of the phrases "*de plenitudine potestatis*" and "*non obstantibus*" by which it was signified that the pope had absolute power in such matters, and that his will was paramount to all difficulties or objections.

The papal legates continued to excite the indignation of those to whom they were sent by their extortions and assumptions. Clement IV describes them as having a power like that of proconsuls over the provinces committed to them, and they exercised jurisdiction and invaded patronage with all the authority which the popes themselves assumed. In some cases, sovereigns refused to admit such visitors into their dominions, and popes were reduced to the evasion of sending envoys without the title of legate, although with all or more than all the legatine power. But it was part of the oath exacted from Otho IV and his successors, that they would not throw any hindrance in the way of legates; and, if a pope agreed to refrain from

sending legates into any country, it was held by the Roman party that his successors were not bound by his act. Alexander IV, in consequence of the innumerable complaints which were made as to the misbehaviour of legates, endeavoured to put them under some restraint; but almost immediately after this, we find the same complaints as before.

The resistance of the English to the spoliation of their church by foreigners who performed none of the duties of pastors, and to the merciless exactions by which it was drained for the benefit of Rome, has been already mentioned. In France, where similar oppressions were attempted, they were met in a like spirit. And in that country the strength which the crown had acquired under St. Lewis, with the influence of his personal character, and the authority which his legal counsellors could advance from their study of ancient law, enabled him effectually to check the papal spirit of aggression on the national rights by the provisions of the Pragmatic Sanction.

A great forgery of bulls and other documents professing to emanate from the papal chancery was now carried on; and privileges of questionable character were often produced by persons whose interest they favoured, as the fruits of a visit to Rome. Richard, the successor of Becket in the see of Canterbury, after denouncing persons who attempted to pass themselves off as bishops by counterfeiting “the barbarism of Irish or Scottish speech,” goes on to complain of spurious bulls, and orders that the makers and users of such documents shall be periodically excommunicated. Innocent III makes frequent mention of these forgeries, of which a manufactory was in his time discovered at Rome; and he exposes some of the tricks which were practised—such as that of affixing to a forgery a genuine papal seal taken from a genuine deed, the erasure of some words and the substitution of others. But the canons of later councils prove that the system of forgery survived these exposures and denunciations.

The canon law during this time received important additions. Gratian’s ‘Decretum’, notwithstanding his endeavour to harmonize the materials of which it was composed, gave rise to frequent questions, which drew forth papal decretals and rescripts in order to their resolution; and these all became part of the law of the church. This body of law had also been increased by the canons of important councils—some of which councils even claimed the title of general. From the growth of such additions, from the contradictions, the repetitions, and other defects of the existing canons, there was no small danger lest ecclesiastical law should fall into utter confusion. Many attempts had already been made to form a digest of the matter thus accumulated, when in 1230 Gregory IX, himself a man of great learning in canon law, intrusted the formation of an authoritative work to Raymond of Peñaforte, a Spanish Dominican, who, after three years of labour, with the help of other learned canonists, produced five books of Decretals; and to these a sixth, made up of five smaller books, was added by Boniface VIII in 1298. Thus it happens that the standard law-books of the Roman church date from the time when the power of the papacy was at its greatest height. By Gregory’s order, the Decretals compiled by Raymond were published at Paris in 1234, and at Bologna in the following year. In these collections the conflict between earlier and later authorities, which had perplexed the students of Gratian, no longer appeared. All obsolete matter was excluded, and the materials for decision of questions were ready at hand; and in consequence of the greater convenience of such books for use, Gratian’s work came to be practically superseded by them.

When the election of bishops had passed into the hands of the cathedral chapters, members of these chapters pursued towards the bishops the same policy by which the ecclesiastical and other electors diminished the rights of the German crown—exactng concessions from every new bishop at the time of his election; and, although such “capitulations” were declared by Innocent III and other popes to be null, the practice continued. The pretensions of the chapters to privileges and independence rose higher. In some cases they became “close” (*capitula clausa*)—refusing to admit any members but such

as could satisfy a certain standard of noble descent ;k but this exclusive system did not find favour with popes, when questions arising out of it were carried to them for decision.

As there was nothing in general to limit the number of canons, except the want of sufficient endowments for their support, a new system was introduced of appointing canons in reversion. These, who were styled *domicellares*, differed from the junior canons of Chrodegang's rule, inasmuch as the juniors had small estates, while the *domicellares*, during their time of expectancy, had none; while on the other hand the *domicellares*, unlike the juniors, were entitled to vote in the chapter. But this unlimited multiplication of canonries, and the disposal of such dignities before they were vacant, were discouraged by popes and by several councils.

By way of some compensation for their former share in the appointment of bishops, sovereigns now acquired the "right of first prayers"—*jus primarum precum*—by which they were entitled to claim one piece of patronage from every new bishop or abbot. This privilege appears to have originated in an imitation of the similar interference with patronage which had lately been introduced by the popes, and the first recorded instance of it is said to be no older than the year 1242, when it was exercised by Conrad, son of Frederick II, as king of the Romans. But within a few years after that time, Richard of Cornwall and Rudolf of Hapsburg are found professing to have derived it from the ancient custom of their predecessors.

The evils which arose from long vacancies of sees had been much felt, and especially in England. During such times, which were protracted for the advantage of sovereigns, the tenants and the property of sees suffered greatly, while the diocese or the province was left without pastoral superintendence; and the decree of the fourth council of Lateran—that every see should be filled up within three months—was far from remedying the evil. But, although much is said of these things, it is only the abuse that is complained of by writers of the time, and the king's right to the income during vacancy is admitted. Philip the Fair asserts very strongly his claim in this respect, arguing that as, on the vacancy of a fief, the liege-lord stepped in, so the sovereign was entitled to the temporal jurisdiction and property belonging to a vacant see, prebend, or other dignity.

From the time when the questions of investiture and homage were settled, it was understood that bishops were subject to the performance of all feudal duties in consideration of their temporalities. Thus, in the reign of Philip Augustus, when the bishops of Orleans and Auxerre had withdrawn their troops from the national army, under the pretext that they were not bound to furnish them unless when the king commanded in person, Innocent III admitted the king's right to the troops, provided that he had not invaded the especial property of the sees, although the question whether the bishops themselves were bound to serve was left for further consideration. At the Lateran council, Innocent, in forbidding secular potentates to exact oaths of fealty from such clergy as held no temporalities under them, admits the feudal right which arose out of temporalities; and the decisions of some later popes were in accordance with this view. Boniface VIII, however, in a bull addressed to William of Gainsborough, bishop of Worcester, affected to give him possession of the temporalities of his see, as well as of the spiritual jurisdiction. But Edward I obliged the bishop to renounce that clause in the bull which related to the temporalities, and fined him a thousand marks for having received a document so derogatory to the English crown.

The clergy now insisted on a right to immunity from lay taxation—a pretension which, according to the principles of the age, was fair, if it were understood to mean that the amount of their contributions to public purposes was to be assessed by members of their own order. But the clergy were very commonly disposed to extend it to a claim of entire exemption, whether from national taxes, from local rates, or from tolls on the conveyance of their property and of the produce of their estates. Against this unreasonable pretension the free cities of Lombardy took the lead in defending themselves by the infliction of civil disabilities on the clergy; and both there and elsewhere the opposite principle was eventually established.

We have seen how much this question entered into the great quarrel between Boniface and Philip the Fair.

The question as to the immunity of the clergy from secular justice, which had been the chief occasion of Becket's struggle with Henry II, had not been clearly decided. In England, although that constitution of Clarendon which had especially excited the archbishop's indignation was not formally abrogated, even after his death, the full acknowledgment of the "rights and liberties of the English church" in the first article of Magna Charta, may seem to imply a virtual repeal of it. At a later time, Grossetete is found complaining that lay courts interfered with the rights of the clergy, although he was willing to allow that the secular officers should arrest a clerk detected in grievous crime, and should keep him until claimed by his ordinary. A council held by archbishop Boniface at Lambeth in 1261 complained that clerks were sometimes imprisoned on mere suspicion by laymen, who refused to give them up to the ordinary. The council enacted that laymen so offending should be punished by excommunication and interdict; that every bishop should provide one or more prisons for criminous clerks, and that clerks convicted of any crime which in a layman would, be capital, should be confined for life. In 1275 was enacted by the first statute of Westminster, that, if a clerk accused of any felony were demanded by his ordinary, his person should be given up, but the charge should be investigated by the secular judge, and, if the clerk were found guilty, his lands and other property should be seized into the hands of the king. If, however, he were able to purge himself in the spiritual court, it was ordered both by the council of Lambeth and in the Westminster statute that the confiscated property should be restored.

In other countries also the clergy endeavoured to secure exemption from all secular jurisdiction. Frederick II, both at his coronation as emperor in 1220, and at his reconciliation with Gregory IX ten years later, acknowledged such exemption in broad terms, with the single exception on the latter occasion, of cases relating to feudal matters.

Yet although the clergy were able to obtain such acknowledgments, the evident justice of the objections raised by Henry II of England and others to the actual working of the system had the effect of bringing about a stricter execution of the ecclesiastical laws against offending clerks. Thus Innocent III, while forbidding the laity to draw clergymen before secular courts, was careful to order that the ecclesiastical courts should render full justice to the laity, and that bishops should deal strictly in the punishment of clergymen who were convicted of crime. And, while the officers of secular justice were entitled to arrest a clerk and to detain him until claimed by his ecclesiastical superior, the ecclesiastical authorities were forbidden, after a clerk had been degraded from his orders for his crimes, to provide for his escape from the secular authorities.

The church claimed an oversight of the administration of justice, on the theory that the secular powers derived from it their commission to execute justice, and that the church was still entitled to exercise its right through priests. And on the ground that crimes are also sins, or on some other ground, the clergy contrived to bring within the scope of their canons and jurisdiction a multitude of affairs which seemed rather to belong to the secular province. Hence arose frequent complaints of encroachment on both sides. Matthew Paris relates that in 1247 an association of French nobles drew up an agreement for the purpose of restoring the former state of things, in which the ecclesiastical courts had limited their cognizance to matters of heresy, marriage, and usury, and that St. Lewis affixed his seal to this document. It has indeed been remarked as a singular circumstance, that for this important movement of the French nobles no other authority than that of the English chronicler is known but although it is not recorded by the French annalists of the time, it would seem that the story is confirmed by evidence of other kinds.

The too frequent use of ecclesiastical censures, such as excommunication and interdict, the slightness of the occasions on which they were pronounced, and the evident

injustice of the sentences themselves in many cases, tended to lessen their effect on the minds of men; and, with a view of restoring this, the clergy endeavoured to get the spiritual sentences enforced by temporal penalties. Thus Philip of Swabia was persuaded to annex outlawry to the anathema of the church; Frederick II in 1220 made a somewhat similar promise; and the addition of the secular to the ecclesiastical sentence is embodied in the book of laws known by the title of 'Schwabenspiegel', which was drawn up between 1270 and 1285. But these laws do not appear to have been put in practice; and we have seen that St. Lewis refused to grant the petition of his bishops when they desired that the sentences of the church might be carried out by secular penalties in France.

Another new engine of discipline was the excommunication *lata sententiae*; by which it was meant that persons guilty of certain gross crimes should be considered as having already had a sentence of excommunication passed on them, and as being subject to its penalties without any further formality.

We have already seen that, on account of the misconduct of archdeacons, bishops endeavoured to relieve themselves in some degree by the appointment of officials or penitentiaries, on whom the business of the archdeacons was devolved as much as possible; and this practice continued throughout the thirteenth century. Another new class of ecclesiastical dignitaries arose in consequence of the loss of the Latin possessions in the Holy Land, by which a great number of bishops were deprived of their occupation and income. Some of these were found useful by the prelates of the West as assistants in the performance of their functions; and, as it was thought well to keep up this titular episcopate, in the hope that the East might yet be recovered, employment was found for many "bishops in the parts of the infidels" by regular engagements as suffragans in the dioceses of other bishops, who seem to have very commonly devolved on them the performance of the more ordinary episcopal functions.

The property of the church and of the monastic bodies was still increasing. In the south of France, the prevalence of heresy afforded a colour for requiring that no person should make his will without the presence of a priest, and that any one who should neglect this should be excluded from Christian burial until the church were satisfied. But such a provision was as likely to serve the church by securing the bounty as the orthodoxy of the dying man, and it was repeated in other canons without any reference to heresy, but with a direct view to the encouragement of bequests to the church. In some quarters, however, measures began to be now taken for restraining the growth of ecclesiastical and monastic property. Thus a parliament at Westminster, in 1279, enacted, under pain of forfeiture, that no bequests should be made to spiritual corporations, or to the "dead hand," except with the king's special consent. The clergy were greatly annoyed by this statute; but king Edward told them to refrain from any resolution to the disadvantage of the crown and the state, if they set any value on the baronies which they held under the sovereign; and other statutes of mortmain, with enactments of similar tendency, followed in the course of the same reign. When the bishops represented that such acts were an infringement of the liberties promised to the church by Henry III in his confirmation of the Great Charter, and desired that they might be mitigated, Edward replied that nothing must be done without the royal license, but that he would grant this according as might be expedients. In Germany the bishops endeavoured by the enactment of canons to set aside the principle which required that, in order to the validity of a will, the testator should afterwards have been able to go abroad without support; and, finding their canons ineffectual, they tried to secure the validity of wills by inserting in them curses against any who should question it.

The advocates, who had for centuries been felt by churches and monasteries as an oppressive weight, were now somewhat restrained in their tyranny. Honorius III, after strongly denouncing their evil practices, orders that, whenever the office of advocate should be vacant, churches shall not grant it away, and especially that no church shall have more than

one advocate. Philip of Swabia forbade the advocates to exact enforced labour; Frederick II ordered that they should not build castles, and in other ways circumscribed their powers of doing mischief; and in the end of the century Adolphus of Germany forbade them to interfere with the endowments of the church or clergy.

Celibacy was enforced by canons as before, and was now established as the rule in Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, and in the Scandinavian kingdoms, which had formerly held out against it; but it is evident, both from the satirical vernacular poetry which was now largely produced in various countries, and also from more serious testimony, that the clergy in general had fallen into disrespect, which was increased by the startling contrast between their lives and the growingly mysterious sanctity of their professions; between the severity with which offences against orthodoxy were treated and the lenient toleration of immorality. And while celibacy was rigidly enjoined on the clergy, all the chief schoolmen of the age—Albert the Great, Thomas of Aquino, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, and others—agree in representing it as merely a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, as to which some of them would not unwillingly have seen an alteration.

MONASTICISM

The variety of religious orders, which in the preceding century had been a subject of perplexity and complaint, was restrained in its further increase by a canon of the fourth Lateran council, which enacted that any person who might wish to adopt a monastic life should take up one of the rules which had already been approved, instead of attempting to invent a new one. The only very considerable additions which were made to the number of orders within this century were the two great fraternities of Dominic and Francis. But as these, by proclaiming mendicancy as their principle, excited many imitators, Gregory X, at the second council of Lyons, reduced the unbridled multitudes of friars to four orders, joining with the Dominicans and Franciscans the Carmelites (who had adopted the mendicant system) and the Augustinian eremites.

The two great mendicant orders surpassed all other monastic bodies in vigour and in popularity. They were to the elder orders much as these had been to the secular clergy—outshining them in the display of the qualities which were most admired, and endeavouring to surpass and supersede them in every way. Matthew Paris tells us that they disparaged the Cistercians as rude and simple; the Benedictines, as proud and epicurean. The mendicants increased the more readily because they were able to dispense with costly buildings. Their numbers were recruited, not only by young men who flocked into the mendicant cloisters, often against the will of their parents, but by many members of the older orders; and, while the friars were allowed by popes to receive accessions from other orders, it was forbidden that any other order should receive members from the friars. By the institution of tertiaries they were so widely connected with the laity, that a writer of the age speaks of almost every one as being enrolled on the lists of one or other of the new fraternities. And while the mendicants penetrated, as none had before done, to the very poorest classes of men, they knew too how to recommend themselves to the rich and great. They were favoured by popes, who employed them in business both ecclesiastical and secular; they were familiar with the courts of princes, and were trusted by them with offices, and with the conduct of negotiations, which might have seemed strangely incongruous with their rigid and unworldly professions. Bishops of the more zealous kind, such as Grossetete, of Lincoln, employed them in their dioceses, to make up for the deficient zeal or ability of the secular clergy; and they soon assumed for themselves authority to act independently of episcopal sanction, and were so far countenanced by the privileges they acquired from popes that they had little to fear from the opposition of bishops. They invaded parishes and derided the ministrations of the secular clergy, while they endeavoured to draw everything to themselves; their services were shorter, livelier, and more

attractive; they preached, administered the sacraments, and directed consciences; they persuaded the dying that bounty to their order, death in its habit, and burial in their cloisters, were the surest means to salvation. By hearing confessions, they annulled the penitential discipline; for while one formal confession a year to the parish priest was considered to satisfy the decree of the Lateran council, the intention of that canon was frustrated by the system of confession to strangers and interlopers.

Although Francis had expressly discouraged study, his order, as well as that of Dominic, was soon able to boast of men of the highest intellect and learning. In like manner, although both he and Dominic had intended that their followers should avoid ecclesiastical dignities, we find before the end of the century many Franciscan and Dominican bishops, and even a Franciscan pope. So too the extreme plainness which was at first affected in their houses and churches, was soon superseded by an almost royal splendour of architecture and decoration; and, while the rough exterior of dress was still in general kept up, there were some mendicants who took advantage of the commissions on which they were employed to exhibit themselves on fine horses, with gilt saddles, arrayed in splendid robes, and with boots of a fashion peculiar to knights or warriors. It was said that a friar had been informed by revelation that the devils, who yearly held a council against the order, had devised three especial means for its ruin—"familiarity with women, reception of unprofitable members, and handling of money"; and, although we may doubt the truth of the story, we cannot fail to understand its significance. Matthew Paris, who, as a Benedictine of the great monastery of St. Alban's, delights in denouncing the faults of the new orders, tells us that the mendicants, within a quarter of a century from their first settlement in England, had degenerated more than any of the older monastic orders had done in three or four centuries; and a letter written in the name of the secular clergy to Henry III of England contrasts their profession with their practice by saying that "although having nothing, they possess all things; and, although without riches, they grow richer than all the rich."

Among other labours, the friars undertook that of religious teaching; and it is said that the freshness of their lectures enabled them to triumph over the somewhat faded and spiritless performances of the other teachers. Paris was then the intellectual centre of Europe. The university had been continually advancing in reputation and influence, until in 1229 it was broken up, in consequence of a serious conflict with the municipal authorities. After having applied in vain to the queen-mother and the bishop for redress of their alleged wrongs, the professors dispersed, with their respective trains of students, into provincial towns, to which their residence gave for a time an unwonted celebrity. At this time, while the regular theological teaching of the university was in abeyance at Paris, the Dominicans, with the bishop's permission, established a professorship of theology, which they filled with a succession of their most eminent doctors; and, when the university was able to resume its place in Paris, it was found necessary to guard against the aggressive spirit of the friars. No open outbreak, however, took place until 1251, when the secular clergy complained that, of the twelve theological professorships, three were occupied by the canons of Paris, and two by Dominicans; so that, if the five other monastic communities of the city were each to get a professorship, only two out of the whole number would be left for the seculars, for whom the whole had originally been intended. A fresh decree was therefore passed, that no religious order should be allowed to hold more than one of the theological chairs. Against this decision the Dominicans appealed to Innocent IV, who, possibly thinking that the papacy had no further need of the special services of the mendicants, decided against them. But within a few days after having issued his judgment, Innocent died, and the friends of the Dominicans did not scruple to attribute his death to the effect of their prayers. Alexander IV, perhaps alarmed by his predecessor's end, rescinded the bull of Innocent, and decreed that the chancellor of Paris might appoint professors either from the religious orders or from the secular clergy. The university, in order to avoid the operation of the decree, professed to dissolve itself; and in

consequence of this step it was placed under excommunication by the pope's representatives, the bishops of Orleans and Auxerre. In 1256 four archbishops, who had been chosen as arbiters, awarded two professorships to the Dominicans, but under the condition that they should not be admitted into the academic society without the consent of the seculars. But the pope rejected this compromise, and, with the permission of king Lewis (who, as a tertiary of St. Francis, was favourable to the mendicants), he issued bull after bull, until in 1257 the university was compelled to succumb to the friars, and to admit at once as teachers the great Dominican Thomas of Aquino, and the great Franciscan Bonaventura.

But, although the preachers and the minorites were in some respects united by a common interest, their orders were also rivals of each other, so that jealousies and collisions might readily arise between them. While the Franciscans carried reverence for their "seraphic father" to the degree of idolatry, the great miracle of the stigmata was denied and ridiculed by the Dominicans. In their philosophical principles, the Dominicans were nominalists and the Franciscans realists; and as to some important points of religious doctrine they might be regarded as opposite schools. Thus, as to the question of grace and free-will, while the Dominicans, under the guidance of Aquinas, held the Augustinian system, the Franciscans, under Scotus, were semipelagian. And as to the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin, while the Franciscans advocated the opinion which in our own time has become an article of the Roman faith, the Dominicans strenuously opposed it.

But the Franciscans were also divided among themselves by differences both broad and deep. Even during the lifetime of St. Francis, Elias, who afterwards became master of the order, had taken advantage of his absence in Egypt to introduce some mitigations of the rule, on the ground that the grace which had been given to the founder was not to be expected of his successors; and after the death of Francis he had more freely developed his views in departing from the original idea of the order. When Francis had been canonized, and a church was to be built in his honour at Assisi, Elias, in defiance of the saint's own precepts, resolved that it should have all the splendour that could be given to it by beauty of design and by richness of materials and ornament. Many members of the order began to murmur against the strict rule of poverty; and Gregory IX relaxed it in 1230, declaring that the founder's testament, on which the opposition to the change was rested, had no power to bind his successors. But a strong and earnest party, who were known by the names of *Zelatores* or *Spirituals*, refused to accept this relaxation, and, while the church of Assisi was rising in all the glory of variegated marbles and gilding, of decorative painting and sculpture, these rigid professors of poverty buried themselves among the rocks and forests of the Apennines. Elias dealt severely with the members of this party, and Gregory, on receiving a protest against his mitigation of the rule, punished the authors of the movement. But Elias, after having been already deposed from the headship of the order and restored to it, was finally deprived in 1239, and spent the remainder of his days under papal excommunication at the court of the emperor Frederick, whose hatred of the papacy and the mendicant orders he probably helped to exasperate.

In 1245 Innocent IV issued a fresh relaxation of the rule—declaring that the property of the order belonged to the apostolic see, but that the members were entitled to appoint prudent men to manage it for their use. Two years later, John of Parma, formerly a professor at Paris, became head of the order, and under him the rigid party gained the ascendancy. The spirituals declared that in John their founder had come to life again; but with his ideas of monastic rigour John combined some apocalyptic fancies, derived from abbot Joachim of Fiore, which were widely prevalent in the order, and could hardly be regarded as consistent with dutiful obedience to the Roman see. In consequence of the excitement which had arisen as to these opinions (though nominally on the ground that the spirit of laxity was too strong for him), John, at the suggestion of Alexander IV, resigned his mastership in 1256. By his recommendation Bonaventura was chosen as his successor; and under the new master's

conciliatory rule, the order in 1260 asked and received leave from Alexander IV to abolish the interpretations of Innocent IV, except in so far as they agreed with those of Gregory IX.

Among the most prominent champions of the university of Paris in its contest with the mendicants, was a doctor of the Sorbonne, named William, a native of St. Amour, in Franche Comté, who, not content with acting on the defensive, vigorously assailed the whole system of mendicancy. He preached against the friars with an eloquence which their most famous orators could hardly rival, while eager audiences listened to him with such prepossessions as had been naturally produced in them by the late assumptions of the mendicants; and he sent forth a treatise 'Of the Perils of the Last Times', in which he unsparingly chastised the principles and the practice of the friars, and applied to them the description of the false teachers of whom St. Paul spoke as about to arise in the perilous times which were to come. The book was censured by an assembly of bishops at Paris; but the Dominicans, not content with this, prevailed on king Lewis to send it to the pope, who committed it for examination to four cardinals—one of them being the Dominican Hugh of St. Cher. William of St. Amour, too, was sent to the pope, with others, on the part of the university; but on caching Anagni, where Alexander then was, he found that his book had been already condemned; that it had been burnt in front of the cathedral, under the pope's own eyes; and that strict orders were given for the immediate destruction of all copies of it, although it had not been found to contain any heresy, but was blamed only as tending to stir up enmity against the mendicants. William was forbidden to teach, was deprived of all preferments "had or to be had," and, in consequence of the pope's having demanded his banishment, with that of three others who had opposed the friars in the university, he withdrew to his native province, where he remained until after the death of Alexander; but his treatise, notwithstanding the repeated sentences against it, was translated into French, and even versified in that language. In 1263 William took advantage of a bull of Urban IV to return to Paris, and three years later he produced an improved edition of his book, which he defended with spirit and success against the greatest champions of the mendicant orders, such as Albert the Great, Bonaventura, and Thomas of Aquino. There is a letter from Clement IV to William, in which the pope professes to have read only a part of the revised work, and cautions the writer as to the display of his old animosity, but it does not appear that the pope ever proceeded further in his censure.

William of St. Amour died in 1270. We are told by a contemporary Franciscan writer that he drew away many members from the mendicant orders; and the popular poetry of the time gives evidence of the strong impression which his attacks on them had made on the general mind.

Among the charges brought against the mendicants by William was that of believing the "everlasting gospel"; under which name it would seem that we are not to understand any single book, but the substance of abbot Joachim's apocalyptic interpretations and of his doctrine as to successive states of the church. In 1254 appeared a book entitled an 'Introduction to the everlasting gospel', in which, among other objectionable propositions, it was asserted that the gospel had brought no one to perfection, and was to be superseded by a new dispensation in the year 1260. This book was long supposed to have been the work of John of Parma, but is now known to have been written by another Franciscan—Gerard or Gerardino of Borgo San Donnino—who, on account of the reproach which his opinions brought on the order, was imprisoned for eighteen years by his superiors, and at last was buried in unhallowed earth. In the year after the publication of the 'Introduction', the university of Paris gained something of a triumph over the mendicants by obtaining from Alexander IV a condemnation of the book, with its "schedules", in which a great part of the mischievous matter was contained; and the 'Introduction' was burnt at Paris, although, out of consideration for the mendicants, the burning, instead of being public, took place within the Dominican convent. But the opinions of Joachim's school spread widely among the Franciscans, more especially as the relaxations of the rule by papal authority tended to

alienate the “spiritual” party more and more from the papacy, and to convince them that Rome was, as Joachim’s followers taught, the Babylon and the great harlot of the Apocalypse. The extreme section of this party came to be known by the name of *fraticelli*—a name which, like that of beghards, was used in many ways, but, as applied to the minorites, denoted those who wished to carry the principle of beggary even further than Francis himself—insisting on the duty of living on alms from day to day.

In 1279 Nicolas III issued a bull which is known by the title of *Exiit*, mitigating the rule of St. Francis in some respects, and declaring that, although the right of property was in the apostolic see, the friars were entitled to the use of such things as were necessary. By this the *fraticelli* were exasperated, and a new prophet of their party arose in Peter John of Olivi. Olivi was born in 1247 at Serignan, near Narbonne; he was dedicated to the Franciscan order at the age of twelve, studied at Paris, and about 1278 made himself conspicuous by the extravagance of his language as to the blessed Virgin, which the annalist of the order pronounces to be “not praises, but fooleries,” such as the object of them would herself be unwilling to accept. The scandal excited by Olivi’s writings on this subject was so great that the general of the order, Jerome of Ascoli (afterwards Nicolas IV), condemned him to burn them with his own hand. Olivi also plunged deeply into the quarrels between the opposite parties of the Franciscans, and distinguished himself by his severity against all laxity in the order. His views on prophecy were set forth in various books, of which his ‘Postills on the Apocalypse’ were the most notorious. He taught that there were three states of the church; that in the first, God had revealed Himself as Fear; in the second, as Wisdom; and in the third, He was to be revealed as Love. As Christianity had superseded Judaism, so a new state, under the Holy Ghost, was to supersede Christianity; St Peter was to give way to St. John. The history of the church was divided into seven ages, of which the sixth (opened by St. Francis, the angel of the sixth seal) was now running out, and the seventh was to coincide with the third state. The renewal of the church was to be effected through the tertiaries of the Franciscan order; and as the preachers of the gospel in the apostolic age found more acceptance among heathens than among Jews, so the new spiritual mission would have greater success with Jews, Saracens, and Tartars, than with the fleshly church of the Latins. The Holy Ghost was to receive from the church as Christ had received from the Holy Ghost. Of Rome and its hierarchy Olivi spoke in terms of the strongest denunciation; and he supposed that the Roman church was to be destroyed by Frederick of Sicily before the coming of Antichrist.

In 1282 Olivi’s doctrines were investigated by the authorities of the order, who condemned him in a document which, from having been sealed by seven inquisitors, is known as the ‘Book of the Seven Seals’; but he appeared uninvited before them, preached in such a manner as to satisfy them of his orthodoxy, and subscribed the condemnation of the errors which were imputed to him. In 1290, however, Nicolas IV addressed a letter to the general of the Franciscans, desiring him to proceed against the “brethren of Narbonne”, the followers of Olivi. In consequence of this, many of the party were imprisoned, or subjected to other severities. Olivi himself retracted in 1292, and is said to have emitted two orthodox confessions on his death-bed, in 1297. Yet although he had died in peace with the church, his memory was not allowed to rest. The council of Vienne, in 1311, condemned some opinions which were imputed to him, and in 1325 pope John XXII, after an inquiry by eight doctors, condemned his *Postills* on account of the errors which they contained. The reading of his books had already been forbidden in the order of which he had been a member; the inquisition of Toulouse denounced him as a false prophet; and it is said (although on doubtful authority) that after the sentence of John XXII his bones were taken from the grave and burnt. Yet there were many stories of miracles done by his remains, and his writings were widely circulated in translations. The adherents of his opinions denied that either pope or general council was entitled to condemn them; they revered him as a saint and a martyr, nay, as the “mighty angel”, who “had in his hand a little book open”, and they kept a festival in his honour. The

condemnation of his writings was rescinded by Sixtus IV, himself a Franciscan, in the latter part of the fifteenth century, when they were supposed to be no longer dangerous. In the meantime, the discords within the Franciscan order continued. The stricter and the laxer parties by turns got the ascendancy, and each in the day of its triumph banished the members of the opposite faction. The *fraticelli* became more and more extravagant in their opinions and practices. They pretended to visions and revelations; they maintained that no pope was entitled to alter the rule of St. Francis—that since the time of Nicolas III there had been no real pope or prelate except among themselves. In 1294, Celestine V combined them with his own especial followers in the order of Celestine eremites. But Boniface VIII, who had no love for the mendicants, rescinded this privilege, and banished them to one of the Greek islands, where they were not allowed to remain. One of Olivi's disciples, a Provençal, is said to have been elected pope in St. Peter's by five men and thirteen women of the party; and by these and others their doctrines were spread into Sicily, Greece, and other countries, becoming everywhere a leaven of opposition and discontent, actively though secretly working against the papacy.

Rites and Usages.

Although the canon by which the fourth Lateran council enforced the belief of transubstantiation was generally construed as prescribing that doctrine in its grossest form, there was yet in many minds a strong repugnance to such a manner of understanding the Eucharistic presence. Many, while they held the belief that the Saviour was present in the sacrament, shrank from defining the mode of His presence; and the university of Paris, the most distinguished school of theology in Christendom, was especially suspected of lagging behind the development of orthodoxy on this point. In 1264, it was reported that an archbishop of Narbonne, when at Rome, had expressed the opinion that the body of Christ was not on the altar in reality, "but as a thing signified under its sign," and had declared this to be the general opinion of the Parisian teachers; and, although he disavowed the words which were imputed to him, the charge can hardly have been without some foundation. At a later time, John of Paris, or de Soardis, a famous Dominican, although he professed his own belief in transubstantiation, maintained that it was enough for the satisfaction of the ecclesiastical definitions as to faith to believe the presence without determining the manner of it; that instead of holding a change of substance, men were at liberty to suppose an assumption of the quality of bread into union with the Saviour's human nature. For this opinion John was called in question by some French prelates and divines, who after an examination of his doctrines forbade him to teach at Paris; and, while engaged in prosecuting an appeal to the pope, he died, so that the question was left undetermined.

But, whatever latitude of opinion as to the manner of the Eucharistic presence may have been assumed by some persons, or may have been really within the intention of the Lateran decree, the ordinary view of the matter appears beyond all doubt from the stories of miracles, in which the consecrated wafer took the form of a beautiful child, of a bleeding piece of flesh, or the like. Such stories had a great effect on the popular mind; but that they were not universally accepted appears from a passage of Alexander of Hales, who, while strongly maintaining the established doctrine, speaks of some miracles in its favour as being the effect of human, or possibly of diabolical, contrivance.

Strange questions were proposed and discussed by the theologians of the time in connexion with the doctrine of transubstantiation. Thus, in the Greek church, where that doctrine had been established as well as in the West, there was a controversy whether the Saviour's body, after having been received in the Eucharist, was incorruptible, as after His passion and resurrection, or corruptible as before. Alexander of Hales inquires whether, if the Eucharistic body appear in such forms as the miraculous stories represented, it ought to be

eaten, and he replies in the negative. It was asked whether, if a mouse or a dog should eat the consecrated host, it would eat the Lord's body? Peter Lombard, in the preceding century, Pope Innocent III, and Bonaventura answered in the negative. But this hesitation as to the consequences of the doctrine soon passed away. Thomas of Aquino boldly maintained the affirmative, adding that this no more derogated from the Saviour's dignity than did His submission to be crucified by sinners; and Peter Lombard's adverse opinion came to be noted as one of those points in which the authority of the "Master of the Sentences" was not generally held good.

We have already seen that the heightened ideas as to the sacredness of the Eucharistic symbols gave occasion for scruples as to the administration of the chalice, and during the century which witnessed the formal decree of transubstantiation, the withdrawal of this part of the sacrament from the laity became general, although the older practice still continued in many places, and especially in monasteries. This withdrawal of the cup was defended by all the great theologians of the time, but in some cases with curious qualifications and exceptions. The authority of Gelasius I, in the fifth century, against administration in one kind only, was set aside, not by the pretext of later Roman controversialists, that his words were meant against the Manicheans only, but by the assertion that he spoke of the priest alone. And, as in the preceding century, divines who, on the ground of the doctrine of concomitancy, maintain the new practice as to the administration of the sacrament, are found at the same time declaring their belief that the administration under both kinds is of higher perfection or conveys a fuller grace.

In order to reconcile the laity to the withdrawal of the consecrated chalice, it now became usual to give them unconsecrated wine, which was said to be intended as a help to them in swallowing the host; and in some places a compromise was attempted by leaving in the chalice a small portion of the consecrated wine, and pouring on it other wine, which was then distributed to the people.

The ceremony of elevating the host had been used in the Greek church from the seventh (perhaps as early as the sixth) century, but without any meaning beyond that of typifying the Saviour's exaltation; nor, when it was adopted by the western church, in the eleventh century, did Hildebert, Ivo of Chartres, Rupert of Deutz, and their contemporaries, give any other reason for the observance of it. But when the Lateran canon had prescribed the doctrine of transubstantiation, it was ordered that both at the elevation of the host in the mass, and when it was carried through the streets to a sick person, all who were present should fall on their knees in reverence to it. Hence arose a festival of Adoration of the Host, which eventually became the festival of Corpus Christi. The common story refers the origin of this to a nun of Liege named Juliana, who from the year 1230 had frequent raptures, in which she saw a full moon, with a small part of it in darkness; and it was revealed to her that the full moon was the glory of the church, and that the dark part signified the want of a festival in especial honour of the Lord's body. For twenty years Juliana kept this revelation to herself, praying that some worthier organ might be chosen for the publication of it. At length, however, she disclosed it to a canon of Liege, by whom it was told to the archdeacon James—afterwards pope Urban IV. Urban, who, after attaining the papacy, had his attention further drawn to the subject by the miracle of Bolsena, decreed in 1264 an annual festival in honour of the Eucharistic body; and, as the day of the original institution of the sacrament—Thursday before Easter—was already much taken up with other ceremonies, Thursday after the octave of Pentecost was fixed on for the celebration of the Corpus Christi. The death of Urban followed within two months after the issuing of this decree, and his order did not meet with general obedience; but at the council of Vienne, in 1311, the festival was established for the whole church by a bull of Clement V.

The increased mystery and awfulness with which the sacrament of the Lord's supper was invested by the new doctrine had not the effect of rendering the general reception of it

more frequent. Although some councils endeavoured to enforce the older number of three communions yearly, it was found that the canon of the Lateran council, which allowed of one yearly reception as enough for Christian communion, became the rule. Instead of personally communicating, people were taught to rely on the efficacy of masses, which were performed by the priests for money; and from this great corruptions naturally followed.

The number of seven sacraments was in this age firmly established. Among them a pre-eminence was indeed given to baptism and the Lord's supper, as having been instituted by the Saviour during his earthly life; but it was held that he had, in truth, instituted the other sacraments also, although "not by exhibiting but by promising them".

The doctrine of *opus operatum* was now introduced, and was first distinctly laid down by Duns Scotus, whose words will suffice to convey the interpretation of it, as understood in the middle ages :—"A sacrament confers grace through the virtue of the work which is wrought, so that there is not required any inward good motion such as to deserve grace; but it is enough that the receiver place no bar" in the way of its operations.

INDULGENCES

During the thirteenth century, the system of indulgences was carried further, both by the development of its theory and by new practical applications. From the idea of the union and communion of all the faithful in one spiritual body was deduced the idea of benefits which might be derived by one member of the body from another. It was supposed that the saints, by their works of penitence, and by their unmerited sufferings in this world, had done more than was necessary for their own salvation, and that their superabundant merits, with those of the Saviour, formed a treasury, of which the church possessed the keys, and which it could apply for the relief of its members, both in this life and in purgatory. It was, indeed, said that the Saviour himself was the source of all merit; but the merits of his saints were more and more put forward in the popular teaching of the age. The supposed treasury of merits came to be applied in a wholesale way, as in the plenary indulgence which had been set forth as an inducement to join the crusades for the recovery of the Holy Land, and which was now extended to religious wars in Europe, or to wars undertaken by the popes against Christian sovereigns with whom they had quarrelled. And of this wholesale offer of indulgences, another remarkable instance was the jubilee instituted by Boniface VIII.

Each of the two great mendicant orders held forth its special indulgence as a means of attracting popular devotion. The Franciscans offered the indulgence of the Portiuncula—the church so called at Assisi—granted, according to their story, by the Saviour himself in answer to the prayer of St. Francis, and confirmed on earth by pope Honorius III. By this indulgence a full pardon of all sins was offered to every one who, on the festival of St. Peter's chains (Aug. 1) should visit the Portiuncula and make his confession; and it is said that as many as 100,000 persons were sometimes drawn together by the hope of partaking in this privilege.

The Dominican indulgence was connected with the Rosary—an instrument of devotion which had been known in earlier times, but which now became the especial property of this order. The manner of performing the devotion of the rosary was by reciting the angelic salutation, with a prayer for the blessed Virgin's intercession in the hour of death. A rosary of 150 beads represented a like number of *aves*, which were divided into fifteen portions, and between these portions a recitation of the Lord's prayer was interposed. Some mystery of the Christian faith was proposed for meditation during the performance of this exercise, and the whole was concluded by a repetition of the creed.

Bishops had formerly been accustomed to grant indulgences, and it was still considered that they were entitled to do so within their own dioceses, unless specially prohibited by higher authority. But the fourth council of Lateran, in consequence of the indiscreet profusion with which indulgences had been given by bishops, limited the amount which could be granted at the consecration of a church to one year, and that which could be granted at the

anniversary of the consecration to forty days. So Honorius III in 1255 abolished the indulgence of Sarracinesco, among the Sabine hills, because the clergy misled the people by telling them that they were cleared of their sins as a stick is peeled of its bark. But, while they thus limited the abuses practised by inferior persons, the popes in their own exercise of the power of indulging and absolving went further than ever. The commutation of penances and obligations for money was more shamelessly carried out. In like manner, the power of dispensing for breach of a law, which had formerly been limited to offences already committed, and had been excised by bishops in general, became now the privilege of the pope alone, and was exercised also with regard to future or intended violations of the law. And it was held that the pope's authority extended to dispensing with everything except the law of nature and the articles of the faith; nay, according to some writers, he might dispense with the law of nature itself, provided that he did not contradict the gospel or the articles of faith.

How much the indulgences of the church imported, was a matter of dispute. Some divines held that in order to their efficacy the ordinary conditions of penitence and devotion were necessary on the part of the receivers. But others asked, If this were so, what was there in the indulgences? and the popular opinion understood them in the plainest sense, without any idea of conditions or limitations. Some writers, while admitting this, said that the people were deceived, but held that the deceit was lawful on account of the good effects which were supposed to result from it. "The church deceives the faithful", says William of Auxerre, "yet doth she not lie." In like manner Thomas of Aquino says that, if the offers of indulgence may not be literally understood, the preaching of the church cannot be excused from the charge of falsehood; that, if inordinate indulgences are given, "so that men are called back almost for nothing from the works of penitence, he who gives such indulgences sins, yet nevertheless the receiver obtains full indulgence."

The enactment of the Lateran council, that every faithful person should confess once a year, was intended to remedy the evils which had arisen out of the promiscuous use of indulgences by securing a periodical inquiry into the spiritual condition of each person; and the power which it conferred on those who were thus intrusted with the scrutiny and direction of all consciences was enormous, while, as we have already seen, it was in a great degree diverted from the parish priests to the mendicant friars, and so the benefit of the spiritual discipline intended by the Lateran canon was lost. Bonaventura holds that until the passing of this canon it had not been heretical to deny the necessity of confession for all, although from that time such a denial could not be maintained without heresy. But, although in this he is supported by Aquinas, Duns Scotus considers it "more reasonable to hold that confession falls under a positive Divine command." Many other questions, of greater or less practical importance, arose out of the law of confession. Was it necessary in the case of mortal sin only, or of venial sins also? Again, was confession to a layman valid? Peter Lombard, relying in part on a treatise wrongly attributed to St. Augustine, had answered that it was. Albert the Great considers such confession as sacramental. Aquinas more cautiously says that, if the penitent perform his part of the work by contrition and confession, then, although the lay confessor cannot give priestly absolution, the Great High-priest will in case of need make up the defect; and thus confession to a layman, when a priest cannot be had, is "in a manner, although not fully, sacramental." But Scotus holds a contrary opinion, and considers that it would be better for a man to put himself to shame for his sins, if he could do so with equal intensity of shame, than to confess to one who has no commission to judge.

Another question related to the extent of the efficacy of the sacerdotal absolution. In this century the absolution was changed from the precatory form which had until then been used into the declaratory "I absolve thee." William of Auvergne, bishop of Paris, who died in 1249, writes that the confessor does not, like a secular judge, say "We absolve thee," but that he prays over the penitent for God's forgiveness and grace; and another writer of the age, in

objecting to the new form, says that scarcely thirty years had passed since the time when the precatory form was used by all. But Thomas of Aquino replied to this writer in defence of the declaratory absolution, and by his authority, chiefly, it came to be established in the church. Aquinas, while he holds that the power of forgiving sins is with God only, says that He may exercise it through his priest as an instrument, and that the absolution is from guilt as well as from punishment.

The abuses as to the matter of indulgences were in no small degree connected with the superstitious veneration of relics. Popes and councils attempted from time to time to check the practices of itinerant “quaestuaries,” who in England were known as “pardoners” and in Germany as “penny-preachers.” They denounce the ignorance of these men, their hypocritical pretensions to sanctity, their vicious and disreputable lives, the impudence with which they vended indulgences on the strength of the relics which they paraded, the danger that they might disseminate old heresies and errors; and they endeavour to remedy the evil by forbidding the pardoners to preach, by confining them to the display of their relics, by providing that these, if they could not be warranted as genuine, should at least be sanctioned by the pope, or by competent ecclesiastical authority, and by ordering that the profits of such exhibitions should not be appropriated by the showmen. But in the following centuries we find frequent notices which prove that the pardoners continued to carry on their trade with unabated impudence and with undiminished success.

The prevailing veneration for saints called forth in this time some legendary writers who attained great fame and popularity—especially Symeon Metaphrastes in the Greek church, and James de Voragine (so called from his birth at Vorago—Viraggio or Varese, on the Gulf of Genoa) in the Latin. James, who was born about 1230, became a Dominican, was highly respected for his personal character, and in 1292 was raised to the archbishopric of Genoa by Nicolas IV. But his ‘Lombard History’ more commonly known by the title of ‘Golden Legend’, carries legendary extravagance to a degree which has been seldom, if ever, equalled. Yet notwithstanding this extravagance—or rather, perhaps, in consequence of it—the ‘Golden Legend’ became popular beyond all similar collections; it was translated into several languages; and even so late as the sixteenth century a divine who had spoken disrespectfully of it in a sermon was compelled by the theological faculty of Paris to retract his words.

About the same time with James of Viraggio wrote William Durantis or Durandus, who was born in the diocese of Beziers in 1237, became bishop of Mende in 1286, and died at Rome in 1296. Durantis was greatly honoured by popes, and was employed by them in important political business. He had in earlier life been a professor at Bologna, and his knowledge of both canon and civil law was displayed in a book entitled ‘Speculum Juris’, from which he got the name of Speculator. But his wider and more equivocal fame is derived from his ‘Rationale of Divine Offices’, in which the system of allegorical interpretation, which we have noticed in an earlier period, is carried to a very extravagant length. Yet, foolish and absurdly trifling as much of this book is, Durandus was not so foolish in other respects as the peculiar admiration which he has received in our own time and country might lead us to suppose; nor must we forget that many things which cannot among ourselves be repeated without manifest and ridiculous affectation, might in the thirteenth century have been said simply and naturally. In some important points, indeed, Durandus deserves the credit of having endeavoured rather to check than to forward the development of popular superstition. Perhaps a sufficient evidence of the popularity which the ‘Rationale’ attained may be found in the facts that it was one of the earliest works which issued from the press of Fust, and that forty editions of it, at least, were published before the end of the fifteenth century.

The veneration for the blessed Virgin increased so as more and more to encroach on the honour due to her Divine Son. The beginning of the movement for the doctrine and the celebration of her immaculate conception has been already noticed. The original celebration

of the blessed Virgin's conception did not relate to her having been conceived in her mother's womb, but to her having conceived the Saviour of mankind. The earlier celebrations of her own conception did not attach to it the idea of her having been conceived without sin; nor, although the doctrine of the immaculate conception had been broached in the preceding century (when it was opposed by the powerful authority of St. Bernard), did it for a long time gain the support of any considerable theologian. Even the Franciscans, as Alexander of Hales, Antony of Padua, and Bonaventura, maintained that the Virgin was conceived in sin, until Duns Scotus asserted (although not with absolute certainty) the opposite opinion, which from the fourteenth century became the creed of the order. The Dominican Aquinas (who says that, although the Roman church does not celebrate her conception, it bears with certain churches in their celebration of it), argues that she was conceived in sin, but was sanctified in the womb, not by the removal of the *fomes peccati*, but by its being placed under restraint; that she never committed actual sin, because that would have been a disparagement of her Son; but that the "fomes" was not removed until she had conceived Him. Yet theologians who rejected the doctrine of the immaculate conception contributed to forward it by the extravagant language which they applied to St. Mary. A distinction had been drawn between the reverence which was due to the Saviour as God and as man : while his Divinity was to be worshipped with *latria*, his humanity was to be revered with *hyperdulia*, which was so styled as being greater than the *dulia* paid to saints. But now the human nature of the Saviour, as well as his Divinity, was to be worshipped with *latria*, while *hyperdulia*, which Aquinas defines as midway between *dulia* and *latria*, was to be rendered to the Virgin Mother. To her were applied a multitude of Scriptural expressions, which in truth had no reference to her. Thus, she was said to be the rock on which Christ was to build his church, because she alone remained firm in faith during the interval between his death and his resurrection. She was said to be typified by the tree of life, by the ark of Noah, by Jacob's ladder which reached to heaven, by the burning bush which was not consumed, by Aaron's rod that budded, and by many other scriptural figures, down to the apocalyptic "woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet." And her sinlessness was supposed to be foreshown in the words of the Canticles—"Thou art all fair, my love; there is no spot in thee." The greater and lesser 'Psalms of the blessed Virgin' in which the Psalms of David are parodied with unintentional profanity, although not the work of Bonaventura, to whom they have been ascribed, belong to the thirteenth century. And Bonaventura himself went great lengths in several works which were expressly devoted to her honour. In accordance with these developments of reverence for St. Mary, we find in the chronicles of the time notices of the introduction of devotions addressed to her, and of festivals and offices in celebration of her. And a fast of forty days before the festival of the assumption was kept by many persons, and was recommended, although not enforced, by Peckham, the Franciscan archbishop of Canterbury.

It was in this time that the house which had been inhabited by the holy family at Nazareth is said to have been carried by angels, first into Dalmatia, and then into the neighbourhood of Loreto, where, after having thrice changed its place, it finally settled, to draw to it the devotion and the offerings of innumerable pilgrims. To argue against such a story would be either superfluous or hopeless; but it may be well to state, as some of the most obvious objections to it, that the pilgrims to Palestine, although they mention churches on the site of the house where the blessed Virgin was visited by the angel, and on that of the house where the Saviour was brought up, give no hint that any remains of the houses themselves existed; that Urban IV in 1263, in reporting to St. Lewis the destruction of the church at Nazareth, says nothing of the "aedicula," which later ingenuity has supposed to have been contained in it and miraculously preserved; and that, although the removal to Loreto is placed in the year 1294, no notice of it is to be found before the latter half of the fifteenth century.

The excess of reverence for the blessed Virgin found expression in a multitude of hymns; but in the time which we are now surveying, compositions of this kind were also

produced which may be regarded as precious contributions to the stock of truly Christian devotional poetry. Among these may be mentioned, as perhaps the best known, the *Dies Ira*—probably (although not certainly) the work of Thomas of Celano, a Minorite, and one of the biographers of St. Francis; the *Stabat Mater*, which is generally ascribed to another Franciscan, Jacopone of Todi; and the German Easter hymn, *Christus ist erstanden*, which, like the *Dies Irae*, is introduced with wonderful effect in the most famous poem of recent times.

The drama was now pressed into the service of religion. The imitation of Plautus and Terence, which had marked the attempts of Roswitha, the nun of Gandersheim, in the tenth century, had given way to a vernacular drama, of which the subjects were not only Christian, but commonly founded on Scripture, as distinguished from legend; and such plays, which were usually acted by the members of confraternities, became important means of conveying some sort of knowledge of sacred history to the people. We have seen that the drama was even employed, although with indifferent success, as an instrument of conversion among the heathens of Livonia.

The number of canons directed in this century against the “festivals of fools” and other burlesque celebrations which grew out of religion; against profanations of churches and churchyards by dancing and revelry, by holding of markets and of civil courts, by secular plays, wakes, and the like; against the introduction of players, jugglers, and yet more disreputable persons into monasteries,—shows how strongly these abuses had become rooted. Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury, in 1279, endeavoured to check the disorders which had thus crept in, and the church was in some degree forced to give way, compromising the matter by allowing the children of the choir to celebrate their mummeries, while it forbade such celebrations by the clergy, and limiting the festival of the boy-bishop strictly to the Holy Innocents’ day, so that it should not begin until after vespers on St. John’s day.

INTERDICTS

The abuse of interdicts, and the indifference to them which arose out of that abuse, have been already mentioned. It was found that those who suffered from such sentences, now turned their indignation, not against the princes or others whose offences had provoked them, but against the ecclesiastics who had pronounced them. As they were uttered by bishops on all manner of slight occasions, popes often took the prudent line of superseding the diocesan authority, sometimes by annulling the sentence, sometimes by mitigating it. Recourse was occasionally had to temporal sovereigns by way of appeal against such sentences. Even St. Lewis annulled an interdict pronounced by the archbishop of Rouen in 1235, and one of the bishop of Poitiers in 1243; and in France it came to be regarded as a settled thing that the secular power was entitled to receive appeals in such cases. A council at Aschaffenburg, in 1292, speaks of the laity in some places as caring so little for interdicts that they took it on themselves to perform some of the offices, such as that of burial, which the clergy were charged to refuse to them. The monks often contributed to weaken the force of interdicts by making holes in the doors of their churches or by opening the windows, and so enabling the people, while standing outside, to hear the divine offices. This and other practices of a like tendency were forbidden by special canons.

Arts and Learning.

Between the middle of the eleventh century and the end of the thirteenth, the development of ecclesiastical architecture had been rapid and signal. In France before the year 1150, and in other countries north of the Alps a little later, the massive round-arched architecture which marked the beginning of this period was succeeded by a lighter and more

graceful style, which had for its chief feature the pointed arch. This form of arch had been long known—in Provence, it is said, even from the time of Charlemagne—before it came into favour as the characteristic of a style; and the first church in which it becomes thus predominant is said to be that of St. Denys, rebuilt by abbot Suger about 1144. The transition from the Norman to the Gothic is exemplified in many great French churches, where the victory of the pointed arch and of the lighter forms is as yet incomplete; and the perfection of Gothic in that stage where it has shaken off the influence of the older style, but is still capable of further development, is seen in the “holy chapel” of Paris, built by St. Lewis exactly a century after the date of Suger’s work at St. Denys.

In England, the pointed arch was introduced from France in the latter part of the twelfth century. The specimens of the transitional style are few—the best known being the choir of Canterbury, (begun under, a French architect,) and the round part of the Temple church in London (A.D. 1175-1184). But the pointed architecture of England soon began to display features unborrowed from any foreign example—such as the combination of a number of narrow lancet-headed windows in one large design; and here the most perfect example of the pure early Gothic style is the cathedral of Salisbury (A.D. 1220-1258). Henry III, the contemporary of St. Lewis, was, like him, a munificent patron of the arts connected with religion, and has left his best monument in that part of Westminster abbey which was erected by him.

Into Spain, too, the Gothic style made its way from France; and there it appears in remarkable contrast with another style, which has in common with it the pointed arch, and from which it was on that account formerly supposed to have taken its origin—the Moorish or Saracenic architecture derived from the East. In Sicily, on the other hand, the pointed styles of the North and of the East appear to mingle harmoniously together, and even to admit, without any striking incongruity, elements which belong to the architecture of Greece and Rome.

In Germany, where a peculiar variety of the round-arched style had been developed, chiefly in the provinces along the Rhine, the pointed arch did not make its appearance until the beginning of the thirteenth century; but before the middle of that century, had been laid the foundation of the vast and still unfinished cathedral of Cologne. Another remarkable German Gothic church of this time is that erected at Marburg in honour of St. Elizabeth.

In Italy, where the native art of the eleventh and twelfth centuries produced, among other works, the cathedral and the leaning tower of Pisa, the new style never took root in its purity. In the buildings which are classed as belonging to it (except in a few, which were erected under foreign influence) the round arch is combined with the pointed, and the development of Gothic is controlled by the remembrance of the old classical forms. The earliest example of a pointed church is that of St. Andrew at Vercelli, begun by Cardinal Gualo after his legation in England, under the superintendence of an English architect (A.D. 1219) and next to this followed the church built in honour of St. Francis at Assisi (1228-1253) where the political connection of Elias, then general of the Franciscans, induced him to employ a German of the emperor’s train, named James Arnulf, the original architect of the cathedral at Florence, which was begun in 1294 or 1298, has been described as the son of this James, but was more probably only his pupil; but at Florence the character of northern Gothic is modified by the Italian taste, both in Arnulf’s work and in Giotto’s bell-tower, which belongs to the following century. In Rome itself Gothic architecture never established a footing, although we are reminded of it by the pointed arches of a single church, by some portions of other churches, and by such works as sepulchral monuments and the canopies of altars.

At the same time with architecture, the arts of painting and sculpture, which as yet were chiefly employed as accessory to it, made rapid progress. In painting, the first who deviated from the traditional Byzantine style was Cimabue, who died in 1302. In sculpture,

the genius of Nicolas of Pisa led the Italian revival; but much of the sculpture of this age in Italy, as at the cathedral of Orvieto, was the work of Germans. The staining of glass had been early brought to a perfection of richness in colour which was lost in the more ambitious and more correct productions of a later style; and the skill of illuminators, workers in mosaic, workers in metal, embroiderers, and other decorative artists, worthily contributed in their degrees to the splendour of the age which, in addition to the churches already named, produced, entirely or in their finest parts, such buildings as the cathedrals of Paris, Chartres, Reims, Bourges, Rouen, and Amiens, of Orvieto and Siena, of Toledo, of Lincoln, Glasgow, and Elgin.

During this time literature was much encouraged. Among the princes who patronized it, the emperor Frederick, and Alfonso X (the Wise), of Castile, are especially distinguished. Frederick in 1224 founded the university of Naples, with the intention of saving his Italian subjects from the necessity of seeking knowledge beyond his own dominions, nor would he allow them to study elsewhere; and, as it had suffered from the political troubles of the time, he founded it afresh in 1234. With a like view, and in order to punish Bologna for the part which it had taken in his quarrels with the popes, the emperor established the universities of Padua and Vienne. To this century is also ascribed the origin of some other universities—such as Toulouse (founded in order to counteract the teaching of the Albigenses), Ferrara, Piacenza, and Lisbon (which in 1308 was transferred to Coimbra). At Rome, Charles of Anjou, in the character of senator, professed to found a place of “general study” for law and arts in 1265; but this attempt seems to have been abortive, and the university of Rome really owes its beginning to a bull issued by Boniface VIII a few months before his fall. The Germans, having as yet no university of their own, continued to resort chiefly to Paris and Bologna. The pre-eminent fame of Paris for the successful cultivation of all branches of learning was still maintained. Honorius III in 1218 endeavoured to limit its range of subjects by forbidding lectures on law; but this exclusion of the popular science did not last long, as we find about the middle of the century that Paris had the three “faculties” of theology, law, and medicine, in addition to the older division into four “nations” which made up the body of “artists” or students in arts. In 1250 the famous school of the Sorbonne was founded in connection with the university, by Robert, a native of Sorbonne in Champagne, canon of Paris, and chaplain to St. Lewis; and, although it is a mistake to speak of this as the theological faculty of the university, the two were in so far the same that the members of one were very commonly members also of the other.

It was in this age that the scholastic philosophy received its full development under the influence of an increased study of Aristotle. Hitherto the acquaintance of western readers with this philosopher’s writings had been confined to one or two books which were accessible in the old translations of Victorinus and Boethius; but he now became more fully known, partly through translations from the Arabic versions current in Spain, and partly through direct translations from the originals, of which copies had been brought into the West in consequence of the Latin conquest of Constantinople. By the opening of these sources a great eagerness for the study of dialectics and metaphysics was excited. But in the case of Aristotle there were grave prejudices of long standing to be overcome. In earlier times, he had been in favour with some heretical sects, and on that account (if on no other) had been denounced by many writers of orthodox reputation and of high authority, down to St. Bernard, in whose day he had fallen under fresh suspicion on account of Abelard’s fondness for him. His works, in passing through the hands of Mussulman and other translators, had been mixed up with foreign matter which brought on him additional disrepute. And in the beginning of the century, his name incurred still further obloquy from the circumstance that Amalric of Bène and David of Dinant professed to ground their pantheistic speculations on his method. He was therefore involved in the condemnation of those speculations by the council of Paris in 1209, although it would seem that the writings which were condemned under his name were really

the work of his Arabic followers; the legate Robert Curzon, in 1215, while allowing the study of his dialectics, forbade that of his books on metaphysics and natural philosophy; and in 1231, Gregory IX issued a bull by which they were again forbidden “until they should have been examined, and purged from all suspicion of errors”. Yet, as Aristotle became more known through the new translations from the Greek, which showed him without the additions of his Mahometan expositors, he found students, admirers, and commentators among men of the greatest eminence as teachers and of unquestioned orthodoxy, such as Albert the Great and Thomas of Aquino; and thus, from having been suspected and condemned, he came to be very widely regarded even as an infallible oracle. While his system was employed to give form and method to Christian ideas, he was considered as a guide to secular knowledge, on which theology was said to repose, while rising above it; and some divines, finding themselves perplexed between the authority of the Stagyrte and that of the Scriptures, attempted to reconcile the two by a theory that philosophical and religious belief might be different from each other and independent of each other—that a proposition might at once be philosophically true and theologically false. It was not unnatural that such notions should excite suspicion; and thus we find Gregory IX, in a letter written in 1228 to the professors of Paris, reproving them for the unprofitable nature of their studies—for relying too much on the knowledge of natural things, and making theology, the queen, subordinate to her handmaid, philosophy.

The leader of the Schoolmen was an Englishman, Alexander of Hales (Alensis), who taught philosophy and theology at Paris, entered the Franciscan order about 1222, and died in 1245. With him began that method of discussing a subject by arraying the arguments on each side in a syllogistic form, which became characteristic of the schoolmen in general. The authority which Alexander acquired appears from the lofty titles bestowed on him—“Doctor of Doctors” and “Irrefragable Doctor.” William of Auvergne, who held the see of Paris from 1228 to 1249, deserves mention as a famous schoolman, although his works are on a less colossal scale than those of his eminent contemporaries.

The titles of “Great” and of “Universal Doctor” were given to Albert, a Swabian of noble family, who taught at Cologne, and, after having held the bishopric of Ratisbon from 1260 to 1263, resigned it, that he might die in his profession as a simple Dominican friar. Albert is described as showing much reading, but (as might be expected in his age) a want of critical skill; great acuteness in argument; a courage which sometimes ventures even to contradict the authority of Aristotle; and an originality which entitles him to be regarded as the real founder of the Dominican system of doctrine. Under Albert, at Cologne, studied Thomas, a member of a great family which held the lordship of Aquino and other possessions in the Apulian kingdom. Thomas of Aquino was born in 1225 or 1227, and after having been educated from the age of five at Monte Cassino, from which he passed to the university of Naples, entered into the Dominican order in 1243, greatly against the will of his nearest relations. At Cologne he was chiefly distinguished for his steady industry, which led his fellow-students to style him in derision the “dumb ox of Sicily”; but Albert was able to discern the promise of greatness in him, and reproved the mockers by telling them that the dumb ox would one day fill the world with his lowing. In 1255, Thomas was nominated as professor of theology at Paris, but the disputes between his order and the university delayed his occupation of the chair until 1257. He also taught at Rome and elsewhere; his eminence was acknowledged by an offer of the archbishopric of Naples, which he declined; and he had been summoned by Gregory X to attend the council of Lyons, in 1274, with a view to controverting the peculiarities of the Greeks who were expected to be present, when he died on his way, at the monastery of Fossa Nuova. It is said that a short time before his death he was seen, while praying before a crucifix, to be raised into the air, and that the Saviour was heard to say to him from the crucifix—“Thou hast written well of me, Thomas; what reward wilt thou receive for thy labour?” To which he replied, “Lord, I desire no other than Thyself.”

Among the best known of his voluminous writings are the ‘Summa Theologica’, which stands foremost among works of its class; the ‘Catena Aurea’, a commentary on the four Gospels, compiled with much skill from the fathers; original commentaries on many books of Scripture; an elaborate commentary on the ‘Sentences’ of Peter Lombard, the great text-book of the schools; a treatise ‘Of the truth of the Catholic Faith, against the Gentiles’; some writings against the Greek church; and a book ‘Of the Government of Princes’—of which, however, the latter part is said to be by another author. The writings of Thomas became a standard of orthodoxy in the Dominican order, so that everyone who entered it was bound to uphold the opinions of the “Angelical Doctor” or “Angel of the Church”. His master, Albert, is reported to have said of him that he had “put an end to all labour, even unto the world’s end.” At the council of Trent, nearly three hundred years after his death, the ‘Summa’ was placed on the secretary’s desk, beside the Holy Scriptures, as containing the orthodox solution of all theological questions. Thomas was canonized in 1323 by John XXII and in 1567, Pius V, himself a Dominican, assigned to him the next place after the four great doctors of the West.

John of Fidanza, a Tuscan, who is better known by his conventual name of Bonaventura, endeavoured to combine the mystical element with the scholastic dialecticism. He was born in 1221 at Bagnorea, in the Roman states, and in consequence of a vow which his mother had made on his being delivered from a dangerous sickness by the prayers of St. Francis, he entered the Franciscan order at the age of twenty-one. He studied under Alexander of Hales, who expressed his feeling of Bonaventura’s purity of character by saying that in him Adam did not appear to have sinned. At the age of thirty-four he was chosen general of his order, and, after having held this dignity two years, he became a professor of theology at Paris, where he had before taught. In 1265, he declined the archbishopric of York, which was offered to him by Clement IV, and on the death of that pope, the Franciscans assert that Bonaventura might, but for his own unwillingness, have become his successors

After having been made cardinal-bishop of Albano by Gregory X, he died at the council of Lyons in 1274. He was canonized by Sixtus IV (a Franciscan pope) in 1482, and in 1587 Sixtus V assigned to the “Seraphic Doctor” the sixth place among the great teachers of the church. Bonaventura’s devotion to the blessed Virgin has been already mentioned. He is said to rely more on Scripture than the great Dominican, but to be inferior to him in knowledge, and to be guided in a greater degree by imagination and feeling. It is said that when Aquinas, on visiting him, asked for a sight of the books from which his learning had been derived, Bonaventura answered by pointing to the crucifix.

Thus far the schoolmen had differed but little in opinion. But among the Franciscans arose a teacher who introduced important novelties—John Duns Scotus, the “Subtle Doctor”, who appears to have been a Northumbrian, although some refer his birth to Dunse in Scotland, or to Ireland. Duns studied at Oxford, where he is said to have displayed a great genius for mathematical science. He became a doctor, and taught at Paris until 1308; but beyond these facts, his life is enveloped in the obscurity which some connect with his name of Scotus, and declare to be characteristic of his style. His death, according to some authorities, took place at the age of thirty-four; according to others, at forty-three or at sixty-three, while, if it were true that he had been a pupil of Alexander of Hales, he must have nearly attained fourscore : and, if the vast extent of his works makes it impossible to believe the first of these accounts, it is difficult to understand how his fame should have begun so late in life as the last of them would require us to suppose. To the Franciscans Scotus became what Aquinas was to the Dominicans; it was decreed in general assemblies of the order that all teachers should inculcate his opinions, both in theology and in philosophy and on some important questions, both theological and philosophical, the followers of these two great oracles were strongly and perseveringly opposed to each other.

Of a different character from the reputations of those who won for themselves such titles as “Seraphic”, “Angelical”, and the like, was that of Roger Bacon, the “Wonderful Doctor,” as he was justly styled. Bacon, born near Ilchester in 1214, was educated at Oxford and at Paris, and at the age of thirty-four became a Franciscan friar. His researches in physical science, while they placed him immensely in advance of his contemporaries, drew on him the popular suspicion of magic, and exposed him to persecution at the hands of his Franciscan superiors. Clement IV, who, when legate in England, had heard of his fame, desired in 1266 that the friar’s books should be sent to Rome; and in consequence of this, Bacon, who explains that his opinions had not before been formally embodied in writing, produced within fifteen months (notwithstanding great difficulties as to the expense of materials and other necessary charges) his ‘Opus Majus,’ his ‘Opus Minus’ and his ‘Opus Tertium’. But, as the pope died soon after, Bacon derived no benefit from his favour; he was again imprisoned by his monastic superiors, was condemned under the generalship of Jerome of Ascoli (afterwards Pope Nicolas IV) and did not recover his liberty until the year before his death, which took place in 1292.

Bacon strongly denounces the idea that philosophy and theology can be opposed to each other. True philosophy, he says, is not alien from, but is included in, the wisdom of God. All wisdom is contained in Holy Scripture, but it must be explained by means of law and philosophy; and he protests against the injustice of condemning philosophy on account of the abuse made of it by persons who do not couple it with its end, which is the truth of Christ. On the one hand, we must use philosophy in the things of God; on the other hand, in philosophy we must assume many things which are divine. Bacon often speaks with much severity of the defects which prevailed in the studies of his time; that boys were admitted into the religious orders, and proceeded to theological study, without having laid the groundwork of a sound grammatical education; that the original languages of Holy Scripture were neglected; that children got their knowledge of Scripture, not from the Bible itself, but from versified abridgments that the translations of Aristotle were generally wretched, with the exception of those made by Grossetête, an early patron of his studies, whom he everywhere mentions with deep respect; that lectures on the ‘Sentences’ were preferred to lectures on Scripture, and that Scripture was neglected on account of the faults of translators; that the civil law, as being more lucrative than philosophy, drew men away from the study of it; that the preachers of his time were bad, with the exception of Bertold the German, whose performances in this way he considered to be worth nearly as much as those of all the Dominicans and the Franciscans together. He professes that, although he himself had laboured forty years in study, he would undertake by a compendious method to teach all that he knew within six months—a boast which might excite the envy of those instructors who, in our own day undertake to communicate universal knowledge by short and summary processes. He complains bitterly of the difficulties he had met with in his studies, on which he declares that in twenty years he had spent two thousand pounds. The troubles which this extraordinary man endured at the hands of his brotherhood furnish a melancholy illustration of the lot which then awaited any one who, by a perhaps somewhat ostentatious display of originality, might provoke questions, however unfounded, as to his soundness in the established faith.

The object of the schoolmen was to apply the syllogistic method of reasoning to proving the truth of the church’s traditional doctrine, and to the ascertainment of truth or probability in points which the church’s authority had not decided. Their system deserves high praise for the thoroughness with which it discusses the subjects which fall within its range—viewing each subject in all possible lights, dividing and distinguishing with elaborate subtlety, laying down clearly the doctrine which the writer approves, stating objections and disposing of them, balancing probabilities and authorities, and bringing the opinion which is to be maintained safe and triumphant through all the conflict. If cumbrous and inelegant, it makes up for these defects by exhaustiveness and precision; if fettered by the conditions of deference

to authority, it derives from these conditions a protection against the wildness of speculation into which intellects trained to the highest degree of refinement might naturally have been disposed to run. On the other hand, there was in such a method much of temptation to sophistry, to frivolous and unsubstantial exercises of acuteness; and the results attained by it were too commonly ill-proportioned to the pomp and toil of investigation by which they had been reached. No one, assuredly, can be justified in speaking with the ignorant contempt which once prevailed of a system which for centuries ruled the minds of mankind, and which, in age after age, engaged in its service the profound and ingenious thought and the prodigious industry of those who were foremost among their contemporaries. Yet among the many subjects which now offer themselves to the attention of educated men, the claims of the scholastic philosophy to engage our time and labour in the study of the massive and multitudinous volumes in which it is embodied can hardly be considered as of very urgent obligation.

BOOK VIII.
FROM THE DEATH OF POPE BONIFACE VIII TO THE END OF THE COUNCIL OF
CONSTANCE,
A.D. 1303-1418.

CHAPTER I.

BENEDICT XI. AND CLEMENT V.
A.D. 1303-1313.

The state of affairs at the death of Boniface VIII (a.C. 1303) was such as might well fill the chiefs of the Roman church with anxiety. The late pope had provoked the most powerful sovereign in Christendom, had uttered sentences of excommunication and deposition against him, and had fallen a victim to his enmity. Philip had been supported in the contest by the prelates and clergy, the nobles and the commonalty of the realm; and while such were the relations between the Roman see and France, Boniface had also seriously offended the rulers of some other countries. Was, then, his policy to be carried out by his successor in defiance of all the fearful risks which beset such a course, or was the papacy to endure submissively the indignities which had been inflicted on it?

In the conclave which met at Perugia for the election of a pope, the influence of the Orsini family was predominant. On the 23rd of November—eleven days after the death of Boniface—the choice of the cardinals fell on Nicolas Bocassini, bishop of Ostia, who took the name of Benedict, and was at first reckoned as the tenth of that name, but was eventually styled the eleventh. He was a native of Treviso, and was of very humble origin; he had been general of the Dominican order; had been promoted to the cardinalate by Boniface, who employed him on important missions to England and other countries; and he had been one of the few who stood faithfully by his patron throughout the outrages of Anagni. Bui if Benedict's principles agreed with those of Boniface, his character was mild and conciliatory, and his policy was sincerely directed to the work of reconciling the spiritual with the temporal power.

In congratulating Benedict on his election, Philip the Fair expressed a hope that he would redress the wrongs which his predecessor had committed against France. But it was needless to urge such a request; the pope, without waiting to be entreated, hastened to restore the "lost sheep" to the fold, by releasing the king from his excommunication. He annulled all acts which might be to the prejudice of the French crown or nation, and revoked all sentences which had been incurred by neglect of Boniface's citations to Rome, or by forbidding obedience to those citations. He repealed or suspended various decrees of the late pope, on the ground that they had been made without the advice of the cardinals. He restored to the French chapters their rights of election; to the universities their privileges of teaching and of conferring degrees; and he ratified all the appointments which had been made since the time of Boniface's inhibitions. The bull *Clericis laicos* was so far mitigated as to allow the payment of all voluntary subsidies by the clergy to the sovereign, and the tithe of benefices was granted to Philip for two years. The Colonnas were restored to their position, and to so much of their property as had not been bestowed on others, although the rebuilding of Palestrina was forbidden unless the pope's permission should be obtained; and the cardinals of

the family were reinstated in their dignity, although they did not as yet recover the full exercise of its privileges. Even the actors in the outrage of Anagni were forgiven, with exception of those who had actually plundered the papal treasures, and of Nogaret, whose case was reserved for the pope's special judgment.

But these concessions were insufficient to satisfy the enmity of Philip against the memory of his antagonist. With the royal sanction a libellous life of the late pope was circulated, describing him, under the name of "Maleface", as a wicked sorcerer, whose end had been attended by terrible prodigies; and a petition was contrived, in which the French people were made to entreat that the king would take measures for getting him declared a heretic, as having notoriously died in heresy and in mortal sin, without sign of repentance. By such means only (the petitioners were made to say) could the independence of the kingdom be asserted. An emissary of the king, Peter of Peredo, prior of Chese, had been employed during the last days of Boniface's life in endeavouring to stir up the Roman clergy against him. With the same object he now put forth a long list of points in which he represented Boniface as having encroached on the rights of the clergy by acts which he contrasted with the alleged system of earlier popes; and it was urged that a general council should be assembled at Lyons, or some other convenient and neutral place. To this proposal Benedict gave no answer.

Rome was again distracted by the factions of its cardinals and nobles, which were complicated and embittered by the influence of the French king; and the pope, unsupported by any family connexions, found himself unable to hold his ground. It was believed that he intended to seek a refuge in Lombardy; but when, on the approach of the heats of summer, he announced an intention of going to Assisi, it was at first opposed by the cardinals, although through the influence of Matthew Orsini, the most important member of the college, he was able to carry out his design, and reached Perugia.

In various directions Benedict found it necessary to assert his authority. He had rebuked Frederick of Trinacria for presuming to reckon the years of his reign from the time when he assumed the crown instead of dating from the papal acknowledgment of him as king. He had endeavoured to pacify the exasperated factions of Florence, where about this time the great poet, who has invested the squabbles of Whites and Blacks with an interest not their own, attempted, with some fellow exiles, to surprise the city, and was condemned to banishment without hope of return. But Benedict's legate was driven to flight, and the pope avenged the indignity by an anathema against the Florentines.

It was, however, on the side of France that difficulties were most to be feared. The bitterness with which the persecution of Boniface's memory was urged on compelled Benedict, unless he would submit to the utter degradation of the papacy, to depart from that policy of conciliation which best accorded with his desires. He refused William of Nogaret's petition for provisional absolution and declined to treat with him as an ambassador from the king; and on the 9th of June he issued a bull, by which, with much strength of denunciation, Nogaret, with fourteen others who had been especially concerned in the seizure of Boniface and the plunder of his treasures, together with all their abettors, was declared excommunicate, and was cited to appear for judgment on the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul. But two days before that term Benedict died after a short illness, produced by eating largely of figs which had been brought to him as a present, and in which it was commonly suspected that poison had been administered by some enemy.

For many months after the death of Benedict the cardinals were unable to agree in the choice of a successor. The nineteen members of whom the college then consisted were divided between a French and an Italian party—the Italians headed by Matthew Orsini, who was supported by Francis Gaetani, a nephew of Boniface VIII; while the chiefs of the French party were Napoleon Orsini and Nicolas Ubertini, bishop of Ostia, but more commonly styled cardinal of Prato, an able and subtle Dominican, who was the confidential agent of king Philip. At length the citizens of Perugia became impatient of the delay, and threatened to force

an election by shutting up the cardinals in conclave and stinting their allowance of provisions; but before this threat was carried into act, a compromise was settled on terms which the cardinal of Prato had proposed to Gaetani—that the Italians should name three candidates from beyond the Alps, and that from these three the French cardinals should select a pope. This arrangement was accepted by the Italians in the belief that the power of limiting the election to three candidates would secure the triumph of their party; but the cardinal of Prato, according to the story which has been commonly believed, pursued a deeper policy. Knowing the men who were most likely to be put forward, he trusted that the French, by having the final choice in their hands, would be able to gain over the most formidable of their opponents. Of the three who were nominated by the Italians, he fixed on Bertrand d’Agoust or Du Got, archbishop of Bordeaux, a Gascon of noble family, who had been a thorough partisan of Boniface, had been indebted to that pope for the metropolitan see of Bordeaux, and had attended his synod of November 1302. The archbishop was a subject of the king of England, and therefore owed no immediate allegiance to the French crown; he had made himself obnoxious to Philip, and had more especially offended the king’s brother, Charles of Valois. Yet this was the man in whom Nicolas of Prato, reckoning on his notorious vanity and ambition, saw a fit instrument for bringing the papacy into subserviency to France. Between the nomination of the three and the final choice of a pope there was to be an interval of forty days. Within eleven days a courier despatched by cardinal Nicolas arrived at Paris; and it is said that within six days more the king held a secret interview with the archbishop of Bordeaux in the forest of St. Jean d’Angely. In consideration of receiving the papacy, the archbishop is reported to have submitted to six conditions, of which five were expressed at the time, while the sixth was to be reserved until the occasion should come for the performance of it. Each party swore to the other on the holy Eucharist, and the future pope gave his brother and his two nephews as hostages for his good faith. He bound himself (1) to reconcile the king perfectly with the church; (2) Philip and his agents were to be readmitted to communion; (3) the king was to be allowed the lithe of the ecclesiastical income of France for five years, towards the expenses of the Flemish war; (4) the memory of pope Boniface was to be undone and annulled; (5) the Colonnas were to be restored to the cardinalate, and certain friends of the king were to be promoted to the same dignity. As to the sixth condition, attempts have been made to gather it by conjectures from the sequel of the history—that it related to the empire, to the order of the Templars, or to the settlement of the papal court in France.

But this story, which in itself appears suspicious from the fullness of detail with which transactions so mysterious are related, has of late been contradicted in almost every point; and, more especially, a document has been discovered which proves that, at the time of the alleged interview in the forest of St. Jean d’Angely, the archbishop was engaged in a provincial visitation which must have prevented his meeting Philip there or elsewhere. It would seem, therefore, that the negotiations between the king and the prelate were carried on through the agency of other persons; and the particular conditions which are said to have been imposed on Du Got may have been inferred from his later conduct. That he had thoroughly bound himself to Philip’s interest is, however, unquestionable. On the 5th of June 1305 the archbishop was elected to the papal chair, and each of the rival parties among the cardinals suppose him to be its own.

But soon after the election the Italian cardinals, who had requested the new pope to consult the interests of the church by repairing to Italy, were surprised at receiving from him a summons to attend his coronation, not at Rome, but at Lyons. Matthew Orsini, the senior of the college, is said to have told the cardinal of Prato that, since he had succeeded in bringing the papal court beyond the mountains, it would be long before it would return; “for,” he added, “I know the character of the Gascons”.

On St. Martin’s day the coronation of the new pope, who took the name of Clement V, was solemnized. The king of England had excused himself from the ceremony, on account of

his war with the Scots; but Philip of France and king James of Majorca were present, and, as the pope rode from the church of St Just towards his lodgings, the king of France held his horse's reins for part of the way. But as the procession was passing near an old and ruinous wall, on which many spectators were crowded together, the wall gave way. The pope was thrown from his horse, and his crown was rolled in the mud; the duke of Brittany, who was leading the horse, was killed; and many other persons, among whom was Clement's own brother, perished. The accident was regarded as ominous of evil to come.

Another near relative of Clement was soon after slain in an affray which arose out of a disreputable amour, and, in consequence of the exasperated feeling of the citizens, the pope thought it well to withdraw from Lyons to Bordeaux. As an instance of the manner in which the resources of cathedrals and monasteries were drained by the expense of entertaining him and his train on this journey, it is recorded that, after his departure from Bourges, the archbishop, Giles Colonna, found himself obliged to seek the means of subsistence in the daily payments which were allowed to members of his chapter for attendance at the offices of the cathedral. During five years Clement sojourned in various parts of France, until at length he fixed his residence at Avignon, a city held under the imperial kingdom of Arles by the count of Provence, who, as king of Naples, was also a vassal of the papal see. But, although nominally beyond the French territory, the popes at Avignon were under the influence of the kings of France; and the seventy years' captivity in Babylon (as it was styled by the Italians) greatly affected the character of the papacy. Among the popes of this time were some whose memory deserves to be held in very high respect; but the corruption of the court grew to a degree before unknown, its exactions raised the indignation of all western Christendom, and its moral tone became grossly scandalous. Clement himself openly entertained as his mistress Brunisenda de Foix, the wife of Count Talleyrand of Perigord, and lavished on her insatiable rapacity the treasures which he wrung out from the subjects of his spiritual dominion. Simony was practised without limit and without shame; and some payments which had formerly been made to the bishops, such as the first fruits of English benefices, were now seized by the popes themselves. Ecclesiastical discipline was neglected, and the sight of the corruptions of Avignon swelled the numbers of the sectaries who regarded the church as apostate; while in the meantime the ancient capital of western Christendom was left to neglect and decay. But, whereas the Italians denounce the corruption of the papal court as an effect of its settlement in France, French writers represent the luxury and vices of Avignon as imported from Italy, to the destruction of the virtuous simplicity which they supposed to have formerly marked the character of their own countrymen. In truth the state of things which had been bad at Rome became worse at Avignon; but it is in vain that either nation would endeavour to throw the blame of this on the other.

From the very beginning of his pontificate Clement showed his subserviency to the author of his promotion. He granted to Philip the tenth of the ecclesiastical revenues of France for five years, under the pretext of a crusade; he restored the king and all his abettors in the late struggle to the communion of the church; at his request he reinstated the cardinals of the Colonna family in all the privileges of their office he created ten new cardinals, who were all either Frenchmen or devoted to the French interest; he withdrew all that was offensive in Boniface's bulls, the *Clericis laicos* and the *Unamsanctum*. At the same time he began to display his own character by using his new power for purposes of revenge on persons who had formerly offended him, and by scandalous promotions of his near relations to dignities for which they were notoriously unfit. "The whole court," says St. Antoninus of Florence, "was governed by Gascons and Frenchmen."

During the vacancy of the papal chair, William of Nogaret had repeatedly presented himself before the official of the bishop of Paris, and had protested against the sentence which the late pope Benedict had uttered against him, as having been based on false grounds. He claimed for himself the character of a champion of the church against the evil practices of

Boniface; he declared that Boniface's misfortunes were the result of his obstinacy, and tendered a list of sixty articles against his memory. He charged him with the most abominable and monstrous crimes, with having obtained his office irregularly, with having been an enemy of the French church and kingdom and he quoted against him the saying as to his having entered like a fox, reigned like a lion, and died like a dog. As to his own behaviour at Anagni, he asserted that he had been obliged to use force because the pope could not be dealt with by gentler means; that he had protected Boniface and the papal treasures, had saved his life and that of his nephew Peter Gaetani; that in consideration of his exertions, which had cost him much reproach, he had received the pope's thanks and absolution after Boniface had been set at liberty. And he professed a wish to be heard in his own justification before a council.

Philip was not disposed to let the memory of Boniface rest. Immediately after the coronation of Clement he had desired him to listen to charges against his predecessor; and, although the pope was able to defer the matter for a time, Philip persisted in his design. In 1307 he invited Clement, who was then at Bordeaux, to Poitiers—ostensibly with a view to a crusade under Charles of Valois, who, by marrying the heiress of the Courtenays, had acquired pretensions to the throne of Constantinople. It was said that the reigning Greek emperor, Andronicus, was too weak to hold his ground against the advancing Turkish arms; that it was therefore expedient to set him aside, and to oppose to the infidels a strong Christian power, with Charles as its head. The pope entered into this scheme, wrote letters in favour of it, granted ecclesiastical tenths, and in other ways showed himself willing to favour the interest of the French princes. Of a vast debt which Charles of Naples had contracted to the papal treasury, two-thirds were forgiven, and the remainder was to be transferred to the proposed crusade; the crown of Hungary was awarded to the Neapolitan king's grandson, Charobert, and proceedings were begun for the canonization of his second son, Lewis, who had died in 1297 as archbishop of Toulouse. All who had been Philip's instruments in his contest with Boniface were allowed to go unpunished; even William of Nogaret was absolved, on condition that he should join the next crusade to the Holy Land, and that in the meantime he should make pilgrimages to the shrine of St. James at Compostella, and to certain other places of devotion.

But still Philip urged on the case against Boniface, requiring that he should be condemned as a heretic, and that his bones should be disinterred and burnt. Clement felt that by such a course the credit of the papacy would be grievously impaired; that if Boniface had not been a rightful pope, his appointments to the cardinalate must be void, and consequently Clement's own election, by cardinals of whom a large proportion owed their dignity to Boniface, would be annulled; and, as was natural, the cardinals whose position was affected were allied with the pope in opposition to Philip's wishes. Finding that, although treated with a great show of respect at Poitiers, he was virtually a prisoner, Clement attempted to escape in disguise, carrying with him a part of his treasures; but the attempt was unsuccessful. At length, however, it was suggested by the cardinal of Prato that the question should be reserved for the consideration of a general council, which Clement intended to assemble at Vienne, a city beyond the bounds of the French king's territory. The pope eagerly caught at the suggestion; and Philip, who had often pressed for such a council, found himself now debarred from opposing it, however distasteful to him.

But during the conferences at Poitiers another subject was brought forward, which held out at once to Clement a hope of rescuing the reputation of Boniface and the credit of his see, and to the king the prospect of replenishing his exhausted treasury. For, notwithstanding the unexampled severity of his taxation, and the absence of all splendour in his court, Philip was continually in difficulties as to money, chiefly on account of his unsuccessful wars with the Flemings. In order to supply his needs, he had more than once expelled the Jews and the Lombards from his dominions, and had confiscated their property; and he had practised a succession of infamous tricks on the coinage, so as to provoke his subjects to discontent,

which in 1306 broke out into insurrection. Philip, finding himself insecure in his own palace, took refuge in the house of the Templars at Paris, which was more strongly fortified; and having appeased the multitude which besieged him there by concessions, he afterwards hanged nearly thirty of their leaders. The society to which he had then been indebted for shelter and deliverance was now to feel his enmity.

The great military orders of the Temple and the Hospital, while they grew in importance and in power, had incurred much enmity by their assumptions, and had not escaped serious imputations. Although the Templars at their outset had received no special exemptions (for to such privileges their great patron, Bernard of Clairvaux, was opposed) they had gradually acquired much of this kind. Their lands were free from tithes. They were untouched by interdicts uttered against any place where they might be. A bull of Alexander III, granted as a reward for their adhesion to him against the rival claimant of the papacy, had made them independent of all but the papal authority, and allowed them to have a body of clergy of their own. But Alexander himself found it necessary, at the Lateran council of 1179, to censure them, in common with the Hospitallers, for having greatly exceeded their privileges; and about thirty years later, Innocent III reproved them as undutiful to the holy see, as insubordinate to all other ecclesiastical authority, as interfering with the discipline of the church, and as having fallen into many vices, so that they used the show of religion in order to blind the world to their voluptuousness. At a later time, they had opposed Frederick II in his expedition to the Holy Land, and it was said that they had offered to betray him to the Sultan—an offer which the more generous infidel made known to the object of the intended treachery. Since the loss of Palestine, both orders had established themselves in the island of Cyprus, and many of the Templars had returned to settle on the estates which their order possessed in Western Europe.

The order of the Temple now consisted of about 15,000 members—the most formidable and renowned soldiery in the world; and the whole number of persons attached to it may probably have amounted to not less than 100,000. About half of them were Frenchmen, and the preponderance of that nation was shown by the fact that all the grand-masters of the order had been French. They had vast wealth, which it was supposed that they held themselves bound to increase by unlawful as well as by lawful means; and, strong and powerful as they already were, it may have been not unnatural to suspect them of intending, after the example already given by the Teutonic knights on the Baltic, to establish a sovereignty of their own. They were animated by a spirit of exclusive devotion to the brotherhood, and of contempt for all men beyond it. When Clement had projected a union with the Hospitallers, the master of the Temple, James de Molay, had declined the proposal on grounds which although partly reasonable, showed a scornful assumption of superiority to the order which made the less rigid profession. Towards the bishops, from whose authority they were exempt, towards the sovereigns of the countries within which their vast estates were situated, the behaviour of the Templars was disrespectful and defiant. The unpopularity caused by their pride was increased by the mystery and closeness which they affected in all that concerned the order; and out of this not unnaturally arose dark suspicions against them. During the latter part of their career in the Holy Land, they had become familiar with the infidels, whom they had at first opposed with unrelenting hatred; and it was supposed that both their religion and their morals had been infected by their oriental associations. In their ordinary habits it is said that they were lax and luxurious, so that “to drink like a Templar” was a proverb,

When Gregory IX, in 1238, had reproved the Hospitallers for having allied themselves with the Greek Vatatzes against the Latin emperor of Constantinople, he had taken occasion to speak of imputations of unchastity and heresy which were cast on them. It was not until a later time that any accusations of heresy were brought against the Templars; but now strange and shocking reports of this kind were circulated, and, instead of the charge of familiarity with women, there were suspicions of unnatural vices, which were less abhorred in the east than in

the west. It would seem that the loss of the Holy Land had told unfavourably on their character. Having been deprived of their proper occupation, they may naturally have yielded to the temptations which arise out of idleness; perhaps, too, the spirit which commonly led the people of these days to judge by visible appearances may have inclined the Templars themselves to doubt the power of the God whose champions had been forced to give way to unbelievers, while it disposed the generality of men to accept tales and suspicions against the order, to whose sins it was natural to ascribe the loss of that sacred territory which it had been their especial duty to defend. And it is probable that even before their withdrawal from Palestine they may have taken up oriental superstitions as to the virtue of charms and magical practices.

Philip the Fair had at one time endeavoured to establish a connexion with the order, probably in the hope of becoming master of its treasures; but his suit had been rejected. In the contest with Boniface, the Templars, notwithstanding the allegiance which most of them owed to the crown of France, had inclined to side with the pope, and when Benedict XI had granted Philip the tenths of spiritual property in France, the Templars had firmly stood on their exemptions. The king had been largely in their debt for money advanced to pay the dowry of his sister, the queen of England; and his acquaintance with their resources had been extended by his late sojourn in the head-quarters of the order at Paris—a large enclosure, covered with buildings sufficient to contain a vast number of dependents, and strong enough to hold out against a more formidable siege than that which he had there experienced. And to the motives of cupidity and jealousy may have been added the influence of a Dominican confessor over the king's mind; for the Dominicans, who had at one time been closely allied with the Templars, had since become their bitterest enemies.

The circumstances which led Philip to attack the Templars are variously reported. The story most generally received is, that one Squin of Floyrac or Florian, a native of Beziers, who had been prior of Montfaucon, having been imprisoned at Paris for heresy and vicious life, became acquainted in prison with a Florentine named Noffo Dei, an apostate from the order; and that these wretches conspired to seek their deliverance by giving information of enormities alleged to be committed by the Templars. Squin of Florian refused to tell the important secrets of which he professed to be master to anyone but the king; and Philip heard the tale with eager delights. It appears that he spoke of the matter to the pope as early as the time of Clement's coronation at Lyons; but nothing was done until later.

The pope summoned the masters and other chief dignitaries of the two great military orders from Cyprus, in order to a consultation as to the best means of carrying out an intended crusade. The master of the Hospitallers, Fulk de Villaret, was able to excuse himself, on the ground that he and his brethren were engaged in the siege of Rhodes; but the master of the Templars, James de Molay, a knight of Franche-Comté, who had been forty-two years in the order, obeyed the summons, and appeared in France with such a display of pomp and of wealth as naturally tended to increase the envy and the mistrust with which his brotherhood was already regarded. By Philip, to one of whose sons he had been godfather some years before, he was received with great honour, and the pope, in accordance with the invitation which had been given, consulted him as to the proposed crusade. But the Templars soon became aware that rumours of an unfriendly kind were current, and themselves requested the pope to investigate the truth of the suspicions which had been cast on them. The result of this inquiry was favourable to the order; but Philip held firmly to his purpose. On September the 14th, 1307 (the festival of the Exaltation of the Cross), orders were issued to his officers in all quarters, desiring them to prepare a force sufficient for the execution of certain instructions which were not to be opened until the 12th of October; and by these instructions they were charged to arrest all the Templars at one and the same time—a measure similar to those which the king had already employed towards the Jews and the foreign merchants. At the dawn of the following day the orders were carried out without any difficulty; for the Templars,

unsuspecting and unprepared, made no attempt at resistance. So closely was Philip's secret concealed, that, on the 12th of October, James de Molay had, at his request, been one of those who carried the wife of the king's brother Charles to the grave; and within a few hours the master and his brethren were arrested, and conveyed to prison by a force under the command of William of Nogaret. The king took possession of the Temple, and throughout the kingdom the property of the order was placed under seal by his officers.

Philip lost no time in following up the arrest of the Templars. Next day the canons of the cathedral and the masters of the theological faculty in the university were assembled in the chapter-house of Notre Dame. The question was proposed to them whether the king might of his own authority proceed against a religious order; and, although the answer was not immediately given, it was foreseen and acted on—that the secular judge was not entitled to take cognisance of heresy, unless in cases remitted to him by the church; but that he might properly arrest suspected persons, and might keep them for ecclesiastical judgment. On the following day, which was Sunday, the pulpits were filled with friars, who were charged to denounce the alleged crimes of the Templars; and some of the king's ministers addressed assembled crowds on the same subject. Within a week from the time of the arrest, Philip set on foot an inquiry under his confessor, William Imbert, who also held the office of grand inquisitor, and, as a Dominican, was hostile to the Templars. The master and others of the order were examined, and it is said that De Molay admitted the truth of almost all the charges. In other parts of France also the investigation was carried on at the same time under the general superintendence of Imbert.

By taking it on himself to direct an inquiry into such charges against a body which was especially connected with the Roman see, the king gave great umbrage to the pope, who wrote to him in strong terms of remonstrance, desiring that the prisoners should be made over to two cardinals and reserved for his own judgment, suspending the powers of inquisitors and of bishops over them, and ordering that their property should be kept inviolate for the benefit of the Holy Land. At the same time the pope declared his willingness to co-operate with Philip by desiring other sovereigns to arrest the Templars within their dominions. To these demands Philip, after some delay, professed to yield; and by this concession he was able to overcome Clement's opposition.

As in the case of Boniface, the king resolved to get up a national demonstration of concurrence in his policy; and with this view the estates of the realm were convoked at Tours in May 1308. From such an assembly the Templars could expect no favour. They were (for reasons which have been already explained) hated by the nobles and by the clergy; and the commons were prepossessed against them by the tales which had lately been circulated. To deal with the assembled estates was an easy task for the subtlety of Nogaret (to whom the eight chief barons of Languedoc had entrusted their proxies) and of Plasian; and the meeting resulted in a memorial by which the king was entreated to go on with the process against the Templars, even although the ecclesiastical power should refuse to support him.

While the French estates were sitting at Tours, the murder of Albert of Austria, by causing a vacancy in the empire, suggested to Philip a new object of ambition, for the attainment of which he desired to secure the pope's assistance, and found it necessary to deal tenderly with him. Repairing from Tours to Poitiers, he laid before Clement the memorial of the estates, and offered to produce convincing evidence as to the guilt of the Templars. Seventy-two members of the order, carefully selected under the king's directions, were examined in the pope's presence, where they confessed the truth of the charges against them; and some days later they heard their confessions read, and expressed their adhesion to them as true.

The master and other dignitaries of the order were on their way to Poitiers, when it was found that they were too ill to travel beyond Chinon; and there they were examined by three cardinals. It is said that De Molay confessed the charge of denying the Saviour in the

ceremony of reception, and that he then referred the cardinals for further evidence to a serving brother of the order who attended on him. The avowals of his companions reached still further; but, in consideration of their professions of penitence, the cardinals were authorized by the pope to absolve them from the sins which they had acknowledged, and they commended them to the king's mercy.

The pope professed to be convinced by the evidence which had been produced, and issued a number of documents in accordance with Philip's wishes. The powers of the bishops were restored, so that each might take cognisance of the matter within his own diocese; and, until the meeting of the intended general council, the king was to retain the custody of the accused, in the name of the church, and was to maintain them out of their property, which was allowed to remain in his hands.

On the 12th of August appeared a bull, which begins with the words *Faciens misericordiam*. In this the pope, after having mentioned the reports which were current against the order, with the avowals which had been made by some members of it, both in his own presence and elsewhere, and having declared that King Philip acted in the matter not from rapacity, but from zeal for the orthodox faith—appoints commissioners to inquire into the case of the Templars in each province of France, and authorizes them to call in, if necessary, the aid of the secular arm. By another document of the same date he orders that all property belonging to the Templars shall be given up, and threatens severe penalties against all persons, however eminent, who should venture to detain any part of it.

Another bull, which is known by the title of *Regnans in coelis*, bears the same date with the *Faciens misericordiam*, and has much in common with it. By this bull the archbishop of Narbonne, the bishop of Mende (William Durantis, nephew and successor of the famous canonist and ritualist whose name he bore), the bishops of Bayeux and Limoges, and other ecclesiastics, were commissioned to investigate the matter of the Templars, with a view to the intended general council; and a list of 127 questions was annexed, embodying the charges already mentioned, with others of a like odious character. The inquiries of the commissioners were to concern themselves with the order generally, while the cases of individuals were left to the ordinary judges of such offences. Their first sitting was on the 7th of August 1300. The confessions formerly made were put in evidence, but an opportunity of disclaiming them was allowed; and, although the archbishop of Narbonne and other members of the commission often absented themselves, as if ashamed of their work, the examination was in general conducted with mildness.

On the 26th of November, the master, De Molay, was brought before the commissioners, and was asked whether he would defend the order. He answered that it was confirmed and privileged by the apostolic see, and contrasted the hasty character of the proceedings against it with the long delay of thirty-two years which had taken place before the deposition of the emperor Frederick II. For himself, he professed that he had neither the wisdom nor the skill necessary for the defence of the order; but that he must deserve contempt and infamy if he should fail to do what he could for a body to which he owed so much. He spoke of himself as a prisoner, with but four *deniers* in the world, but said that he wished to have assistance and counsel, so that the truth might be known with regard to the order. The commissioners offered him time and other facilities, but told him that in cases of heresy the proceedings must be simple and straightforward, and that the arts of advocates were inadmissible. They then read to him the pope's bull, in which his own confession before the cardinals at Chinon was mentioned. On hearing this he crossed himself twice, and made other demonstrations of the utmost astonishment and indignation. "If," he said, "the commissioners were persons of another sort, they would hear something of a different kind from him." To this they replied that they were not to be challenged to the ordeal of battle; whereupon the old knight rejoined that he had not thought of such things, but only wished that in this case the same rule might be observed which was observed by the Turks and Saracens—that false

accusers should have their heads cut off or should be cleft down the middle of their bodies. He then, observing William of Plasian, who had attended the session uninvited, desired leave to speak with him. The old man's confidence was won by Plasian's professing to love him as a brother knight, and affecting to caution him against imprudence in the management of his cause; and the examination was adjourned until the next day but one. When the master was again brought forward, the effects of Plasian's insidious counsels were evident. He declared that, as an unlearned and poor man, he would not undertake the defence of the order; but, as it appeared from the bull that Clement had reserved to himself the judgment of the chief officers, he desired that he might be carried before the pope with as little delay as might be. On being told by the commissioners that their business was to deal with the order, and not with individuals, he asked leave to state three facts in favour of the brotherhood—that he knew of no order in which the divine services were better performed or with greater splendour of ornaments; none in which almsgiving was more liberal; no religious order, and no kind of persons, who more readily shed their blood for the Christian faith, or were more dreaded by its enemies.

The commissioners remarked that unless the foundation of faith were sound, all these things were unavailing; to which De Molay assented, and, in proof of his own orthodoxy, stated his belief in the chief articles of the Christian creed. Nogaret, who was present, asked some questions as to the stories which were current against the order, but the master replied that he had never heard of them. He begged Nogaret and the commissioners that he might be allowed to enjoy the offices of religion with the services of his chaplains, and they promised to see to the matter.

Of the other knights who were examined, some said that they would defend the order; some, that they were willing to do so, if they might have their liberty and their property restored to them, but that in their captive and destitute condition the question was a mockery; some, apparently in the belief that the order was doomed, and tempted by the hope of making good terms for themselves, declined to stand up for it; one expressed a belief that, by administering the holy Eucharist to those who gave evidence on opposite sides, a Divine judgment might be obtained for the manifestation of the truth.

On the 28th of March 1310, about 550 knights from all parts of France, who had professed themselves willing to undertake the defence of the order, were assembled in the orchard of the bishop's palace at Paris. The charges were read over in Latin by a notary, but when he was proceeding to restate them in French, a cry arose that this was needless, that they did not care to hear in the vulgar tongue such a mass of charges, too vile and abominable to be mentioned. When asked whether they would defend the order, they said that they were ready to do so if permitted by their superiors. They were desired to name six, eight, or ten persons as proxies; and Peter of Boulogne, a priest, was appointed, with three others, although they said that they could not act without the master's sanction.

After the meeting in the bishop's orchard, the commissioners visited the various houses in which the Templars were confined. In the course of these visits it became evident that a great part of the confessions to the disadvantage of the order had been wrung out by torture, by hunger, or by the other hardships of their long imprisonment. The torments which had been applied are described by some of the sufferers, and, among them, by one who had been racked by the original accuser, Squin of Florian. He professes himself willing to endure death in any form, but unable to withstand the protracted agony of the torture—by which some of the knights declare that they might have been wrought to confess anything whatever, even the guilt of having put the Saviour to death. They entreat that no layman, or other person who might be likely to disturb them, may be allowed to be present at the examinations, and protest that, when their terrors and temptations are considered, it was not wonderful that some should lie, but rather that any should venture to speak the truth. They complain bitterly of the rigorous treatment which they met with; that they were miserably lodged, loaded with chains,

and scantily fed; that they were deprived of the ministrations of religion; that their brethren who had died in prison had been excluded from the last sacraments and from Christian burial; that they themselves, in addition to other heavy charges, were even compelled to pay, out of the wretched pittance which was allowed them, a fee for unloosing and refastening their chains, and a toll for their passage across the Seine, on every day of their examination. They represent that they cannot act in behalf of the order without the master's leave; they urgently entreat that, as being nearly all unlearned men, they may be allowed the assistance of advocates, and that so much of the order's property may be granted to them as would suffice for the costs of their defence.

In the meantime Philip had set another engine in motion for the accomplishment of his purpose. By exerting a strong pressure on the pope, he had contrived that Philip de Marigny, a young brother of his favourite counsellor, Enguerrand de Marigny, should be promoted to the archbishopric of Sens. The new archbishop received his pall at Easter 1310, and on the 10th of May he opened at Paris a provincial council, before which a number of Templars, who had retracted their confessions, were brought to trial as relapsed heretics. Some of them yielded, and were allowed to escape altogether, or with slight punishment; others were put to penance, or were sentenced to imprisonment for life; but those who adhered to their retraction were condemned to be made over to the secular arm—such of them as belonged to the clerical order being previously degraded.

While the commissioners were engaged in their investigations, they were informed of the summary processes by which the archbishop of Sens was sentencing men to death, and the four chosen defenders of the order put in an appeal to them, lest the knights who had offered to defend it should be dealt with in like manner; but they answered that they had no power to interfere, as the archbishop was independent of them by virtue of the pope's late decree, which had restored to the French prelates their ordinary jurisdiction in such matters. They sent, however, a message to the council, requesting that it would delay its proceedings, as the report of these had so terrified the witnesses before the commission as to render them incapable of giving evidence calmly; but their envoys were not allowed to see the archbishop, and they made no further attempt to interpose.

On the 12th of May fifty-four Templars were, by the sentence of the council, conveyed to a field near the convent of St. Antony, where a stake had been prepared for each. It was announced that anyone who would confess should be set at liberty, and the unhappy knights were beset by the importunities of their kindred and friends, entreating them to save themselves by accepting this offer. But although deeply affected by the feelings which are natural in such a case, not one of the whole number flinched. They endured the slow 'kindling of the faggots, and the gradual progress of the flames which were to consume their bodies; and with their last breath they attested their orthodoxy by invoking the Saviour, the blessed Virgin, and the saints'. The courage and constancy of these brave men impressed the popular mind deeply and widely; but it soon became manifest that their fate had struck terror into the hearts of many among their brethren. On the following day, a Templar named Aimeri de Villars was brought before the commissioners, and appeared as if beside himself from terror and excitement. With vehement gestures, beating his breast, tossing his arms in the air, and imprecating on himself the most frightful curses unless his words were true, he declared that the charges against the order were all false, although under extremity of torture he had before admitted some of them; but that the sight of the victims, as they were dragged in carts to the place of execution on the preceding day, had so terrified him that, rather than endure the fire, he was ready to own whatever might be imputed to him, even if it were said that he had slain the Saviour.

The commissioners, in disgust at the cruelties which had been committed, and in despair of obtaining trustworthy evidence so long as the impression of the terror should be fresh, adjourned their sittings from the 19th to the 30th of May, and afterwards for a longer

time; and when they met again, in the middle of October, the effect of the late proceedings was plainly shown. Many knights, who had professed their readiness to defend the order, now renounced the defence, lest they should make themselves liable to the doom of relapsed heretics from the archbishop of Sens and his suffragans. Of the four chosen representatives, Peter of Boulogne had disappeared; another had become disqualified through having been degraded from his orders by the council; and the remaining two declared that, after the loss of their colleagues, they were no longer equal to the task. From this time the evidence before the commissioners was more in accordance with the wishes of the prosecutors than before; it seemed as if the fate of the order were hopeless, and as if its members were bent only on trying, by whatever means, to secure their individual safety. Between August 1309 and the end of May 1311, two hundred and thirty-one witnesses were examined; and at length the commissioners sent off the report of the evidence to the pope without pronouncing any judgment of their own on it. In the meantime both councils and commissioners in other parts of France had been engaged on the affair of the Templars. The only council of which a record has been preserved is one of the province of Reims, which met at Senlis; and by its sentence the body of a dead Templar was dug up and burnt, while nine members of the order perished at the stake, steadfastly declaring their innocence of the crimes imputed to them.

We may now proceed to examine the charges which were brought against the order of the Temple, with the evidence which was drawn forth by the inquiry.

The ceremonies of initiation are described with an amount of variety which proves that they must have differed according to places, times, and other circumstances; but the avowals of those who confessed may be thus summed up as to their general substance. The candidate, on bended knees, requested that he might be admitted into the society of the order, and might be allowed to share in its bread and water and clothing. He was told, by way of answer, that what he asked was a great thing. He was warned that he must prepare himself to endure hardships; that he must not judge of the order by the splendid appearance and equipments of the knights; but that he might have to walk instead of riding, to be hungry when he might wish to eat, to thirst when he might wish to drink, to go when he might wish to stay, to watch when he might wish to sleep, to give up his liberty for absolute obedience and servitude. If he still persevered in the desire to be admitted, he was then questioned as to his freedom from impediments, such as debts or secret ailments; he was required to profess his Christian faith, and in some cases to kiss the cross; he took the monastic vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and swore to observe the statutes of the order; after which an instruction in his duties as a member of it was addressed to him. Then, according to the confessions of many Templars, the new knight was led into some small chapel or other secret place; a cross, either plain or with an image of the Saviour on it, was produced; and he was required (in some cases thrice) to deny God and to spit on the cross—perhaps also to trample on it. He was next required to kiss the receiver on various parts of his body—sometimes in the most obscene and degrading manner. In some instances, it was said, the new member was told that unnatural lust was permitted in the order: sometimes an idol was produced, a cord was passed round its head, and this (or, at least, a cord which was supposed to bear some mysterious meaning) was very commonly worn by the Templars. In some instances these offensive ceremonies were not required until some days after the more legitimate form of reception.

As to the alleged abominations of the initiation, there is first the question of fact; and with regard to such of the circumstances as may be accepted for facts, there remains the question how they are to be understood. A late writer supposes the whole to be symbolical—that the applicant for admission was represented as sunk in the depths of sin and apostasy, and that from this state the order was supposed to raise him. But of this ingenious theory there is no proof, nor has the supposed symbolism any real analogy to the Festival of Fools and other such things, with which the writer in question would compare it. Rather we may perhaps suppose that the ceremonies were imposed—injudiciously and blamably indeed, but without

necessarily involving any evil meaning—as a test of the obedience which had just been professed; in order to typify, by the denial of that which had been acknowledged as holiest, by compliance with degrading and disgusting requirements, the entire and unreserved submission which the new member of the order had become bound to yield to the commands of his superiors. That this intention was not explained, would seem to have been of the very essence of the system: the Templars were left to interpret it for themselves; they were forbidden to communicate with each other as to the mode of reception, and many of them may have failed to understand a meaning which may nevertheless have been really intended. In many cases no such ceremonies were enforced at all; many Templars asserted that they had never heard of them until after the arrest of the order; and men who deposed that they themselves had been obliged to submit to them deposed also that in later receptions, which they had witnessed or in which they had themselves acted the part of receivers, the offensive forms were not required. The witnesses all declared that they had been horrified at hearing these proposed—that they would rather have been on their way to the galleys, in the depths of the earth, even in purgatory itself, than be put to such a trial, and that they had earnestly endeavoured to escape it. In some cases resistance had been successful in obtaining an exemption from the ceremonies either wholly or in part; but more commonly the novices were told that they were bound to submit, in virtue of the obedience which they had sworn, and because these were points established in the order; while, for the satisfaction of their scruples, they were assured that the denial of the Saviour was merely a form, a jest, an imitation of St. Peter's denials; that it was to be made with the mouth only, not with the heart, and was not contrary to Christian religion, or dangerous to the soul. All declared that their denials had been made with the mouth alone, and some professed to have uttered a like declaration at the time when they were received. All declared that their spitting had not been on the crucifix or cross, but near it, and some had been told by their receivers that the mere pretence of spitting was enough. Although they were usually told they must make no confession except to the clergy of the order, they had invariably carried their tale of the initiation to some other confessor, who had listened to it with astonishment and horror, and had enjoined some penances by way of expiation. Sometimes the receivers themselves, while requiring submission, told the candidates that they might confess to whomsoever they would. In one case the confessor suggested that the denial of the Saviour had been required in order to test the novice's spirit, and that, if he had steadfastly refused, he would have been considered fit to be sent earlier to the Holy Land, and to encounter the dangers of intercourse and captivity among the infidels. All the witnesses agreed in testifying that after their admission no attempt had been made to confirm them in apostasy; that the order adored the cross on Good Friday and on the festivals of its Invention and Exaltation; and that they considered their brethren in general to be true Christian believers, although some of them suspected that those who had enforced such ceremonies at the reception could not be sound in the faith.

With regard to the kissing which was said to be a part of the rite of admission to the order, and to have been the subject of much ridicule from their rivals of the Hospital, it appears that the clerical members were usually excused from it; that a formal appearance of kissing the receiver between the shoulders, or in some such place, was considered to be enough; and that when objections were taken to any further kissing, it was never enforced.

The most revolting of the accusations against the order might be supposed to have grown out of a charge which was given to the new members that each should share his bed with a brother, if required—a charge of which the true sense was, that they should be ready to give up their own convenience for that of others. Some witnesses, indeed, deposed that they were expressly authorized to indulge in unnatural lusts. But, even if this were true, the real intention might have been, not to sanction such abominations, but (as has been already suggested with regard to the denials) to try the spirit of the new members by the shock of an apparent contrast with the vows of religion and purity which had just been taken; and it is

certain that acts of the kind in question were denounced in the institutes of the Templars as deadly sins, that they were regarded with abhorrence, and that, in the very rare instances which were detected they were visited with severe punishment, such as lifelong imprisonment in chains, or expulsion from the order.

The tales as to the use of idols are very indistinct and perplexing. Some witnesses deposed that an idol had been produced at their reception, but could give no satisfactory account of it. They said that they had been too much disturbed in mind to look at it; one stated that at the sight of it he had run away in terror. And the descriptions of its appearance were very various: that it had one head, and that it had three; that it had two feet in front and two behind; that it was a bare human skull, that it was black, that it was gilt and silvered, that it had a long white beard, and that its eyes were glowing carbuncles; that it was the head of St. Peter or of St. Blaise, of one of St. Ursula's virgin companions, of a master who had apostatized to Islam and had introduced the guilty customs into the order,—or of a cat. Some declared that they had often seen an idol—to which the name of Baphomet (a corruption of Mahomet) was given—produced for adoration at chapters of the order at Montpellier, and even at Paris. But there is no evidence as to actual use elsewhere, nor, although the suddenness of the arrest would have put it out of the power of the Templars to conceal their idols, if they had possessed any, was any such object discovered in any of their houses. Perhaps, therefore, the charge of idolatry may have had no other foundation than the use of reliquaries made (as was very common) in the form of a human head, to which credulity annexed the wild stories which were current.

The practice of wearing a cord round the body was established by the evidence; but the object of it was very variously explained. Although some witnesses deposed that the cord, which was given to them at their initiation, had been previously applied to an idol, the greater number knew nothing of such a contact, and stated that the cord had not been delivered to them on the part of the order, but that they were allowed to procure it for themselves.

On the question at what time and on what occasion the offensive rites had been introduced into the order, no satisfactory or consistent testimony was to be obtained. There were stories of their having been instituted by a master who had been captive to a sultan; it was said by some that they had been used under the last four masters only; but other witnesses declared that nothing was known on the subject.

The mystery in which the proceedings of the order were shrouded gave occasion for much popular suspicion against it. The receptions and the chapters were held with closed doors, sometimes by night or in the faint light of dawn, and the members were forbidden to talk even among themselves of what took place on these occasions. A witness who did not belong to the order was told by one of the high officers that, at the proceedings of the chapters, there was one point so wonderful and so secret that, if the king of France himself were by chance to witness it, those who held the chapter would be compelled to secure his silence by putting him to death. The same officer had also declared that, in addition to the ordinary book of statutes, the Templars had another, so mysterious that he would not for the whole world allow it to be seen; and other witnesses deposed that the members in general were not allowed to see the rules or the statutes, except by special permission. The suspicion of guilty secrets was supported by the charge that the Templars were bound to confess to no one but the chaplains of their own order. But it appears that, although such an injunction was laid on them, it was not strictly observed, and that an exception was made as to cases of necessity; and if such exceptions were allowed, the rule cannot fairly be blamed as unreasonable, or as really warranting the suspicions which were not unnaturally founded on it. Another accusation was, that the master and other lay officers took it on themselves to grant absolution. As to this, it is clear from the evidence that the only offences for which absolution was really given by laymen were breaches of the rules of the order; but the testimony of some witnesses appears to show that this distinction was not always rightly apprehended, and that

some Templars may have shared in the popular opinion which supposed it to supersede the necessity of absolution from a priest. With regard to the charge that the priests of the order, in reciting the canon of the mass, omitted the four words on which the consecration of the host was supposed to depend, the greater part of the witnesses declared that they knew nothing of it; and those who admitted that they had heard of it, denied that they had observed any such omission in the performance of the office. The practice of the order as to almsgiving was among the subjects of inquiry; and the result of the answers appears to be that, notwithstanding the grandmaster's claim in behalf of his brethren as to this point, the Templars did not enjoy the reputation of liberality; that they exercised hospitality towards persons of wealth and condition rather than charitable bounty to the poor; and that in many places their alms had of late years become less than before.

The charges that they were enjoined to gain acquisitions for the order by wrongful as well as by rightful means, appeared by the evidence to have no other foundation than vague reports. One member deposed that at his reception he was told to practise such arts without scruple, but only against the Saracens; and others declared that they had been charged to avoid all ways of unfair gain.

The circumstance that there was no novitiate, although explained on the ground that the members ought, immediately on their admission, to be ready to proceed to the holy war, excited much suspicion—as if the rites of initiation were such that no one who had witnessed them should have an opportunity of leaving the order; and terrible stories were told of persons who, after having gone through those rites, never smiled again. It was said that one expressed his grief by causing a signet-ring to be made with an inscription which described him as lost, and that within a year and a half after his reception he pined away. An English witness related that a Templar spoke of himself as having lost his soul by joining the brotherhood. Another said that his grandfather entered the order in full health and in high spirits, taking his hawks and dogs with him; and that three days later he was a dead man. Another knight, who had before been rallied by his friends as to the popular stories of the manner of reception, came out from the ceremony pale and overwhelmed with sorrow; and on being urged to relate the details, as he had promised, he sternly forbade all questioning on the subject. Some professed to have forsaken the order on account of the abominations which were connected with it; others said that they had wished to leave it, but that they and many others were kept in it by fear; but these witnesses appear to have been men of low character, and little entitled to belief. It is indeed impossible to decide as to the value of much of the evidence. The witnesses make confessions to the discredit of the order; they avow that they had done this from a wish to save themselves at its expense, retract their confessions, and yet afterwards retract their retractations. Many of them declare that they had yielded to force or to the fear of tortures, and that by the same means they might have been wrought to confess anything, however false or monstrous. Many had been won by the blandishments which were practised on them, and by the hopes of royal favour which were held out, to give testimony agreeable to Philip's designs; and many—especially in the south of France—when they were pressed with the avowals which had been extracted from the grand-master and others, declared that there was no truth in them.

In other countries, also, inquiries as to the Templars had been carried on, and with results less doubtful than in France.

With England, Clement, notwithstanding his subserviency to the French king, had studied to be on friendly terms. As archbishop of Bordeaux, he had been subject to the English sovereign. As pope, he had released Edward I from his oath to observe the charters, and had allowed him to levy ecclesiastical tenths throughout the British islands for two years; and in consideration of this he had himself been permitted to extort large sums from the English church, notwithstanding strong remonstrances of the parliament. He had countenanced the attempts to subdue Scotland, had suspended the Scottish bishops who were obnoxious to

Edward, and had excommunicated Robert Bruce, who, after the execution of Wallace in August 1305, had become the champion of the national freedom. He had suspended the English primate, Robert Winchilsey, who had offended Edward by acts which have been in part already mentioned; and by these and other compliances he had established a friendly understanding, although he had declined the king's request that Bishop Grossetete of Lincoln, whom the court of Rome could not but regard as an enemy, should receive the honour of canonization. At the time when the process against the Templars was begun in France, Edward II, who had just succeeded to the English crown, was about to marry a daughter of Philip, who wrote to bespeak his co-operation against the order; and Clement, by a bull dated on the 22nd of November 1307, after reciting the confessions which were alleged to have been made by the master and other members, desired him to imprison the Templars of his dominions, and to commit their property to the custody of independent persons until the charges against them should be investigated.

In compliance with these letters—although Edward had before regarded the Templars with great favour, and was still so little inclined to believe the charges, that even at this time he wrote to the kings of Spain, Portugal, and Sicily, desiring that they would not too readily take part against the order—all the Templars in the British islands (for Scotland was then under the English dominion) were arrested in January 1308, with the same suddenness which had before been used against their brethren in France. Councils of the two provinces were held at London and at York respectively, and showed themselves disposed to treat the accused with fairness. The pope had ordered that the witnesses should be examined by torture,—a novelty in English procedure; and the York council ask, with visible repugnance, what should be done if no one capable of applying it should be found in England—whether torturers should be brought from abroad? to which no other answer was given than that it must not be so applied as to maim the victims for life.

Forty knights were examined before the bishop of London, and after these followed a number of other witnesses, who did not belong to the order. The interrogations, which were furnished by the pope, were eighty-seven in number, and to these twenty-four were afterwards added. The evidence (of which some portions have been quoted already) presents the same features with which we have become familiar in that of the French Templars. There are stories of denying the Saviour, of spitting on the cross, of obscene ceremonies and abominable licenses as connected with the reception. One witness, Stephen of Staplebridge, who is described as a fugitive and apostate from the order, and professed much contrition for his sins, states that there were two ceremonies of reception—a good and a bad—and that he himself had gone through both; he believed that any who should refuse compliance with the objectionable rites were put to death in foreign countries, but was not aware of any such case in England. There is much about idols, brazen heads with either one face or two, a cat, a calf, a black monster with glowing eyes; and one witness, a Franciscan friar, had been told by a “veteran,” who had left the order, that there were four principal idols in England. Yet on this point there was no clear testimony from personal knowledge, and it was commonly stated that, with very few exceptions, the faith of the members was sound. There were tales of the mystery in which the order delighted, and of the terrible effects which an initiation into its secrets had in some cases produced.

The councils both of London and of York were inclined to greater lenity than the French tribunals. Many of the accused were persuaded to forswear all heresy, on which they were absolved, and placed in monasteries for penance until the expected general council should decide the fate of the order. But for those who persisted in a denial of guilt, severer measures were used. Thus one was shut up for the time “in a most vile prison, being bound with double irons;” and the grand preceptor, William de la More, was reserved for the pope's judgment, and died in prison.

In Scotland, only two knights—both of English birth—were arrested. They admitted that the great officers were accustomed to give absolution as if by authority from God, St. Peter, and the pope. One of them said that at his reception he was charged to accept no service from a woman—not so much as water to wash his hands. Many witnesses not belonging to the order were examined, but nothing beyond mere suspicions could be drawn out from them. The abbot of Dunfermline stated that he had never heard of any reception as having taken place in Scotland.

In Ireland, after some Templars had been examined without admitting any of the charges, the evidence came chiefly from Franciscans, who were bitter enemies of the order. One who had been a servitor in it had heard that many Templars had been put into sacks and thrown into the sea; but when questioned as to the story that one was lost at every general chapter, he said that he had himself disproved it by counting them as they went in and as they came out. Another deposed that at the elevation of the host Templars had been known to look down to the ground; and that from this and other circumstances he believed them all and each to be conscious of some guilty secret.

In Italy, although the usual avowals to the discredit of the order were extorted in the papal states and in the southern kingdom, which was under the influence of France, the result of inquiries elsewhere was favourable. The archbishop of Ravenna, as inquisitor for Tuscany and northern Italy, held two synods for the consideration of the subject, where it was resolved that the guilty members should be punished and that the innocent should be absolved; that those who retracted confessions made under torture should be reckoned as innocent; and that, as the innocent outnumbered the guilty, the order should be allowed to retain its property.

In the Spanish kingdoms the affair took a peculiar course. The Templars of Castile and Aragon, warned by the sudden arrest of their brethren in France, shut themselves up in their castles, and offered to do battle for the defence of the order. Some of their fortresses were reduced by the king of Aragon, and were made over by him to papal commissioners. The case of the Aragonese Templars was considered by synods at Tarragona in 1310 and 1312—between which times some of them had been put to torture, but without making any confession. At the second synod they were declared to be innocent of heresy; but as the pope had already dissolved the order, it was decreed that, until he should determine further, they should be allowed to hold houses and income within the dioceses where their property lay, and to live under the inspection of the bishops.

For the kingdoms of Castile and Leon, the inquiry was carried on by a commission which sat at Medina del Campo, and afterwards by a synod at Salamanca, in 1310. The prelates who were present expressed great satisfaction that no crime had been established against the Templars, but referred the decision of the case to the pope, on the ground that an acquittal by him would carry greater weight than one pronounced by an inferior tribunal; but eventually the Templars of Castile were involved in the general fate of the order.

In Germany, the Templars of Mayence, Toul, and Verdun denied all the charges. The case of the order was brought before a council at Mayence in 1410, when, to the astonishment of the assembled prelates, Hugh, count of the Rhine and waldgrave, the provincial head of the Templars, appeared with twenty companions, in the full armour and habit of the Temple. On being asked by the archbishop of Mayence, Peter Aichspalter, to explain their business, the count said that he and his brethren protested against the charges of “enormous and more than heathen crimes,” which had been brought against them; that the innocence of those who had been burnt elsewhere had been proved by a miracle, their white cloaks and red crosses having been unconsumed by the fire; and he appealed to a future pope and to a general council. The archbishop answered that he would refer the matter to the pope; and in the following year a second council was held, by which it was declared that the Templars were innocent. Yet at Mayence the property of the order was confiscated; and in other parts of Germany there were serious commotions, and some of its members perished at the stake.

The pope wrote to the king of Cyprus and to the Latin patriarch of Constantinople, urging inquiry into the case of the Templars, and enjoining the use of torture. In reply, Amaury of Cyprus reported that he had not been able to arrest the knights, as they had been warned against a surprise; but that they had waited on him, asserting their innocence, and offering to submit to the papal judgment.

Within a few months after the beginning of Philip's proceedings against the Templars, the empire had been left without a head by the death of Albert of Austria, who, while on his way to suppress an insurrection of the Swiss, was murdered by his nephew John, within sight of the castle of Hapsburg, the original seat of their family. His eldest son, Frederick, became a candidate for the vacant dignity, but found that his hope of gaining the electors was destroyed by their remembrance of Albert's harshness, and of the policy by which he had strengthened the crown. Philip now conceived the scheme of gaining the empire for a member of his own family—which, in addition to France and Navarre, already possessed the thrones of Naples and Hungary, and through agents at Florence and at Rome swayed the affairs of central Italy; and (as we have seen) he lost no time in visiting Clement at Poitiers, with a view to secure the pope's interest for his brother, Charles of Valois. It has, indeed, been supposed by some writers that this interest was the object of the secret article which Philip was said to have exacted from Clement before his election. But the pope had reason to dread the vast aggrandizement of French influence which was designed; and although, in compliance with Philip's wishes, he wrote in favour of Charles to the electors, he at the same time took measures underhand to defeat the king's policy. In consideration of his apparent subserviency, not only as to the Templars but as to the empire, he was allowed to leave Poitiers, and Philip was about to visit him at Avignon, in order to press his suit with greater advantage at the head of 6,000 cavalry. But Clement, having been informed of this design by a member of the king's council, employed Cardinal Nicolas of Prato (who had been alienated from Philip by his bitterness against the memory of Boniface) to urge the electors that they should choose speedily, and to recommend to them, as the fittest candidate, Duke Henry of Luxemburg, who had lately visited the papal court. The important see of Mayence was at this time occupied by Peter of Aichtzspalt (Aichspalt or Aspelt), who having been sent to solicit it for Henry's brother Baldwin, and having recommended himself to the pope by his medical skill, had himself been promoted from the see of Basel to the German primacy, for which Baldwin was considered to be too young; and within two years he had been able to console Baldwin by procuring for him the archbishopric of Treves. Through the exertions of Peter Aichspalter, aided by Baldwin, it was now contrived that the election should fall on Henry—a petty prince who had not at first been thought of as a candidate, but who had been distinguished by the justice and the vigour of his administration within his own small territory, and was renowned as the most accomplished knight in Europe. The archbishop of Mayence and the other electors took, as was usual, the opportunity to secure large privileges or other advantages for themselves and their successors; and the pope, in ratifying the election, exacted from Henry an engagement that he would confirm the grants of former emperors to the church, that he would exterminate heresies and heretics, that he would never intermarry or ally himself with Saracens, heathens, or schismatics, and that he would secure to the Roman church the lands which had been mentioned in former compacts.

Philip—whether or not he knew or suspected that the pope's duplicity had been the cause of his failure as to the empire,—was rendered eager to console himself for the disappointment by pursuing his suit against the memory of Boniface; and, although it had been intended that the matter should be reserved for the general council, which had been summoned to meet in October 1310, Clement was urged to a more speedy trial. He announced an intention of hearing the case in Lent 1310, and summoned Philip and his sons, with Nogaret and Plasian, to appear as accusers. The king and the princes, however, declined to

undertake that character in a question of heresy; and thus the task was thrown on Plasian and Nogaret, who had staked their all on the process.

Witnesses were on their way from Italy, under Reginald of Supino, who had been concerned in the attack on the palace of Anagni, when, within three leagues of Avignon, they were assailed by some of Boniface's partisans, who had been lying in wait for their arrival. Some of the Italians were killed; the rest were scattered and returned across the Alps; and their leader hints, in a protest which he made at Nimes, that the scheme for thus getting rid of their evidence had not been unknown to pope Clement. The power and wealth of Boniface's family had provided him with able advocates, when, on the 16th of March, 1310, the question came before the pope in his consistory. The French king's civilians were confronted by men learned in the ecclesiastical law, among whom the most conspicuous was Baldred Bisset, a canon of Glasgow, whose name has already come before us in connexion with the question as to the Scottish crown. By each party an attempt was made to deprive its opponents of a standing in the court. On the one side, it was said that a man who was dead, and who was charged with heresy, was not entitled to counsel: on the other, that a dead man ought not to be brought to trial, since he had been cited before a higher tribunal; that a pope could not be judged by any man—not even by his own successor, forasmuch as an equal has no power over an equal; or, at least, that he could not be judged by any authority less than a general council. To this it was rejoined that Boniface, being dead, was no longer pope; that the pope represented the whole church, so as to render a general council superfluous; while Clement himself disclaimed the right to try his predecessor. Nogaret objected to some of the cardinals, as unfit to be judges on account of their partiality; while the opposite party asserted that Nogaret himself ought not to be heard on account of his notorious enmity against Boniface, of his acts against that pope, and of the excommunication which he had incurred. Against Plasian, too, disqualifying circumstances were alleged, Nogaret and his advocate, Bertrand of Roccanegata, replied that he had not incurred excommunication; that, since he had spoken with Boniface before the pope's death, he could not be in an excommunicate state; but the pope said that, although this opinion was held by some lawyers, it could not be admitted. Both Plasian and Nogaret asserted those doctrines of royal, as opposed to ecclesiastical, power which were characteristic of their class—maintaining, among other things, the right of the sovereign to prevent his subjects from going out of the realm, and to take the property of the clergy without their consent. The trial went on for many months.

Evidence, partly obtained by a commission sent to Italy, partly given by witnesses who appeared in person, was brought to prove a long list of accusations. It was said that Boniface had been a blasphemer from his youth upwards; that he had not only disbelieved the chief articles of the Christian faith, but had openly and habitually scoffed at them; that he had neglected the outward duties of religion, and had not confessed for thirty years; that he had been a gamester and a profligate; that even in extreme old age he had indulged in the most odious and abominable forms of dissoluteness; that he had declared the sins of the flesh to be as much a matter of indifference as the act of washing the hands; that he had been seen by night performing pagan sacrifices and incantations, while voices of demons had been heard in the air; that he had worshipped a devil enclosed in a ring, and an idol given to him by a famous sorcerer. And, together with these and other such monstrous tales, was brought up the old history of the irregularities connected with the resignation of Celestine and his own promotion, and of the cruelties which he was said to have exercised on his predecessor, of whose death he was even alleged to have been guilty.

Clement found himself in a great perplexity. Was he to give up the reputation of Boniface, and with it the credit of the papacy, the validity of Benedict's election and of his own? or was he to tax Philip with falsehood, fraud, and subornation of perjury in the persecution of the deceased pope? He had already requested the intervention of Charles of Valois, whose hopes of the empire he had lately frustrated. The kings of Castile and of Aragon

also remonstrated with Philip against his proceedings and at length a compromise was agreed on, to which Philip was the more readily brought to consent, because the new emperor's successes in Italy suggested the fear that in him the pope might find another protector. In consideration of being allowed to carry out his designs against the Templars—with whom an attempt had been made to connect Boniface by a story that he was aware of their heresy, but had been bribed to connive at it—the king agreed to forego the fullness of his triumph over the memory of his old antagonist, to leave the judgment of Boniface's case to the pope and cardinals, and never to question their decision. A special bull was issued, by which it was declared that all Boniface's acts against the king and kingdom of France were annulled; they were to be erased from the papal registers, and it was forbidden under penalties that any one should keep a copy of them. The bulls known as *Unam sanctam* and *Remnon novam* only were excepted, and these were to be understood in a qualified and inoffensive sense. At the same time Philip, after a number of cardinals and others had, at the pope's request, testified to the purity of his zeal, was pronounced to be free from all blame in his proceedings against Boniface—to be innocent as to the attack on the pope, and as to the plunder of his treasures; and it was declared that neither the existing pope nor his successors should molest the king on account of Boniface. All who had been concerned in the contest with Boniface were forgiven, except the authors of the outrage at Anagni, and even for these some other way of release was to be used. Nogaret himself was absolved *ad cautelam*, on condition that he should perform pilgrimages to Compostella and certain other places, and that in the next crusade—an expedition which was never to be made—he should serve until the pope should authorize his return.

The council of Vienne, after having been deferred from time to time, met on the 16th of October 1311. The number of bishops and mitred abbots is given by one writer as 114; by others as upwards of 300. The pope, in his discourse at the opening of the proceedings, announced three subjects for consideration—the case of the Templars, a crusade, and the reform of the church; and, in addition to these, the question as to Boniface was discussed. Three advocates—a civilian, a decretalist, and a theologian—appeared in his behalf, and it is said that two Catalan knights offered to do battle for the deceased pope's memory, but that no one took up their challenge. The question both as to Boniface's character and acts, and as to the French king's opposition to him, was settled on the footing of the compromise which has been already mentioned.

On the subject of reform in the church, the bishops gave in written statements of their views; one of these memoirs, by Durantis, bishop of Mende, displays so much of knowledge and understanding, that it has led some writers to draw from it a presumption in favour of the judgment which he formed as a commissioner in the affair of the Templars.

In this tract the bishop, with a great display of canonical learning, treats the principal subjects which appeared to him to require the council's attention. He urges a thorough reform of the church, from the head downwards. He would have the character of the Roman primacy exactly defined; that the pope should not, in contradiction to the prohibition of Gregory the Great, be styled universal bishop, and that in various ways his pretensions should be limited. If the papacy should be vacant more than three months, the right of election ought to pass from the cardinals to certain other representatives of the church. He proposes that a general council should be assembled once in ten years, and that the power of making general laws should belong to such councils alone. He urges the restoration of the rights of the episcopate in cases where they had been invaded from various quarters, as by the undue preference of cardinals and members of the pope's household above the bishops, and by those grants of dispensations and exemptions to monastic communities which had been found ruinous to discipline, and had often led even the inferior members of such communities to fancy themselves equal to bishops and archbishops. He denounces simony, pluralities, the system of granting monastic and other benefices to *cardinals in commendam*, the employment of

bishops and clergy in secular affairs, improper promotions, the pride, luxury, and ignorance of the clergy, the want of decent ornaments and vestures in churches, defects in the performance of the services, and the profanation of Sundays and holydays by giving them up to unseemly merriment. He urges reform among the bishops and clergy, and, while maintaining the immunity of the clergy from secular courts, he would guard against the abuse of this privilege as a protection to unworthy persons. He proposes that the decretal *De clericis conjugatis* should be revoked, as having been made by pope Boniface without the concurrence of a general council; that the western discipline as to the marriage of the clergy should be conformed to that of the eastern church; and he suggests the revival of those canons by which the offspring of the amours of the clergy were condemned to servitude. But although the question of reform had been thus fully brought forward, the council did little to effect a reformation in the points which had been indicated as faulty.

The subject of a crusade was discussed, but languidly. A grant of tenths for six years was voted for the purpose; money and jewels were contributed, and some knights, among whom were Philip of France, Edward II of England, and Lewis of Navarre, son of the French king, took the cross with a view to the expedition. But nothing came of these acts, and, although attempts were made to aid the cause by a report that the Mussulmans themselves foretold a speedy extinction of the false religion, it was more manifest than ever that the period of crusading enthusiasm was over. A chronicler relates that, when some thousands of crusaders, in obedience to the pope's summons, made their appearance at Avignon, Clement absolved them from their vow, and desired them to return to their homes; "and thus," says the writer, "their labours and very great expenses became like a mockery and had no effect."

While the council was engaged in hearing and considering the evidence which had been collected as to the case of the Templars, seven knights presented themselves at one of the sessions; and at a later meeting, two more appeared in like manner, offering to defend the order, and stating that from 1500 to 2000 of their brethren, concealed at Lyons and in its neighbourhood, were ready to support them; but the pope in alarm ordered them to be arrested and imprisoned. In February 1312, Philip, impatient at the slowness of the council, appeared before the gates of Vienne at the head of a large force, declaring an intention to "make the cause of Christ triumphant," and demanding the abolition of the order, on the ground that it had been convicted of heresies and crimes. A vast majority of the council, however—all but one Italian bishop and the archbishops of Sens, Rouen, and Reims, who had been concerned in the burnings of the French Templars—desired that the accused should be heard; and Clement in perplexity caught at a suggestion which had been made by the bishop of Mende, that the order should be abolished, not on grounds of law, but as a measure of expediency for the good of the church. On the 22nd of March, he brought the question before his secret consistory, when no objection was raised against the course which he proposed; for the members of the council had been gradually subdued to the papal influence. And at the second general session, on the 3rd of April, when king Philip and three of his sons were present, the dissolution of the order was proclaimed, "not," as the pope avowed, "by way of definitive sentence, forasmuch as, according to the inquisitions and processes which have been held, we cannot of right pass such a sentence, but by the way of provision or apostolical ordination." Thus the very instrument by which the abolition of the order was determined left the question of its guilt or innocence open, and has left it to perplex later ages, without even such assistance towards the solution of it as might have been derived from a papal judgment. A writer who lived near the time, and who professes to have special authority for his statement, reports Clement as having said that the order could not be destroyed in the way of justice, but that it must be destroyed by the way of expediency, "lest our dear son the king of France should be offended".

The members of the order individually were left to the judgment of provincial synods. For those who should seek and receive absolution, a maintenance was to be provided; and the

property of the order in France was made over, for the benefit of the Holy Land, to the Hospitallers, who had achieved the conquest of Rhodes at the very time when the great rival society was in the agonies of ruin. Many members of the dissolved order were received into that of the Hospital, while others sank into humbler conditions of life. But such was the rapacity of Philip, and so effectually did he use the means of extortion which he possessed, that his exactions for the temporary custody of the property, and under other pretexts, are said to have left the Hospitallers for a time rather losers than gainers by the great possessions which were thus transferred to them. The property of the Templars was also bestowed on the knights of the Hospital in Germany, England, and other countries; but a different arrangement was made as to Spain, where the lands of the dissolved society were assigned to the sovereigns, with a view to the continual war against the Moors; while some smaller brotherhoods, devoted to the prosecution of that war, grew out of its ruins, and were in part composed of persons who had been among its members.

The grand-master, James de Molay, and three other great dignitaries of the order, had spent six years and a half in prison when it was at length resolved to bring their case to a final decision. They were produced for trial before a commission, of which the archbishop of Sens was president, were condemned on their old confessions to imprisonment for life, and on March 11th 1314 were brought forward in the presence of two cardinals on a platform which had been erected in the parvis of the cathedral. The cardinal of Albano began to read out their confessions; but suddenly this was interrupted by the grand-master, who denied and repudiated the avowals imputed to him, declaring himself to deserve death for having, from fear of torture and in flattery of the king, made a false confession. The master of Normandy adhered to him in his protest; but the other two brethren, worn out and dispirited by their long imprisonment, had not the courage to join them. The cardinals, at a loss how to act on this unexpected emergency, adjourned the further proceedings until the morrow: but Philip, on being informed of the scene which had taken place, at once, and without consulting the cardinals or any other clerical advisers, gave orders for the execution of the two who had retracted their confessions. On the same day De Molay and the master of Normandy were led forth to death on a little island of the Seine, below the island of the City, to which it has since been joined. Molay requested that his hands might be unbound, and that in his last moment the image of the blessed Virgin might be held before his eyes; and, as the flames gradually rose around him and his companion, they firmly protested their orthodoxy and the innocence of their order. Philip watched from the bank the death of his victims, whose constancy in suffering produced a deep impression on the people, so that their ashes were carefully collected and were treasured up as relics, while their fate was generally ascribed to the king's insatiable rapacity. It was afterwards commonly believed that Molay at the stake summoned the pope and the king, as the authors of his death, to appear before the judgment-seat of Christ within forty days and a year respectively, and that each of them died within the time assigned. This story, however, does not appear at all in contemporary writings; and the earliest versions of it are without those coincidences of time which would at once give it a prophetic character, and furnish a strong presumption of its falsehood. The two knights who had hung back from taking part with the master in the parvis of Notre-Dame ended their days in prison.

ITALY

In Italy the enmities of the Guelf and Ghibelline factions had continued with unabated bitterness. The head of the Guelf party was Robert of Naples, who, on the death of his father, Charles II, had been preferred by the pope, on account of his maturer age and of his abilities, to the son of his elder brother, Charles of Hungary. Robert had received the crown from the pope's hands at Avignon, which was within his own territory of Provence; and at the same

time he had been excused the payment of a very large debt which his grandfather and father had incurred to the Roman see on account of their Sicilian wars.

Since the deposition of Frederick II at the council of Lyons in 1245, no king of the Romans had received the imperial crown; and Albert as well as Rudolf had been severely rebuked in Dante's enduring verse for neglecting Rome and Italy. Yet while the empire was thus in a state of abeyance or weakness, the idea of the emperor's power, as an absolute monarch and supreme arbiter, had been raised higher than before through the exertions of the lawyers, who grounded their theories on the old legislation of Justinian, and had never been in greater authority than at this time. For Henry of Luxemburg his want of territorial power and family connexions made it important that he should be invested with the imperial crown; and in August 1309 he announced to an assembly at Spire his intention of proceeding into Italy for this purpose. At Lausanne, where many representatives of Italian princes and parties waited on him, in October 1310, he renewed the oath which his envoys had already taken to the pope; and towards the end of the same month he crossed the Mont Cenis, with a force which did not in all exceed 5000 men. On the Epiphany 1311—the second anniversary of his coronation at Aix-la-Chapelle—he was crowned at Milan as king of Italy by the archbishop of that city. From a throne erected in a public place at Milan he proclaimed that he desired to know nothing of party, but everywhere to establish peace and justice, and to restore the exiled citizens; and the people wept for joy at the announcement. The factions of the Milanese, which were headed respectively by the families of Visconti and Della Torre, were not, however, to be at once appeased; and the exactions to which Henry was driven by his necessities produced a commotion, in consequence of which he was led to expel the Della Torres, who, from having been the first to welcome him, had afterwards turned against him. In faithful adherence to his declaration that he had not come into Lombardy for the benefit of a party, but of all, Henry proceeded from city to city, everywhere restoring the exiles, whether Ghibellines who had been banished by Guelfs, or Guelfs who had been banished by Ghibellines. But some of the Lombard cities rose against him on account of this impartial procedure, and it was not without much labour that he was able to reduce them; while the detention thus caused (as at Brescia, which did not capitulate until after to having been reduced to extreme distress by a siege of four months) involved the loss of opportunities which might have enabled him to make himself master of central and southern Italy. At Genoa, where he spent four months—partly on account of the illness and death of his queen—he received ambassadors from Robert of Naples, proposing term of friendship and alliance; but on proceeding southward, he found that Robert was exerting all his influence against him, and that the king's brother, John, prince of Achaia, was in possession of the approach to Rome by the Ponte Molle, and of some strong places within the city. After some negotiation he compelled John to withdraw from the bridge (although the prince professed to do so for strategical reasons); and he gradually got possession of the Capitol, the Colosseum, the Pantheon, and other strongholds on the left bank of the river. But the Capitol was recovered by the Neapolitan party, through the influence of money. The Vatican quarter and the Trastevere, with that part of the Campus Martius which is nearest to the river, were in the hands of John and of his allies, the Orsini; bloody encounters were frequent in the streets; and after repeated attempts to gain possession of St. Peter's, by force or by treaty, with a view to his imperial coronation, Henry was obliged to submit to receive the crown on St. Peter's day in the half-ruinous church of St. John Lateran, which had lately been in great part destroyed by fire. For this there was a precedent in the case of Lothair III, who had been crowned in the Lateran because St. Peter's was occupied by the antipope Anacletus, and it was sanctioned by a decree of the Roman senate and people; but the three cardinals who had been commissioned by the pope to officiate, did not consent to such a deviation from the usual practice until after much difficulty and under protest; and the ceremony, shorn of its usual splendour, was performed in the midst of danger and alarm.

Immediately after the coronation, the duke of Bavaria and others of Henry's supporters left Rome with their troops, in fear of the heats which had so often been fatal to the Germans; and the emperor himself, who had been reduced to great straits by the diminution of his force, finally took his departure on the 20th of August. It was in vain that Clement desired Henry and Robert, as sons of the church, to make peace; for Henry, having been advised by his legal counsellors that the pope was not entitled to interfere thus between him and his vassal, was determined to assert the fullness of his imperial rights.

After some previous formalities, he uttered at Pisa the ban of the empire, by which Robert, on account of treasons and other offences which were recited, was declared to have forfeited both his southern kingdom and the county of Provence. His subjects were absolved from their allegiance, and, as an outlaw, he was threatened, if he should fall into the emperor's hands, with the same death which his own grandfather, the founder of the Angevine dynasty, had inflicted on the unfortunate Conradin. The pope declared this sentence to be null, and reminded Henry of his oaths to the apostolic see; to which Henry replied that he had taken no oath of fealty to any one; and, having made this declaration solemnly before witnesses, he caused it to be formally recorded.

Henry's army had been greatly reduced by defections, war, and sickness, and he was obliged to wait for reinforcements from Germany. Yet the firmness with which he held to his purpose, and the other great qualities which he displayed, were such as even to extort the admiration of those who were opposed to him. Being as yet unable to attack Robert directly, he laid siege to Florence, which now for the first time began to take a prominent part in the general politics of Italy; but the strength of the defence and a sickness among his troops obliged him to relinquish the attempt. The pope, greatly incensed, threatened excommunication and interdict against anyone who should invade the Neapolitan kingdom, as being a fief of the church; but Henry replied to his legate, "If God be for us, neither the pope nor the church will destroy us, so long as we do not offend God." The pope, instigated by Philip's influence in behalf of his Neapolitan kinsmen, pronounced his curses; but before the publication of them, Henry had died at Buonconvento, on the 24th of August 1313, at a time when his power was greater and when his prospects appeared brighter than they had ever before been. His death appears to have been really occasioned by natural causes but its suddenness gave countenance to the suspicion of poison, which was said to have been administered in the eucharistic cup by his confessor, a Dominican named Bernard of Montepulciano, who had been bribed (according to various theories) by Robert of Naples, by Philip of France, by the Florentines, or by the pope.

With Henry's attempt to restore the dignity of the empire Dante's famous treatise 'Of Monarchy' is connected by its subject, although it was probably composed somewhat earlier. From one of the poet's letters it is inferred that he waited on the emperor at his appearance in Italy and his interest in Henry personally appears from a well-known passage of the 'Paradise'. The treatise 'Of Monarchy' may be regarded as a remarkable instance of the manner in which the advance of the papal claims provoked the development of a rival theory, which invested the emperor with a majesty partly derived from the remembrance of the ancient Roman greatness, and partly borrowed from the theocratic idea of the papacy. The author proposes to himself three questions whether monarchy be necessary for the wellbeing of the world; whether the Romans acquired their empire rightfully; and whether the monarch's authority be derived from God immediately, or through some other power;—and all these questions he decides in favour of the imperial pretensions. He argues that in every society there must be a head, and in the great human society this head must be a monarch. He regards this monarchy as absolute and universal, and declares that such a government is the only means of establishing universal peace, which never existed except under the empire of Augustus Caesar. The Romans, he says, were the noblest of peoples, and therefore were worthy of universal empire. They got their empire rightfully; for they got it by war, and war is

a recourse to the Divine arbitration. In proof of this, he alleges stories of miracles from Livy and from Virgil; and he argues that, if the empire were not of right, the Saviour, by being born under it, would have sanctioned wrong. In the third book, Dante discusses the question of the emperor's deriving his authority from God immediately or mediately. He admits that the secular power is under certain obligations to the spiritual power; but he denies that the phrase of the "two swords" showed St. Peter to be possessed of temporal as well as spiritual government. He combats such deductions from the "two great lights" and from other scriptural language as would make the temporal power inferior to the spiritual; and, without questioning the genuineness of the donation ascribed to Constantine, he denies the inferences from it as to the emperor's having made over his power to the pope. As the empire existed in its fullness before the church, it could not be derived from the church; the emperor has his power immediately from God, and he is chosen by God alone, while the so styled electors are merely the instruments for declaring the Divine will. The whole treatise—and nothing in it more signally than the wild inconsequence of some of the arguments—may be regarded as evidence of the fascination which the idea of the imperial grandeur and the traditional dignity of Rome as its seat could exercise over a mind lofty, solitary, perhaps unequalled in some elements of greatness, but ill fitted for the practical work of human politics.

The pope had been embroiled with the Venetians as to Ferrara, where, on the death of Azzo III, in 1308, the succession was disputed between his brother Francis, and his illegitimate son Frisco. Frisco, finding himself odious to the Ferrarese, called in the aid of the Venetians, to whom he afterwards sold his interest; while his uncle threw himself on the protection of the pope. The Venetians, who had always been inclined to hold themselves independent of Rome in ecclesiastical matters, persisted in keeping their questionable acquisition; while Clement advanced an apocryphal claim to Ferrara as a dependency of the Roman see. A papal nuncio was insulted, and even stoned, at Venice; and on Maundy Thursday 1309, the pope issued a bull so monstrous that even the papal annalist Rinaldi is ashamed to transcribe it at full lengths. Clement declared by it that, unless the Venetians would submit, they should be excluded from religious offices, from civil intercourse, and from all benefit of laws; their magistrates were to be branded as infamous, their doge was to be stripped of the ensigns of office, their whole property was to be subject to confiscation, they were to be liable to slavery, and their goods were to be at the mercy of any who might care to plunder them. Princes were invited to carry out these outrageous denunciations, and a crusade was proclaimed against the republic, with the usual promise of indulgences. The clergy and monks withdrew from Venice in obedience to the pope's order, and multitudes were readily found to catch at the license to plunder which was held out in the name of religion. In England and in France the property of Venetian traders was violently seized; at Genoa and in the ports of the Romagna, of Tuscany, and of Calabria, many of them, in addition to the loss of their effects, were reduced to slavery, or even were slain. Cardinal Arnold of Pelagruè, whom the pope had commissioned as legate for Tuscany and northern Italy, marched an army to Ferrara, which he took with great slaughter by the aid of the party opposed to Frisco; and he exercised cruel vengeance on the Venetians who fell into his hand. The interdict on Venice continued in force until the year 1313, when Francis Dandolo (afterwards doge) was sent to the papal court at Avignon, and, by the adroitness of his submission, was able to obtain the absolution of his countrymen.

Feeling his health declining, Clement in 1314 resolved to seek a restoration of it by a visit to his native province; but he had proceeded no further than Roquemaure, on the western bank of the Rhone, when death came on him on the 20th of April. His body was removed to Carpentras for burial; and it was said that, having been left unattended in a church, it was partly burnt in a conflagration occasioned by the candles which were placed around it. Notwithstanding the expenses of his court and the rapacity of his mistress, he left vast wealth to his nephews.

Ignominious as Clement's subserviency to the king of France appears, he had yet been able by his policy to gain some points which would have been certainly lost if he had attempted to carry on the lofty manner of Boniface. His underhand dealings had frustrated Philip's attempt to gain the imperial crown for the reigning family of France; he had succeeded in rescuing the memory of his predecessor from reprobation, and by so doing had rescued the credit of the papacy itself.

The last years of Philip the Fair were not happy, and many saw in the troubles which befell him the punishment of his outrages against Pope Boniface or of his injustice to the Templars. He was dishonoured in his family by the infidelity of his queen and of the wives of his three sons. The falsification of the coinage, and his other oppressive means of raising moneys although they failed to enrich him, provoked discontents which sometimes found a vent in insurrection and compelled him to withdraw his offensive measures. But in the meantime his piety and his cruelty were shown at once in the punishment of religious error, as in the case of Margaret Porrette, a native of Hainault, who in 1310 was burnt for having produced a book on the Love of God, written in a strain of mystical fervour which seems to have bordered on the errors of the sect of the Free Spirit. So noted was Philip's zeal for orthodoxy, that Arnold of Villeneuve, a Provençal physician, and professor in the university of Paris, after having published a book against the prevailing religious system, thought it well to secure his safety by seeking a refuge in Sicily. After a reign of twenty-nine years, Philip, although he had reached only the age of forty-six, was prematurely broken and worn out. An accident which befell him while hunting in the forest of Fontainebleau produced an illness, which he is said to have borne with great patience; and on the 29th of November 1314 he died, leaving the memory of a rule more despotic and oppressive than any that had been known in France.

CHAPTER II

FROM THE DEATH OF POPE CLEMENT V TO THAT OF THE EMPEROR
LEWIS IV
A.D. 1314-1347.

The cardinals met at Carpentras, the place of Clement V's burial, for the election of a successor to him. Of twenty-three who composed the college, six only were Italians, and the feeling of these is shown in a letter which was addressed by one of them, Napoleon Orsini, to king Philip. The cardinal expresses his deep dissatisfaction with the result of the last election. Rome and Italy had suffered by Clement's withdrawal, and had fallen a prey to confusion. The patronage of bishoprics and other ecclesiastical dignities had been prostituted to money or to family interest. The Italian cardinals had been slighted in all possible ways; the pope had shown his intention to confine the church to a corner of Gascony: and the letter concludes by praying that Philip would concur towards the election of a pope who may be as unlike his predecessor as the good of the church required that he should be.

The Italians urged a return to Rome, and maintained that, in order to preserve the ascendancy of the pope over the hearts of men, the chair of St. Peter must be fixed in the apostle's own city. To this course they were strongly urged by the great poet of the age, who addressed a letter to them, in which he represented the faults which were commonly imputed to their order, lamented the condition of Rome, "now deprived of both lights" (the empire and the papacy), "sitting solitary and a widow"; and he exhorted them to make the disgrace of the Gascons, who greedily attempted to usurp the glory of the Latins, a warning to future ages. The French cardinals, although nearly thrice as many as the Italians, hesitated to force an election by outvoting them; but while the conclave was sitting, two of Clement's nephews, under pretence of accompanying his body, entered the town at the head of a party of Gascons, who, with shouts of "Death to the Italians!"—"We will have the pope!" attacked the houses of the Italian cardinals, killed many of their dependents, and began to plunder and to burn in several quarters. The palace in which the cardinals were assembled was set on fire, and they were compelled to make their escape by breaking through the back wall of the building. The cardinals were scattered "like frightened partridges"; and although Philip urged them to meet at Lyons for an election, the matter was unsettled at the time of his death.

His son and successor, Lewis X, who from his noisy and disorderly habits acquired the name of *Hutiny* was a frivolous, prodigal, childish prince, and while he gave himself up to the amusements of the tilt-yard and to other enjoyments, the real conduct of affairs was in the hands of his uncle, Charles of Valois. The late king's ministers and instruments were disgraced: Enguerrand de Marigny and others of them were put to death; and in the course of the proceedings against them were discovered the arts of some sorcerers, who, in complicity (as was said) with Marigny, his wife, and his sister, were supposed to practise against the lives of the king, of his uncle Charles, and of others, by placing waxen images of them before a slow fire, when, as the figure gradually melted away, a corresponding decrease took place in the fleshly substance of the person who was represented.

The spirit of party was strong among the cardinals. The Gascons would have no one but a Gascon for pope, while those who had been discontented under Clement were not inclined to elect one of his countrymen. In consequence of these differences the papacy had

already been vacant two years, when Lewis, by promising that the rule for closing the conclave should not be enforced, persuaded the members of the college to assemble at Lyons for an election, and deputed his brother Philip, count of Poitiers, to superintend it. But before any decision had taken place, Philip was informed that Lewis had suddenly died, on the fifth of July 1316; and, being advised by some counsellors that the engagement as to the conclave was illegal, and therefore invalid, he ordered that the Dominican convent, in which the cardinals were assembled, should be walled up and guarded, while he himself set off to secure his own interests in the new circumstances of the kingdom. A son whom the widowed queen bore after her husband's death lived only a few days; and as the only other child of Lewis, a daughter, was set aside on account of her sex, Philip "the Long" himself became king, although not without a protest in the name of the excluded princess.

The cardinals were at length brought, through the management of Napoleon Orsini, to elect James d'Euse, or Duèse, cardinal of Porto, who took the name of John XXII. John was a native of Cahors, and appears to have been the son of a respectable citizen of that place, although some represent him as descended from a knightly family, while others make his father a tavern-keeper or a cobbler. He was a man of small stature, of simple personal habits, and of vehement and bitter temper; he was distinguished for his acuteness, his eloquence, and learning; he had been chancellor to king Robert of Naples, and had held the sees of Frejus and of Avignon, to the latter of which he was promoted by Clement V, in compliance with a recommendation which was signed and sealed by the chancellor in the king's name, but to which Robert himself was not privy. He had been employed in Italy to inquire into the case of Boniface VIII; at the council of Vienne he had rendered important services to Clement by labouring both for the rescue of Boniface's memory and for the condemnation of the Templars; and these services had been rewarded by his promotion to the dignity of cardinal.

It is said that at the election John conciliated the Italian cardinals by swearing that he would never mount on horseback unless to return to Rome; and that he eluded his oath by descending the Rhone to Avignon in a boat, and walking from the landing-place to the papal palace, which he never afterwards quitted, except in order to attend the services of the neighbouring cathedral.

But although John remained in France, his condition was very different from that of his predecessor. The kings with whom he had to deal did not possess the vigour of Philip the Fair; and the air which the pope assumed towards them was not that of a subordinate but of a superior. Even if he endeavoured to bring about that transference of the imperial crown to the royal house of France which Clement's art had been employed to prevent, it was with a view to establishing more thoroughly the superiority of the papacy over the empire. He took it on himself, in disregard of a right which had always been claimed by sovereigns, to redistribute the dioceses of southern France, erecting Toulouse into an archbishopric, with six suffragan bishops under it, and to make similar changes in other parts of the kingdom. And, in reliance at once on his pontifical authority and on his personal reputation for learning, he undertook to reform and to dictate to the universities of Paris, Toulouse, and Orleans.

John was especially severe against those magical practices which have been already mentioned, and by the fear of which the public mind was at that time thrown into a state of panic. The Inquisition was employed to discover those who carried on similar arts—with whom the remains of the Albigensian sectaries were sometimes confounded. For such crimes (real or imaginary) many persons were put to death; among them was Hugh Gerald, the bishop of John's native city, who, having been found guilty of having compassed the pope's death by unhallowed arts, was degraded from his orders, flayed alive, and torn asunder by horses, after which his remains were dragged through the town to the place of public execution, where they were burnt. The lepers, who, during the time of the crusades had generally been regarded with compassion, and who, in the early days of the Franciscan order, had been the special objects of its charity, now fell under suspicion of a conspiracy against the

rest of mankind. It was said that they were engaged in a design to poison all the wells of France, by putting into them little bags, containing the consecrated host, mixed with human blood, herbs, and various loathsome substances; that by such means they hoped either to destroy all Christians, or to infect them with their own miserable disease; that with a view to this plot they had held four general councils, at which all lazar-houses were represented; that they had been instigated to the crime by Jews, who were the agents of the Moorish king of Granada; and that, while lending themselves to the plots of the infidels, the lepers had engaged themselves to deny the Christian faith. In consequence of these wild tales, a general persecution was carried on against the lepers. In some places they were shut up in their houses, which were set on fire by excited mobs; many of them were burnt indiscriminately by sentence of the king's judges, who were commanded to deal summarily with them; but at Paris and elsewhere the distinction was at length established, that such of them as could not be convicted of any personal share in the alleged crimes should be confined for life within the lazar-houses, in the hope that by a separation of the sexes their race might become extinct.

The Jews also, who in the reign of Lewis had been allowed to return to France, and had paid heavily for the privilege, were now persecuted. Many of them were burnt, their property was confiscated, and the pope ordered that the bishops should destroy all copies of the Talmud, as being the chief support of their perversity. Many Jews threw their children into the fire, in order to rescue them from being forcibly baptized.

Under Philip the Long the system of administration which had pressed so heavily on France in his father's time was resumed. Among other means of exaction, he was authorized by the pope to levy a tenth of ecclesiastical income for the crusade; but when he attempted to collect the money, the bishops, who suspected that it was intended to serve the king in some design on the empire, refused to pay until they should be assured that a crusade was really intended. The oppressiveness of the king's exactions produced in 1320 a new movement of *pastoureaux*, which, like that in the reign of St. Lewis, began in the north of France. The leaders in this movement were a priest who had been deprived of his parish for misconduct, and an apostate Benedictine monk; their followers were at first shepherds and swineherds—chiefly boys; and they set out as if for the Holy Land, marching along silently, preceded by a cross, with staves in their hands and empty wallets, trusting to find their support in alms. But gradually the company was swelled by persons of lawless character, and from begging they proceeded to plunder. Their violence showed itself in an alarming degree at Paris, and when some of them were imprisoned, the rest broke open the prisons and forcibly released them. Wherever they went, the Jews were especial objects of their fury. At Verdun, on the Garonne, where many of these had been driven to take refuge, the *pastoureaux* shut up more than 500 of them in the castle, and set it on fire. At Toulouse they slew all the Jews and plundered their goods, in defiance of the magistrates and of the king's officers. The wave rolled on, everywhere spreading terror, so that the inhabitants of the country fortified themselves against the strangers, and would not sell them any provisions. As they approached Avignon, the pope uttered an anathema Ascension-day, against all who should take the cross without his sanction, and requested the protection of the seneschal of Beaucaire, who had already put many of them to death. When they reached Languedoc, the *pastoureaux* had numbered 40,000. The seneschal shut them out of Aigues Mortes, where they had intended to embark, and, enclosing them with his troops in the adjoining country, he left them to the operation of famine, of nakedness, and want of shelter, and of the fever generated by the swamps,—occasionally falling on them when thus weakened, and hanging them in large numbers on gibbets or on trees. Thus this unhappy fanaticism was speedily extinguished.

With the extreme party among the Franciscans pope John was very seriously embroiled. The luxury and splendour of his court, the wealth which he was visibly accumulating, although a large part of the treasures left by his predecessor Clement escaped his endeavours to get possession of it—such things contrasted violently with the severe

notions which this party held as to the nature and obligation of evangelical poverty. While in other matters they mostly adhered to the opinions of Peter John of Olivi—declaring the pope to be the mystical antichrist, the precursor of the greater antichrist, his church to be the Babylonian harlot, the synagogue of Satan, and in some cases professing to support their opinions by the authority of new revelations,—they denied that the Saviour and his apostles had possessed anything whatever; they maintained that He and they had only the use—not the possession or the disposal—of such things as were necessary for life, of their dress, and even of their food; that the scrip and the purse of which we read in the Gospels were allowed only by way of condescension to human infirmity; that the use of such repositories as cellars and granaries is a distrust of the Divine providence. If, it was argued, the Saviour had possessed, whereas St. Francis did not, He would not have been perfect, but would have been excelled by the founder of the minorites. As even the fanaticism of the *fraticelli* recoiled from such a supposition as blasphemous, it was concluded that therefore the Saviour possessed nothing; and it was inferred that He ought to be obeyed not only in his precepts but in his counsels. In such opinions John saw a revolutionary tendency which threatened the papacy and the whole hierarchical system; and he condemned them by several bulls, in some of which he argued the question, maintaining that, in the case of such things as food, the power of use involves possession and ownership. But the “spirituals” met the pope’s condemnation by denying his right to dispense with their statutes, by taking their stand on the bull of Nicolas III, which was known by the title of *Exiit*, and by appealing to a future pope. In Languedoc some convents broke out into rebellion, and the spirituals, who were supported by the popular favour, expelled those who differed from them. An inquiry was set on foot by a commission, of which Michael of Cesena, the general of the order, was a member; and by it many of the more violent faction were condemned either to the flames or imprisonment. A general chapter of the Franciscans, which was held at Perugia in 1322, affirmed the doctrine of evangelical poverty, and Michael of Cesena, who presided, was now with the rigid party. The pope declared the chapter to be heretical, and denounced the Franciscans as hypocritical for enjoying great wealth under pretext of the fiction that the use alone was theirs, and that the possession belonged to the papacy. He renounced the nominal right on which this fiction was grounded; he forbade the order to employ the name of the apostolic see in collecting or administering money, repealed the bull of Nicolas III, on which they relied, and subjected them to various disabilities. The University of Paris, which was under the influence of the rival order of St. Dominic, condemned at great length the extreme doctrine of poverty. A division took place in the Franciscan order, and Michael of Cesena, who had fled from Avignon in defiance of the pope’s orders that he should remain there, and had denied the validity of the deposition which John had thereupon pronounced against him, was superseded as its head by the election of Gerard Odonis in June 1329. But in consequence of these differences with the pope, the more rigid Franciscans were driven into Ghibellinism and while the learned men of the party, such as the famous schoolman William of Ockham, employed themselves in inquiries which tended to the overthrow of the papal pretensions, the results of such inquiries were spread everywhere by the itinerant friars, who familiarized the people, down even to the lowest classes, with the notion that the pope and the Roman church were the mystical antichrist and Babylon of Scripture. And thus that order on which the popes had relied as their surest support and instrument was turned in great part into dangerous opposition to their interest.

In order to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Henry VII, Frederick and Leopold of Austria, the sons of his predecessor Albert, were brought forward; but they were opposed by the late emperor’s partisans, of whom the archbishop of Mayence, Peter Aichspalter, was the leader. The candidate of this party was Lewis of Bavaria, a grandson of Rudolf of Hapsburg through female descent, and therefore a cousin of the Austrian princes whom he was reluctantly persuaded to oppose. On the 19th of October 1314 Frederick was elected by one party, and on the following day Lewis was chosen by the other. Both elections took place

in the suburbs of Frankfort; but Lewis, in addition to being supported by three unquestionable votes, while Frederick had only two, had the advantage of being able to gain admission into the city, where he was raised aloft on the high altar of the great church, and was afterwards displayed to the people assembled in the surrounding place. As the archbishop of Cologne, when asked to crown him according to custom at Aix-la-Chapelle, pretended to a right of investigating the election, the coronation was performed there by the archbishop of Mayence; and on the preceding day the archbishop of Cologne had crowned Frederick at Bonn. The papacy was then vacant by the death of Clement V, and each party drew up a statement of its case, to be submitted to the future pope, with a request that he would confirm the election of its candidate. Clement, after the death of Henry, had declared the imperial ban which had been pronounced against Robert of Naples to be null, had claimed for himself—by ancient right, as he pretended—the administration of the empire in Italy, and on the strength of this novel claim had appointed Robert as vicar over the imperial territories in that country. By John this pretension was carried yet further. He issued a bull, declaring that all authority which had been held in Italy under grants of the late emperor was at an end, and forbidding the officials to continue the exercise of such authority without fresh commissions from himself; he even attempted to set up a similar pretension to a vicariate in Germany during the vacancy of the imperial throne, and refused to confirm German bishops in their sees unless on the condition of their owning neither of the elect as king until the apostolic see should have decided between the rivals. In Italy the chiefs of the Ghibelline party were not disposed to obey the new claim; the most conspicuous among them, Matthew Visconti, although he laid down the title of imperial vicar, got himself chosen by the Milanese as their captain-general, and thus founded a hereditary dominion which afterwards became the dukedom of Milan. In consequence of this John thundered against him charges of heresy and other offences, curses, and interdicts, and proclaimed a crusade with the full crusading indulgences; yet Visconti maintained his power against all the forces which the pope could raise up against him, until a short time before his death, when he transferred it to his son John Galeazzo, and gave up his remaining days to devout preparation for his end. It was, however, found necessary to conceal the place of his burial, lest the papal vengeance should be wreaked on his body as that of one who had died under excommunication.

Robert of Naples, by spending some years in Provence, gained an entire ascendancy over his old chancellor, the pope, which he intended to employ for the subjugation of Italy; but throughout the peninsula the dread of falling under his power contributed strongly to foster an antipapal spirit. Almost all the cities had now parted with their republican liberties, and had fallen under the dominion of lords, of whom many were detestable tyrants, yet at whose courts literature and the arts, which were now bursting into splendour, found an enlightened and a munificent patronage. Thus Dante's last years were spent at the court of Ravenna, under the protection of Guy of Polenta, nephew of that Francesca on whose name the poet has bestowed a mournful immortality.

In the dissensions of Germany John seemed for a time to take no side, giving the title of king of the Romans alike to each of the rival claimants of the crown, while he contented himself with desiring them to settle their quarrel and to report the result to him. But this quiescence did not arise from indifference; for no pope ever entered into political strife more keenly than John, and the part which he at length took was not provoked, as the action of popes in other cases had been, either by any personal vices in the emperor, or by aggressions on the church. In his contest with Lewis of Bavaria, John's single motive was a desire to assert for his see a power over the empire. He is said to have avowed the principle that "when kings and princes quarrel, then the pope is truly pope". So long, therefore, as Lewis and the Austrian princes were wearing each other out in indecisive struggles, the pope looked on with calmness. But when the great battle of Muhldorf, on Michaelmas-eve 1322, had given victory to Lewis, and had thrown into his hands Frederick of Austria and his brother Henry as

prisoners, John was driven from his policy of inaction, and put forth a manifesto, in which his claims were strongly asserted. The pope lays down that, as the election to the empire had been doubtful, it ought to be referred to him for judgment; he desires Lewis to cease within three months from using the title or the authority of the Roman kingdom or empire, and to recall, in so far as might be possible, the acts which he had done as king. He forbids all obedience to Lewis, and declares engagements to him as king elect to be null. The document was not sent to Lewis, as the pope considered the display of it on the doors of the cathedral at Avignon to be a sufficient publication. Lewis, on being made acquainted with it, sent forth a protest, which was read in the presence of a large assembly at Nuremberg. With much profession of veneration for the Roman church, he denounces the injustice and the enmity which he had experienced at the pope's hands. He maintains that one who had been rightfully chosen by the electors, or by a majority of them, and who had been duly crowned, had always been acknowledged as king of the Romans; and he complains that he himself, after having held that dignity for ten years, should now find his title questioned by the pope, with a disregard of all the usual forms of justice. He repels the charge of favouring heresy, which the pope had brought against him on account of his connexion with Galeazzo Visconti and others, and even retorts on John himself for neglecting the accusations brought against the Franciscans, that they revealed the secrets of the confessional, and so deterred Christian people from confession, to the great danger of their souls. He concludes by appealing to a general council, and he also sent envoys to the papal court, with a request that the time allowed him for defending himself might be extended. To this the pope replied that the time was not allowed for defence, but for submission. He consented, however, to grant two months more; and as within that period Lewis did not submit, he pronounced him excommunicate, forbade all acknowledgment of him as king of the Romans, and annulled all engagements to him as such, while he yet suspended for three months the further penalties which had been threatened.

Lewis again appealed to a general council, and to a true and lawful future pope. He again denied the charge of favouring heresy, and protested against the disregard of the rules of justice which had been shown in John's proceedings against him. The liberties of the church, he says, were the gift of Constantine to pope Sylvester. He charges John with invading the rights of the empire and of the German electors, and taxes him with cruelty and perfidy towards the imperialists of Italy, with having stirred up rebellion in Germany, with profanation of the sacraments and contempt of the canons, and with having prevented the deliverance of the Holy Land by detaining the money collected for that purpose. And whereas in a former document he had blamed him for partiality to the Franciscans, he now accuses him of heresy and profanity in endeavouring to blacken that order by asserting that the Saviour and His apostles possessed goods in common. John, finding his opponent still contumacious, issued on the 11th of July his "fourth process," by which Lewis was pronounced to be deprived of all that he might claim in right of his election, while his excommunication was renewed, all who had abetted him were placed under ban or interdict, and he was cited to appear, either in person or by proxy, before the pope at Avignon on the 1st of October. The archbishops of Sens, of Canterbury and York, of Magdeburg and of Capua, were charged with the proclamation of this sentence in their respective countries.

In these proceedings the pope did not meet with the general acquiescence and support which he probably expected. Electors and other great personages—even Leopold of Austria—began to take alarm at the extravagance of the papal pretensions. At Paris and at Bologna doctors of both canon and civil law gave opinions condemnatory of his acts. In Germany the sentences against Lewis were not published by any prelates except such as had before been his enemies, and at Basel a clerk who ventured to proclaim them was thrown into the Rhine. Some Dominicans in German cities, who adhered to the pope, found themselves deprived of the alms on which they had relied for a maintenance, and were compelled to leave the country. The canons of Freising refused to receive a bishop who had been nominated by the pope.

Respect for ecclesiastical sentences had died out, unless in cases where the justice of them was clear; and the charges to avoid the emperor as an excommunicate person were unheeded.

Lewis was aided in his struggle by men of letters, whom the exaggerated pretensions of the papacy had provoked to follow in the line opened by Dante's treatise "Of Monarchy", and to inquire into the foundations of the ecclesiastical power with a freedom of which there had as yet been no example. The jurists were, as of old, on the imperial side, and maintained the emperor's entire independence of the pope; even those who were hindered by circumstances from taking a declared part—as the lawyers of Bologna, who were subject to the pope's temporal rule—allowed their imperialist principles to be seen. And in the "spiritual" party among the Franciscans, who were already embroiled with John on the question of evangelical poverty, and whose rigid opinions on that subject accorded with the emperor's desire to humble the secular greatness of the papacy, Lewis found a new and important class of allies.

Of these Franciscans the most famous was the Englishman William of Ockham, so called from his native place in the county of Surrey, who, according to the custom of the schools, was distinguished by the titles of "Singular and invincible Doctor", and "Venerable Inceptor". William had studied at Paris under Duns Scotus, of whose system he afterwards became a conspicuous opponent, and he had taught both there and at Bologna. He had revived the almost extinct philosophy of the nominalists, which his followers maintained against the realism of the Scotists with such zeal that their disputes often ran into violent affrays. In the contest between Philip the Fair and pope Boniface he had written a treatise on the side of royalty; and, as a provincial of his order, he had taken a conspicuous part in the synod of Perugia, which asserted opinions contrary to those of pope John on the question of evangelical poverty. A papal sentence drove him from Bologna; and, like others of his order, he took refuge with Lewis, to whom he is reported to have said, "Defend me with the sword, and I will defend you with the word."

Ockham's chief contribution to the controversy, a "Dialogue" between a master and a disciple, is (although incomplete) of enormous length, while it is also repulsive from its difficulty, and is written with a scholastic intricacy which might often lead any but a very careful reader to confound the author's opinions with those which he intends to refute. He professes, indeed, to give impartially the arguments for the opposite sides of each question; but the greater weight of argument is always laid on that side which the author himself espoused. After discussing the nature of heresy, he decides that not only the pope, but the Roman church, a general council, the whole body of clergy—nay, all Christians—may err from the faith. He holds that general councils may be summoned without the pope's consent. He attacks the papal pretensions as to temporal dominion and to "plenitude of power," and discusses questions as to the form of civil government. He holds that general councils have only a general influence of the Holy Spirit, and are not infallible as to matters of detail; that our Lord's promises to St. Peter were given for the apostle himself alone. In another division of the work, he denies that the empire is in the pope's disposal, and maintains that the gift of it may not be transferred to the pope, but belongs to the Roman people; that the emperor is not dependent on the pope, but has the right of choosing him; and that in coactive power the pope is inferior to the emperor. It is not to be supposed that such a work as this "Dialogue" can ever have found many readers; but the anti-hierarchical opinions which were embodied in it were spread in all directions, and made their way to all classes, through the agency of the itinerant friars.

On the same side wrote John, who takes his name from his native village, Jandun, in Champagne, and Marsilius Raimondini, of Padua, a physician, who had also studied law at Orleans. These two are supposed to have shared in the authorship of the "Defensor Pacis"—a treatise of which the title was intended as a sarcasm on the pope for fomenting war instead of acting, as became his office, for the maintenance of peace. Passing beyond the technicalities

on which the jurists had rested their assertion of the imperial prerogative, the authors inquire into the origin of civil government, founding their theory on Aristotle's "Politics". It is laid down that there ought to be no power uncontrolled by law; that election is to be preferred to hereditary succession that the pope, according to ancient testimony as well as to Scripture, has no coercive sovereignty or jurisdiction, but ought to be subject to earthly powers, after the Saviour's own example. As to the power of the keys, it is said that God alone can remit sin, with or without the agency of the priest, forasmuch as He alone can know in what cases sin ought to be remitted or retained; that the priest's absolution relates only to the communion of the church on earth; that he is as the keeper of a prison, who, by releasing a prisoner, does not free him from guilt or from civil punishment. The identity of the orders of bishop and presbyter is maintained, and, in quoting the well-known words of St. Jerome, who speaks of "ordination" as the only function by which bishops are distinguished from presbyters, the writers interpret the term as meaning administrative power. They maintain the equality of all the apostles, and deny that the Roman bishops derive from St. Peter any superiority over others. They trace the rise of the papal power to the peculiar circumstances of Rome. The final decision of ecclesiastical questions is ascribed to general councils, which must, it is said, be summoned by the emperor; and as an instance of the unfitness of popes, who may possibly be heretical, to interpret doubtful points, they mention the reigning pope's opinions on the subject of evangelical poverty. The precedence of one church over others is declared to be a subject for general councils to settle. The popes are denounced for having assumed an unfounded "plenitude of power"; for having confined to the clergy the privilege of electing bishops, which ought to belong to all the faithful; for having further narrowed it by excluding the priests of the diocese from a share, and restricting the election to the canons, who are described as rarely in priestly orders, and as ill qualified for such a trust; and, finally, for having extinguished the right of election, by reserving all questions on such matters to themselves. It is maintained that the choice of a pope belongs to the people and to the emperor; and that those who elect are also entitled, on sufficient cause, to depose. The usurpations of the popes on the imperial power (which are illustrated by the fable of the snake warmed in the husbandman's bosom)—their abuse of indulgences as encouragements to war against Christian princes—their attempts to prevent the election of an emperor, in order that they themselves might claim power during the vacancy; the injustice, and consequent invalidity, of their sentences, the iniquity of John's behaviour towards Lewis, the hostility of the papal pretensions to all secular government, the great calamities and injury to religion occasioned by the pope's proceedings—are strongly denounced. The idea of the necessity of one earthly head for the church, the Roman bishop's claim to judicial power, his pretensions to unfailing faithfulness, are controverted; and the treatise ends by exposing some of the current sayings as to the superiority of spiritual to secular power, and by combating the inferences which were drawn in the papal interest from the alleged transference of the empire from the Greeks to the Germans.

The freedom of speculation which these antipapal writers displayed was, indeed, more likely to alarm than to convince the men of that age; but this effect was perhaps more than counterbalanced by the extravagances into which the assertion of the papal pretensions was carried out by such champions as Augustine Trionfi, an Augustinian friar of Ancona, and Alvar Pelayo, a Spanish Franciscan who eventually became bishop of Silves, in Portugal. All the old claims of the Hildebrandine party were put forward, with those falsifications of history to which time had given the currency of undoubted truths. It was maintained that all powers, both spiritual and secular, belonged to the pope, and that princes exercised power only as his delegates; that to deny this would be "not far from heresy"; that whatever might have been granted by emperors to popes (as the donation of Constantine to Sylvester) was not properly a gift, but a restitution of something which had been wrongfully taken away; that the pope's sovereignty extends even over the heathen; that he has all kingdoms in his absolute disposal;

that he is entitled to appoint and to depose the emperor and all other sovereigns; that the German electors hold their power of election from him; that the pope cannot be deposed for any crime—even for heresy, if he be willing to be corrected; and that he cannot be judged, even by a general council.

The Germans in general were strongly in favour of Lewis, and the more so because the pope showed an inclination to make over the imperial crown, as if it were forfeited and vacant, to the reigning sovereign of France. With a view to this, Charles IV, who succeeded his brother Philip in 1322, and who, like his father, bore the epithet of “le Bel,” had visited the papal court in company with king John of Bohemia, who, in consequence of some supposed wrongs, had turned against Lewis. Robert of Naples, who was then at Avignon, joined in the consultations which were held; and it was after these conferences that the ban of March 21, 1324, was pronounced. With the same purpose, an alliance with the Austrian party was projected; but a meeting between Charles and Leopold, at Bar on the Aube, was unsatisfactory, and although the proposal was discussed in an assembly of the German princes at Rhense, early in 1325, it was rejected, chiefly through the effect of an appeal which Bertold of Bucheck, commander of the knights of St. John, made to the national feeling by insisting on the disgrace of transferring the empire to foreigners for the mere gratification of the pope’s vindictiveness.

Leopold of Austria, despairing of success for his party, was induced to send the insignia of the empire to Lewis, in the hope of obtaining the release of his brother Frederick. In this he was disappointed; but an agreement was soon after made by which Frederick was set at liberty on certain conditions, among which it was stipulated that he should renounce all further designs on the empire, and should ally himself with Lewis against all men, especially “against him who styles himself pope, with all who abet or favour him, so long as he should be opposed to the king and kingdom”. Although the details of this compact were kept secret for a time, the pope, without knowing what they were, annulled it, on the ground that no such agreement with an excommunicated person could be binding. But Frederick disdained to avail himself of this evasion, and finding, after strenuous efforts, that it was impossible to fulfill the conditions of his engagement, he carried out the alternative which had been prescribed in the treaty by repairing to Munich, and throwing himself on the mercy of his rival. Lewis met this “old German fidelity” with a corresponding generosity, and admitted his captive into the closest intimacy. They ate at the same table, and even slept in the same bed; and when Lewis was called away for a time from Bavaria, he left the care of defending the country to Frederick as his representative. A scheme for sharing the empire between them as equal colleagues was devised, as Lewis was in fresh difficulties, which made some compromise desirable; but as this was found to give offence to the electors, who complained that their right of choice was set aside, it was proposed that one of the elect kings should reign in Italy, and the other in Germany. But the sudden death of Leopold, who was regarded as the chief support of the Austrian party, appeared at once to relieve Lewis from all dread of that party, and to release him from any engagements which had not been completed with it.

He now resolved to proceed into Italy, in compliance with invitations which he had received from the Ghibelline chiefs and from a party among the Romans. But on proposing the expedition to a diet at Spire, he found that the great feudatories (especially the ecclesiastical electors) refused to accompany him; for, although bound to do so when a king of the Romans was about to receive the imperial crown, they alleged that they owed no such duty to a king who was excommunicate, and whose relations with the pope were altogether such as to shut out the hope of coronation. Lewis, however, persevered, although the force which he was able to take with him across the Alps was so small that a chronicler of the age likens it to a hunting party. At Trent, where he was met by some heads of the Ghibelline faction, and by the representatives of others, a great demonstration took place against the pope, to whom he had lately made fresh overtures without success. Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun

excited the indignation of the assembly by enlarging on the misdeeds of “priest John” (as they contemptuously styled him); eighteen articles were drawn up against him, and he was declared to be a heretic and unworthy of the papacy. In these proceedings the emperor was supported by many bishops, by the grand-master of the Teutonic order, and by a multitude of Franciscans, Dominicans, and others, whose natural attachment to the papacy had been turned into enmity against the existing pope. At Milan, as the archbishop had taken night, the iron crown was placed on the head of Lewis by three bishops who had been expelled from their sees by the Guelfs; but he imprudently alienated the family of Visconti, who had been the chief supporters of the imperial interest in northern Italy, and, by depriving Galeazzo of his signory and imprisoning him, he spread alarm among the Ghibelline tyrants of Lombardy and of Tuscany. In the meantime the report of the meeting at Trent provoked the pope to issue a “fifth process” by which, after a long recital of the previous dealings, Lewis was pronounced to be deprived of all fiefs which he held, not only under the church, but under the empire, and was summoned to appear at Avignon in order to hear his sentence. About the same time were uttered other papal denunciations.

Rome had, since the withdrawal of the popes, been under a republican government, and had in turn been swayed by the influence of Robert of Naples, of the papal legates and other envoys, and of its great families—the imperialist Savellis, the papalist Orsinis, and the Colonnas, whose chiefs, the brothers Stephen and Sciarra, were arrayed in opposition to each other. The Romans had already entreated the pope to return, and now renewed the request; but John excused himself on the ground of important business which detained him in France, of the unsettled state of Italy, and of the commotions and changes which had lately taken place in Rome itself. He promised, however, to return at a later time, and he warned them in the meanwhile to avoid Lewis, as being a heretic, excommunicate, and a persecutor of the church. By this reply, and by the attempt of a Genoese force, in alliance with the pope, to surprise their city and to set fire to the Vatican quarter, the Romans were disposed in favour of Lewis, who entered the city on the 7th of January 1328, and was received with general exultation. Of the clergy who adhered to the pope, some fled, and others refused to perform the offices of religion; but Lewis was accompanied by a train of bishops, clergy, monks, and friars, who made him independent of this opposition. A great assemblage at the Capitol proclaimed him king of the Romans and lord of Rome; and on the 17th of January he was crowned as emperor in St. Peter’s. The unction was administered by the bishops of Castello and Aleria, both already excommunicated by the pope; the sword was girt on his thigh by Castruccio Castrucani, lord of Lucca, as count of the Lateran palace; and the crown was placed on his head by Sciarra Colonna, whom the Romans had lately elected as their captain. At the same time the empress was crowned, and Lewis bound himself by three decrees to maintain the catholic faith, to reverence the clergy, and to protect widows and orphans. The pope, on being informed of these proceedings, denounced the emperor afresh, declared his coronations, both at Milan and at Rome, to be null, proclaimed a crusade against him, and exhorted the Romans to arrest the two impugners of the papal authority, Marsilius and John of Jandun—the former of whom had been appointed imperial vicar of the city, and exerted himself in compelling the reluctant clergy to say mass.

On the 18th of April the emperor appeared with all the insignia of his dignity on a throne erected in the Place of St. Peter’s. In the presence of a vast assembly which stood around, an accusation against the pope was delivered by some Franciscans, and by two syndics who professed to represent the Roman clergy; and the question was thrice proclaimed whether any one wished to appear as procurator for priest James of Cahors, who styled himself Pope John the Twenty-Second; but no one took up the challenge. A German abbot then preached an eloquent sermon in Latin, enlarging on the emperor’s love of justice and on the offences committed by Pope John; and the imperial sentence was read aloud. In this John was charged with having neglected the interest of Christendom and with having exposed it to

Saracens and heathens; with having asserted that the Saviour and His disciples were possessed of property; with having attempted to usurp temporal power, whereas Christ commanded that we should render unto Cesar the things that are Caesar's, and declared His kingdom to be not of this world; with having questioned the emperor's election, which had been regularly made and did not need the papal confirmation. For these offences John was pronounced to be deprived of the papacy and of all benefices spiritual or temporal, and to be subject to the penalties of heresy and treason; and the emperor declared that, after the example of his predecessor Otho the Great, he held it his duty to provide the apostolic see with a new and fit occupant. The rashness of such a step began to be manifest four days later, when James Colonna, a canon of the Lateran, and son of Stephen (who had been driven from the city by his brother Sciarra), read in public the pope's last and bitterest sentence against Lewis, which no one had as yet ventured to publish at Rome. After having declared his adhesion to John, he affixed the paper to the door of the church of St. Marcellus, and escaped unmolested to Palestrina. Yet Lewis was resolved to go on.

On the following day a statute was published, by which it was forbidden that the pope should go to the distance of two days' journey from Rome without the consent of the clergy and people, and it was enacted that, if after three citations he should refuse to return, a new pope should be chosen in his stead.

On Ascension-day, the 12th of May, a multitude was again assembled in front of St. Peter's. A sermon was preached by a monk, in which pope John was compared to Herod, while Lewis was likened to the angel who delivered St. Peter out of prison; and the bishop of Venice thrice proposed to the assembled multitude that Peter Rainalucci, of Corbaria, should be elected to the papacy. The imperialists were present in such numbers as to overpower all differences of opinion; and Peter was invested with the papal mantle by the emperor, who saluted him by the name of Nicolas the Fifth, placed him at his own right hand, and afterwards accompanied him into the church in order to be present at his celebration of mass. The antipope, a man of humble parentage, had been married in early life, but had separated from his wife that he might enter the Franciscan order; he had held the office of papal penitentiary, and, notwithstanding the aspersions of his enemies, it would seem that he had been highly esteemed for learning and prudence. But, although he had hitherto professed the opinion of the most rigid party among his order as to evangelical poverty, he fell at once, on assuming the title of pope, into the traditional habits of pomp and luxury, for which the means were chiefly provided by the traditional expedients of selling offices and preferments. He made seven cardinals, all of them men who had been deposed from dignities by pope John, or had been prominent in opposition to him; he pronounced deposition against bishops who adhered to his rival, and nominated others to fill their sees—among them, Marsilius to be archbishop of Milan; he affected to appoint legates, and on Whitsunday he confirmed Lewis in the imperial dignity, and pronounced on him a solemn benediction, but with a careful avoidance of everything that might have seemed to imply a claim to the right of conferring the imperial office, or a subordination of the secular to the spiritual power.

Lewis soon began to find himself uneasy at Rome. His delay there had given an advantage to Robert of Naples, whereas it is not improbable that, by vigorously pushing forwards to the south, he might have been able to overthrow the Angevine dynasty. A Neapolitan fleet took Ostia, and some of the ships advanced up the Tiber as far as the convent of St. Paul, committing devastations of which the blame was commonly thrown on the emperor. The citizens, instead of receiving from the emperor the benefits which they had expected, found themselves oppressed by taxes, which his own necessities and those of his pope compelled him to impose. The Ghibellines had been offended by some impolitic measures; and, while Nicolas met with little or no acknowledgment even among the imperialists of the city, the party of John, whose intrigues were incessant, recovered its force. Provisions became scarce, partly because the supplies were cut off by the Neapolitan troops, and the emperor's

own soldiers, being unable to get their pay, swelled the grievances of the Romans by plundering; the northern Germans quarrelled with those of the south, and many of the soldiers deserted. After a vain attempt to proceed southward, Lewis left Rome on the 4th of August, amidst general curses and derision, mixed with acclamations in honour of "holy church." Stones were thrown as he retired, and some of his men were killed. In token of the popular feeling, the privileges which had been granted by the emperor and the antipope were burnt in the Place of the Capitol; even some bodies of Germans were dragged from their graves and ignominiously thrown into the Tiber.

At Pisa, where he had been joined by the leaders of the disaffected Franciscans—Michael of Cesena, Bonagratia, and William of Ockham, who had all escaped from detention at Avignon—the emperor held an assembly on the 13th of December, when Michael denounced pope John as a heretic, and the emperor again pronounced him to be deposed. About the same time John at Avignon renewed his condemnation of the emperor as a heretic and a persecutor of the church, and declared the antipope a heretic and schismatic. The antipope joined Lewis at Pisa, where he carried on the system of ejecting Guelf bishops and substituting Ghibellines, from whom payments were extorted for their promotion. But, on the emperor's departure from that city Nicholas was left behind, and Lewis, as he proceeded northwards, found the Italians less and less favourably disposed, while discontent and desertion became more rife among his own troops. In the end of January 1330 the emperor recrossed the Alps. His expedition to Italy had ruined the imperial cause in that country, and his failure had given additional force to the impression made by the papal curses. The Romans swore fealty anew to the pope, and, with Pisa and other Italian cities, entreated his forgiveness for their temporary submission to Lewis.

The antipope, when left at Pisa, was glad to find shelter with a powerful nobleman, count Boniface of Donoratico, but in the following year was, after much urgency, given up by him to the pope, on condition that his life should be spared. On St. James's day Nicolas abjured his errors in the cathedral of Pisa, expressing deep contrition for his conduct and casting much blame on the emperor. The ceremony was afterwards repeated at Avignon, where he appeared with a rope around his neck, and threw himself at the feet of his triumphant rival. John raised him up, released him from the rope, and admitted him to the kiss of peace. The fallen antipope spent the remaining three years of his life in an apartment of the papal palace, where he was supplied with the means of study, but was strictly secluded from all intercourse with men.

The death of Frederick of Austria, in January 1330, appeared to favour the establishment of peace between the papacy and the empire; but the pope, acting under the influence of Naples and of France, was bent on effecting the ruin of Lewis. He scornfully rejected the mediation of the king of Bohemia, who had been empowered by the emperor to offer very humiliating terms: he uttered fresh anathemas, in "aggravation" of his former denunciations; he endeavoured to stir up enemies against Lewis on all sides, and encouraged his neighbours to attack him—not scrupling even to let loose the heathens who bordered on Brandenburg for an invasion of that territory, where they committed atrocious cruelties and profanations he urged the German princes to choose a new emperor; he declared Germany to be under an interdict so long as Lewis should be acknowledged. A fearful confusion prevailed in that country, although, notwithstanding all the pope's denunciations, the emperor was still generally obeyed. Some of the clergy, in obedience to the interdict, refused to perform the Divine offices in cities where Lewis was, and on this account they were driven out by him. Alliances were continually changing, and the ascendancy was always shifting from one party to another. In these movements John of Luxemburg played a very conspicuous part. At the age of fourteen he had received the kingdom of Bohemia from his father, Henry VII, as a fief of the empire which had become vacant through the failure of male heirs, and at the same time he had married the younger daughter of the late king, Wenceslaus—thus excluding Henry

duke of Carinthia, the husband of her elder sister. But he speedily found that he and his subjects were ill suited to each other, and while the queen, with her children, lived in the palace at Prague, John made his home in his hereditary territory of Luxemburg, and roamed over Europe in quest of adventures, visiting Bohemia on rare occasions for the purpose of raising money. In 1330 he was invited by the citizens of Brescia to defend them against the Visconti of Milan and the Scaligers of Verona, and in consequence of this he proceeded at the head of 10,000 men into Italy; where his intervention was welcomed at once by the Guelfs, who saw in him a friend of the pope, and by the Ghibellines, who regarded him as the son of Henry VII and as a representative of the emperor. His influence was beneficially exerted for the pacification of many Lombard cities but gradually both parties began to distrust him, so that he found himself obliged to withdraw before a combination which was formed against him; and, after a second expedition, in which he enjoyed the countenance of the French king and of the pope, he was compelled to retire altogether from the field of Italian politics.

The three sons of Philip the Fair, who had successively reigned over France, were all carried off at an early age; and while the clergy saw in this the vengeance of heaven for Philip's outrages against pope Boniface, the popular opinion traced it to the martyrdom of the Templars, and to the supposed curse or prophecy of James de Molay.

After the death of Charles IV, which took place in January 1328, his widow gave birth to a second daughter, who lived only a few days; and as the hope of a male heir was extinguished, Philip, the son of Charles of Valois and nephew of Philip the Fair, became king, to the exclusion of his predecessor's surviving daughter. Philip of Valois revived much of the chivalrous splendour which had lately been wanting to the court of France; and in his ecclesiastical policy he endeavoured, like St. Lewis, to maintain the rights of the national church as against the papacy. When, however, he proposed a new crusade, it was evident that the idea was not prompted by a spirit of self-sacrificing devotion like that which had animated his saintly ancestor. He designed, by placing himself at the head of Christendom in such an enterprise, to gain for himself and his family a title to the empire; and he endeavoured in other respects to turn it to his own advantage by obtaining great concessions from the pope. John granted for the crusade the title of ecclesiastical benefices throughout the whole western church for six years; and in October 1333 Philip took the cross, and swore to set out for the holy war within three years. But he was reminded that some of his predecessors, after having collected tithes, as if for a crusade, had spent them on other objects; and, whatever his intentions may really have been, circumstances arose which prevented the execution of the project. When the collection of the tithe was attempted in Germany, the emperor, in a great diet at Spire, declared that no such impost could be raised without his permission, and hinted his doubts whether the money would be spent for the professed object. He added that, if peace were re-established, he himself would head an expedition for the recovery of the Holy Land; for he considered that he would have lived long enough if he might once see a pope who cared for his soul's good. Mission after mission was sent to Avignon, but all brought back reports of the pope's implacable hardness. The difficulties which pressed on the emperor were so serious that in 1333 he was willing to resign his crown for the sake of restoration to the communion of the church; but the plan was frustrated through the indiscretion of his cousin, Henry, duke of Lower Bavaria, in whose favour the abdication was intended.

John XXII, who had been so profuse of accusations of heresy against others, himself fell under a new charge of this kind, by asserting in a sermon that the saints would not enjoy the beatific vision until the end of the world; he was reported to have said that even the blessed Virgin herself would until then behold only the humanity, but not the God-head, of her Son. This opinion, although agreeable to the authority of many early fathers, had been generally abandoned for centuries; it endangered doctrines and practices which had become firmly established in the church—the belief in purgatory, the use of indulgences, masses for the dead, and invocation of saints. Although the papal court in general acquiesced, an English

Dominican, named Thomas Waleys, raised an alarm by preaching against it. John's old Franciscan opponents, Michael of Cesena, Bonagratia, and William of Ockham, eagerly raised the cry of heresy; and the question was referred by king Philip to the theological faculty of Paris, in an assembly held at the palace of Vincennes, while John laboured to influence the opinion of divines by heaping preferment on those who sided with him. At Paris great excitement arose, and men were divided in their judgment. The Dominicans opposed the pope's view; the general of the Franciscans, who had superseded Michael of Cesena, supported it; the doctors of the Sorbonne condemned the doctrine, but suggested that John might have propounded it only by way of a doubt or a question. The king is said to have threatened not only the Franciscan general, but the pope himself, with the punishment of heresy, and made use of John's danger to extort important concessions from him; while the Italian cardinals, in their dislike of a French pope, threatened to bring him before a general council. John offered to produce ancient authorities in his behalf, but was glad to avail himself of the escape which the doctors of Paris had suggested, and declared that he had intended only to state the opinion, not to decide in favour of it. But the excitement burst out afresh, and at last John, on his death-bed, was brought—it is said chiefly by the urgency of his nephew or son, cardinal Bertrand de Poyet—to profess the current doctrine, "that purged souls, being separated from their bodies, are in heaven, the kingdom of heaven, and paradise; that they see God face to face, and clearly behold the Divine essence, in so far as the condition of separate souls permits."

On the day after having made this declaration, John died, at the age of ninety. The treasures which he left behind him were enormous, partly the produce of exactions raised under the pretext of a crusade, partly of the arts of the papal court as to the disposal of preferments and favours. In these arts John showed himself a master. Under the pretence of discouraging simony, he kept valuable reserves in his own hands. By the bull *Execrabilis*, he compelled pluralists to give up all but one benefice each, and got for himself the disposal of the rest. He took into his own hands the appointment of bishops, in disregard of the capitular right of election, which had been so hardly extorted from sovereigns. Whenever any high preferment fell vacant, he made it the means of promoting the greatest possible number of persons, advancing each of them a single step, and so securing the payment of fees from each. And to the exactions which already pressed on the church, he added the invention of annates—the first year's income of ecclesiastical dignities. Yet although his long pontificate was chiefly remarkable for the unrelenting hostility with which he pursued the emperor Lewis, and for the extortions and corruptions by which he so largely profited, it must in justice be added that he is described as temperate in his habits, regular in the observances of devotion, and unassuming and unostentatious in his manner of life.

At the time of John's death, the college of cardinals consisted of twenty-four members, among whom the French, headed by Talleyrand of Perigord, had a great majority. Both Frenchmen and Italians, however, agreed to choose the cardinal of Comminges, bishop of Porto, if he would pledge himself that the papal residence should not be removed from Avignon; but he refused to comply with this condition, and the cardinals, shut up in the palace of Avignon by an officer of king Robert of Naples, began afresh the usual intricate manoeuvres of a papal election. By an unforeseen concurrence of circumstances, the result of which was considered to be a divine inspiration, their choice fell on James Fournier, a member of the Cistercian order, cardinal of St. Prisca and bishop of Mirepoix, whose remark on the announcement of his new dignity was, "You have chosen an ass." The new pope, Benedict XII., was a native of Saverdun, in the country of Foix, and had risen from a humble condition in life. He was highly respected for his learning, and, notwithstanding his modest estimate of himself, was a man of sense and judgment. He is praised for his sincerity, his justice, his liberality in almsgiving, and his benevolence of character; while his orthodoxy had been displayed by his activity as an inquisitor in his own diocese and throughout the region of

Toulouse. Disinclined to share in political affairs he was earnestly bent on a reform in the church, and in order to this he reversed in many respects the system of his predecessors. The crowds which, in hope of preferment, had thronged the city of the papal residence, the idle and greedy friars who hung about the court, were dismissed to their own homes. A reform of the monastic system was strenuously taken in hand. The abuse of commendams was done away with, except only in the case of such as were held by cardinals. Pluralities were steadily discouraged. Expectancies of benefices not yet vacant were abolished, and such as had been already granted were revoked. The late pope's custom of multiplying promotions on every vacancy was abandoned. All practices which might appear to savour of simony were forbidden. It was ordered that no canonries in cathedrals should be bestowed on boys under fourteen years of age, and all applicants for the pope's patronage were examined as to their fitness. Preferments were given to men of learning, without solicitation, and although they did not frequent the court. The pope withstood the entreaties of great men, who attempted to influence his patronage; and he was careful not to favour his own relatives unduly. He refused great matches for his niece, whom he married to a merchant of Toulouse, with a dowry not more than suitable to the husband's condition; and when the pair visited his court, in the hope of favour, he told them that as James Fournier he knew them, but that as pope he had no kindred; that he could only give them his blessing, with payment of the expenses of their journey. One nephew alone obtained high office in the church, having been urgently recommended by the cardinals for the archbishopric of Arles. The officials of the court were required to swear that they would not accept any gifts. The messengers who conveyed the papal letters were bound in like manner neither to ask nor to receive anything beyond food and other necessaries. The pope moderated the expenses of episcopal visitations, which had long been a subject of complaint; and he caused a visitation of cathedrals to be undertaken by commissioners, who corrected such irregularities as they discovered. Yet, great as Benedict's merits were, he has not escaped serious imputations. His desire to purify the administration of the church and the monastic orders appears to have been too little tempered by courtesy or by discretion, so that it excited much animosity, which has left its lasting traces in the chronicles of the times. Petrarch speaks unfavourably of him in more than one place, and mentions especially that excessive love of the pleasures of the table which is said to have given rise to the saying, "Let us drink like a pope." And a biographer, whose enmity would seem to have been provoked by Benedict's avowed dislike of the mendicant orders, charges him with avarice and with harshness of character, with negligence in some parts of his duty as to administration, and with a general distrust and ill opinion of mankind.

Benedict's virtues were also marred by a want of courage, which prevented him from carrying out his wish to deliver himself from the thralldom of king Philip, and from the oppressive influence of the French cardinals. And, when he attempted to prepare the way for a return to Rome, or at least to Bologna, where the foundations of a palace had been laid by the legate Bertrand de Poyet, he was deterred by the manifestations of an antipapal spirit, by the dangers of the way, and by other such considerations. He therefore, as if to guarantee the continuance of the papal residence at Avignon, began the vast and costly structure which still remains as the chief monument of it; but at the same time he showed his interest in the ancient capital of Christendom, by spending large sums on renewing the roof of St. Peter's, and on repairing other churches and palaces at Rome. He accepted the office of senator, to which he was elected by the Romans in 1337; he forbade the use of the terms Guelf and Ghibelline, as being continual sources of discord, and he endeavoured to keep up a semblance of influence in Italy, by investing some party chiefs with the character of vicars under the apostolic see.

Philip, however, notwithstanding his ascendancy, was not able to gain all that he desired from Benedict. When he asked the newly-elected pope to make over to him the treasures of John XXII, and to bestow on him the ecclesiastical tithe for ten years—professedly with a view to a crusade, but in reality for the war into which he had been drawn

with England—Benedict replied that his predecessor's wealth, having been collected for the crusade, must not be given up until that expedition was actually begun; and he withdrew the grant of tenths which John had previously sanctioned. It was in vain that the king asked the vicariate of Italy for himself, and the kingdom of Vienne for his son; and when he went to Avignon, for the purpose of urging his suit as to the pretended crusade, the pope declared that, if he had two souls, he would gladly sacrifice one of them for the king; but that, as he had only one, he must endeavour to save it.

The controversy which John XXII had raised as to the Beatific Vision, and in the discussion of which Benedict had formerly taken a conspicuous part, was now determined by him in a formal decree, which declared that the glory of the saints is perfect; that they already enjoy the vision of the blessed Trinity; and that, although they will have their perfect consummation in body and in soul after the judgment-day, the joy of their souls will not be sensibly increased.

The pope, both from natural character and from alarm at the French king's inordinate requests, was heartily desirous of peace with the emperor Lewis, and with a view to this made overtures, both indirectly and directly, to him. Lewis, on his part, sent a fifth and a sixth embassy to Avignon, with offers of submission; but the influence of France, of Naples, and of Bohemia, with that of the cardinals, whose property Philip had threatened to confiscate if they made peace with the Bavarian, prevailed over the pope's favourable dispositions. Yet he made no secret of his real feeling. Thus, on one occasion, when urged by the representatives of the French and the Neapolitan kings, he asked whether they wished to do away with the empire. On their answering that they did not speak against the empire, but against Lewis, who had been condemned as an enemy of the church,—“Rather,” said Benedict, “it is we that have sinned against him. He would, if he might have been allowed, have come with a staff in his hand to our predecessor's feet; but he has been in a manner challenged to act as he has done.” The emperor's sixth embassy, in October 1336, was authorized to offer very humiliating terms: to confess that he had done grievous wrong in setting up an antipope, in his alliances with the Visconti, with the rebellious minorites (whose opinions he disavowed), with John of Jandun and Marsilius, by whom he professed to have been deceived and misled. The ambassadors professed that he was ready to submit to penance, to lay down the imperial title, to persecute heretics, to build churches and convents, if the pope would release him from excommunication and interdict, and would grant him the empire anew. But they became weary of waiting for an answer, and Lewis, despairing of any satisfactory result so long as the French king's influence should be exerted against him, declined an invitation to resume negotiations, and allied himself with Edward of England, who had now set up that claim to the crown of France which for a century and a half arrayed the two nations in deadly hostility to each other. Benedict's warnings to Edward against entering into a connexion with an excommunicated person were unheeded, although the king professed all dutiful submission to the papal authority, and said that he had advised Lewis to make his peace by humbling himself.

Another mission—the seventh—in behalf of Lewis, was sent to Avignon by the archbishop of Mayence, Henry of Virneburg, and his suffragans, after a council held at Spires. The pope is said to have had tears in his eyes as he told the envoys that he could not grant absolution to Lewis, in consequence of his breach of treaties with France; that Philip had threatened him with a worse fate than that of Boniface VIII, if the Bavarian should be absolved without the French king's consent; and that he could hold no communication with the archbishop of Mayence, who had given great offence by a compact which he had lately made with his chapter, in order to obtain admission to his see.

The Germans were indignant that their requests should thus be rejected at the dictation of a foreign sovereign, and that pretensions should be set up which seemed to transfer the right of the electors to the pope. In reliance on this feeling, Lewis summoned a great diet,

consisting not only of princes and nobles, but of deputies from cities and cathedral chapters, to meet at Frankfort on Rogation Sunday, 1338. Before this assembly Lewis stated, in a pathetic tone, the course of his dealings with the papal see, and the pretensions which had been set up for the papacy in derogation of the imperial dignity; and in proof of his orthodoxy he recited the Lord's prayer, the angelic salutation, and the creed. The case was argued on his behalf by lawyers and canonists, especially by the famous Franciscan, Bonagratia; and the assembly resolved that the emperor had done enough, that the censures uttered against him were wrongful, and therefore of no effect; that the clergy ought not to observe the papal interdict, and that, if unwilling to celebrate the Divine offices, they should be compelled to do so.

On the 15th of July the electors, with the exception of the king of Bohemia, held a meeting at Rhense, where they expressed their apprehensions that, if the papal claims were admitted, they might in future have to choose only a king—not an emperor. They resolved that the empire was held immediately under God; that the emperor, chosen by all the electors, or by a majority of them, needed no confirmation from the pope; and they swore to defend the dignity of the empire and their own rights against all men, and to accept no dispensation from their oath. These resolutions were confirmed by a diet held at Frankfort, and several documents were drawn up by which the late pope's processes against Lewis were pronounced to be null, and pope Benedict was requested to withdraw them, while the emperor appealed against John to a general council. It was declared that the vicariate of the empire, during a vacancy of the throne, belonged not to the pope but to the count palatine of the Rhine; that the oath taken by emperors was not one of fealty to the pope; and it was forbidden to receive papal bulls without the sovereign's permission.

A great excitement followed in Germany. While the imperialists posted on church-doors manifestoes annulling the papal sentences, the papalists placarded copies of those sentences, and denunciations against all who should hold intercourse with the excommunicated Lewis. The clergy and monks who observed the interdict were driven out, and their property was confiscated; many of them went to Avignon, but, as their distress found no relief there, some returned to Germany and submitted to the emperor. Each party defended itself by the pen; and on the imperial side the most conspicuous writers were William of Ockham and Leopold of Bebenburg, who afterwards became bishop of Bamberg.

In September 1338 the emperor held a meeting with the king of England at Coblenz. The importance of the occasion was marked by a great display of splendour on both sides. Each of the sovereigns set forth his causes of complaint against Philip of France; an intimate alliance was concluded, and was confirmed by oath, and Edward was appointed vicar of the empire over the territories westward of Cologne. Yet notwithstanding the solemnity of his compact with Edward, from whom he received large subsidies, the emperor allowed himself to be soon after enticed,—chiefly through the influence of the countess of Hainault, who was at once his own mother-in-law and Philip's sister,—into making an alliance with the French king; an inconstancy which can only be explained by supposing that he was sincerely disquieted in conscience by the papal excommunications, and that he wished to secure Philip's intercession with the pope. But although Philip affected to mediate, the faintness of his interest in the matter was too manifest, and Benedict looked with no favour on such an alliance between the sovereign whom the holy see had regarded as its especial favourite, and him who had been the object of its most terrible condemnations. He expressed his willingness to listen if Lewis would sue for absolution according to the forms of law, but intimated that the orthodoxy or the heresy of Lewis could not be dependent on the French king's conveniences.

About this time a new cause of difference arose. Margaret, the heiress of the Tyrol, had been married to a boy six years younger than herself, a son of the king of Bohemia. The marriage had not been happy, and the emperor now formed a scheme of securing Margaret and her possessions for his son Lewis, on whom he had already bestowed the marquise of

Brandenburg. It was alleged that the Bohemian prince was incapable of performing the duties of a husband, and Leopold, bishop of Freising, was found willing to pronounce a separation on this ground, and to grant a dispensation for the marriage of Margaret with the younger Lewis, to whom she was related within the forbidden degrees. But before these things could be done, Leopold was killed, while on a journey, and no other bishop could readily be found to carry out the plan. In this difficulty the emperor's literary allies, Marsilius and William of Ockham, came to his aid, by writing treatises in which it was maintained that the jurisdiction in such cases was not for the church, but for the temporal sovereign; that it had belonged to heathen emperors, and therefore much more must it be the right of the Christian emperor; that, while it is for bishops and theologians to decide whether certain defects in one of the parties would justify a divorce, the application of the rule so determined is the business of the secular judge; that "it is for the human lawgiver to order that to be done which is established by the Divine law."

On the strength of these opinions Lewis proceeded. Margaret's husband was cited, and, as he did not appear, the emperor took it on himself to decree a divorce, and to dispense with the laws as to consanguinity with a view to her second marriage. But although Lewis thus gained his immediate object, this invasion of a province which had always been supposed to belong exclusively to the hierarchy excited a general distrust, which told severely against him. He made enemies of the king of Bohemia, with his uncle the powerful archbishop Baldwin of Treves, and all the Luxemburg party. The pope desired the patriarch of Aquileia to declare the late proceedings null, and to interdict the Tyrol and at this very time the death of Benedict XII made way for a successor more formidable to the emperor.

The election fell on Peter Roger, a Limousin of noble family, who styled himself Clement VI. He had been a Benedictine monk, and at the time of his election was archbishop of Rouen and cardinal of SS. Nereus and Achilleus. He had also been chancellor to king Philip, who, from unwillingness to lose his services, had for a time hindered his promotion to the cardinalate. His devotion to the interest of France was indicated in the ceremonies of his coronation, where the chief parts were assigned to great French dignitaries; and it was soon after more fully shown by the circumstance that, of ten cardinals whom he appointed at once, all but one were French.

Clement was noted for his learning, for his eloquence, and for an extraordinary power of memory; his manners were agreeable, and he is described as free from malice and resentments. His morals were never of any rigid correctness; and while he was pope, a countess of Turenne, if not actually his mistress, is said to have exercised an absolute influence over him. He was a lover of splendour and luxury. The great palace of Avignon was growing under his care, and the princely houses of the cardinals rose around it; the court of the successor of St. Peter was perhaps the gayest and most festive in Europe. Under Clement the vice of the papal city became open and scandalous. Petrarch, who himself cannot be described as a model of severe and intolerant virtue, expressed in the strongest terms his horror at the abominations which filled the new "Babylon of the West," and withdrew in disgust from the papal city to the solitudes of Vaucluse.

In his ecclesiastical administration, Clement reversed the policy of Benedict. Preferments which the late pope had kept open, from a conscientious anxiety as to the difficulty of finding suitable men to fill them, were now bestowed without any regard to the qualifications of the receivers. Bishoprics, cardinalates, and other high dignities were given to young men whose sole recommendation was the elegance of their person and manners, while some of them were notorious for their dissolute habits. Other benefices were declared to be vacant as papal reserves, and were conferred with a like want of discrimination. The higher offices of the church were reserved for the pope's own disposal, in contempt of the claims alike of sovereigns and of cathedral or conventual electors. The pope's own kindred, both clerical and lay, were loaded with benefices and wealth to a degree of which there had been no

example; among his cardinals were one of his brothers, two nephews, and another relation; and when someone ventured to remark on this, Clement's answer was, "Our predecessors did not know how to be pope."

The Romans, by two legations composed of persons who represented the various classes of the community, invited the pope to take up his abode in the ancient capital, and Petrarch, who was one of the deputies, urged the prayer in a poetical epistle, setting forth the attractions of the imperial and apostolic city. In reply, Clement alleged the necessity of remaining north of the Alps, that he might act as a peacemaker between England and France; but he promised to visit Rome as soon as the troubles of France should be settled. In the meantime he accepted the office of senator, which was offered to him, not as pope, but as a private person, and he granted another of their requests—that the jubilee, which was supposed to recur only once in a century, should be celebrated every fiftieth year.

Towards the emperor Lewis, the pope, while yet archbishop of Rouen, had shown his hostility by a sermon, in which he condescended to play on the words *Bavarian*, *barbarian*, and *boor*; and his behaviour towards him was marked throughout by a rancour which contrasted strongly with the easiness of Clement's general character. The emperor sent a mission to Avignon, caused processions and other religious services to be celebrated with a view to an accommodation, and reminded king Philip of his engagement to intercede for him; but although Philip made a show of exerting himself, the terms which the pope prescribed were too rigid. It was required that Lewis should penitently acknowledge all the errors of his past conduct—that he should resign the empire, and restore the Tyrol to the Bohemian prince John; and on Maundy Thursday 1343 a new bull was issued, in which, after a long recital of the emperor's offences—his contempt of ecclesiastical censures, his opposition to pope John on the question of evangelical poverty, his proceedings in Italy and at Rome, especially the crime of setting up an antipope, his usurpation of the right to grant a dispensation for the "incestuous and adulterous" union of his son with Margaret, "whom her immodesty will not allow us to call our beloved daughter"—the pope charges him within three months to lay down the imperial title and authority, to appear in person for penance, and to amend his offences against the church; and he threatens him with yet worse punishments in case of failure. At the same time Clement, by private letters, desired the German princes to prepare for another election, and threatened that, if they should be backward, he would give the empire a new head, by the same authority which had formerly transferred it from the Greeks to the Germans.

Notwithstanding the French king's intercession, the pope, at the expiration of the time which he had named, pronounced Lewis to be contumacious; and a meeting of electors was held at Rhense, under the influence of John of Bohemia and his uncle, archbishop Baldwin, who were now strongly opposed to the emperor. Lewis, although on receiving the report of his first mission to Clement he had angrily sworn that he would never yield to the assumptions of the papal court, was warned by tokens of a growing disaffection to attempt a different course. He appeared at Rhense, and was able to avert the immediate danger by professing himself willing to be guided in all things by the judgment of the electors, and to labour in all ways for a reconciliation with the church, and by producing a letter in which the French king held out hopes of his obtaining absolution.

As his former applications had been considered insufficient, Lewis now begged that the pope would himself furnish him with a draft of the terms which were required of him; and in answer to this he received a document to which it might have seemed impossible that an emperor could submit in any extremity. He was required not only to acknowledge the errors of his past conduct, but to profess that he had never thought it right; to give up the imperial title, and to own that it was in the gift of the pope alone; to undertake a crusade whenever the pope should call on him; to amend all faults against the church and the pope, and to promise absolute obedience. Even pope Clement was surprised when Lewis authorized his

ambassadors to accept these terms; but still these were not enough. Another document was prepared, by which Lewis was required to amend and retract all that he had done, not only as emperor, but as king—not only as to Italy and Rome, but as to Germany—and to pledge himself for the future to absolute slavery to the papal will. At this, which concerned the electors as well as himself, the emperor hesitated. He summoned a diet to meet at Frankfort in September 1344, and, after having exposed the pope's dealings with him, he asked the advice of the assembly. Great indignation was expressed, and it was resolved, in accordance with the determination of the electors in a previous meeting at Cologne, that compliance with the pope's demands would be incompatible with the emperor's oath of office and with the duty of the electors. But the feeling of the assembly, instead of being favourable to Lewis, turned against him, as having by his weakness and vacillation lowered the dignity of the empire, and as being now for personal reasons the only hindrance to peace. Another meeting was held a few days later at Rhense, where John of Bohemia took the lead in opposition to him. When Lewis offered to resign, the electors showed themselves willing to accept the offer, and in his place to set up Charles, marquis of Moravia, a son of the Bohemian king; and the emperor's attempt to recommend his son, Lewis of Brandenburg, as his successor, was met by the insulting declaration that, since one Bavarian had so degraded the empire, they would have no more Bavarian emperors.

Clement was resolved against any reconciliation. Another mission from the emperor appeared at the papal court, but without effect; and on Maundy Thursday a fresh anathema was issued, in which the pope, after forbidding all intercourse with Lewis except for the benefit of his soul, denying him the right of Christian burial, and, charging all Christian princes to expel him from their territories, proceeds to implore the most horrible curses on him; and the document concludes by charging the electors to make choice of a new king, with a threat that, in case of their neglect, the pope would himself provide a person to fill the vacant throne.

John of Bohemia, who had lately become blind, visited Avignon with his son Charles, who had received in the French court an education of almost a clerical character; and Clement, who, as abbot of Fecamp, had been the prince's tutor, was now favourable to his pretensions. But when the question of the empire was brought before the cardinals, a violent conflict arose. The French party, headed by Talleyrand of Perigord, bishop of Albano, was with the pope; the Gascons, under the cardinal of Comminges, a nephew of Clement V, were on the other side. Odious charges and imputations were bandied to and fro; the two chiefs had risen from their seats to rush at each other, when they were with difficulty restrained by the pope, and the meeting was suddenly broken up; whereupon the members of the hostile factions fortified their houses and armed their servants, as if in expectation of a general tumult. A paper of terms was offered by the pope to Charles, and was accepted by him. By this the future emperor bound himself to a degrading submission to the papal see.

The pope now issued a mandate desiring the electors to proceed to a new choice. As there was no hope of gaining Henry of Virneburg—to whom, as archbishop of Mayence, belonged the privilege of superintending the election—Clement set him aside in favour of Count Gerlach of Nassau, a youth of twenty; and he desired that Lewis of Brandenburg, son of the deposed emperor, should be excluded from a vote, as holding his position unlawfully. The young archbishop summoned a meeting to take place at Rhense on the 10th of July, when he appeared with the electors of Cologne and Treves, the king of Bohemia, and Rudolf, duke of Saxony. The empire was declared to be vacant; Charles of Moravia was elected by the five, and the ceremony of raising him aloft was performed on the "King's Chair" of Rhense, as Frankfort was in the hands of the opposite party. The services of his supporters were, as usual, rewarded by large payments or other concessions, and the election was, although not until nine months later, confirmed by the pope.

The general feeling of the Germans was against Charles. They saw with indignation that the same humiliations to which Lewis had submitted only in the extremity of distress were accepted by the new claimant as the very conditions on which he was to be allowed to supplant a lawfully-chosen emperor. A diet at Spires, under Lewis, declared the election of his rival to be null, and denied the pope's right to depose an emperor. No secular prince would side with Charles; no city would countenance or harbour him; even at Basel, the bishop and his monks were unable to procure his admission. Aix-la-Chapelle, the traditional scene of the German coronations, shut its gates against him; and he was derided by the name of the "priests' emperor." In this state of things he found it expedient to withdraw with his father into France; and at the great battle of Cressy, where the blind king died in the thick of the fight, Charles fled from the field. As Aix and Frankfort were closed against him, he was, with the pope's consent, crowned at Bonn by the archbishop of Cologne; and Germany seemed to be on the verge of a civil war, when Lewis suddenly died of a fall received in hunting, on the 11th of October 1347—the last emperor against whom the anathema of the church was directed, and the one who felt it most severely, although living at a time when such denunciations were generally less dreaded than in the days when men had not become familiar with them through abuse.

CHAPTER III.

JOANNA OF NAPLES—RIENZI—LAST YEARS OF CLEMENT VI.
A.D. 1343-1352.

ROBERT, who from the year 1309 had reigned over the kingdom of Apulia, or Naples, with a reputation for wisdom and political skill unequalled among his contemporaries, lost his only son, Charles, in 1328 and, seemingly from a wish to compensate the elder branch of his family for its exclusion from the Neapolitan throne at an earlier time, he resolved to bestow his granddaughter Joanna, who had thus become his heiress, on one of its members. For this purpose, Andrew, the second son of Robert's nephew, king Charobert of Hungary, was chosen, and the marriage took place in 1333, when the bridegroom was seven and the bride five years old. Andrew remained at Naples in order that he might be duly trained up for his future dignity; but the roughness of his character, which the Italians ascribed to his Hungarian birth, refused to yield to the southern culture, and he grew up rude, passionate, and headstrong. On the death of Robert, in 1343, Joanna, to whom her grandfather had already caused an oath of allegiance to be taken, succeeded to the throne; but intrigues were busily carried on by members of the royal family, and a Hungarian faction, headed by a friar named Robert, attempted to make itself supreme at Naples. Andrew endeavoured, through the interest of his brother Lewis, king of Hungary, to obtain the pope's consent that he should be crowned, not as consort, but as king by hereditary right; and he indiscreetly uttered threats of the punishments which he intended to inflict on all who had offended him, as soon as he should be established in the kingdom. He also suspected his wife of infidelity, and the mutual ill-feeling which arose from this and other causes was artfully fomented by interested courtiers. A conspiracy was formed against Andrew, and, while residing with the queen and a hunting-party at the Celestine convent of Aversa, he was decoyed from his chamber and strangled, on the night of the 18th of September 1343. By desire of the Neapolitan nobles an inquiry was made as to the murder, and some of the persons who had been concerned in it were put to death, or otherwise punished. But Joanna herself was suspected, and when she sent a bishop to Lewis of Hungary, entreating his protection for herself and for the child with whom she had been pregnant at the time of his brother's death, he replied in a letter which, with unmeasured severity, declared his belief of her guilt.

On the death of his posthumous nephew, Lewis claimed the Apulian kingdom as his inheritance, and invaded it, displaying at the head of his army a banner on which was painted the murder of Andrew. He also sent an embassy to the pope, with a request that he might be crowned as heir of Sicily and Apulia; but his envoys were unable to obtain a public audience, as it was alleged that he was connected with the excommunicated Lewis of Bavaria. In the meantime, Joanna, yielding (as it was said) to the entreaties of her subjects, who dreaded a Hungarian rule, married her cousin Lewis of Taranto, who had been suspected of criminal intimacy with her during the life of her former husband, and of a share in the guilt of his death; and by this she appeared to confirm the imputations which had been cast on her. The pair withdrew from Naples before the approach of the Hungarian force, and fled by sea to the queen's territory of Provence, where she was received at Avignon with great honour, all the cardinals going out to meet her. Clement, who had already pronounced a general excommunication against the murderers of Andrew, at the request of Lewis, appointed a commission of three cardinals to investigate the case, but without any definite result; he granted a dispensation for the queen's second marriage, and endeavoured to mediate between her and

the king of Hungary. After a time Lewis withdrew from Apulia, where he had inflicted severe punishment on many who were suspected of a share in his brother's murder. Joanna and her husband were requested by a party among her subjects to return and, in order to provide money for this purpose, she agreed to sell Avignon to the pope for a price far below its real value, in consideration (as was believed) of the favours which she had received or might still desire from him in the matter of Andrew's murder. In 1351 the king of Hungary again appeared in southern Italy; but Joanna and her husband were able, by the help of one of the mercenary bands which were then at the service of any power that would pay them to make so vigorous a resistance that a truce was concluded. By this the question was referred to the pope and cardinals for arbitration, with the understanding that, if Joanna were found guilty of the crime imputed to her, she should forfeit the kingdom, and that if acquitted, she should retain peaceful possession, but should reimburse the Hungarian king for the expenses of the war. The decision of Clement was in her favour, and she and her husband were crowned by a papal legate on Whitsunday 1352.

The long absence of the popes from Rome had been disastrous in its effects on the city. Although still an object of pilgrimage, it no longer enjoyed the wealth which had been drawn to it by the residence of the court, and by the resort of persons from all quarters for official business. Even the pilgrims were often plundered on the way by robbers, or by the bands of mercenary soldiers which beset the roads. The churches were falling into decay; the great monuments of antiquity were turned into fortresses, or were left to utter neglect. While the popes were usually elected, each in his private capacity, and for his own life, to the nominal dignity of senator, the city was a prey to anarchy, and to the contentions of the great families. In these circumstances some romantic spirits felt themselves thrown back on the memories of an earlier time, regarding less the veneration which was attached to Rome as the religious capital of Christendom than the fame of its ancient republican and imperial grandeur. Thus Dante had desired to see Rome the seat of the papacy and of the empire; and now Petrarch, the foremost man of his age in poetry and general literature, endeavoured from time to time, by letters both in prose and in verse, which found circulation wherever the Latin language was understood, to stir up both emperors and popes to make Rome again their residence. Petrarch was decorated with the laurel crown in the Capitol on Easter-day 1341, having received at the same time an offer of that tribute to his genius from the university of Paris and from the Roman senate, and having chosen to be so honoured by the representatives of ancient greatness rather than by the body which, in his own time, was most distinguished in the cultivation of literature.

Among the spectators of this ceremony it is probable that there was one in whom the romantic feeling which has been described was soon to find a remarkable expression; indeed, it has been supposed that his enthusiasm had drawn nourishment from the sight of the great poet wandering among the monuments of Rome's former majesty on an earlier visit to the city. Nicolas, who, from a popular corruption of his father's name, is commonly called Rienzi, was born about the year 1314, in the region named Regola, which extends along the left bank of the Tiber, adjoining the Jewish quarter of Rome. His father was a tavern-keeper, his mother a washerwoman and water-carrier; and although, in the later part of his life, he professed to be an illegitimate offspring of the emperor Henry VII, it is certain that this attempt to glorify his paternal descent at the expense of his mother's reputation was merely the invention of a diseased vanity.

Rienzi was educated for the profession of a notary; but his delight was in the study of the old Roman authors,—of Livy, Caesar, Cicero, Boethius, and the poets,—and he acquired an unusual skill in reading and interpreting ancient inscriptions. From brooding over these records of the past he conceived visions, which he attempted to realize with an amount of success which for a time was wonderfully great, and might have been far greater and more lasting but for his own utter inadequacy to the part which he attempted to act; and the anarchy

into which Rome had fallen was especially brought home to him by the circumstance that his brother was killed in an affray, and that no redress was to be obtained from the great families which then exercised the powers of government.

In 1342-3 Rienzi was one of the deputation sent by the Romans to beg that pope Clement would return to their city; and it is said that his eloquence won the admiration of the pope himself, while it is certain that he excited the enthusiasm of Petrarch, who afterwards found reason to regret that he had too easily allowed himself to be fascinated. The embassy, as we have seen, was put off with fair words, and with a grant of the petition that the jubilee should be celebrated every fiftieth year, instead of once in a century; but this concession was hailed by Rienzi with a joy so extravagant that he extolled Clement above the greatest of the ancient Roman worthies.

Rienzi returned to Rome with the official character of papal notary, and resumed his old studies, while his indignation at the oppression of the nobles (who mocked at his ideas as the fancies of a crazy enthusiast) became more vehement than ever. He endeavoured to excite the patriotic feeling of the people by various means, such as expounding inscriptions which attested the glory and liberty of former days, and by exhibiting a picture which, in the midst of many other symbols, displayed Rome under the figure of a majestic matron, clothed in tattered garments, with disheveled hair, weeping eyes, and hands crossed on her breast, kneeling on the deck of a ship, which was without mast or sail, and appeared about to sink. On the first day of Lent 1347, he announced by a placard on the church of St. George in the Velabro that the Romans would “soon return to their ancient good estate”; and after having held many meetings on the Aventine, in order to prepare the minds of the citizens, he gave out at Whitsuntide that this good estate was come. Rienzi, at the Capitol, assumed the title of tribune, with the pope’s legate, Raymond, bishop of Orvieto, for his colleague; the laws of his government were proclaimed, and forthwith he entered on the administration of the republic. A strict and rigid system of police was enforced without respect of persons; the fortresses of the nobles, both in the city and in the Campagna, were demolished; the owners were compelled to swear to the observation of peace, and long and bitter feuds were extinguished by a forced reconciliation of enemies. The streets of Rome and the highways of its neighbourhood became, for the first time since many years, safe the Romans, in the enjoyment of the unwonted security, fancied themselves once more free. The tribune’s authority was respected far beyond the bounds of his jurisdiction; his announcement of his elevation, and his invitation to the Italian cities to combine for their common country, were received with a respectful welcome: it is said that even the sultan of Babylon was affected by the change which had taken place in the government of Rome. Petrarch, watching with enthusiastic delight the course of affairs in the city, congratulated the tribune and his people on having thrown off the domination of foreigners, and exhorted them to profit by their opportunities.

But very early Rienzi began to show that his mind—vain, fantastic, and unsteady from the first—had become intoxicated by success. With the title of tribune he combined others at once pompous and inconsistent, including some which belonged to the imperial dignity. He claimed a special influence of the Holy Ghost,—a pretension which, when taken in connexion with the oracles of abbot Joachim and his school, was likely to awaken suspicions of heresy; nay, he did not hesitate even to compare himself to the Saviour. He levied new and heavy taxes, the proceeds of which, and of the confiscations to which he subjected the wealthier citizens, were spent in luxurious living, and on theatrical displays, in which he himself was the chief figure. Among these exhibitions the most noted were his admission to the order of knighthood after having bathed in rose-water in the porphyry vessel which was traditionally believed to have been the font of Constantine’s baptism, and his coronation with seven crowns, each of which was intended to bear particular symbolical meaning. He promoted his own relations to all sorts of offices, in which they disgraced themselves and him by their unfitness, and by their extravagance of vulgar luxury; and his own indulgences in food and

drink were such that his figure became gross and bloated. He kept a train of poets to celebrate his actions, and of jesters to amuse him. Fancying himself seated on the throne of the Caesars, he summoned the pope to return to Rome, and the rival claimants of the empire, together with the electors, to submit themselves to his arbitration; and although this was unheeded, Lewis of Bavaria stooped to entreat his mediation, with a view to reconciliation with the church, while Lewis of Hungary and Joanna of Naples each endeavoured to enlist him as a partisan in their contest.

But Rienzi's errors became more and more palpable, and speedily brought on his ruin. He treacherously arrested the chiefs of the adverse nobles, as if on suspicion of a conspiracy; and, after having alarmed them with the expectation of death, he not only set them free at the intercession of some citizens, but loaded them with offices and honours. The Colonnas and others, having collected a force in their fastnesses among the mountains, attacked him under the walls of Rome : and, when their blunders had given him a victory which his own ability could not have gained for him, he abused it by cruel insults to the dead, and was unable to profit by his success. Although he had throughout professed the deepest reverence not only for religion, but for the papacy, the pope had not unnaturally viewed his proceedings with jealousy. He was charged with heterodoxy, and even with magic and the legate, who had once been his colleague in power, but had separated from him on finding that Rienzi intended to use him merely as a tool, pronounced an anathema against him. Pipin, count palatine of Minerbino and Altamura, a Neapolitan noble, who had been banished from his own country, and had become the head of a band of mercenaries, having been summoned to appear before the tribune on account of his violent acts, proceeded to attack him; and Rienzi, who had forfeited the affection of the people by his misconduct and tyranny, did not venture to stand his ground, but fled in abject terror. After having been sheltered for a time by the Orsini in the castle of St. Angelo, he privately made his escape from Rome, and found a refuge among the fanatical fraticelli of the Apennines, while the churches resounded with the papal denunciations of him, and Rome relapsed into a state of anarchy worse than before.

Two years and a half after his flight from Rome, Rienzi appeared at Prague, in consequence of a commission given to him by a hermit named Angelo, who believed that he and Charles IV were destined to reform the world. He obtained access to the emperor, and endeavoured to draw him into the hermit's schemes, but the wildness of his talk, which savoured of the society in which he had lately been living, excited such suspicions that Charles thought it well to commit him to the care of the archbishop of Prague, by whom, in compliance with a request from the pope, he was after a time sent to Avignon. The charge of heresy, however, was not prosecuted against him. His life was spared, partly through the intercession of Petrarch, who, although grievously disappointed in his career, still regarded him with interest and sympathy, and partly in consequence of a mistaken belief that he was entitled to the honours of a poet; and he was kept in confinement, which, according to the notions of the time, was lenient, as he was bound only by a single chain, and was allowed the use of books, especially of the Scriptures and of Livy. In this condition he remained until circumstances brought him once more into public life.

About the same time when Rienzi was in power at Rome, a pestilence of oriental origin made its appearance in Europe, and raged with unexampled virulence from Sicily to Iceland and even to Greenland. This "Black Death" (as it was called) is said to have carried off at least a fourth of the population in the countries which it visited. Among the places which most severely felt its ravages was Florence, where the historian John Villani was among its victims, and where its tragic details furnished an incongruous framework for the lively and licentious tales of the "Decameron". At Marseilles it carried off the bishop and all his chapter, almost all the Dominican and Minorite friars, and one-half of the citizens. At Avignon three-fourths of the inhabitants are said to have died, among whom was cardinal Colonna, the chief patron of Petrarch, with several other princes of the church, and the lady

whom the poet has made for ever famous under the name of Laura. So great was the mortality in the city of the papal residence that the living were insufficient to bury the dead, and the pope had recourse to the device of consecrating the Rhone in order to receive the bodies which could find no room in the cemeteries. In England the pestilence raged violently, and among its victims was John de Ufford, whom the king, in his anger against the Canterbury monks for having elected the learned schoolman Thomas Bradwardine without the royal licence, had begged the pope to appoint by provision to the archbishopric. After the death of his rival (who had not been consecrated) Bradwardine was promoted by the consent of all parties, and received consecration from the pope; but within a few days after landing in England he too was carried off by the plague. At Drontheim, all the members of the chapter except one died; and the survivor elected a new archbishop, without any interference on the part of the crown.

The moral effects of this visitation were not altogether favourable. In many it produced a spirit of selfishness and covetousness and a decay of charity. It is said that in Italy many of the survivors, finding themselves easier in their circumstances through the consequences of the pestilence, ran into all sorts of dissoluteness and self-indulgence; while the lower classes of society, for a like reason, gave themselves up to idleness and dissipation. In England, when such persons of the labouring classes as had escaped death demanded an increased price for their work, a royal decree forbade all servants, artisans, and the like, to receive higher pay than in former years. In consequence of this, such persons found that, as the cost of living was increased, their state was worse than before; and their discontent was shared by the lower clergy. For a time the surviving members of this class had found their services so much in request, as curates or chaplains, that they had insisted on receiving four or five times as much as before; and, in consequence of this, many laymen who had lost their wives by the pestilence pressed into the ministry of the church, without any other qualification than an imperfect knowledge of reading. But through this multiplication of their numbers, combined with the increase of prices and with the diminution of fees which followed on the decrease of population, the condition of the lower clergy speedily became worse than it had ever been before. Even on monastic discipline it is said that the Black Death told unfavourably; as in many places the older and more experienced monks were carried off and those who succeeded them were unable or unwilling to enforce the rules with the strictness of former times. This great calamity was naturally followed by outbreaks of superstitious terror. The Jews were suspected of having poisoned the wells and infected the air; some of them were tortured into a confession of these crimes, and multitudes of the unfortunate people suffered death. In some places the Jews were driven by despair to attack the Christians; at Mayence they killed about 200, and the act was avenged by a butchery of 12,000 Jews. The persecution raged especially in the towns along the Rhine; and when the pope threw his protection over the Jews, the age was so little able to apprehend any good motive for such humanity that he was commonly supposed to have been bribed. The end of the world was believed to be at hand. The fanaticism of the flagellants, which had been first known in the preceding century, and of which there had since been some smaller displays, was now revived. The flagellants professed to have come into Germany from Hungary, and displayed a letter which an angel was said to have brought down to Jerusalem, declaring the Saviour's wrath against mankind for profanation of the Lord's day, for neglect of fasting, for blasphemy, usury, adultery, and other sins. They went about half-naked, singing, and scourging themselves; and they declared that the blood which was thus shed was mingled with that of the Redeemer, and that it superseded the necessity of the sacraments. When the Saviour's passion was mentioned in their hymns, they threw themselves on the earth "like logs of wood," with their arms extended in the form of a cross, and remained prostrate in prayer until a signal was given to rise. They were under "masters" of their own, to whom all that joined them were required to swear obedience, and their behaviour towards the clergy

was hostile and menacing. From Germany the movement spread into France, but the king forbade the flagellants to approach the capital, and the university of Paris pronounced their practices to be a “vain superstition”. At the instance of the university, flagellancy was condemned by the pope, and at his desire it was forbidden by the royal authority. Some of the flagellants carried their fanaticism from the Low Countries into England; but the English looked on their wild exercises with indifference, and suspected them of heresy.

In many towns the parochial clergy fled from the pestilence, and their places were taken by the more courageous friars, who visited the sick, administered the last sacraments, and performed the offices of burial. This devotion was rewarded with large bequests, especially from persons who had lost their natural heirs; and a complaint was made to the pope by the cardinals and the secular clergy, who desired that the mendicant orders should be suppressed for interfering with the parochial system of the church. But Clement, according to a writer who himself belonged to the mendicant brotherhood of Carmelites, rebuked the objectors severely. He asked them what they themselves would preach if the monks were silent? He told them that if they were to preach humility, poverty, and chastity, their exhortations would be vitiated by the glaring contrast of their own pride and luxury, their avarice and greed, and the notorious laxity of their lives. He reproached them for closing their doors against the mendicants, while they opened them to panders and buffoons. If, he said, the mendicants had got some benefit from those whose deathbeds they had attended, it was a reward of the zeal and the courage which they had shown while the secular clergy fled from their posts; if they had erected buildings with the money, it was better spent so than in worldly and sensual pleasures; and he declared the opposition to the friars to be merely the result of envy. The rebuke carried weight from its truth, if not from the character of the pope who uttered it.

Although the death of Lewis of Bavaria had removed a great obstacle from the path of his rival Charles, the “priests’ emperor” found that his difficulties were not yet ended. In going about the cities of Germany, attended by clergy who offered the pope’s absolution from ban and interdict, on condition that the people should renounce the late emperor and all his family, he met with hostile demonstrations in some places. Thus at Basel, when the bull announcing the terms of absolution was read, the mayor of the city stood forward, and addressing the pope’s commissioner, the bishop of Bamberg, declared that the citizens of Basel did not believe the emperor Lewis to have been a heretic; that they were resolved to acknowledge as king and emperor anyone who should be chosen by the electors, or by a majority of them, without requiring the pope’s confirmation of the choice; that they would do nothing contrary to the rights of the empire, but were willing to accept the pope’s forgiveness of all their sins, if he should be pleased to bestow it. By this firmness an unconditional absolution was extorted. In other towns the emperor’s arrival was the signal for scenes of disorder. Many of the most religious persons, such as the famous mystic John Tauler, of Strasburg, regarded the pope’s proceedings against Lewis as unjust and invalid; and, as at some earlier times, the impatience of the papal rule gave rise to a popular expectation that the emperor Frederick II would reappear, to destroy the clergy and the friars, and to restore the glories of the empire.

The Bavarian party, headed by Henry of Virneburg, who was still acknowledged by most of the Germans as archbishop of Mayence, endeavoured to set up an emperor of its own. The crown, after having been declined by some German princes, was offered to Edward of England, whose fame had lately been enhanced by the victory of Cressy; but Edward, in deference to the opinion of his parliament, and fearing that the offer might be intended to divert him from the prosecution of his designs on France, refused it. At length a champion was found in count Gunther of Schwarzburg, in Thuringia, a man of great renown for prowess, but of no considerable territory or power. Gunther was elected by his partizans on the 30th of January 1349, was displayed on the high altar of St. Bartholomew’s at Frankfort as king, and

was enthroned in the same city but he found few adherents, and after a time his chief supporters were gained over to the side of Charles by means of matrimonial alliances or other inducements. Gunther himself, who had been attacked by a hopeless illness, was persuaded, although unwillingly, to resign his pretensions, chiefly in consideration of a large sum of money. The Bavarian party was conciliated by Charles's undertaking to get the papal sanction for the marriage of Lewis of Brandenburg with Margaret of the Tyrol and Lewis made over to Charles the insignia of the empire, which had come into his hands at his father's death. Thus Charles acquired peaceable possession of his dignity, to which, according to some writers, he submitted to be again elected, so that the honour of the empire might be formally saved, although the acceptance of the pope's nominee proved that the electors were no longer inclined to oppose the papacy.

The character of Charles as a sovereign is very differently estimated by the Germans and by the Bohemians; but their estimates are not inconsistent. To the Germans he appeared to neglect the empire for the interests of his family, which he laboured to secure by marriages and peaceful negotiations rather than by the more brilliant exploits which accorded with the taste of the age while in his hereditary kingdom, which he had governed as his father's deputy while John was seeking adventures all over Europe, his name is honoured above those of all other sovereigns for his good administration, and for his patronage of literature and the arts. To him Prague was indebted for its splendour as a capital and for the foundation of its university, which drew to it a vast concourse of students, not only from the Slavonic countries, but from all parts of Germany—as in that country no such institution yet existed.

Notwithstanding the late mortality, and the dangers which in a time of such disorder beset the ways, the jubilee of 1350 drew vast multitudes of pilgrims to Rome. Many persons of the higher classes, indeed, availed themselves of the dispensations which the pope offered to those who should be prevented from undertaking the journey. And Edward of England, although he granted licenses for the pilgrimage, forbade his subjects in general to take part in it, alleging the necessities of war in answer to Clement's remonstrances on the subject. Yet Matthew Villani states that the number of those who visited Rome from Christmas to Easter was 1,000,000 or 1,200,000, and that in the season of the Ascension and Whitsuntide there were 800,000 more. The same writer tells us that the streets leading to the churches which were to be visited—St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and St. John Lateran—were so crowded as to admit of no movement except with the stream of the multitude; and that the Romans were extortionate as to the prices of lodging, food, fodder, and other necessaries. Another chronicler, who was present, tells us that at the exhibition of the Veronica many were crushed to death. The numbers of the pilgrims must probably have been swelled by the serious impressions of the late calamity; and while Matthew Villani describes them on their journey as cheerfully braving the inconveniences of an unfavourable season, the interest with which the more pious might view the decayed but venerable city, and the relics of especial fame for holiness which were displayed before their eyes, may be conceived from the fervent language of Petrarch. Yet, as to the result of the pilgrimage, we may probably believe a contemporary chronicler's statement, that many came back from Rome worse than before.

On the 6th of December 1352 Clement suddenly died in consequence of the bursting of a tumour, having in the preceding year mitigated the law of papal elections by allowing that the cardinals, when shut up in conclave, should have their portions of the room separated by curtains; that each of them might have two attendants, who might be either clerks or laymen; and that the rigour of the regulations as to the supply of food should be abated on the third day.

CHAPTER IV.

FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE INNOCENT VI. TO THE DEATH OF
GREGORY XI.

A. D. 1352-1378.

AT the death of Clement VI the cardinals had reason to suppose that John, who in 1350 had succeeded to the crown of France, would endeavour to set up a pope of his own nomination; and, notwithstanding their devotion to the French interest, they resolved to preserve a show of independence by making their election before any intimation of the royal will could reach them. It seemed as if John Birelli, general of the Carthusian order, were about to be chosen; but cardinal Talleyrand warned his brethren that the Carthusian, if he were to become pope, would reduce them to primitive simplicity of living, and would degrade their splendid horses to drag the waggon or the plough. The cardinals then determined to choose one of their own number, under a system of capitulation such as had sometimes been practised in elections of bishops, and had lately been usual in the elections of emperors. Every member of the college was to swear that, if chosen, he would make no new cardinals until the college should be reduced to sixteen; that he would never raise their number to more than twenty; that he would not create, depose, or arrest any cardinal without the consent of the whole body; and that he would make over to the cardinals one-half of the revenues of the Roman church. By these terms the future pope would have bound himself to become a tool of the cardinals; and, although all took the oath, some of them did so with the reservation “provided that these laws be agreeable to right”.

On the 18th of December the choice of the cardinals fell on Stephen Aubert, a Limousin, bishop of Ostia, a man eminent for his learning in civil and ecclesiastical law, who styled himself Innocent VI. Soon after his election, the new pope took advantage of the reservation which he had made in swearing to the late agreement, by declaring that he had found such engagements to be contrary to the decrees of some former popes; and also that they were void for attempting to limit the power which God had bestowed on St. Peter and his successors. And the cardinals, who seem to have become aware of the evils which might result from such capitulations, acquiesced in this determination.

Innocent betook himself earnestly to the work of ecclesiastical reform. He did away with the system of reserves, and in his bull for that purpose he dwelt on the mischiefs which had arisen from them—such as the neglect of pastoral care, the dilapidation of churches, and the decay of hospitality. He abolished many of the corruptions of the court, and did much to restrain the extortion of his officials. He suppressed the scandalous abuse by which prostitutes had been allowed, on payment of a tax to the papal treasury, to ply their trade at Avignon. He insisted on an abatement of the excessive luxury in which the cardinals had indulged, and himself set an example in this respect; and those members of the college who offended him by their laxity of life were awed by threats that he would remove the court to Rome. The bishops who haunted Avignon were compelled to return to their dioceses. He discouraged pluralities: there is a story that when a favourite chaplain, who held seven benefices, asked for some preferment in behalf of a nephew, Innocent desired him to give up to the young man the best of his own preferments; and, as the chaplain showed dissatisfaction at this, he was further required to resign three other livings, each of which the pope bestowed on a poor clerk. Innocent was careful in the disposal of his patronage; and, although he is charged with too

great fondness for advancing his own relations, it is admitted that in general the kinsmen whom he promoted did him no discredit.

Innocent was able to act with an independence unknown to the earlier Avignon popes; for king John, weakened by the disastrous war with England, in which he himself was made a captive at Poitiers, was unable to exercise a control like that of Philip the Fair, or of his own father, Philip of Valois.

In the meantime Italy was a prey to disorder. While every division of the country had its own little tyrant, the Milanese family of Visconti had gained such a predominance in the north that the ancient parties of Guelfs and Ghibellines forgot their enmities in order to combine against a foe who threatened them all. On the death of Lucchino Visconti, in 1348, the lordship of Milan fell to his brother John, who was already archbishop of the city. By violently seizing on Bologna, a city which belonged to the pope, he incurred threats of excommunication and deprivation from Clement VI; but by bribing the king of France and other powerful intercessors, including that pope's favourite, the countess of Turenne, he was afterwards able to make terms, and was allowed to retain the place for twelve years, on condition of paying tribute. It is said that, when required by a legate to choose between the characters of archbishop and secular prince, he desired that the message might be repeated in the face of his clergy and people; and when this was done on the following Sunday, after he had celebrated mass with great pomp, he rose from his throne, holding in one hand his crosier, and in the other his drawn sword—"These", he said, "are my arms spiritual and temporal; and with the one I will defend the other". He signified, however, his willingness to appear at Avignon; but the proceedings of his harbingers, who set about hiring all the houses that could be got in the city and for leagues around it, as if to lodge an overwhelming train, alarmed the pope to such a degree that the archbishop's visit was excused.

The citizens of the Italian republics, devoting themselves to the accumulation of wealth, ceased to cultivate the art of war, and relied for their defence on the mercenary bands which now, under the name of free companies, overran both France and Italy. These companies were at first composed in great part of soldiers who, by the conclusion of peace between France and England, had found their occupation gone. They admitted into their ranks men of various nations, and enlisted themselves in the service of any power that could afford to hire them—keeping their contract faithfully so long as it lasted, but holding themselves at liberty to go over to an opposite party at the end of the term; and when not thus engaged, they plundered and ravaged on their own account. Among the captains of such mercenaries the most famous was Sir John Hawkwood, an Englishman, who, after having distinguished himself in the French wars, passed into Italy, and there served for thirty years under the Visconti, the pope, and lastly under the republic of Florence, which at his death commemorated him by a colossal equestrian portrait, still existing in the cathedral. Hawkwood had the reputation of being the most skilful commander of his age; and in our own day he has been characterized by an eminent historian as "the first real general of modern times; the earliest master, however imperfect, in the science of Turenne and Wellington". Avignon was repeatedly threatened by these companies, which laid waste the country around it; and the popes endeavoured to protect themselves, sometimes by uttering anathemas, sometimes by engaging the aid of princes and nobles, but more successfully by the payment of large sums of money, by which the adventurers were persuaded to transfer themselves to some other quarter. Thus Innocent in 1362 bought off the "White company", which thereupon crossed the Alps, at the invitation of the marquis of Montferrat, and engaged in the wars of Italy. With a view to defence against such assailants, Innocent fortified his palace and the city of Avignon—enclosing within the walls an extent of ground which left room for the future increase of the place.

Rome had been in a state of confusion since the time of Rienzi's withdrawal, in January 1348. With a view to recovering his power over the city, and over the territory of the church, Innocent in 1353 sent into Italy an army under Giles Alborno, cardinal of St. Clement, a Spaniard, who had been a knight in his youth, and afterwards archbishop of Toledo—a man eminent both for military and for political talents. With this legate was joined Rienzi, who had been released from prison, and invested with the dignity of senator, in the hope that he might be able to resume his influence over the Romans, and that he would use it in the interest of the papacy. But although the citizens, weary of anarchy, appear to have begged that their former tribune might be restored to them, and received him with enthusiasm, he speedily forfeited their favour by his misconduct. The faults which had led to his earlier fall were repeated in a worse degree than before. The people were oppressed by heavy taxes levied on the necessaries of life. His power was exercised with caprice and cruelty; and especial distrust was excited by the death of one Pandulf, whose only crime was the possession of influence, and by that of Walter de Montreal, a famous Provençal condottiere, who, from having been formerly a knight of St. John, was commonly styled Brother Moreale. This man had offended against the public peace by acts which pope Innocent describes as worse than the outrages of Holofernes or of Totila; but his brothers had laid Rienzi under great obligations by advancing sums of money which were necessary to the fulfilment of his mission; and when the senator, in disregard of this, treacherously decoyed Moreale into his power, tortured him and put him to death, the victim's faults were forgotten in indignation at the manner of his end. Meanwhile Rienzi's personal habits became grossly sensual; he fed immoderately on sweetmeats, drank strong mixed wines at all hours, and showed the effect of these indulgences in the swelling of his body, which a contemporary likens to that of a fatted ox or of an abbot of unreason. His reputation was lowered by failure in an attempt to take the fortress of Palestrina from the Colonnas. Rome became impatient of his yoke, and his oratory had lost its power over the multitude. A rising took place, there were cries for his death, and Rienzi was arrested while attempting to escape in disguise. For an hour he was exposed to the derision of the mob, who then fell upon him, cut him to pieces, and treated his remains with indignities which showed the violence of their exasperation against him. Although, however, the attempt to turn Rienzi to account had utterly failed, the legate Alborno, a man of a very different stamp, conducted his affairs with such skill that he succeeded in recovering Bologna and the Romagna, with almost all the other ecclesiastical territories.

In 1354 the emperor Charles, with the pope's sanction, proceeded into Italy for his coronation. He found that the formidable archbishop of Milan, John Visconti, had died in consequence of a surgical operation, and had been succeeded in his secular power by his three nephews, of whom the eldest, Matthew, was soon after poisoned by his brothers Bernabò and Galeazzo, because his excessive dissoluteness endangered the interests of the family. Charles received the iron crown at Milan on the Epiphany, 1355, and, leaving Bernabò Visconti as his vicar (an appointment which greatly offended the pope), he continued his progress towards Rome. The smallness of the force by which he was accompanied—a mere escort of three hundred horsemen—disarmed the suspicion of the Italians, and, because of his very weakness, Charles was everywhere received with an extraordinary show of respect; even the rigid Guelf republicans of Florence did homage, and bound themselves to the payment of tribute. At Pisa he was strengthened by the arrival of those Germans whose duty required them to attend the emperor on such expeditions, so that he found himself at the head of a considerable force, composed of the Rower of the German nobility. A condition by which he had pledged himself not to enter Rome before the day of the coronation, had been in so far relaxed by the pope that, on arriving on Thursday in the holy week, he was allowed to visit the churches and the cardinals as a pilgrim. But his solemn entry was deferred until Easter-day, when he and his empress were crowned in St. Peter's by the cardinal-bishop of Ostia; and on the same day, agreeably to his engagement, he again left the city. Without having made an

attempt to recover any rights of the empire which had been invaded, or to establish any authority over Rome, Charles returned northward so hastily, and with so little display, that his journey almost resembled a flight; and Petrarch, who had urged him to revive the glories of Rome, and had been summoned to meet him at Mantua on his way to the coronation, expressed strongly the bitter disappointment of the hopes which he had rested on the emperor. In July 1355 Charles arrived again in Germany, enriched by the money which he had levied on the Italian cities, but without having increased his reputation.

Charles had announced from Piacenza that, if he should be permitted to return to Germany, he intended to do some good thing for the benefit of the kingdom and, in fulfilment of this promise, he summoned a diet to meet in January 1356 at Nuremberg, where the document known as his Golden Bull was enacted as a fundamental law of the empire. By this bull many circumstances of the election to the crown were settled—the forms to be observed, the duties of the chief officers, the time within which an election must take place after a vacancy, the election at Frankfort, and the coronation at Aix-la-Chapelle. By a provision which doubtless originated in Charles's own rare knowledge of languages, it was ordered that, whereas the empire consisted of various nations, the sons of the lay electors should, from their seventh to their fourteenth year, be instructed in Italian and Slavonic. But the bull was chiefly important as determining to whom the right of sharing in the election should belong. For as to this there had been much difficulty and uncertainty, from the circumstance that the rule of inheritance by primogeniture had not been established in the families of the lay electors, and that consequently their territories were liable to be broken up among several heirs, each of whom might claim the electoral suffrage. By the "golden bull" it was settled that in every case the vote should be attached to a certain portion of territory, which was to be regarded as the electoral land, and that this portion should descend according to the order of primogeniture. The claim of the pope to interfere with the election was not mentioned at all; and it was assumed that in Germany, at least, the king or emperor had full power from the time of his election, so as to need no confirmation in his office. The "priests' emperor" had secured the crown against the pretensions of the papacy; and Innocent was greatly annoyed at the result.

After a pontificate of nearly ten years, Innocent died on the 12th of September 1362. Twenty cardinals assembled for the choice of a successor; but they were unable to agree as to the promotion of one of their own body, and their choice fell on William de Grimoard, a native of the diocese of Mende, and abbot of the Benedictine monastery of St. Victor at Marseilles. The new pope, Urban V, who was supposed to have been elected under a special influence of the Holy Ghost, had attained the age of sixty, was respected alike for his sanctity and for his learning, and had exerted himself greatly in the service of the church. Like his predecessor, he showed himself an enemy to the corruptions of the court, to simony, pluralities, and non-residence. He took away from the houses of the cardinals the privilege of sanctuary, which had been much abused. As pope he retained the monastic dress and the simplicity of monastic habits but, while thus sparing of expense on himself, he laid out vast sums for the benefit of the church, as on the restoration of the Roman churches and palaces, the erection and endowment of a monastery and a college at Montpellier, and the encouragement of learning by maintaining a thousand students in various universities, and by liberally supplying them with books. He chose his cardinals for their merit alone, whereas the late popes had limited their choice to such persons as were devoted to the French interest. Nor did he fall into the usual fault of enriching his own kindred, whether laymen or clergy, at the expense of the church; for only two of his near relatives were advanced to the prelacy, and of these it is said that both were deserving, and that one was promoted at the special request of the cardinals.

The south of France continued for a time to be infested by the free companies; but at length they were put down under this pontificate. In Italy, however, the evil endured longer, and the country suffered greatly from the power, the tyranny, and the ambition of Bernabò

Visconti, who was now the head of his family. Innocent had proclaimed in 1356 a crusade against the Visconti for detaining certain cities which belonged to the church; but the design was marred by the misconduct of the preachers, who endeavoured to make a profit for themselves out of the indulgences which they were authorized to offer, and the payments for exemption from service.

Bernabò showed himself especially hostile to the clergy. For instance, it is said that he seized a priest who had been sent to preach the crusade, put him into an iron cage, and roasted him to death on a gridiron; and that he caused some Franciscans to be shod with iron, like horses, the nails being driven into their feet. He declared himself to be both pope and emperor within his own dominions; he tore up papal letters, and imprisoned the bearers of them; Urban himself when sent to him as legate by pope Innocent, had been forced to swallow the bull which he carried, with the leaden seal and the string by which it was attached to the parchment; and he compelled a priest of Parma to utter an anathema against Innocent and the cardinals. The pope denounced him excommunicate, authorized his wife to separate from him as a heretic and unbeliever, formed an alliance against him with the emperor and with some Italian states, and put off, in favour of a crusade against Bernabò, one in which king John of France and many of his nobles had enlisted themselves for the recovery of the Holy Land. But Bernabò was able to hold his ground, and the pope was glad at length to conclude a peace with him, by which Bologna was recovered for the papacy, while Urban undertook to mediate for him with the emperor.

Urban before his election had been strongly in favour of restoring the papal residence to Rome, and he was now entreated to act on the desire which he had expressed. The emperor Charles urged him; the Romans invited him to take up his abode among them; Peter, a prince of Aragon, who had become a Franciscan, brought the authority of visions in support of the return; and Petrarch renewed the suit which he had so often made to preceding popes. The poet represents the desolate state of Rome, where the holiest and most venerable buildings lay in heartrending decay, while the pope lived in ease and splendour on the banks of the Rhone. He dwells on the beauty of Italy, which wanted nothing but peace, while he sneers at Avignon as the "native country of the winds". He even argues from Urban's name the duty of returning to the city. He endeavours to gain over the cardinals, whom he supposes reluctant to tear themselves away from the wines of Burgundy, by assuring them that Italy too has its delicious wines, and that in any case they will be able to import the other vintages. In a loftier strain Petrarch admonishes Urban by a comparison between the ancient capital of Christendom and the French city which had become infamous for its vices from the time when the popes made it their residence; and, after setting forth the terrors of the judgment-day and of the account to be then exacted, he asks the pope whether he would rather choose to rise with the notorious sinners of Avignon, or with St. Peter and St. Paul, St. Stephen and St. Laurence, and the thousands of other saints whose relics or whose memories were connected with Rome.

On the other hand, Nicolas Oreme, an ecclesiastic attached to the French court, argued in behalf of Avignon and of France, insisting especially on the superiority of that country in literary fame. But Petrarch indignantly rejoined that many of the men to whom France owed its renown in letters were of Italian birth, as Peter Lombard, Thomas of Aquino, Bonaventura, and Giles Colonna; and, as he had been blamed for calling Gaul a place of exile, he justified the phrase by referring to the banishment of Herod and of Pilate.

In May 1365 the emperor Charles visited Avignon, professedly in order to concert measures for the crusade; but the visit resulted in an agreement that both the pope and the emperor should go to Rome in the next year but one. The cardinals were opposed to the removal of the court; but Urban, who had never been a member of the college, set light by their opposition, and is said to have made two new cardinals by way of showing his power April 30, over them. On this they took alarm, and while some of them reluctantly

accompanied him, breaking out into lamentations and reproaches as they put to sea, others made the journey by land, although five stubbornly remained at Avignon.

On landing at Corneto he was met by the legate Alborno, to whose prudence and warlike skill the papacy had been indebted for the recovery of much of its temporal power, but this eminent man died at Viterbo during Urban's stay there. The insolence of a cardinal's servant, who washed a favourite dog in a public fountain, excited the populace of Viterbo to a tumult, in which cries of "Death to the church!" were raised, and it was suspected that the outbreak was contrived by the cardinals in the hope of disgusting the pope with Italy.

At Rome, however, he was welcomed with enthusiasm; and within a year from the time of his arrival he received the homage, not only of the queen of Naples and of the king of Cyprus, but of the emperors both of the west and of the east. John Palaeologus, whose object was to obtain the aid of the western Christians against the Turks, acknowledged in all points the faith of the Roman church and the claims of the papacy. Charles behaved towards the pope with the deepest show of reverence : he led his horse from the gate of St. Angelo to St. Peter's, and then officiated as deacon at a mass celebrated by Urban, who placed the crown on the head of the emperor's fourth wife. But we learn from an eye-witness that, while the clergy were exulting over this subordination of the temporal to the spiritual dignity, other persons viewed with deep disgust a scene which they regarded as a humiliation of the empire. The pope himself was disappointed at finding that Charles, instead of carrying out an alliance against Bernabò Visconti, made peace with him on condition of receiving a large sum of money. In like manner the emperor allowed himself to be bought off by various cities on his way homewards; and, as after his former visit, he returned to Prague with the general contempt of the Italians.

Urban's favourite place of residence was Monte Fiascone, which he preferred to Rome on account of its quiet and of its more salubrious air; and there, in September 1368, he increased the preponderance of the French party among the cardinals by adding six Frenchmen to the college, while of other nations there were only one Italian and one Englishman.

After three years spent in Italy, the pope announced his intention of returning to Avignon. To the Romans, who remonstrated, he expressed gratitude for the peace which he and the members of his court had enjoyed among them, and assured them that he would still be with them in heart; but he alleged the necessity of public affairs—a plea which, although it might have been warranted by the renewal of war between France and England, is supposed to have really meant that the French cardinals would no longer endure to be at a distance from the delights of Avignon. St. Bridget of Sweden, whose oracles exercised a powerful influence on the age, solemnly warned the pope that, if he returned to France, it would be only to die; Peter of Aragon added his monitions to the same purpose; and these prophetic threats were supposed to be fulfilled when Urban's arrival at Avignon was followed within three months by his death. In his last sickness he formally retracted anything (if such there were) that he might have taught or said contrary to the faith of the church. The general reverence for his character was expressed in a belief that miracles were done at his grave and it is supposed that his canonization, which was solicited by Waldemar III of Denmark and others, was prevented only by the troubles which soon after came on the papacy.

GREGORY XI. MASSACRE OF CESENA

On the 30th of December, Peter Roger, cardinal of Sta. Maria Nuova, was elected to the vacant chair, and took the name of Gregory XI. He was a nephew of Clement VI, by whom he had been advanced to the cardinalate at the age of seventeen or eighteen; but Clement, "lest he should seem to have conferred with flesh and blood", had been careful to place the young cardinal under the best tutors, so that Gregory was respected for his learning

in civil and in canon law, as well as for his modesty, prudence, and generosity. The chief defect noted in him was that same regard for family interests to which he had owed his own early promotion.

Gregory took an active part in the affairs of Italy, where Bernabò Visconti and his brother Galeazzo continued to be formidable. In 1372 a bull was issued by which they were excommunicated, their subjects were released from allegiance, and all Christians were invited to take part in a holy war against them. There were serious commotions in the papal states, where eighty towns threw off their subjection to Rome. Robert, cardinal of Geneva, was sent into the Romagna as legate, with a band of Breton mercenaries, whose acts of license excited the detestation of the people. At Cesena a rising took place, in which some hundreds of them were killed, and the rest were driven from the town. The legate, having secured the cooperation of the famous condottiere Sir John Hawkwood, persuaded the citizens to admit him peaceably, allowing that they had received great provocation from his troops, and even (it is said) swearing that no vengeance should be taken if they would lay down their arms. Having thus lulled them into security, he then gave loose to a massacre in which, according to some writers, three thousand perished, while others reckon the number at four, five, or even eight thousand. A thousand women were saved by the humanity of Hawkwood, who furnished them with an escort; but atrocious acts of cruelty were committed by the infuriated Bretons; and it is said that the cardinal overcame the scruples of Hawkwood and his men by desiring that all the inhabitants might be killed indiscriminately.

The Florentines, for their resistance to the papal authority, against which they had formed an extensive league, were put under ban and interdict in March 1376. It was even declared that they might be made slaves, and advantage was taken of this against many of them who were in England, while their old rivals of Genoa and Pisa, by scrupling to act on the permission, incurred the penalty of interdict against themselves. The Florentines entreated the mediation of St. Catharine of Siena, whose austerities were supposed to be connected with prophetic insight and she, having repaired to Avignon for the purpose of pleading their cause, used the opportunity to set before the pope the misgovernment of the ecclesiastical states, and to urge his return to Rome. The voice of Petrarch was no longer to be heard in the cause which he had so often advocated but St. Bridget of Sweden, who had seen the beginning of Gregory's pontificate, had solemnly warned him, on the ground of revelations, that, unless he returned to Rome within a certain time, the States of the Church would be rent asunder, even as her messenger was charged to read the letter which he conveyed, and her prophetic authority had been inherited by her daughter, St. Catharine of Sweden, who now joined her representations to those of the virgin of Siena.

It is said that Gregory had vowed that, if he should be chosen pope, he would return to Rome; and, in addition to all other incitements, he was now convinced that his interest in Italy suffered, and was even in danger of being absolutely ruined, through his absence. The Bolognese had driven out the legate and all the papal officials; the sovereignty of the church was hardly anywhere acknowledged throughout the ecclesiastical states. It is said, too, that the pope was much influenced by the repartee of a bishop, who, on being asked by him why he did not go to his diocese, retorted the question on Gregory himself. In 1376 Gregory announced his intention of returning to Rome; and, although it was opposed by the French king, by his own relations, and by many of his cardinals, six of whom refused to leave Avignon, he set out on the 13th of September. After a tedious journey, performed partly by land and partly by sea, he landed at St. Paul's on the 15th of January 1377, and his entrance into Rome was welcomed with great demonstrations of joy. The "Babylonian captivity" of seventy years was ended.

Gregory, however, soon found that his course was beset with difficulties. Although the hostility of the Visconti had been appeased by a compact that Galeazzo should retain certain towns on consideration of paying a sum of money to the papal treasury, the differences with

Florence still remained, and the nobles of Rome and of the ecclesiastical states were insubordinate. The pope could not feel himself at home in his capital. The ruinous state of the walls, the churches, the palaces, and other buildings, depressed him. The long absence of the court, and the anarchy of Rome, had produced an offensive rudeness in the manners of the citizens. Even his want of acquaintance with the language of his subjects—the meaning of which he could only guess at by the help of Latin, French, and Provençal—aggravated not a little the discomfort of Gregory's position. It is believed that he meditated a return to Avignon, when he was seized with an illness, which, acting on a weak constitution, carried him off on the 27th of March 1378, at the age of forty-seven. His feeling towards the saints whose prophetic admonitions had influenced him in his removal to Rome is said to have been remarkably shown on his death-bed, when, holding the holy Eucharist in his hands, he warned those who stood around against the pretensions of enthusiastic men or women who uttered as revelations the fancies of their own brains.

A Florentine embassy had been well received at Rome but the terms of reconciliation which Gregory proposed were too severe to be accepted; and when the pope in turn sent some envoys to Florence, the citizens not only refused to submit to their proposals, but compelled the clergy to defy the interdict, which had until then been so far respected that the offices of religion had been performed with closed doors. The pope retaliated by aggravated denunciations; but at length certain terms of peace had been agreed on, when the death of Gregory put an end to the negotiation.

The eagerness of Charles IV to secure the imperial crown for his own family had furnished Gregory with an opportunity for asserting the papal claim to a control over elections to the empire. On the emperor's proposing that his son Wenceslaus, then only seventeen years of age, should be chosen as king of the Romans, some of the electors (perhaps from a wish to hide their own dislike of the scheme) expressed an apprehension that the pope might object; and Charles, in contradiction to the principles asserted by the union of Rhense in 1338, and afterwards in his own golden bull, applied for the pope's consent. The election of a son during his father's lifetime was opposed to the Roman policy, which discouraged the idea of inheritance in the imperial crown, and even Rudolf of Hapsburg had failed in a similar request. But Gregory, in consideration of the advantage which the papacy might derive from the acknowledgment that his sanction was necessary, assented after some delay, although with the warning that his assent was not to become a precedent. Although Charles himself, in his golden bull, had charged the electors to give their votes gratuitously, and had prescribed that they should swear to do so, he was obliged to pay heavily, both in money and in capitulations, for his son's election, and even to pledge or alienate some cities and territories which belonged to the imperial crown.

In another quarter Gregory obtained a success which was rather apparent than real. The long contest between the Angevine dynasty of Naples and the house of Aragon for the possession of Sicily was ended in 1372 by a treaty which Frederick of Sicily concluded with Joanna and her husband Lewis. By this, the island was to be held under the Apulian crown, on condition of paying tribute, and of furnishing soldiers in case of war; and the title of king of Sicily was to belong to the sovereign of Apulia, while the actual ruler was to style himself king of Trinacria. The "Sicilian monarchy", which, although originally sanctioned by a pope, had been a grievous offence to his successors, was to be abolished; and in other respects the treaty was greatly in favour of the papacy. But these terms were never carried into effect. The papal confirmation was not sought either by Frederick or by his daughter Mary, who succeeded him in 1377. Sicily never performed the feudal obligations which had been stipulated; and its sovereigns, so long as the island remained a separate kingdom, bore in their title the name, not of Trinacria, but of "Sicily beyond the Strait".

CHAPTER V.

THE GREAT SCHISM OF THE WEST, TO THE END OF THE COUNCIL OF
PISA.

A. D. 1378-1409.

AT the death of Gregory XI the Romans were resolved to put an end, if possible, to the residence of the popes in France, by insisting that one of their own countrymen should be chosen. Gregory, foreseeing the danger of a schism, had, in the last days of his life, made a decree that a pope chosen by a majority of the cardinals should be acknowledged, whether the election were made in Rome or elsewhere, and although the usual formalities of the conclave were not observed. But the Romans were bent on carrying out their purpose. In order that the cardinals might not escape from the city, they took the keys of the gates from the officials of the church, and replaced the sentinels by partisans of their own; they expelled the nobles, and, with a view to overawing the electors, they called in a multitude of armed and half-savage peasants from the neighbouring mountains, while Italian prelates, within and without the city, were busily employed in stirring up the people. The number of cardinals then at Rome was sixteen—four Italians, a Spaniard (Peter de Luna), and eleven Frenchmen, of whom seven were Limousins; while of the other seven members of the college one was employed as legate in Tuscany, and the rest had remained at Avignon. It was with difficulty that the electors were able to make their way through the threatening crowd which beset the Vatican, and, as they entered the chamber appointed for the conclave, they were alarmed by a violent thunderstorm, which seemed like an omen of coming evil. But they were yet more terrified by the behaviour of the multitude, which had forced its way into the palace, furiously clamouring, “We will have a Roman, or at least an Italian!” After a time the greater part were turned out, but about forty persisted in remaining; they searched the beds of the cardinals and the most secret corners of the apartment, in order to discover any men who might be hidden, or any private outlet by which the electors might escape; and, as the Romans had not allowed the usual form of walling up the entrance to be observed, the intruders were able to terrify the cardinals by their menaces and by their display of force.

The French cardinals, although more than twice as many as all the rest, were weakened by a division among themselves; for the Limousins, who for six-and-thirty years had enjoyed the papacy and its patronage, wished to choose one of their own number, while the other section, headed by Robert of Geneva, was resolutely opposed to the election of a Limousin. Each of these factions, if unable to carry a candidate of its own, would have preferred an Italian to one of the rival French party; and thus the Italians, although few, found that they held the balance in their hands.

As the tumult increased, two bannerets of Rome (the chiefs of the regions into which the city was divided) asked admittance, and urged the expediency of yielding to the wishes of the people. But they were told that the election was a matter with which no personal regards must interfere; that the cardinals, after having celebrated the mass of the Holy Ghost on the morrow, would be guided by Him alone in their choice. All through the night the uproar waxed wilder and wilder. The ruffians who had remained in the palace, after having unwillingly consented that the conclave should be shut, took up their position in the room below; they plundered the papal stores of food and wine in their heightened excitement, they dashed their swords and lances against the ceiling, so as to add to the terror of the cardinals, and even

made preparations as if for burning the palace; while the multitude without kept up their cries for a Roman or an Italian, mingled with shouts of "Death to the cardinals!". The great bells of St. Peter's and of the Capitol were beaten with hammers as if the city were on fire.

In the morning the numbers of the mob were greater than ever. When the cardinals were at mass, the words of the service could not be heard for the noise without; and now the cry was for a Roman only. The cardinals again met for the election, while the door of the conclave was assailed with violent blows, and the noise became louder every moment. It was suggested that someone should be declared pope, in order to appease the multitude, and that another should be privately chosen, with a view to his being afterwards substituted for the first. The cardinal of Florence proposed Francis Tibaldeschi, cardinal of St. Sabina, and archpriest of St. Peter's, the oldest member of the college; but the motion met with no support; and on a second vote, all, with the exception of James Orsini, who declined to act under such coercion, agreed in the choice of Bartholomew Prignani, archbishop of Bari, who was not a cardinal, but, as being at once an Italian and a subject of the French sovereign of Naples, might be supposed to be acceptable to both parties. On the announcement of the election an accident led the multitude to believe that it had fallen on Tibaldeschi. They plundered his palace, according to the custom on such occasions, forced a way into the conclave, and overwhelmed the old man with violent congratulations, while he strove to make them understand their mistake, and desired them, even with curses, to let him go. In the meantime the cardinals dispersed in terror, leaving their hats and cloaks behind them, and some of them were severely handled by the mob.

Next day, however, they met again; and, although the announcement of the archbishop of Bari's election caused some tumult, as his title was mistaken for the name of James of Bar, a Limousin of the papal household, he was peaceably invested with the mantle of office. It is said that, in answer to his doubts as to the validity of his election, the cardinals assured him that all had been rightly and fairly done. He received their homage, and they all took part in his coronation, which was solemnly performed on Easter-day. The election was announced to the sovereigns of Europe, not, as had been usual, by the pope himself but by the cardinals; and they also reported it to their brethren at Avignon in a letter which declared that their choice had been made unanimously, and (as they professed to believe) under the direction of the Holy Spirit.

Urban VI (as the new pope styled himself) was a Neapolitan of humble birth, and a man of strictly ascetic life. He was deeply read in ecclesiastical law, but was more especially respected for his devotion to the study of Scripture, and for the humility, the disinterestedness, the equity, and the compassion which were supposed to mark his character. But almost immediately after his elevation, it began to appear that some of the virtues by which he had been hitherto distinguished were exchanged for qualities of an opposite kind. He was open to flattery, while, in dealing with his cardinals and with other high ecclesiastics, he behaved with a haughtiness and a rudeness which were felt to be intolerable, and called forth open remonstrances. Even his good actions were so done as to produce an unfavourable impression. He announced reforms of an unpopular kind, without any consideration for the prejudices or the interests which might be affected by them. He threatened to reduce the luxurious cardinals to one dish at table, after his own example; to overwhelm the French influence in the college by the addition of Romans and Italians; and he further provoked the French cardinals by absolutely refusing to go to Avignon. Preaching in his own chapel, he denounced the bishops who were at the court as perjured for neglecting their dioceses; to which the bishop of Pampeluna immediately replied that the charge was in his case untrue, as he was there on diocesan business. The pope desired the cardinals to repair to the churches from which they took their titles, and to reside at them. At a consistory he charged such of them as had been sent on embassies with having allowed themselves to be bribed; to which James de la Grange, cardinal of St. Marcellus, retorted, "As archbishop of Bari you lie!", and the cardinal, who

was one of the French king's councillors, went off to use his influence with Charles V in opposition to Urban. Joanna of Naples had celebrated the election of the Neapolitan pope by public festivities; she sent him magnificent presents of money, food, and wine, and deputed her husband, duke Otho of Brunswick, to convey her congratulations and respects to him; but Urban, although he had formerly been on terms of friendship with the duke, now treated him with such discourtesy that Otho returned to Naples indignant and alienated. St. Catharine of Siena, although she adhered zealously to Urban in the differences which afterwards arose, found herself compelled to remonstrate with him on his irascibility and on the impolicy of his behaviour.

The majority of the cardinals, angry and disgusted at his treatment of them, and the more so because they saw that he endeavoured to ingratiate himself with the people of Rome, began to question the soundness of the pope's mind, and to consider how they might rid themselves of him. One by one they made their way out of the city, and assembled at Anagni, where they invited Urban to join them. Instead of complying with this request, he summoned them to Tivoli, where he was with the four Italian cardinals; but they answered that they could not conveniently leave Anagni, as they had laid in large stores of provisions there. Their design, which had probably been nothing more than to draw Urban into a capitulation, was now carried further. In the presence of three of their Italian brethren, who had conveyed the pope's invitation, they swore on the Gospels that their consent to Urban's election had been extorted only by the fear of death; and on the 9th of August, after having celebrated a solemn mass, they sent forth a letter in which they renounced him as an apostate and a deceiver—professing to have chosen him in the trust that, as a man of integrity and acquainted with the canon law, he would feel himself bound to regard as null an election which had been made under constraint, and to take the earliest safe opportunity of declaring its nullity.

Yet, although the election had unquestionably been influenced by fear of the Roman populace,—although the cardinals, if they had been free, would probably have chosen otherwise,—their choice of Urban had really been rather a compromise than a compliance with the will of the multitude, who had cried out for one of their own fellow-citizens, and, far from wishing for the archbishop of Bari, had been eager to enthrone the cardinal of St. Peter's. And, whatever might have been the original defects in Urban's title, the cardinals appear to have debarred themselves from insisting on these. They had, it would seem, gone through a second form of election, in order to make the matter sure; they had accepted him after the restoration of peace in the city; they had with apparent willingness taken part in all the forms which were necessary in order to put him completely into possession of the papacy; they had announced his elevation to the Avignon cardinals and to the sovereigns of Christendom as having been made in due form, and even under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. They had assisted at his celebration of the most solemn rites. They had solicited and received preferment at his hands, for themselves or their friends, even since their withdrawal to Anagni. In all possible ways they had acknowledged him, until driven by his outrageous behaviour to seek for pretexts which might warrant them in forsaking and superseding him.

The cardinals now hired a band of Breton and Gascon soldiers to protect them. They got possession of the papal jewels and insignia, which had been deposited in the castle of St. Angelo. They entered into an understanding with the queen of Naples, and removed from Anagni to Fondi, within the Neapolitan territory, where the count of the place, a turbulent man of the Gaetani family, who had long held the government of Campania under the Roman church, was induced by his enmity against Urban to support them. They persuaded three out of the four Italian cardinals to join them—it is said, by holding out to each the hope of being chosen as pope. They endeavoured to fortify their cause by procuring the opinions of eminent lawyers; but in this their success was imperfect, as the jurists in general held that the election of Urban had been regular, or that, if it were not so, the power of amending it belonged, not to the cardinals, but to a general council.

CLEMENT VII, ANTIPOPE

The aged cardinal of St. Peter's was the only member of the college who still adhered to Urban; but he did not long survive. Urban now announced an intention of creating nine cardinals; but in the Ember-week of September he proceeded to bestow the dignity at once on twenty-nine persons—a number which exceeded that of the French and the Italians together. Many of these were Neapolitans like himself and recommended by powerful family connexions, or by other circumstances which might enable them to exercise an influence in his favour among their countrymen.

On the 20th of the same month, the rebellious cardinals at Fondi renewed their declarations against Urban, and, although the Italian members of the college withdrew before the election, chose as pope Robert of Geneva, cardinal of the Twelve Apostles and bishop of Cambay, who took the name of Clement VII. The antipope, who was recommended to them by his enterprising spirit, as well as by his birth—which connected him with almost all the chief princes of Europe—was only thirty-six years of age. His qualities were rather those of a warrior than of a prelate; he had been the leader of a company of Breton mercenaries, and had been deeply concerned in the massacre of Cesena, and in other barbarities by which the late contests of Italy had been stained. The election of Clement was accepted by the cardinals of Avignon and thus was begun the great schism of the west, which for nearly forty years distracted Latin Christendom, between rivals who hurled against each other the spiritual weapons of excommunication and anathema, while each loaded the other with charges of the worst of crimes. France declared for Clement, although not until 1379, when Charles V requested the university of Paris to give a judgment on the question. The faculties of theology, law, and medicine, with the French and Norman nations in the department of arts, pronounced in favour of Clement, and the neutrality of the English and Picard nations of “artists” was overpowered. England was on the side of Urban, because France was with Clement; and Scotland was for Clement, because England was with Urban. Germany and Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, and Portugal, tired of the long series of French popes, were in favour of Urban; so, too, was all Italy except the Neapolitan kingdom, which he had alienated by his behaviour to queen Joanna's husband, and by showing an inclination to favour the pretensions of Charles of Durazzo as a rival claimant of her throne. Castile and Aragon were brought, after some delay, to declare for Clement—in great measure through the skilful negotiations of his legate, cardinal Peter de Luna. Within a short time after the beginning of the schism, changes occurred by which the chief thrones of Europe were transferred from experienced sovereigns to princes whom a writer of the time describes in general as voluptuous youths, and whose authority was not such as to exercise much influence in the question. In France, Charles V, a king distinguished for his prudence and for his love of learning and the arts, was succeeded by his son Charles VI, a boy of fourteen, who from his early manhood became subject to fits of lunacy, in consequence of which the kingdom fell a prey to the rivalries of the princes of the blood. In England, Edward III had been succeeded in 1377 by the young and feeble Richard II. In Germany and Bohemia, Charles IV was succeeded by his son Wenceslaus, whose slender capacity was obscured by continual debauchery. Nor, while the power of sovereigns was thus ineffective, was there any predominant saint who, like Bernard in an earlier age, could, by throwing his influence into the scale of one of the claimants of the papacy, have made the other to be generally regarded as an antipope. On each side there were saints and prophets whom their contemporaries regarded with veneration : while Urban had with him Catharine of Siena, Catharine of Sweden, and the royal friar-prophet, Peter of Aragon, Clement was supported by the great Spanish Dominican preacher, Vincent Ferrer, and by a prince of Luxemburg, Peter, bishop of Metz and cardinal, who, although he died at the age of eighteen in 1387, continued after death to throw over the cause of the Avignon

popes the lustre of innumerable miracles. Nor has the question as to the legitimacy of the two popes, and of the lines founded by them respectively, been ever decided by any authority which is regarded as final. It was carefully avoided by the councils which were assembled with a view to healing the schism; and in later times, while writers of the Roman communion in general have been in favour of the Italian popes, the Gallicans have maintained the title of the French line. As to the practical question of communion with the popes of one or the other party, the judgment of St. Antoninus of Florence appears to be commonly accepted—that, while Christians in general are not bound to have such knowledge of canon law as would qualify them to judge of the elections, they are safe in following those who are set over them in the church.

Soon after his election Clement proceeded to Naples, where he was received with great honour by the queen. But the people were on the side of Urban, as being their countryman, and he had strengthened his interest by including several Neapolitans in his late creation of cardinals. Cries of “Death to the antipope and the queen!” were raised in the streets and Clement, after a time, found it expedient to make his way by Marseilles to Avignon, where he settled under the protection of the king of France, and found himself obliged to endure the miseries of a dependent position.

In the meantime Urban was successful in Italy. A mercenary force which he engaged, under a native captain, Alberic of Barbiano, defeated and broke up the Breton and Gascon bands which were in the pay of the opposite party. The castle of St. Angelo, which had been held for the cardinals, was now for the first time assailed by artillery, and fell into the hands of the Romans, who dismantled it and barbarously mutilated it by pulling down a large part of the marble facing, and employing the stones in paving the streets.

Urban was resolved to make Joanna feel the weight of his enmity. He stirred up Charles of Durazzo, the last representative of the Angevine dynasty, to make an attempt on the Apulian crown, instead of waiting until the course of nature should give it to him. The enterprise was favoured by the oracular utterances of St. Catharine of Siena, and in order to contribute to the expenses of it, Urban sold the plate, the jewels, and other precious ornaments of churches, and even alienated ecclesiastical property without regard to the will of the incumbents. In April 1380 he pronounced Joanna, as a heretic and schismatic, to be deprived of her kingdom and of all fiefs held under the Roman see, released her subjects from their allegiance, and proclaimed a crusade against her. Charles was received at Rome with great honour, was anointed as king of Sicily, and was invested in the dominion of all southern Italy, except the papal city of Benevento, with Capua, Amalfi, and other places, which Urban wished to form into a principality for his nephew, Francis Prignano. On the other hand, Joanna resolved to call in to her assistance Lewis, duke of Anjou, a prince of warlike character, whom she adopted as her heir; and the Avignon pope not only sanctioned this, but professed to bestow on Lewis a portion of the papal states, which was to be styled the kingdom of Adria, on condition that neither he nor his successors should accept an election to the German crown, or to the lordship of Lombardy. The gift was one which cost Clement nothing, as the papal territory was in the hands of his rival, and there was a hope that, by professing to give a part, he might gain the assistance of Lewis towards the acquisition of the rest. But the plan failed. While Lewis remained in France, busily engaged in securing the inheritance which had fallen to him by his brother's death, Charles invaded southern Italy. Otho, although distinguished for his military skill, was without money, and was unsupported by the people, who had been irritated by the demand of a heavy war-tax; and Charles, after having defeated him at San Germano, got possession of Naples. The queen was compelled to surrender herself to the victor, and it is commonly believed that by his command she was smothered or strangled in prison. Her death and the manner of it are said to have been determined by the advice of king Lewis of Hungary, who thus avenged, even in its very circumstances, the murder of his brother Andrew. When at length Lewis of Anjou was able to enter Italy at the head of a

powerful and brilliant army, he found that the policy of Charles had raised up difficulties which beset him in his passage through Lombardy. His troops suffered severely from the want of provisions and from the inclemency of the weather, while Charles declined meeting him in the field, and left these enemies to do their work,—so that the soldiers, according to the expression of a contemporary, “died like dogs”, and Lewis himself was carried off by a fever at Bari. His force was utterly broken up, and gallant nobles, who had accompanied him in full confidence of victory, were obliged to beg their way in rags back to France, while Charles remained undisputed sovereign of Naples.

To Urban it seemed that the new king, of whose success he regarded himself as the author, was slow in showing the expected gratitude for his support, and especially in contributing to provide a territory for his nephew, Francis (who was commonly called Butillo). He therefore resolved to go in person to Naples, and when his cardinals endeavoured to dissuade him, he burst into a fury, which seemed to confirm their suspicions of his sanity, and threatened to depose them. At Aversa he was met by Charles, who received him with a show of honour, and acted as his esquire; but both at Aversa and Naples he was closely guarded, from fear that he might engage in political intrigues; and when this restraint was about to be relaxed, a difficulty was caused by the misconduct of the foolish and profligate Butillo, who seduced and carried off a noble and beautiful nun of the order of St. Clare. For this he was condemned to death by the king’s court of justice; but Urban (who usually excused his nephew’s excesses by the plea of youth, although Butillo had reached the age of forty), declared that he himself was suzerain of the Apulian kingdom, and that in his presence no other tribunal had jurisdiction over a grandee. Charles was unwilling to carry matters to an extremity, as the French invasion had not yet passed away. The cardinals, therefore, were able to compound the dispute, by arranging that Butillo should marry a lady related to the king, and Urban withdrew with all his cardinals to Nocera.

During his stay at Naples, Urban had deprived all such clergy of that city as were suspected of leaning to the opposite interest, and, in filling up the vacancies, he had put many low men into dignities for which they were grossly unfit. He had promoted at once thirty-two Neapolitans to archbishoprics and bishoprics. He now resolved on a new creation of cardinals, among whom he wished to include the three ecclesiastical electors of Germany; but these all declined to bind themselves to his fortunes by accepting the doubtful honour. And when he offered it to a number of the Neapolitan clergy, he had the double mortification of finding that they refused from fear of offending the king, and that the cardinalate was discredited in the general estimation by the characters of those whom he had thought worthy of it.

Charles invited Urban to a conference, but was told in answer that it was for kings to wait on popes, not for popes to wait on kings; and he was charged to relieve his subjects from the heavy taxes which he had imposed on them. On hearing this he indignantly exclaimed that the kingdom was his own,—that the pope had no concern with the government of any but the priests; and that he would go to Urban, but at the head of an army. For some weeks the pope was besieged in Nocera, where he showed himself at a window three or four times a-day, pronouncing with bell and lighted candle the sentence of excommunication against his besiegers. He even talked of deposing Charles in punishment for his ingratitude. The old man’s perverseness, self-will, and irritability became intolerable even to the cardinals of his own promotion; and some of them submitted to an able, but somewhat unscrupulous, lawyer, Bartoline of Piacenza, a set of questions, among which was this—whether, if a pope should conduct himself in such a way as to endanger the weal of Christendom by negligence, obstinacy, and engrossing all power, to the exclusion of the advice of the cardinals, these would not be warranted in placing him under the charge of curators. Bartoline replied in the affirmative, and other opinions to the same effect were obtained, although some of those who were consulted thought otherwise. Urban, on being informed of this proceeding by a cardinal who was not concerned in it, caused six of the cardinals to be thrown into a dungeon which

had been formerly used as a cistern, and after a time brought them to trial before his consistory. By the application of torture, they were driven to confess anything that was required; and while Butillo stood by, laughing immoderately at their agonies and shrieks, his uncle walked up and down in the adjoining garden, calmly reciting his canonical hours in a loud tone, so that the executioners might be aware of his presence, and might do their work with vigour. The cardinals were then remanded to their prison, where they suffered from hunger and thirst, from darkness, stench, and vermin; one of them, De Sangro, whose place of confinement was seen by Theodoric of Niem, had not room to stretch himself in any direction.

At length Urban, for whose surrender 10,000 florins had been offered, was rescued from his uneasy position by Thomas of San Severino, and hurried, with his prisoners, across the country to a place on the Adriatic coast, between Trani and Barletta, where he had arranged that a Genoese fleet should be ready to receive him. The bishop of Aquila, who was unable from illness to ride so fast as the rest of the party, was killed on the way by the pope's commands. The six cardinals were carried to Palermo, and thence to Genoa; and there five of them were put to death, with circumstances of mystery which have given rise to a variety of reports—that they were beheaded in prison, that they were buried alive, or that they were put into sacks and cast into the sea. The sixth, Adam Easton, cardinal of St. Cecilia, was spared at the intercession of his sovereign, Richard II, but was degraded from his dignity, and was kept in rigorous imprisonment until after the death of Urban, by whose successor he was reinstated. Two other cardinals, alarmed by the fate of their fellows, made their way from Genoa to Avignon, where they were admitted into the rival college by Clement; one of them, Pileo de Prata, archbishop of Ravenna, having publicly burnt his official hat at Pavia. Within little more than a year after his arrival at Genoa, Urban quarrelled with the doge, to whom he had been indebted for his safety; and he left the city in the middle of December 1386 for Lucca. There he was urged by envoys from the princes of Germany to take measures for ending the schism; but he answered that he was the true pope, and could not throw doubt on his title. From Lucca he removed to Perugia, but he was compelled to leave that place by the scandal which had been occasioned by his nephew Butillo's licentiousness, and in August 1388 he returned to Rome.

Charles of Durazzo, having firmly established himself in the kingdom of Naples, set off, in compliance with an invitation from a party in Hungary, to assert his claims to the throne of that country, where Mary, the daughter of king Lewis, notwithstanding a law which excluded females from the crown, had been chosen "king" on her father's death in 1382. Charles had sworn that he would not disturb the daughters of Lewis in their inheritance; but Mary was persuaded to resign, and he was solemnly crowned in her stead. He was not, however, long allowed to enjoy his new acquisition. Through the contrivance of the late king's widow he was treacherously attacked by assassins, and he died of his wounds soon after; when the Hungarian crown again fell to Mary, who had been betrothed to Sigismund, son of the emperor Charles IV, Urban made difficulties as to allowing Christian burial to Charles, and refused to invest his son Ladislaus, a boy only ten years old, in the Neapolitan kingdom; but by thus indulging his enmity against Charles and his family, he encouraged the interest of his own rival, who favoured the claims of the younger Lewis of Anjou to the Neapolitan crown. The kingdom was for a time a prey to anarchy, while the effect of the schism in weakening the papacy aided the designs of John Galeazzo Visconti—a deeply politic and utterly unscrupulous man, who had deposed and poisoned his uncle Bernabò—to gain a predominating influence in Italy. Urban, on his return to Rome, had been coldly received, and he afterwards increased his unpopularity with the citizens. With a view at once of conciliating them and of bringing money into the treasury of the church, he announced a jubilee. Out of tenderness (as he professed) to those who might be too severely tried by the interval of fifty years between such solemnities, the time was to be reduced to thirty-three years, the length of the Saviour's earthly life; and by this calculation he determined that the

next celebration should fall in the year 1390. But some weeks before the beginning of that year, the pope, who had been severely shaken by a fall from his mule, died; and benefits of his preparations were reaped by his successor.

From time to time attempts had been made to put an end to the schism. Thus in 1381 the university of Paris, disgusted by Clement's proceedings, gave an opinion that a general council should be called for this purpose. In 1387, Clement, feeling himself pressed by the authority of the university, professed himself willing to refer the question to a council, and offered, if Urban would submit to him, to give him the highest place among the cardinals. Urban also professed his readiness to submit to a council; but he added a condition which made the offer nugatory—that he himself should in the meantime be acknowledged as the only pope. Clement is said to have induced persons of influence in the French court, by frequent and costly presents, to refrain from exerting themselves for the closing of the schism; and, as the princes of Latin Christendom had been guided by their former political connexion in the choice of sides as to the question of the papacy, it is remarked by a writer of the time, Richard of Ulverstone, that but for the quarrels of nations the schism would neither have been so lightly begun nor so long kept up.

On the 1st of November the cardinals of Urban's party chose as his successor Peter Tomacelli, cardinal of St. Anastasia, who took the name of Boniface IX. The new pope, according to some authorities, was only thirty years of age; but others, with greater probability, make him fourteen years older. He is described as possessed of some showy personal qualities, but without any learning or any such knowledge of affairs as would have fitted him for his position—although this last defect was afterwards in some degree remedied by experience.

The schism, by throwing on western Christendom the cost of maintaining a second pontifical court, added greatly to the burdens which had before been matter of complaint. Clement VII endeavoured to swell his income by the most unscrupulous means, and the grievances of his administration excited loud outcries from the church of France. He surrounded himself with a body of no less than thirty-six cardinals, for whom he provided by usurping the patronage of all the church-preferment that he could get into his hands. A new kind of document was introduced under the name of *gratia expectativae* by which the reversion of a benefice was conferred, and the receiver was authorized to take possession as soon as a vacancy should occur. The old resources—such as reservations, tenths, dispensations of all kinds, and the *jus exuviarium* (which was now exercised on the property of abbots as well as on that of bishops)—were worked to the uttermost, and were developed in ways before unknown. Promotion was bestowed for money or other improper considerations, without regard to the merit or fitness of the receivers; and, as learning was no longer regarded as a qualification for preferment, schools and colleges were broken up, and even the university of Paris found itself comparatively deserted by students. While the French church and people groaned under these evils, the pope, by bestowing a part of the spoil on princes and powerful nobles, contrived to secure their connivance but a royal edict of 1385 in some degree, although very imperfectly, corrected the abuses which had arisen.

While the French pope was endeavouring to swell his revenues by simony and rapacity, Urban VI was honourably distinguished by his freedom from such practices; and his successor, Boniface, is said to have so far regarded the opinion of the elder cardinals that for the first seven years of his pontificate he refrained from open simony. But when the old men were dead, he entered on a course of rapacity grosser and more shameless than anything that had ever been known. Boniface reserved to himself the first year's income of all bishoprics and abbeys. Persons who aspired to preferment of this kind were required to pay for it in advance, and, if unprovided with ready money, they were obliged to borrow at extravagant interest from the brokers who hung about the papal court. Unions of benefices were simoniacally made, and men utterly ignorant were allowed, if they paid sufficiently, to be

exempt from the laws against pluralities. Spies were sent throughout Lombardy and other countries of Boniface's obedience, to discover whether any incumbents of rich benefices were ill, and to give early notice of any vacancy to their employers. The "spoils" of prelates and cardinals were plundered before the owners were actually dead. The same reversions were sold repeatedly, the last buyers having their papers marked for preference, but as this practice became so well known that after a time purchasers could not be found on such terms, a form of precedence over all other preferences was devised in order to attract and assure them, and was, of course, sold at a much higher price. The pope affected to check these abuses by enacting rules, and found a new source of profit in granting exemptions from his rules. By a like policy he revoked the indulgences, privileges, and other benefits which he had irregularly bestowed, and made the revocation a ground for fresh exactions. Even after the first year's income of a benefice had been paid in order to secure the presentation, the purchaser was liable to see it carried off by a later comer who was willing to pay more highly; for in such cases the pope professed to believe that those who had made the lower offers intended to cheat him. The system of corruption became continually more ingenious and refined. Members of mendicant orders were allowed, on payment of a hundred gold florins, to transfer themselves to orders which did not profess mendicancy; and the world was astonished at seeing such payments made by persons who were bound by their rules to possess nothing. The traffic in indulgences was carried out more thoroughly than before. The pope himself was not above accepting the smallest gains, and his mother, who is described as the greediest of women, with his three brothers, found opportunities of enriching themselves. The theory which some had maintained at an earlier time, that a pope could not become guilty of simony, was brought forward by Boniface's friends as the only plea by which his practices could be justified. Among those who obtained preferment by such means as were then necessary were many worthless and unfit persons, and for a long time afterwards the clergy of the "Bonifacian plantation, which the heavenly Father planted not", were noted as the least reputable of their class. In some countries, such as England or Hungary, the extravagance of the charges exacted by the Roman court on appointment to ecclesiastical dignities produced an effect which Boniface had not reckoned on, as the clergy of those countries ceased to resort to Rome, and the connexion of the national churches with the papacy was practically suspended.

JUBILEE OF 1390.

Boniface, at his accession, found the jubilee of 1390 prepared for him by his predecessor; and, notwithstanding the difficulties of the time—the separation of France from the Roman papacy, and the consequent absence of French pilgrims, with the disturbed state of affairs, which placed extraordinary hindrances in the way of travellers—a large number of visitors appeared, and great sums were contributed to the papal treasury. In consideration of the impediments which made the journey hazardous, Boniface sent emissaries into the kingdoms which acknowledged him, with a commission to offer the benefits of the jubilee and a dispensation from the necessity of visiting Rome in person; and although it is said that much of the money paid for this indulgence was embezzled by the collectors, it brought in a large addition to the profits of the jubilee—which, while a portion of them was bestowed on the repairs of the Roman churches, were mostly retained for the pope's own use. The difficulty as to Naples, which Urban had left to his successor, was overcome by Boniface's acknowledging Ladislaus as king, and thus securing himself against the risk that the kingdom might fall under the spiritual obedience of the Avignon pope, who had crowned the younger Lewis of Anjou as its sovereign. Boniface also complied with the wishes of Ladislaus by sanctioning his groundless and scandalous divorce and re-marriage, and by crowning him as king of Hungary. But in that country Mary and her husband Sigismund were so firmly established that Ladislaus withdrew from the attempt to dispossess them.

With his own subjects Boniface had serious discords, which obliged him to leave Rome for Perugia in 1393; and from that time he lived in provincial towns until the approach of the jubilee of 1400, when the Romans, considering that the absence of the pope would probably reduce the number of pilgrims and the profits of the celebration, made overtures for his return. Boniface, although he had already benefited by the calculation which fixed a jubilee for 1390, was very willing to fall back on the scheme which allowed him to celebrate a second jubilee within ten years; and, feeling the importance of his presence to the Romans, he took advantage of it to make stipulations which, among other things, removed the democratic bannerets from a share of the government and placed the control of it in the pope's own hands. The jubilee was attended by great multitudes; the French had been eager for it, and flocked to Rome, notwithstanding their king's prohibition, and in defiance of the dangers with which the journey was beset from robbers and from the rude and licentious soldiery who swarmed in Italy. From those who were unable or unwilling to undertake the expedition, Boniface contrived to draw large contributions by allowing them, on the payment of offerings, to commute it for the visitation of certain churches in their own neighbourhood. By the wealth derived from the jubilee, and by the produce of the exactions already described, the pope was enabled to repair the fortress of St. Angelo and the harbour of Ostia, to fortify the Capitol and the Vatican, to recover some portions of the papal territory, and to gain such a power over Rome itself as no one of his predecessors in late times had enjoyed.

Early in his pontificate Boniface endeavoured, by repeated letters and missives, to draw the French king into renouncing the obedience of Clement. The university of Paris was diligent in endeavouring to heal the schism, and in January 1394 obtained leave from the duke of Berri, who was then in power during one of the king's attacks of lunacy, to give its judgment on the subject. A chest was set to receive the opinions of members of the academic body, and it is said that upwards of ten thousand papers were thrown into it. The plans proposed in these opinions were found to be reducible to three—that both popes should abdicate; that they should agree, by a compromise, on a list of persons to whose arbitration the matter should be committed; and that it should be referred to a general council. On this basis the judgment of the university was drawn up by Nicholas of Clemanges (who was styled the "Cicero of his age"), with the assistance of Peter d'Ailly June and Giles Deschamps; and it was submitted to the king, who had again become capable of attending to business. But Charles, although he thanked the members of the university for their pains, was persuaded by cardinal de Luna and other friends of Clement to desire that they would not concern themselves further with the matter; and the professors suspended their teaching until their representation should receive due attention. The judgment was forwarded to pope Clement, who declared it to be defamatory of the apostolic see, full of venom and detraction, and unfit to be read; but on finding that his cardinals were inclined to the opinion of the university, he was thrown into an agitation which in a few days put an end to his life on the 16th of September 1394.

On this, Charles of France, at the instigation of the university of Paris, and with the hope of bringing the schism to an end, wrote two letters to the cardinals of the Avignon court, desiring that they would not be in haste to elect a new pope. But his first letter found them already assembled in conclave, although not yet shut in; and suspecting its purport, they resolved to leave it unopened until the election should have been decided. Each member of the college took an oath that, if elected, he would labour for the extinction of the schism, even to the extent of resigning, if such a step should be for the benefit of the church, or if the cardinals, or a majority of them, should think it expedient; and they chose Peter de Luna, cardinal of St. Mary in Cosmedin, who styled himself Benedict XIII. The new pope, a Spaniard, had been noted for his ability as a negotiator; he had obtained for Clement the adhesion of Castile, and at Paris had raised up a party in opposition to the university. Although he was one of those who had begun the schism by the election of Clement at Fondi,

he had been accustomed to lament that step, to blame Clement for the policy by which the separation was continued, and to profess an eager desire for the reunion of the church at whatever sacrifice. But it soon became evident how little he was disposed to act sincerely on his former professions. He had at the election avowed an opinion that the oath which was proposed could not bind the pope except so far as every Catholic was bound by right and conscience; and although he still continued to speak as before—declaring that, if he himself only were concerned, he would put off the papacy as readily as if it were a cloak, that he would rather spend his remaining days in a desert than give occasion for prolonging the schism—he was now able to put his own interpretation on his late engagement.

The university of Paris took continually a more active part in endeavouring to heal the schism. It offered its advice to Benedict, and requested him to exert himself for the union of the church; but the letter received only an evasive reply. The leaders of the university, Peter d'Ailly, Nicolas of Clemanges, and John Gerson, were opposed alike to the papal despotism and to any schemes which would have proposed to remedy this by a revolution in the system of the church. But in the meantime the increasing pressure of the evils which arose out of the schism drove others into speculations as to the means of healing it which touched the very foundations of the papal power.

On the Festival of the Purification, 1395, a national council was held at Paris. The king was prevented from attending by an attack of his terrible malady; but the princes of the royal house were present, and among the clergy were the titular patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, seven archbishops, and a great number of bishops, with representatives of the monastic orders and of the universities. Simon de Cramault, patriarch of Alexandria and administrator of the diocese of Carcassonne, presided. Before this assembly was read the judgment of the university in favour of the plan that both popes should resign. It was adopted by a majority of 87 to 22; and after it had been formally reported by the prelates to the king, a mission, headed by the dukes of Berri, Burgundy, and Orleans, proceeded to Avignon, for the purpose of laying before Benedict the various courses which had been proposed with a view to end the schism, and of recommending the way of cession as the speediest and most dignified. At the same time a letter of similar purport was addressed to Benedict by the university of Paris. The cardinals, although it is said that high words passed among them, for the most part declared themselves in favour of the proposed scheme; but Benedict, after much delay and many evasions, professed to think that a conference between himself and his rival would be more hopeful; while to one who visited him he declared that he would rather be flayed alive than resign, and he wrote letters of remonstrance both to king Charles and to the duke of Burgundy. The representatives of the university were indignant at the rudeness which they experienced from the pope's servants and at his refusal to receive them publicly, and the embassy left Avignon in disgust,—the duke of Berri, in the name of the rest, refusing an invitation to the pope's table. The proposal of a conference was received with general disfavour, as it was suspected that such a meeting would result in an agreement for the partition of Christendom between the two popes, and consequently would prolong the schism.

Still eager to bring the schism to an end, the king of France endeavoured to enlist other princes in the same cause, while the university of Paris entered into correspondence with universities of other countries on the subject. From Cologne a letter had been received, exhorting the Parisians to labour for peace, but showing an inclination to the side of Boniface. From Oxford came a declaration in favour of a general council; but king Richard of England preferred the scheme of a cession, and wrote to both popes in recommendation of it. The university of Toulouse maintained, in opposition to that of Paris, that not even a general council has authority to judge the pope and in this, as in other matters, the Dominicans held against the Parisian university, from which they had been excluded some years before on account of their resistance to the doctrine of the immaculate conception. Provoked by opposition, Benedict condemned some members of the university to the loss of their

preferments; whereupon the academical body appealed against him to a future, sole, and real pope; and when he declared appeals from the pope to be unlawful, it repeated the act, asserting that schismatical and heretical popes were subject in life to the judgment of general councils, and after death to that of their own successors.

In March 1398 the emperor Wenceslaus and the king of France met at Reims, with a view to settling the termination of the schism. It was agreed that abdication should be recommended both to Benedict and to Boniface, with a view to the appointment of a new pope, who should be chosen by the cardinals of both parties; and, if this recommendation should be neglected, each of the sovereigns undertook to depose the pope to whom he had before adhered. Peter d'Ailly, now bishop of Cambrai, was sent to the courts of Rome and Avignon with a charge to announce this resolution; but the mission was ineffectual, as each pope, although he did not absolutely reject the proposal, insisted that his rival should be the first to resign.

Another national council was held at Paris in May 1398, under the presidency of the patriarch of Alexandria. The question was proposed, whether, if Benedict should obstinately refuse to resign, the French should continue to acknowledge him, or whether they should withdraw their obedience, either entirely, or in so far as regarded the patronage and temporalities which he had usurped? A committee of twelve, chosen equally from among the friends and the opponents of Benedict, drew up a statement of the reasons, on the one hand, for adhesion, and on the other hand for total or partial withdrawal. After a discussion of twelve days, two hundred and forty-seven members out of three hundred pronounced for a total withdrawal; and, some weeks later, this resolution was confirmed by the king, who had then recovered in some degree from an attack of madness. The subjects of the crown were forbidden to obey Benedict, or to pay any of the ecclesiastical revenues to him. The king declared that capitular and monastic elections should be free from the control which popes had exercised over them, and he annulled the "expectative" presentations which Benedict had granted. But Benedict, on being informed of the resolutions of the council, declared that nothing should make him resign the dignity which God had been pleased to bestow on him.

On this, the marshal of France, Boucicault, was sent with a force to Avignon, where the citizens admitted him within their walls, while the cardinals withdrew across the Rhone to the French town of Villeneuve, leaving one of their number, whose tastes and habits were military, in command of Avignon. The pope was besieged in his palace, but on each side there was an unwillingness to proceed to extremities; the besiegers, although they tried to enter the papal fortress by various ways, refrained from attempting to take it by storm; and Benedict, in the hope of profiting by the intrigues of the parties which surrounded the throne of the unfortunate Charles VI, refrained from uttering the usual denunciations against the French.

The plans which had been arranged for bringing the influence of sovereigns to bear on the popes, and compelling them to resign, were foiled by the deposition of Richard of England in 1399, and by that of the voluptuary Wenceslaus, who in the following year was set aside, as having shown himself unworthy of his office by alienation of the imperial territory and rights, by cruelty, misgovernment, ill behaviour towards the church, gross personal misconduct, and general neglect of his duties. The king of Aragon, on being requested by Benedict to assist him, had answered, "Does the pope think that, in order to keep up his tricks, I shall go to war with the king of France?". But he exerted himself as a mediator, and through his influence a compromise was arranged after Avignon had been besieged for seven months. The pope, who had been reduced to great distress, was to be allowed to receive provisions into the palace, but a strict watch was kept lest he should escape with his treasures; and this state of partial imprisonment continued from April 1399 until March 1403, when Benedict, by the aid of a Norman gentleman, Robinet de Braquemont, escaped from Avignon, and made his way down the Rhone to Chateau Renaud. There he was under the protection of Lewis of Sicily and Provence, and his cardinals returned to their obedience.

A.D. 1398-1403. RUPERT, KING OF THE ROMANS.

Rupert, count palatine of the Rhine, had been chosen king of the Romans on the deposition of Wenceslaus; and Boniface, although he acted with caution, had given the electors reason to suppose that he would sanction the change. But Rupert, although personally far superior to Wenceslaus, found the force of circumstances too strong to admit of his asserting the rights of the empire with effect; for the princes of Germany, by weakening the power of the crown, had in reality caused the anarchy for which they now blamed the existing sovereign. On going into Italy, to which he had been urgently invited by the Florentines, he found that his citations were little heeded, while his authority was openly treated with contempt by John Galeazzo of Milan, who declared that he had received his duchy from a legitimate emperor, and would not give it up. Discouraged by such manifestations of the temper of the Italians, by a defeat in an encounter with Galeazzo near Brescia, and by the defection of some princes who had accompanied him across the Alps, Rupert returned to Germany without having advanced beyond Padua, and without having obtained even a promise of the imperial crown from the pope. Boniface, however, soon after condescended to confirm the election; for, while his own position was in jeopardy, he continued to hold the lofty language of Hildebrand and of the Innocents. The death of John Galeazzo, who was carried off by a plague in September 1402, threw the north of Italy for a time into frightful anarchy; but although circumstances seemed to invite Rupert to a second Italian expedition, and Boniface granted him a tenth of the ecclesiastical income for the expenses of his coronation, the clergy refused to pay this impost, and the king felt himself compelled to remain at home.

In the meantime circumstances had favoured Benedict. The king's brother, the duke of Orleans, espoused his cause, in the hope of being able to use the papal name as a counterpoise to the influence of his kinsmen, the dukes of Berri and Burgundy. The most eminent theologians—Peter d'Ailly, Nicolas of Clemanges (who had even become the pope's secretary), and John Gerson—were on his side. The university of Toulouse, which had always been with Benedict, urged a return to his obedience. Even in the university of Paris, the French and Picard nations were for a return, while the Normans were against it and the Germans were neutral. It was urged that the withdrawal of obedience had been ineffectual, inasmuch as no one of the powers which acknowledged the rival pope had taken a like step; that Benedict had deserved well by accepting the scheme of abdication, while Boniface had rejected it. A national assembly resolved that France should return to the obedience of Benedict, and the king, who was enjoying an interval of reason, was brought forward to take part in the solemnity by which the return was celebrated. It was agreed that Benedict should resign in case of Boniface's resignation, deposition, or death; that ecclesiastical appointments which had been made during the suspension of obedience should be ratified; and the pope promised that he would speedily call a general council, and that he would carry out the resolutions which it might decree. But he soon showed an inclination to evade these terms, and the royal authority was found necessary to enforce the article as to the confirmation of benefices.

In 1404 Benedict sent a mission to his rival with proposals for a conference. But Boniface refused to allow any equality of terms,—speaking of himself as sole pope, and of Benedict as an antipope; and, although the envoys had a safe conduct from the Romans, and even from Boniface himself, he required them to leave the city. “At least”, said they, provoked by this treatment, “our master is not a simoniac”; and it is said that the words affected the pope so strongly as to produce an illness which carried him off in three days. Thus had occurred one of the contingencies in which Benedict had pledged himself to resign; and the Roman cardinals asked his representatives whether they were furnished with authority

for that purpose. The envoys could only reply that their commission did not reach so far; but they entreated that the cardinals would refrain from any fresh election. This request, however, was treated as a jest, and the cardinals proceeded to choose Cosmato Migliorati, cardinal of Holy Cross, who took the name of Innocent VII. Every one of the electors had bound himself by oath that, if chosen, he would labour in all possible ways for the healing of the schism, and, if necessary, would even resign his office; but the value of such oaths had by this time come to be generally understood.

Innocent VII. was a native of the Neapolitan kingdom. He had been eminent as a canonist, had been employed by Urban VI as collector of the papal revenue in England, and had afterwards been promoted to the bishopric of Bologna. In himself he was a mild and unassuming old man, free from the pontifical vice of rapacity, an enemy to the pontifical practice of simony, and most especially desirous of a quiet and easy life. He attempted to begin a reform by making his secretaries dismiss their concubines; but the greed and the ambition of his kinsmen were too strong for him, and abuses which Innocent had at first reprobated were afterwards adopted into his own practice. His short pontificate, while uneventful in other respects, was full of trouble for himself. The Romans attempted to recover the power which Boniface had wrested from them; the Colonnas renewed the turbulence by which their family had been marked under earlier pontificates; above all, Ladislaus of Naples played an equivocal and alarming part. To the scheming and perfidy of John Galeazzo Visconti, Ladislaus added the quality of personal courage; he was animated by an ambition which exceeded that of John Galeazzo, so as even to aspire to the imperial dignity; and, while affecting to protect the pope, there was reason to believe that, with a view to his own interest, he secretly incited the citizens of Rome to rebellion. In August 1405 Innocent was driven to Viterbo, chiefly in consequence of the act of his nephew, who had treacherously put to death eleven deputies of the Romans; and for a time John Colonna, who professed to be in the interest of Avignon, was master of Rome, being ironically styled John the Twenty-third. But after some months the Romans found it expedient to recall their pope, offering him all the power which had been enjoyed by Boniface. Innocent returned in March 1406. He denounced Ladislaus as a perjured traitor, declared him to be deprived of the kingdoms which he held under the Roman see, and proclaimed a crusade against the Colonnas. Ladislaus, in order to propitiate the pope, surrendered the castle of St. Angelo to him, and a treaty was concluded by which the king took an oath of fealty, and was appointed standard-bearer of the Roman church. But before this measure had produced any considerable effect, Innocent died on the 6th of November in the year of his return. It is said that he had intended to call a general council with a view to the reunion of the church, but that the troubles of his pontificate prevented the execution of this design.

The Roman cardinals, after some hesitation whether they should elect a successor, went through the form of choosing a pope under a promise that he would resign if the benefit of the church should require it, and that he would invite his rival of Avignon to join with him in this sacrifice of private interest to the cause of unity; and thus, says Leonard of Arezzo, the person to be elected was to regard himself rather as a proctor for resigning the papacy than as a pope. The election fell on Angelo Corario, cardinal of St. Mark and titular patriarch of Constantinople, who styled himself Gregory XII. Gregory was a man of seventy, greatly respected for piety, learning, and prudence. It was he who had proposed the engagement by which the cardinals had bound themselves before the election; and it was believed that the straightforward honesty which was supposed especially to mark his character would secure his zealous performance of the obligation. Theodoric of Niem, however, who held an office in his court, speaks of him as a dissembler, a wolf in sheep's clothing; and although this unfavourable representation may have been partly caused by some personal enmity, the writer's statements have an appearance of truth which has won general belief for them. Gregory began by professing an intense desire for the reunion of the church. He renewed the

oath by which he had bound himself to resign for the sake of this objects He wrote to urge the duty of cession on Benedict in terms which were entirely inoffensive, except that the Avignon pope's right to the title was questioned in the superscription; and Benedict, adopting his rival's style of address, offered in return to take his cardinals with him to a conference, and to resign if Gregory would do the like. Gregory professed himself to be like the true mother, who was ready to give up her child rather than suffer it to be divided; he declared that for the sake of re-establishing unity in the church he was willing to go to any place, however remote; that if ships were not to be had, he would put to sea in a little boat; that if he could find no horses, he would go on foot with a staff in his hand. It was only feared that he might not live long enough to carry his noble designs into effect. But even if these professions were sincere, Gregory was under influences which made it impossible for him to act on them. His nephews and other relations exerted themselves to prevent an abdication which would have destroyed their importance and their wealth while Ladislaus of Naples was resolved to oppose a reconciliation which was likely in any case to tell against him, and which, if it should be followed by the establishment of a French pope, would have involved the acknowledgment of a French pretender to the Neapolitan throne. Ladislaus, therefore, harassed Rome by a succession of attacks which—perhaps through an understanding with Gregory or with his nephews—were so timed and conducted as to afford pretexts for delaying the attempts at a reconciliation; he even got possession of the city in April 1408, and remained there until the end of June. Benedict, in answer to Gregory's overtures, proposed a meeting, and after much negotiation, and many attempts at evasion on the part of the Roman pope, it was agreed that it should take place at Savona, on the Gulf of Genoa, between Michaelmas and All Saints' Day 1407. The terms were arranged with elaborate precaution for the security of the parties, and Gregory at length set out as if for the purpose of fulfilling his engagement. But when he had reached Lucca, he professed to feel apprehensions and difficulties which must prevent his appearance at Savona; and Benedict, on being informed of this, endeavoured to gain for himself the reputation of greater sincerity by going on as far as Porto Venere, near Spezzia. As Benedict advanced, Gregory retreated. It was, says Leonard of Arezzo, as if one pope, like a land animal, refused to approach the shore, and the other, like an inhabitant of the sea, refused to leave the water. And Theodoric of Niem tells us that the project of a conference was generally compared to a tilting-match, in which it is understood that the champions are not to touch each other, but are merely to display themselves before the spectators. The scandal presented by the intrigues and insincerity of the two aged men, each of whom professed to claim the holiest office in Christendom, with the mysterious blessings and prerogatives attached to the see of St. Peter, excited general disgust, and it was commonly believed that they had made a secret agreement to prolong the schism for their own benefit.

France had again become impatient of the pretexts under which a reconciliation was continually deferred. In July 1406, after a warm discussion in the parliament of Paris, a letter of the university of Toulouse in behalf of Benedict had been condemned as derogatory to the honour of the king; and it had been decreed that the original should be burnt at Toulouse, and copies on the bridge of Avignon, at Montpellier, and at Lyons. In November of the same year a great national assembly was held under the presidency of the titular patriarch of Alexandria. All agreed that a general council was necessary for the solution of the difficulties which had arisen, and after long and full discussions it resolved that obedience should be again withdrawn from Benedict, unless within a certain time he should come to an agreement with his rival. The publication of this resolution, however, was not to be immediate, but was to be determined by circumstances. The king soon after despatched an embassy to both popes, but neither Benedict nor Gregory could be persuaded to resign, and the agreement for the meeting at Savona had already been concluded between them.

About the time when the failure of that scheme became known, Benedict lost his most powerful friend, the duke of Orleans, who was assassinated in the streets of Paris through the

contrivance of his cousin, John the Fearless, duke of Burgundy. The irritation of the French soon after manifested itself in a declaration of renewed subtraction from Benedict and of neutrality between the claimants of the papacy; but although this was communicated to the two rivals, and although the king exerted himself to draw other sovereigns into the same policy, the document was not yet formally published. Benedict, perhaps encouraged by the distresses which he saw gathering around his rival, replied in April 1408 by sending to Paris two bulls. The first of these, dated eleven months earlier, was intended to counteract the decisions of the French national council by excommunicating all persons, of whatever rank, who should take part against the pope, interdicting the territories of princes who should oppose him, and releasing their subjects from allegiance; the second bull, dated in April 1408, was conceived in a tone rather of complaint than of anger, but warned the king that by persistence in his unkindness towards Benedict he would incur the penalties of the earlier bull.

But the French were no longer disposed to endure such threats. At a great assembly of nobles, ecclesiastics, representatives of the university, and lawyers, John Courtecuisse, an eminent divine, made a discourse in which he charged Benedict with heresy and schism, with trifling and insincerity in negotiating with his rival, and with having shown himself an enemy of all Christendom by hindering the reunion of the church. The bull of excommunication was cut by the king's secretary into two parts, of which one was given to the princes and councillors, and the other to the representatives of the university, and they were then torn into small pieces and burnt. The messengers who had conveyed the bulls were pilloried and imprisoned; the archbishop of Reims and other dignitaries, who were suspected of having been privy to the bull, were arrested. The neutrality of France was now proclaimed, and the pope was publicly denounced as guilty of heresy and schism. Orders were sent to Marshal Boucicault, governor of Genoa (which was then subject to the French crown), that Peter de Luna should be made prisoner until he should conclude a real peace with his rival; but Benedict took the alarm, and, after having issued declarations against the conduct of the French king and others, he made his escape by sea from Porto Venere and took up his abode at Perpignan.

In the meantime Gregory had begun to distrust his own cardinals, who urged him to resign. Fearing lest they should take some steps against him, he forbade them to leave Lucca; and, in disregard of the engagements by which he had bound himself both at his election and in correspondence with his rival, as well as of the remonstrances which were addressed to him by the cardinals and by many bishops, he announced an intention of creating four new cardinals, of whom two were his own nephews. By this step the older cardinals were roused to action. They refused to acknowledge those who had been obtruded on them, and, in defiance of Gregory's command, all but three, who were detained by sickness, removed from Lucca to Pisa, where they sent forth protests against the pope's late proceedings.

The cardinals who had been attached to Benedict now repaired to Leghorn, where they were met by those of Gregory's party, and the two sections joined in issuing a summons for a council to meet at Pisa in March of the following year. In this course they were supported by the universities of Florence and Bologna, as well as by that of Paris. They announced their intentions to both popes, inviting them to appear and to resign their pretensions, agreeably to the engagements which they had made at election; otherwise, it was added, the council would take its own course. Gregory replied by declaring the cardinals to be degraded and excommunicate; he professed to make a new promotion to the college, and announced an intention of holding a council of his own. But for this purpose it was not easy to find a place. The authorities of his native state, Venice, to whom he applied, advised him rather to send representatives to Pisa; and various towns—even Ephesus, which was then for a time in Christian hands—were proposed. At length, when the council of Pisa was far advanced, the Venetians allowed Gregory's council to be held at Cividale, in Friuli; but it was ineffectual for any other purpose than that of showing his impotence.

Benedict also summoned a council, which met at Perpignan in November 1408, and was attended by a considerable number of prelates, among whom four had been decorated by him with the empty title of patriarch. But this assembly, instead of seconding his wishes, almost unanimously advised him to resign, and Benedict soon found himself deserted by all but a few of his partisans, who themselves urged him to abdicate or to send representatives to the council which had been summoned by the cardinals. His indignation vented itself in furious threats against those who had thwarted him, and in declaring them all, from the cardinals downwards, to be deprived of their dignities and excommunicated.

The emperor Rupert had promised to Boniface IX that he would accept no other solution of the question by which the church was divided than the suppression of the papacy of Avignon; and Gregory had conciliated him by declaring that, while the right of summoning general councils belonged to the pope, the emperor, as general advocate of the church, was more entitled to take such a part than the cardinals. At a great assembly, which was held at Frankfort in January 1409, a cardinal appeared on behalf of the Pisan cardinals, and cardinal Antony Corario, Gregory's nephew, as representative of his uncle. Rupert, whose leaning to the interest of Gregory was manifest, agreed to send representatives to Pisa, but declared that he would not forsake the pope unless convinced that Gregory had forfeited his support by misconduct. But in this feeling the majority of the assembly did not concur.

The obstinacy with which the rival popes clung to their pretensions, the manifest insincerity of their professions as to a desire for unity, the charges with which they mutually blackened each other, produced an increasing effect on the minds of men; and, as the hope of their voluntary resignation vanished, the idea of a general council as an expedient for healing the schism gained ground. Among those who, after having favoured the scheme of resignation, adopted that of referring the matter to a council, the most eminent for abilities, reputation, and activity was John Charlier, whose surname is usually superseded by the name of his native place, Gerson, a village near Rethel, in Champagne. Gerson, born in 1363, had studied under Peter d'Ailly and Giles Deschamps, and in 1395 had succeeded his old master d'Ailly as chancellor of Paris and professor in the university. The opinions which he had now formed as to the manner of ending the schism were expressed in various writings, especially in a tract "Of the Unity of the Church", and in one "De Auferibilitate Papae". He believed the authority of the church to reside in the whole catholic body, and in a general council as its representative. He supposed that, although the power of convoking general councils had in later times been exercised by the popes alone, the church might resume it in certain circumstances; that this might be properly done in the case of a division between rival popes; and that in such a case a council might be summoned, not only by the cardinals, but by faithful laymen. He held that, in case of necessity, the church could subsist for a time without a visible head; he greatly mitigated the pretensions which had been set up in behalf of the papacy; and, on the whole, he expressed far more distinctly than any one who had written since the appearance of the false decretals, that theory of the church to which the name of Gallican has been given in later times. Yet Gerson had been unable to take part with the university in its extreme proceedings, and had incurred obloquy by the moderation of his counsels at the national assembly of 1406. And, although his influence was strongly felt in the Pisan council, he himself was not present at it.

The council of Pisa met on the 25th of March 1409, in the cathedral of that city, which three years before had been sold by its doge to its old rivals and enemies, the Florentines. Among those who took part in it (although many of them did not arrive until later) were twenty-two cardinals and four titular patriarchs, with archbishops, bishops, abbots (including the heads of the chief religious orders), envoys of many sovereign princes, proctors for cathedral chapters, and a host of masters and doctors who represented the new and powerful influence of the universities. Henry IV of England, who had laboured for the extinction of the schism, and had practically enforced his counsels by detaining the pope's revenues from

England until a reconciliation should be effected, had taken order for the representation of his kingdom; and at the head of the English members was Robert Hallam, bishop of Salisbury. As the cardinals, in their need of support, were desirous to avoid the risk of provoking jealousies between various classes, it was arranged that all the members should sit together as one house, and that there should be no distinction as to the privilege of voting. Guy de Maillesec, bishop of Palestrina, presided as senior cardinal.

At the opening of the council a sermon was preached by Peter Philargi, cardinal of the Twelve Apostles and archbishop of Milan, who lamented the distractions of the church, and exhorted his hearers to take measures for the restoration of unity. At the first session it was asked by proclamation at the doors of the cathedral whether Angelo Corario or Peter de Luna were present, either in person or by proxy; and as the question, after having been repeated at the second and third sessions, received no answer, the council, in its third and fourth sessions, pronounced both the rivals to be contumacious.

The emperor Rupert, although favourable to the interest of Gregory, had sent the archbishop of Riga, the bishops of Worms and Verden, and others, as his ambassadors. At the fourth session, the bishop of Verden brought forward twenty-three objections to the course of proceedings; and it was proposed, in the emperor's name, that the council should be adjourned to some other place, where Gregory might be able to attend. But this proposal, which was evidently intended to break up the assembly, found no favour; and at a later session the German objections were powerfully exposed by Peter de Ancorano, an eminent doctor of Bologna. Meanwhile Rupert's ambassadors, finding the tone of the council unpromising for their master's policy, had withdrawn, after having made an appeal to a future general council, maintaining that Gregory was the only legitimate pope; and, as Wenceslaus acknowledged the council, he obtained its recognition in return, although his want of energy allowed this advantage to remain unimproved as an aid towards recovering the imperial dignity. At the fifth session thirty-eight charges were brought forward against the rival claimants of the papacy, and at the tenth session a commission which had heard evidence in support of these charges made its report. The opinions of the universities of Paris, Angers, Orleans, Toulouse, Bologna, and Florence were alleged in favour of the proposed course, and at the fifteenth session it was declared that both were guilty, as notorious schismatics, obstinate and incorrigible heretics, perjurers, and vow-breakers; that by these and other offences they had scandalized the whole church, and had rendered themselves unworthy of any dignity. The sentence of the council, which was solemnly pronounced by the titular patriarch of Alexandria, while his brethren of Antioch and Jerusalem stood on each side of him, condemned both Benedict and Gregory to be deposed and cut off from the church; the sentences uttered by them were declared to be null, their nominations of cardinals since the spring of the preceding year, when they had ceased to labour for union by means of cession, to be invalid; and it was added that, if either of them should despise this sentence, he and his partisans should be coerced by the secular power. Thus, although the cardinals, who summoned the council, could not have entered on the investigation of the schism without exposing themselves to fatal questions,—inasmuch as every member of the college had either shared in the election of one or other of the rivals, or owed his appointment to one or other of them,—the council itself assumed the right to decide the matter, in absolute disregard of the pretension which had been maintained for centuries, that the pope could not be judged by man except in the case of manifest heresy.

At the eighteenth session some envoys of the king of Aragon appeared, and one of them, on speaking of Benedict as pope, was assailed with hisses and mockery. The council, however, out of respect for the king's intercession, agreed to give an audience to certain representatives of Peter de Luna; but on the entrance of these, an outcry was raised against them "as if they had been Jews"; and when one of them, the archbishop of Tarragona, gave the title of pope to Benedict, there was a general outburst of derision, with cries that the

speaker was the envoy of a heretic and schismatic. The archbishop was silenced, and, with his companions, immediately left Pisa.

It had become evident to all discerning men that the extinction of the schism would be no sufficient cure for the prevailing evils, unless accompanied by a reform of the church, “both in head and in members”. With a view to this, each of the cardinals, before proceeding to the election of a pope, pledged himself that, if he should be chosen, he would continue the council until a “due, reasonable, and sufficient reformation” should be effected; and it was agreed that, if the election should fall on any one who was not then present, a like pledge should be required of him. On the 15th of June, twenty-two cardinals entered the conclave, and, after eleven days of deliberation, they announced that their choice had fallen on the cardinal-archbishop of Milan, who, as we have seen, had preached at the opening of the council. Peter Philargi was a native of Candia, and had never known his parents or any other relation. When begging his bread in childhood, he attracted the notice of a Franciscan friar, and, in consequence of this patron's kindness, he became a member of the same order. He had studied at Paris and at Oxford, and was much esteemed for his theological learning. As pope, he took the name of Alexander V.

CHAPTER VI.

WYCLIF.

WE have seen that, ever since the submission of John of England to Innocent III, a spirit of disaffection towards the papacy had been growing in the minds of the English people, who held themselves degraded by their sovereign's humiliation; that the popes throughout the thirteenth century had unwisely provoked this spirit by their exorbitant claims on the English church, and by their shameless interference with the disposal of English preferment; and that, although the feeble Henry III was afraid to place himself at the head of the nation as the representative of its feelings towards the papacy, the strong will and hand of Edward I were exerted in opposition to the Roman usurpations. Under Edward II the crown of England again became weak; but the antipapal spirit continued to increase among the people, and was swollen by the circumstance that the popes at this time took up their residence at Avignon, and became subservient to the interest of France. While the college of cardinals was full of Frenchmen, Edward II was unable to obtain, by repeated entreaties, that a single Englishman might be promoted to it, even although a vacancy had been made through the death of an English cardinal. It was found that, in the great war which arose out of the pretensions of Edward III to the French crown, the popes, while affecting neutrality, were always favourable to the opposite side. Edward, able, vigorous, and successful in war, was not disposed to imitate the submissiveness of his feeble and unfortunate father; and the growing power of the commons in the legislature was strongly adverse to the assumptions of the papal court.

Even the privileges of the English clergy were now becoming less than before. The representation of their grievances presented to Edward II in 1316, and known by the title of *Articuli Cleri*, shows a great practical abatement of the system which Becket had endeavoured to establish; and the answer which was made in the king's name, while it admitted some points, refused to concede others, and treated some of the alleged grievances as imaginary. The immunity of the clergy from secular authority, for which Becket had contended, was greatly infringed. When Adam of Orleton, bishop of Hereford, was brought before his peers in parliament, on account of his share in the political intrigues which had resulted in the deposition and murder of Edward II, he was carried off, without having pleaded, by the archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin, as if his clerical privilege exempted him from the jurisdiction of the house. But Edward III, instead of relinquishing the proceedings against the bishop, or transferring them to an ecclesiastical tribunal, caused him to be tried by a common jury of the county in which his see was situated, and, on his conviction, confiscated his property. When Stratford, archbishop of Canterbury, was embroiled with the same king, the ground on which he rested was not that of the clerical immunities, but his privilege as a lord of parliament—a circumstance significant of the change which had taken place in the minds of men. When Simon Langham, archbishop of Canterbury, had been created a cardinal by Urban V, without having previously consulted the king, Edward seized the temporalities of the see, and Langham submitted to spend the rest of his days in exile, without venturing to remonstrate in the tone of Becket, or, like him, securing for himself the sympathy of all Latin Christendom. And in the civil distractions which marked the end of the fourteenth century in England, the treatment of great prelates was yet more regardless of the pretension to exemption from secular judgment. Even the claim of freedom from taxes had been practically decided against the clergy by Edward I, in declaring them to be out of the protection of the

law; and all that they retained of privilege in this respect was the right of assessing their own order in convocation.

Collisions frequently took place between the papacy and the English crown. The popes took it on themselves to nominate bishops, in disregard alike of the right of chapters to elect, and of that of the sovereign to permit and to confirm the election: and in conferring the spiritual character on new bishops, they omitted to request, as had formerly been customary, that the sovereign would invest them in their temporalities. But in order to meet this, the kings compelled the bishops to renounce by oath all things in the papal letters which might be contrary to the rights of the crown, and to acknowledge that the temporalities were held of the sovereign alone. And this system of imposing contradictory obligations continued to later times.

The attempts to burden the benefices of the English church with foreigners, who were unacquainted with the language, who were wanting in qualities suitable for their office, and probably never set foot in the country,—who, perhaps, might also be in the interest of France and opposed to that of England,—such attempts, in proportion as they became more impudent, were more strongly resented. Thus, when Clement VI took it on himself to provide for two cardinals by English benefices to the value of 2,000 marks a-year, his agents were ordered to leave the kingdom; and he was sternly warned against attempting by his own authority to assume the patronage of bishoprics, or to bestow patronage on any who would not reside on their preferments. The encroachments and abuses of the papal court were now met by the legislature with the statutes of provisors and praemunire, which enacted heavy penalties against receiving presentations from the pope, and against appealing from the king's court to any foreign tribunal.

Among the causes of offence during this time, the mendicant orders were conspicuous for their assumptions and their rapacity. They attempted, by acting as confessors and otherwise, to engross all spiritual power, to the prejudice of the secular clergy; to divert to themselves the income which the seculars were entitled to expect from the administration of penance and other sacraments. They attempted to get into their own hands all the teaching of the universities, where they enticed young men of promise to enter their ranks, even in defiance of the will of parents; and it is said that, in consequence of this, the number of students at Oxford was reduced from 30,000 to 6,000, as men chose that their sons should become tillers of the ground rather than that they should be thus carried off by the friars. By these and other practices, the mendicants raised up determined enemies, of whom the most noted was Richard Fitzralph, an eminent teacher of Oxford, and afterwards archbishop of Armagh. Fitzralph inveighed against the prominent faults of the friars—their pride, their greed, their notorious disregard of their rules, their usurpations on the parochial clergy. He tells them that all the privileges which they laboured to acquire for themselves were such as were attended with temporal gain; that they showed no eagerness for those unpaid duties in which they might have usefully assisted. Fitzralph carried his complaints against the mendicants to Avignon; but he was strongly opposed by the interest which their money acquired for them in the papal court, where the funds supplied by the English clergy for the support of his cause were soon exhausted; and while the question was yet undecided, he died there in 1361.

In many respects, therefore, the practical grievances of the Roman system had provoked the angry discontent of the English people; and by this feeling the minds of many had been prepared to welcome an attack on the doctrine of the church, as well as on its administration. The opposition to the doctrines of the church of Rome, however formidable it had been in some instances, had never yet been of such a kind as to be fitted for attracting general sympathy. Sometimes it had been carried on by enthusiasts, who were evidently weak or disordered in judgment; sometimes by men whose opinions were so utterly remote from the traditional system, that they could have little chance of acceptance with those who had been

trained in it; nor had any one of the sects which arose during the middle ages been able to gain a footing in England. A reformer of a new and more dangerous kind was now to arise—a man who, before appearing in that character, had gained a high reputation in literature and philosophy; one who was fitted either to address himself to the learned, or to adapt his teaching, in language and in style of argument, to the understanding of the common people; a reformer whose opinions were not, indeed, free from extravagances, but yet were professedly grounded on Scripture, and appealed from the prevailing corruptions to the standard of an older time.

The earlier part of John Wyclif's life is involved in much obscurity; and such discoveries as have lately been made respecting it have resulted rather in disencumbering the story of errors which had long prevailed than in the establishment of any new truths. His birthplace was probably somewhere in the neighbourhood of Richmond, in Yorkshire : the year usually given for his birth, 1324, is perhaps somewhat later than the true date. He studied in the university of Oxford; but the statements that he was educated at Queen's college, and that he took a prominent share in Fitzralph's controversy with the mendicants, are not warranted by any sufficient evidence.®The first certain notice of him belongs to the year 1361, when he appears as master or warden of Balliol college; and this preferment he exchanged in the same year for the parish of Fillingham, near Lincoln, to which he was presented by his college. It would seem, however, that with the bishop's permission he continued to reside for the most part at Oxford. The statements which were long received as to the offices and benefices held by Wyclif are very perplexing, especially as they seem to show a glaring contradiction between his own practice and the opinions which he professed as to the possessions of the clergy. But it now appears that the reformer has been confounded with another person of the same name, or one nearly resembling it,—and that to this other John Wyclif or Whytecliff are perhaps to be referred the fellowship of Merton college, the living of Mayfield, and the mastership of Canterbury Hall—to the loss of which last preferment, by a papal sentence in 1370, Wyclif's entrance on the career of a reformer has often been ascribed by his enemies. By others among those who have wished to charge him with interested motives, it has been supposed that his zeal was awakened by disappointment as to a bishopric in the year 1364; but his earliest appearance as a reformer has been more truly referred to the time when he became a doctor in divinity, and in right of this degree began to read lectures in the university. He was already eminent as a philosophical and scientific teacher, and, having adopted the theory of Realism (which had for a time been discountenanced by the authority of Ockham and other popular masters), he had produced a treatise "On the Reality of Universals", which was regarded as marking an epoch in the history of opinion. If a book entitled "The Last Age of the Church" were really Wyclif's, it would prove that he was at one time affected by the ideas of abbot Joachim and the fraticelli. But it seems to be certain that this was never the case; and the tract in question is clearly the work of a Franciscan.

In 1366 Urban V demanded from England thirty-three years' arrears of the tribute which king John had bound himself to pay to the Roman see. At a former time, John XXII had obtained from Edward II a similar payment of arrears as a condition of his favour in the conflict with Robert Bruce; and throughout the earlier years of Edward III's reign the money had been regularly paid. But during the costly war with France it had again fallen into neglect; and when in 1357 a claim was made by Innocent VI, the king answered by declaring himself resolved to hold his kingdom in freedom and independence. On the renewal of the claim nine years later, the parliament, headed by the bishops (who gave their opinion before the lay peers), resolved that king John had had no right to bind his people or future generations to such subjection. Wyclif, who was already one of the king's chaplains, appears to have been consulted by the government on this question; and in answer to a challenge by a doctor who belonged to some monastic order, he defended in a determination at Oxford the course which had been taken in answer to the Roman claim.

The employment of ecclesiastics in secular offices was denounced by Wyclif as an abuse; and of this system the most conspicuous representative was William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester, a man whose dignities had been won by his own talents, and whose name is honourably preserved to this day by the great foundations on which his wealth was munificently spent. Against him, therefore, the efforts of a party in the state were chiefly directed. While Edward III, towards the close of his long and glorious reign, had fallen under the domination of a worthless woman, and his son Edward, the favourite hero of the nation, was sinking under long disease, the king's next surviving son, John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, headed the party of the old feudal aristocracy. Lancaster was a man of corrupt life, of selfish ambition, closely allied with Wyclif's enemies, the mendicant friars, and bent on humiliating the clergy, whereas Wyclif's object was to purify them. Yet the two co-operated towards what was nominally a common object, and, with the aid of the commons, Wykeham was in 1371 driven from office and impeached, while other ecclesiastics were also deprived of their secular employments, and the bishop was not summoned to the next parliament.

In July 1374 Wyclif was sent to Bruges, with the bishop of Bangor and others, for the purpose of conferring with some envoys of the Roman court on certain points as to the relations of the English church and the papacy, while the duke of Lancaster and other representatives of England were engaged in political negotiations at the same place with French princes, bishops, and nobles, and with prelates appointed by the pope to mediate between the two nations. The English commissioners complained of the levying of exactions unparalleled in any other country, of the reservations of benefices, and of the pope's interference with the election of bishops; while on the other side it was urged that papal bulls were not received in England as in other kingdoms, and that the representatives of the pope were not freely admitted. After much discussion, a compromise was agreed on, of which the chief articles were, that the pope should give up his claim to reservations, and that the king should no longer confer benefices by the writ of *Quare impedit*. In this arrangement the statute of provisors was over-ridden by the royal prerogative. Nothing was, however, concluded as to the important subject of elections; and in the following year we already find a renewal of the complaints as to the encroachments of the Roman court in the matter of reservations. The "good parliament", as it was called, of that year, while it took up the cause of William of Wykeham and his fellows, and procured their restoration to the royal council, showed itself resolutely hostile to the corruptions of the Roman administration. It was said that the money drawn by the pope from England was five times as much as the taxes paid to the crown; and a formidable list of English preferments held by cardinals and other members of the papal court was exhibited. Such representations were frequent; the statute of provisors was twice re-enacted, and each time with increased severity; but the popes continued to violate these statutes, and to carry on the usurpations by which the mind of the English nation had been so long provoked.

In the end of the year 1375 Wyclif was presented by the crown, in right of a patron who was under age, to the rectory of Lutterworth in Leicestershire—a parish which was his home throughout the remainder of his life, though his residence there was varied by frequent visits to Oxford. The experience which he had gained at Bruges had probably made him more fully acquainted than before with the faults of the Roman system. He had satisfied himself that the pretensions of the papacy had no sufficient foundation; and this conviction he published indefatigably, in learned lectures and disputations, in sermons, and in tracts which for the first time set before the humbler and less educated classes, in strong and clear English prose, the results of inquiry and thought in opposition to the existing state of the church. He denounced the pope as "anti-Christ, the proud worldly priest of Rome, and the most cursed of clippers and purse-carvers." He inveighed against the pride, the pomp, the luxury of prelates, against their enmity to the power of sovereigns, against the claims of the clergy to immunity from secular jurisdiction, their ignorance, their neglect of preaching, the abuse of the privilege of

sanctuary to shelter notorious criminals. He held the temporal lords were entitled to resume such endowments of the church as were abused ; and that it was for the temporal lords to judge of the abuse as well as to execute the sentence, and probably also to benefit by the forfeiture.

It was natural that such opinions should give great offence to those who were attacked, especially as the political connexion of Wyclif with the duke of Lancaster invested them with a more alarming character. Wyclif was summoned to appear before the primate and the bishop of London in St. Paul's church on the 23rd of February 1377; and the character of the prosecution is shown by the fact that, although errors of doctrine had already been laid to his charge, those which were now brought forward related entirely to political and social questions. The reformer had with him two powerful supporters, the duke of Lancaster and Lord Percy, earl marshal, and the scene was one of great violence. Instead of the proposed inquiry, there was an exchange of reproachful words between Wyclif's friends and the bishop of London—William Courtenay, a son of the earl of Devon—while Wyclif himself appears to have been silent throughout, as if ashamed of the unruly conduct of his protectors. Lancaster threatened to bring down the pride not only of Courtenay, but of all the prelaty of England : he charged him with relying on the power of his family, but told him that, instead of being able to help him, they would "have enough to do to defend themselves"; and when the bishop replied with dignity that he trusted not in his kinsfolk, nor in any man else, but in God alone, the duke, unable to find an answer, declared that he would rather drag him out of the church by the hair than endure this at his hand. The Londoners who were present, furious at this insult to their bishop and to the privileges of their city, broke out into tumult, and it was with difficulty that Wyclif and his friends escaped. It happened that on the same day a proposal was made in parliament to transfer the government of the city from the lord mayor to a commission of which Percy was to be the head, and the report of this increased the exasperation of the mob, who next day attacked and plundered Lancaster's palace of the Savoy, barbarously murdered an ecclesiastic who was mistaken for the earl marshal, and might have committed further outrages but for the interposition of the bishop of London, who hastened to the scene of the tumult and succeeded in appeasing it.

Before the meeting at St. Paul's, nineteen articles of accusation against Wyclif had been submitted to Gregory XI, and in the end of May 1377 the pope addressed bulls to the king, to the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London, and to the university of Oxford, reproving the ecclesiastical and academical authorities for their supineness, and requiring an investigation of the case. Wyclif was said to have revived the errors of Marsilius and of John of Jandun—to have maintained doctrines subversive of ecclesiastical and civil government—to have denied the force of papal commands and the power of the keys—to have asserted that excommunication is a nullity, unless a man be excommunicated by himself—that the endowments of the church may be taken away if abused, and that the clergy, including even the pope himself, may be accused and corrected by the laity. In the letter addressed to Oxford it was ordered that such teaching should be suppressed in the university, and that the chancellor should arrest Wyclif and bring him before the primate and the bishop of London. But before these documents could reach England an important change took place through the death of Edward III, who was succeeded by his grandson Richard, then only eleven years old.

The university authorities of Oxford, jealous of its independence, showed no eagerness to carry out the papal commands; but the archbishop and the bishop of London required the chancellor to present Wyclif before them for trial. In the meantime a new parliament made strong representations against the encroachments of the papacy, and consulted certain authorities on the question whether the king were not entitled to prevent the exportation of treasure from the realm, although the pope might have required it to be sent to him. To this Wyclif, always a partisan of the crown as against the claims of the papacy, answered that for

the defence of the country such a seizure would be warranted by the law of Christ, even although the pope's requisition should be made on the ground of the obedience due to him, and should be enforced by the penalty of his censures.

By the death of Edward the duke of Lancaster's influence was lessened, and the clergy felt themselves stronger than before. In December Wyclif was cited to appear again at St. Paul's within thirty days; but the place of hearing was changed to the archbishop's chapel at Lambeth, where, early in the following year, Wyclif was required to answer to the nineteen articles charged against him. But immediately after the proceedings had been opened, a message was received from the young king's mother, desiring that the bishops would carry the inquiry no further; and while the latter were deliberating whether this order should be obeyed, a mob of Londoners, now favourable to Wyclif, as from special circumstances they had lately been opposed to him, broke into the chapel and compelled them to withdraw.

Wyclif had already replied to the charges against him in three tracts, of which one would seem to have been intended for the clergy and for academic readers, while another was laid before parliament, and the third is a vehement attack on some opponent, whom he styles a "medley divine". The obscurity and over-subtlety which have been imputed to these papers arise in part from the scholastic method of argument. Wyclif endeavours to explain and to justify, on grounds of scripture and of canon-law, such of the questioned opinions as he admits to be really held by him, and to obviate the misconceptions which his language might be too likely to produce. He speaks of himself as a sincere son of the church, and as willing to retract wherever he can be convinced that he is wrong—a profession which, as it is often repeated by other reformers of the period, may be presumed to have been in their minds something more than a nugatory truism. Wyclif was not further censured at this time than by being warned to avoid the danger of misleading the ignorant; and he thought himself at liberty to put forth ten new propositions, which were chiefly directed against the interference of spiritual persons with secular power and possessions.

The death of Gregory XI put an end to the commission under which the late proceedings had taken place; but the great schism which followed, while it was favourable to Wyclif by supplying him with fresh arguments against the papacy, and by weakening the power of the clergy everywhere, yet told against him by removing so much of the cause for the anti-papal feeling of the English as had arisen from the connexion of the late popes with France; for England, as we have seen, acknowledged the Roman line of popes, and disowned that of Avignon. Wyclif himself had at first hailed the election of Urban VI as a reforming pope; but he found his hopes disappointed, and, after some observation of the schism, he declared that the church would be in a better condition if both the rival popes were removed or deposed, forasmuch as their lives appeared to show that they had nothing to do with the church of God.

In his preaching at Oxford and elsewhere, Wyclif vehemently attacked the mendicant orders, which he declared to be the great evil of Christendom. He charged them with fifty errors of doctrine and practice. He denounced them for intercepting the alms which ought to belong to the poor; for their unscrupulous system of proselytizing; for their invasion of parochial rights; their habit of deluding the common people by fables and legends; their hypocritical pretensions to sanctity; their flattery of the great and wealthy, whom it would rather have been their duty to reprove for their sins; their grasping at money by all sorts of means; the needless splendour of their buildings, whereas parish-churches were left to neglect and decay.

That these complaints were well grounded there can be no doubt; but it must be remembered that the faults which Wyclif rioted were for the most part deviations from the intentions of those by whom the orders had been founded. Indeed, Wyclif himself had much in common with those founders. He held that tithes and other endowments were in their nature eleemosynary; that the clergy ought to receive only so much as might be necessary for their

support; he insisted on the idea of apostolic poverty which had been advocated by Arnold of Brescia and by many sectaries—not considering that the effect of reducing all clerical income to that which is merely necessary will not be a removal of all secular temptations to enter into the ministry of the church, but will leave such temptations as can attract only an inferior class of men. In his earlier days he had distinguished the mendicants favourably from the other monastic orders; and it was probably not until their faults had been brought home to him by special circumstances that he entered on a declared opposition to them. In order to counteract the efforts of the friars and to spread his own opinions, he instituted a brotherhood of his own, under the name of “poor priests”, who were to go about the country barefooted, roughly clad in russet frocks, penetrating, as the mendicants had done, to the humblest classes of the people, and giving such elementary religious instruction as they could. These simple teachers were employed under episcopal authority throughout the vast diocese of Lincoln, and perhaps elsewhere; but they appear to have been suppressed in a later stage of Wyclif’s career. Wyclif refused to admit the monastic pretensions in favour of a life of contemplation and prayer; he regarded the idea of such a life as selfish, and held that the clergy ought rather to labour in preaching, as being a work beneficial to others.

In 1379 Wyclif, while residing at Oxford, had a dangerous illness, in which it is said that four doctors, belonging to the mendicant orders, visited him with the design of bringing him to express contrition and to retract his sayings against their brethren; but that he astonished and scared them away by declaring, in scriptural phrase, “I shall not die, but live and declare the evil deeds of the friars” : and he was able to keep his word.

He now entered on a new and important portion of his work—the translation of the Holy Scriptures into the vernacular tongue. In the prologue to the version by his follower John Purvey, the venerable examples of Bede and king Alfred are cited in favour of such translations; but whatever means of attaining a knowledge of Scripture through their native tongue may have been open to the English in earlier ages, they had for centuries been without such aids, and in the meantime the reading of Scripture had been forbidden, as being dangerous to the unlearned. Of late, however, renewed attempts had been made to exhibit the sacred writings in an English form. About the beginning of Edward III’s reign, William of Shoreham, vicar of Chart Sutton in Kent, rendered the Psalter into English prose; and he was soon after followed by Richard Rolle, “the hermit of Hampole”, who not only translated the text of the Psalms, but added an English commentary. But no other book of Scripture appears to have been rendered into our language for centuries before the time when Wyclif undertook a version of the whole. How much of the gigantic labour was done by his own hands it is impossible to determine; but to him we must refer at least the general merit of the design and the superintendence of the entire work.

The effect of thus bringing home the word of God to the unlearned people is shown by the indignation of a contemporary writer, who denounces Wyclif as having made the gospel “common, and more open to laymen and to women who can read than it is wont to be to clerks well learned and of good understanding; so that the pearl of the gospel is scattered and is trodden under foot of swine”; and he applies, as if prophetic of Wyclif’s labours, some passages in which William of St. Amour had denounced the “everlasting gospel” of an earlier party. It is said that the bishops attempted in 1390 to get the version condemned by parliament, lest it should become an occasion of heresies; but John of Gaunt “with a great oath” declared that the English would not submit to the degradation of being denied a vernacular Bible, while other nations were allowed to enjoy it; and other nobles added that, if there were danger of heresy from having the Scriptures in English, there had been more heresies among the Latins than among the people of any other language. The attempt at prohibition, therefore, failed, and the English Bible spread far and wide, being diffused chiefly through the exertions of the “poor priests,” whom Wyclif employed to publish his doctrines

about the country, and furnished with portions of his translation as the text which they were to expound, and the foundation on which they were to rest their preaching.

Soon after having engaged in the translation, Wyclif, who had thus far shown himself as a reformer only in matters relating to ecclesiastical and civil government, and as to the powers of the clergy, or as a maintainer of philosophical opinions which differed from those generally accepted, went on to assail the doctrine of the church in the matter of the Eucharist, by putting forth certain propositions, which he offered to maintain in public disputation. This, however, the authorities of Oxford would not allow; the chancellor, William Berthon, with some doctors, condemned Wyclif's opinions, whereupon he appealed to the king—an act which naturally excited the anger of the clergy, as being an attack on the church's right of judgment. His old patron the duke of Lancaster, who took no interest in such questions, charged him to refrain from teaching his doctrine as to the Eucharist, but Wyclif, instead of obeying this order, put forth a "confession" in which he asserted and defended his opinion. He maintained that the sacrament of the altar was not a mere sign, but was at once figure and truth; that all teachers since the year 1,000 had erred, with the sole exception of Berengar,—the devil having been let loose, and having had power over the "master of the Sentences" and others. He distinguished various modes of being, and said that the body of Christ was in the consecrated host virtually, spiritually, and sacramentally, but that it was not substantially, corporally, or dimensionally, elsewhere than in heaven; that, as St. John the Baptist, on becoming the Elias, did not cease to be John—as one who is changed into a pope still remains the same man as before—so it was with the bread and wine of the sacrament. And he severely reprobated the holders of the current doctrine as being "followers of signs and worshippers of accidents". It was, he said, beyond the reach even of almighty power to cause the existence of accidents without any subject. Thus an important addition was made to the subjects of controversy between Wyclif and the ruling party in the church; and in order to set forth his views in a popular form, he produced a treatise which is known as his "Wicket".

In the same year took place the rising of the peasantry under Wat Tyler—a movement similar to those which somewhat earlier had been designated in France by the name of Jacquerie. It was the policy of Wyclif's enemies to connect him with this insurrection, by representing it as the effect of his teaching; and one of the leaders, a priest named John Ball, declared in his confession that he had been two years a follower of Wyclif, whom he described as the chief author of the revolt. But, in truth, this connexion was imaginary. The fury of Tyler's followers was especially directed, not against the clergy (as would have been the case if the impulse had been derived from Wyclif), but against persons in secular authority and administrative office, against lawyers, gentlemen, and men of wealth, especially those who had become rich by commerce. It was not on account of his spiritual office, but as chancellor of the kingdom, that archbishop Simon of Sudbury was beheaded on Tower Hill. Ball, instead of having learnt his principles from Wyclif, had, for twenty years before this outbreak, been notorious as a preacher of communism and revolution; he had been censured by three successive primates, and at length, for his irregularities, had been committed to the archbishop's prison at Maidstone, from which he was released by the rioters. Another priest, who, under the name of Jack Straw, was prominent as a leader, held opinions akin to those of the fraticelli. There were no demonstrations against the popular superstitions of the time; the insurgents were in alliance with Wyclif's enemies, the friars, and were furious against his patron the duke of Lancaster, whose palace of the Savoy underwent a second spoliation and serious damage at their hands. In the suppression of this rebellion, a conspicuous part was borne by Henry Spenser, bishop of Norwich, who had obtained his see as a reward for military services rendered to Urban V in Italy. He took the field in armour, delivered Peterborough from the insurgents, contributed to discomfit them in the neighbouring counties, and, when peace had been restored, made over the local ringleaders to execution, after having, in his episcopal character, administered to them the last consolations of religion.

For Wyclif the result of the insurrection was unfavourable, as the place of the murdered primate was filled by his old enemy Courtenay, who was not likely to distinguish in his favour between political and doctrinal innovations. Immediately after having received his pall, the new archbishop brought the question of Wyclif's opinions before a council of bishops, and other ecclesiastics (mostly belonging to the mendicant orders), with some lawyers, which met at the Dominican convent in Holborn. As the session was about to begin, a shock of an earthquake was felt, and some of the members in alarm proposed an adjournment: but the archbishop, undisturbed by the omen, declared that it signified the purging of the kingdom from heresy. Wyclif was not present, nor does it appear that he had been cited to defend himself; but twenty-two propositions were brought forward as having been maintained by him—ten of them being branded as heretical, while the others were only designated as errors. Among the heresies were the assertions that the material substance of bread and wine remains in the sacrament of the altar; that accidents do not remain in it without a subject; that Christ is not in it “identically, truly, and really, in His proper bodily substance”; that the ministrations of bishops and priests who are in mortal sin, and the claims of evil popes over Christ's faithful people, are null; that contrition supersedes the necessity of outward confession; that God ought to obey the devil; that since Urban VI no one was to be received as pope, but the Christians of the west ought to live, like the Greeks, under their own laws; and that it was contrary to Holy Scripture for clergymen to hold temporal possessions.

Among the propositions noted as erroneous were several relating to the effect of excommunication; the assertions already mentioned as to the power of secular persons to take away ecclesiastical endowments, with others of like tendency; and some denials of the utility of the monastic life.

The council held five sessions, and in the meantime the archbishop wrote to Oxford, denouncing the preaching of uncommissioned persons, and ordering that the opinions of Wyclif should be suppressed in the university. The council condemned the doctrines which were brought before it, and three of Wyclif's most prominent followers—Philip Repyngdon, Nicolas Hereford, and John Ayshton—after having been examined before the primate, were sentenced to various punishments. The archbishop brought the matter before the house of lords, and an order was obtained from the crown, by which the sheriffs were required to assist the officers of the bishops in arresting heretics. But in the following session, the bill which the lords had passed in accordance with the archbishop's wishes was disowned by the commons, who declared that they had never assented to it, and prayed the king that it might be annulled; chiefly, it would seem, in consequence of a petition which Wyclif had addressed to the king and to the parliament.

The reforming party was now attacked in Oxford, which was its chief stronghold. The chancellor, Robert Rygge, although he had subscribed the former condemnation, was inclined to favour the Wyclifites, and to maintain the exemption of the university from the power of the archbishop and bishops. He appointed Repyngdon, and others of like opinions, to preach on some public occasions. On being required by the archbishop to publish a denunciation of Wyclifism, he declared that to do so might endanger his life. And when a Carmelite, named Stokes, appeared at Oxford, with a commission to carry out the archbishop's mandate, it is said that the chancellor made a display of armed men, so that the friar withdrew in terror, without having executed his task. Rygge was, however, compelled to appear in London, with the proctors of the university, and to ask pardon on his knees for having favoured Wyclifism. He was commanded by the archbishop to allow no new doctrines to be taught or held; and, in obedience to a royal order (which had, perhaps, been obtained by representing Wyclif's opinions as connected with the late revolutionary movements), he published the suspension of Repyngdon and Hereford. The bishop of Lincoln, Bokyngham, within whose diocese Oxford was situated, exerted himself vigorously for the suppression of Wyclifism in the university. Repyngdon, Hereford, and Ayshton recanted, after having in vain attempted to gain the

intercession of the duke of Lancaster; but their explanations were not deemed sufficient, and it was not without much trouble that they procured their restoration. Hereford, in order to clear his orthodoxy, went to Rome, where he was committed to prison by Urban VI, who, in consideration of the support which he had received from England, was unwilling to inflict the extreme punishment of heresy on any Englishman. Having recovered his liberty through a popular outbreak while the pope was shut up in Nocera, Hereford returned to England, where he was again imprisoned by the archbishop of Canterbury, and was denounced by the bishop of Worcester as a preacher of Lollardy in 1387; and ended his days as a Carthusian monk. Repyngdon became one of the bitterest opponents of the party to which he had once belonged; and his zeal was rewarded with the bishopric of Lincoln, and with the dignity of cardinal. According to some writers, Wyclif himself appeared before the archbishop and other prelates at Oxford, and explained himself in terms which are treated by his enemies as evasive; and it would seem that his explanation was accepted by his judges as sufficient to justify them in dismissing him. But the party at Oxford never recovered from the effects of these proceedings.

The remaining two years of Wyclif's life were spent in his parish of Lutterworth; and such was the effect of his labours in the surrounding country, that, according to the writer who is known by the name of Knyghton, a canon of Leicester, "You would scarce see two in the way, but one of them was a disciple of Wyclif." During this period of his life his pen was actively employed. When the warlike bishop Spenser, of Norwich, led into Flanders a rabble of disorderly recruits, to fight as crusaders for pope Urban against pope Clement, Wyclif sent forth a pamphlet "On the Schism" and one "Against the pope's Crusade." In these he denounces the system of indulgences in general, and the abuse of holding forth such privileges as an inducement to enlist in such an enterprise, the taking of arms by the clergy, the nature of the war itself, the secular and unchristian motives from which it originated, and the share which the mendicant friars had taken in promoting it. And to this time belongs one of his most remarkable works—the "Trialogue," which, as its name intimates is in the form of a conversation between three persons, bearing the Greek names of Aletheia, Pseustis, and Phronesis—Truth, Deceiver, and Thoughtfulness. In this book Wyclif lays down a rigid doctrine of predestination. He exposes the popular errors of reliance on the saints, declaring Christ to be a better, readier, and more benign mediator than any of them; he mentions without disapproval the opinion of some who would abolish all festivals of the saints, and who blame the church for canonizing men, inasmuch as without revelation it can no more know the sanctity of the persons so honoured than prester John or the sultan. In like manner he reprobates indulgences, on the ground that the prelates who grant them pretend foolishly, greedily, and blasphemously to a knowledge which is beyond their reach. He maintains the superiority of Holy Scripture to all other laws; if there were a hundred popes, and all the friars were turned into cardinals, their opinion ought not to be believed, except in so far as it is founded on Scripture. It is chiefly in the last book of the Trialogue that Wyclif shows himself as a reformer. He states his doctrine of the Eucharist, which, he says, had been held by the church until Satan was let loose. As to the hierarchy, he says that the only orders were originally those of priest and deacon, that bishops were the same with the priests, and that the other orders were the inventions of "Caesarean" pride. The pope he considers to be probably the great antichrist, and the "Caesarean" prelates to be the lesser antichrists, as being utterly opposite to their pretensions as Christ's vicar and his representatives. He declares himself strongly against the endowments of the church; he tells the story of the angel's lamentation over the gift of Constantine, to which he traces all the corruptions, abuses, and decay of later times; he holds that the error of Constantine and others, who thought by such means to benefit the church, was greater than that of St. Paul in persecuting it; nay, he says that the princes who endowed the church are liable to the punishment of hell for so doing. And, as a simple remedy for the evils of the case, he recommends that the king, on getting the temporalities of a bishopric or of an abbacy into his hands through a vacancy, should avoid the mistake of

restoring them to the next incumbent. He denies the necessity of confession, and attacks the penitential system, as also indulgences and the sacrament of extreme unction. And he is severe against the clergy—more especially against the monks, canons, and friars. These last he traces to antichrist, and declares to be the means of spreading all heresies; he even charges their idle and luxurious lives with rendering the land less productive and the air unwholesome, and so with causing pestilences and epidemics.

Although Wyclif's last years appear to have been wholly passed in his retirement, his constant and varied activity, and the influence which he exercised, were not to be overlooked; and it has been supposed that in 1384 he received a citation to appear before Urban VI. The paper which is commonly regarded as his answer does not clearly state the grounds on which he excused himself; but he had been disabled by illness, and especially by a stroke of palsy. On the 28th of December 1384, as he was engaged in the service of the church, he was struck down by a second attack of the same sort: and on the last day of the year he expired. His enemies found a pleasure in relating that his seizure took place on the festival of St. Thomas of Canterbury, the champion and martyr of the hierarchical claims, and that he died on the festival of St. Sylvester, the pope on whom the first Christian emperor was supposed to have bestowed those privileges and endowments which Wyclif had pertinaciously assailed.

It is remarkable that, although Wyclif had many points in common with the Waldenses, he never shows any trace of acquaintance with the history of that party, but seems to have formed his opinions in entire independence of them. Attempts have been made to connect him with the school of Joachim of Fiore; but although the constant use of the word gospel may naturally recall to our minds the "everlasting gospel" of the earlier party,—although there was in both parties a tendency to apocalyptic speculations, and although Wyclif's followers were infected with that fondness for prophecies, partly of a religious and partly of a political tendency, which had prevailed widely from the time of Joachim downwards,—it would seem that these resemblances are no proof of any real connexion.

Wyclif opposed, either entirely or in their more exaggerated forms, most of the corruptions and superstitions which had grown on the church—such as the system of indulgences, the reliance on the merits of the saints, the trust in supposed miracles; and if he held the doctrine of purgatory, and allowed the utility of prayers and masses for the departed, he was careful to guard against the popular errors connected with these beliefs. He denied the usual distinctions of mortal and venial sin. He regarded confession as wholesome, but not as necessary; he limited the priestly power of absolution to that of declaring God's forgiveness to the truly contrite, and blamed the clergy for pretending to something more than this. He denied the effect of excommunication, unless when uttered for just reason, in the cause of God, and agreeably to the law of Christ. He opposed compulsory celibacy, and the practice of binding young persons to the monastic life before their own experience and will could guide them in the choice of it. With regard to marriage he is said to have held some singular opinions—that it had been instituted as a means of filling up the places of the fallen angels, and that the prohibition of marriage even between the nearest relations had no other foundation than human law. He admitted the seven sacraments, but not as all standing on the same level; and he found fault with confirmation, as involving a pretension on the part of bishops to give the Holy Spirit in a new way, and thus to do more than give that Holy Spirit who was bestowed in baptism. He objected to the prevailing excess of ceremonies, although he admitted that some ceremonies were necessary and expedient. As to the splendour of churches, he rejects the authority of Solomon—an idolatrous and lascivious king under the old covenant—forasmuch as our Lord himself prophesied the destruction of the Temple. He did not condemn images absolutely, but the abuses connected with the reverence for them. He also found fault with the elaborate music which had come into use in the church, declaring it to be a hindrance to study and preaching, and ridiculing the disposal of money in foundations for such purposes.

As to the constitution of the church, Wyclif held that God had not bestowed on any man that plenitude of power which was claimed by the papacy; and, while he did not refuse to style the pope Christ's vicar, he considered that the emperor was also His vicar in the temporal sphere; that even the pope might be rebuked, and that even by laymen. With some of the schoolmen he held (as we have seen) that bishops and priests were one and the same order; but it does not appear that he countenanced the practice of some of his followers, who claimed for presbyters the power of ordination. We have already seen that he wished the clergy to cast themselves, like those of the first days, on the oblations of the faithful for maintenance; that he would have allowed them to enjoy only so much as was absolutely necessary, and held it to be the duty of secular lords to take away from them such endowments as were abused. But he disavowed the idea that this was to be done arbitrarily, and limited the exercise of the right by the conditions of civil, ecclesiastical, and evangelical law. And, although his enemies are never found to charge him with inconsistency, he confessed that his own practice had been short of his theory,—that he had spent on himself that which ought to have been given to the poor.

In some respects Wyclif seems to have been justly chargeable with the use of language which was likely not only to be misunderstood by his opponents, but to mislead his partisans. Thus the proposition that "Dominion is founded in grace" seems to imply a principle of unlimited anarchy and fanaticism, but is explained in such a manner as to lose much of its alarming character. Wyclif's conception of dominion was altogether modelled on the feudal system. He believed that God, to whom alone dominion could properly belong, had granted in fee (as it were) certain portions of His dominion over the world, on condition of obedience to His commandments, and that such grants were vitiated by mortal sin in the holders. But this Wyclif admitted to be an ideal view, which must be modified in order to accord with the facts of the case; and by way of corrective he advanced another proposition, of at least equally startling appearance—that "God ought to obey the devil." In other words, as God suffers evil in this world—as the Saviour submitted to be tempted by the devil—so obedience is due by Christians to constituted authority, however unworthy the holders of it may be. The wicked, although they could not have dominion in its proper sense, might yet have power, so as to be entitled to obedience. And thus there is no ground for the imputations which have been cast on him by his enemies as if he had advocated the principles of insurrection and tyrannicide. Wyclif considered that, while the pope and the king are each supreme in his own department, every Christian man holds of God, although not "in chief"; and that hence the final court of appeal is not that of the pope, but of God. In like manner, when he asserted that one who was in mortal sin could not administer the sacraments, the proposition was softened by an explanation—that a man in such a condition might administer the sacraments validly, although to his own condemnation.

Wyclif's opinions as to the doctrine of the Eucharist have been already stated. On predestination and the subjects connected with it, his views were such that his admirers are said to have given him a name derived from that of St. Augustine. He held that all things take place by absolute necessity; that even God himself cannot do otherwise than he actually does; that no predestined person could be finally obdurate or could be lost; that no one who was "foreknown" would have the gift of final perseverance, or could be saved; and that while in the body we can have no certainty who those are that belong to the one class or to the other. Yet with these opinions it is said that he professed to reconcile a belief in the freedom of man's will, so that in this respect he expressed his dissent from the teachers whom he most revered, as Augustine and Bradwardine. Philosophy mingled largely with his theology; he maintained that true philosophy and true theology must go together; and thus, as his own views were strongly realistic, he concluded that the nominalists could not receive the truth of Holy Scripture.

A document is extant which professes to be a testimonial in favour of Wyclif, granted by the university of Oxford in 1406; but it is very inconsistent with what is known as to the disposition of the university authorities towards his memory at that time, and it is supposed to have been forged by a noted Wyclifite named Peter Payne, who published it in Bohemia.

After Wyclif's death the Lollards (as his followers were called) rapidly developed the more questionable part of his opinions. They became wildly fanatical against the Roman church and the clergy. Some of them denied the necessity of ordination, maintaining that any Christian man or woman, "being without sin," was entitled to consecrate the eucharist; or they took it on themselves to ordain without the ministry of bishops. Some declared the sacraments to be mere dead signs; and, whereas Wyclif had held a sabbatical doctrine as to the Lord's day, they denounced the observance of that day as a remnant of Judaism. With such opinions in matters of religion were combined extravagances dangerous to civil government and to society; and prophecies, which were in great part of political tendency, were largely circulated among the Lollards.

Notwithstanding the defection of some of the most eminent clergy of the party, it still numbered among its members many persons of distinction, who encouraged the preachers in their rounds, gathered audiences to listen to them, and afforded them armed protection. But its main strength lay among the humbler classes. London was a stronghold of Lollardism, as were also the counties of Leicester and Lincoln, where Wyclif's personal influence had been especially exerted.

In 1394 the Lollards affixed to the doors of St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey placards in which the clergy were attacked and the current doctrine of the sacraments was impugned; and they presented to parliament a petition, in which the peculiarities of their system were strongly enounced. The bishops took such alarm at these movements that they urgently entreated the king to hurry back from Ireland in order to meet the new dangers which had arisen; and during the remaining years of Richard's power active measures were taken for the discouragement of Lollardism. In 1396 Boniface IX entreated the king to assist him in suppressing heresy, as being dangerous alike to the church and to the crown; and in the same year archbishop Arundel, immediately after his elevation to the primacy, held a synod, in which eighteen propositions, attributed to Wyclif, were condemned. The democratic and communistic opinions which had become developed among the party, while they attracted the poorer people, must have tended to alienate those of higher condition, and thus were, on the whole, disadvantageous to its progress.

But most especially the Lollards suffered from the change which placed Henry of Lancaster on the throne instead of Richard. Archbishop Arundel, their bitter enemy, had a powerful hold on the new king, whom he had greatly aided to attain the crown; and Henry, in his feeling of insecurity, was eager to ally himself with the clergy, the monks, and the friars—so that under the descendants of Wyclif's old patron, John of Gaunt, the condition of the Wyclifites became worse than it had previously been. Henry in his first year sent a message to the convocation, that it was his intention "to maintain all the liberties of the church, and to destroy heresies, errors, and heretics to the utmost of his power"; and in the following year, after a representation by the clergy to parliament as to the necessity of checking the growth of heresy, was passed the statute *De haeretico comburendo*. By this it was enacted that any one whom an ecclesiastical court should have declared to be guilty, or strongly suspected, of heresy, should, on being made over to the sheriff with a certificate to that effect, be publicly burnt.

The first victim of this statute is supposed to have been William Sautre, priest of St. Osyth's, in London, who had before been convicted in the diocese of Norwich, and suffered as a relapsed heretic in 1401, chiefly for the denial of transubstantiation. When the parliament in 1410 asked for a mitigation of the statute, the king answered that it ought to be made more severe. There is a succession of measures intended for the repression of the Lollards. In 1407

an ordinance was passed which condemns their opinions as to church property, and seems to connect the party with those who used the name of the deposed king as if he were still alive. In the following year a synod assembled in London, under the presidency of the archbishop, decreed that Wyclif's books should not be read, unless allowed by one of the universities, and that no English versions of the Scriptures should be made, because of the difficulty of securing a uniform sense, "as the blessed Jerome himself, although he had been inspired, avers that herein he had often erred." It was ordered that at Oxford the authorities should inquire, once a month or oftener, whether Wyclif's opinions were held by any members of the university; and in 1412 two hundred and sixty-seven propositions from his works were condemned there, "as all guilty of fire." The pope, John XXIII, at Arundel's request, confirmed this sentence; but he rejected the archbishop's proposal that Wyclif's bones should be dug up and burnt.

During the reign of Henry IV the statutes against Lollardism were but partially enforced; but Henry V (whatever may have been his conduct in those earlier years, as to which we have received an impression too strong to be effaced by any historical evidence) showed himself, when king, strictly religious according to the ideas of the time, and conscientious, even to bigotry, in the desire to signalize his orthodoxy and to suppress such opinions as bore the note of heresy. Under the influence of his Carmelite confessor, Thomas Netter, one of the bitterest controversial opponents of Wyclifism, the laws were now rigorously executed. The victims were of all classes; but the most conspicuous for character and for rank was Sir John Oldcastle, who, in right of his wife, sat in parliament as Lord Cobham. Oldcastle, who seems to have been a man of somewhat violent and impetuous character, had been highly distinguished in the French wars, and had been on terms of intimacy with Henry in his earlier days. Having taken up the opinions of Wyclif with enthusiastic zeal, he endeavoured, by encouraging itinerant preachers and otherwise, to spread these doctrines among the people; and it was feared that his military skill and renown might make him dangerous as the leader of a fanatical and disaffected party. The king himself undertook to argue with him; but Cobham, knowing his ground better, withstood the royal arguments. After having been called in question by the archbishop of Canterbury for his opinions (as to which he appears, while denying transubstantiation, to have consistently maintained that the very body and blood of Christ are contained under the form of the eucharistic elements), he was excommunicated. He then made his escape from London, and for some years lived obscurely in Wales; but he afterwards reappeared, and, as he was supposed to be concerned in revolutionary designs, was arrested, and was brought to the bar of the house of lords. The sentence which had before been pronounced against him on a mixed charge of heresy and treason was read over in his hearing, and, as he made no defence, he was forthwith, in pursuance of that sentence, hanged and burnt in Smithfield on the 18th of December 1417.

CHAPTER VII.

BOHEMIA.

THE reforming tendencies which appeared in Bohemia towards the end of the fourteenth century have been traced to the ancient connexion of that country with the Greek church, from which it is assumed that peculiar usages—such as the marriage of the clergy, the use of the vernacular tongue in the offices of the church, and the administration of the eucharistic cup to the laity—had been continued through the intermediate ages. But this theory, which was unknown to the Bohemian reformers of the time with which we are now concerned, appears to be wholly unsupported by historical fact. Nor, although some Waldenses had made their way into the country, does it appear that the reforming movement which we are about to notice derived any impulse from that party.

The first person who became conspicuous as a teacher of reformation in Bohemia was not a native of the country, but an Austrian—Conrad of Waldhausen, canon of the cathedral of Prague, and pastor of a parish near the city. Conrad appears to have adhered in all respects to the doctrine which was considered orthodox in his time, and his burning zeal was directed against practical corruptions of religion. He denounced, with indignant eloquence, the mechanical character of the usual devotions; the abuses of indulgences and relics; the practice or simony in all forms, among which he included the performance of charitable duties for money, such as that of tending the sick; and on this ground, among others, he censured the mendicant friars. But he also assailed the principle of their system altogether, offering sixty groats to any one who would prove from Scripture that the Saviour gave his sanction to the mendicant life; and he strongly opposed the practice of devoting young persons—in some cases even children yet unborn—to the cloister, without allowing them the power of choice. He required usurers to disgorge the gains which they had unjustly acquired; whereas the friars used to quiet the consciences of such persons by teaching them that the iniquities of usury might be sanctified by bounty to the church. Yet Conrad, although he strenuously opposed the corruptions of monasticism, set a high value on the idea of the monastic life. His power as a preacher is said to have been very extraordinary; sometimes he found himself obliged to deliver his sermons in market-places, because no church was large enough to contain the multitude of hearers. He carried away from the mendicants all but a handful of “beguines”; even Jews crowded to listen to him, and he discountenanced those who would have kept them off. Conrad was favoured by the emperor Charles; and, although the Dominicans and Franciscans combined against him, and in 1364 exhibited twenty-nine articles of accusation to the archbishop of Prague, he continued his course without any serious molestation until his death in 1369.

Contemporary with Conrad of Waldhausen was Miltz, a native of Kremsier, in Moravia. Miltz had attained the dignity of archdeacon of Prague, and, in addition to other benefices, possessed some landed property; he stood high in the favour of Charles IV, and was greatly respected in his ecclesiastical character. But the desire after a stricter religious life arose within him, and, resigning all the advantages of his position, he withdrew to the poverty and obscurity of a parish priest's life in a little town or village. After a time he reappeared at Prague, and, unlike Conrad of Waldhausen, who had used only the German language, he preached in Latin to the learned, and in the vernacular to the multitude. At first, his Bohemian sermons had little effect on account of his somewhat foreign pronunciation; but this difficulty was gradually overcome, and Miltz was heard four or five times a day by enthusiastic audiences. Usurers were persuaded by his eloquence to give up their gains, and women to

renounce the vanities of dress; and so powerful was he in exhorting prostitutes to forsake a life of sin, that under his teaching a part of the city which had been known as Little Venice acquired the title of Little Jerusalem. Like Conrad, Militz attacked the mendicant system; but, whereas Conrad had confined himself to practical subjects, Militz plunged into apocalyptic speculations. Seeing in the corruption of the church a proof that antichrist was already come, he wrote a tract in which he fixed the end of the world between 1365 and 1367; he even told Charles IV to his face that he was the great antichrist, yet he did not by this forfeit the emperor's regard. In 1357 Militz felt an irresistible impulse to set forth his opinions to Urban V, who was then about to remove to Rome. He arrived there before the pope, and by announcing his intention of discoursing on the coming of antichrist, provoked an imprisonment in the convent of Ara Coeli; but he was able to justify his orthodoxy before Urban, and was allowed to return to Prague. From this time he abandoned apocalyptic subjects, but was unwearied in his labours as a preacher; and he established a school for preachers, at which 200 or 300 students were trained under one roof, but without any vow or monastic rule. Some years later, twelve charges against him were brought before Gregory XI,—among other things, that he disparaged the clergy from the pope downwards; that he denounced their possession of property; that he denied the force of excommunication; and that he insisted on daily communion. In order to meet these charges, Militz repaired to Avignon, but while his case was pending he died there in 1374.

Among the pupils of Militz was Matthias of Janow, a young man of knightly family, who afterwards studied for six years at Paris, and thence was styled "Magister Parisiensis". In 1381 Matthias became a canon of Prague, and he was confessor to the emperor Charles. The influence of Matthias, unlike that of Conrad and of Militz, was exerted chiefly by means of his writings. One of these—a tract, "Of the Abomination of Desolation", mainly directed against the mendicant friars—has been sometimes ascribed to Hus, and sometimes to Wyclif. His chief work, "Of the Rules of the Old and New Testaments" (which is described as an inquiry into the characters of real and false Christianity), has never been printed at full length. Matthias went considerably beyond those practical measures of reform with which his predecessors had contented themselves; indeed it may be said that the later reformer Hus rather fell short of him in this respect than exceeded him. Matthias professed to regard Holy Scripture as the only source of religious knowledge, and declared himself forcibly against human inventions and precepts in religion. He was strongly opposed to the encroachments of the papacy on the church; he regarded the pope rather as antichrist than as Christ's vicar; and he describes antichrist (whom he declares to have come long ago), in terms which seem to point at the degenerate and worldly hierarchy. He denounced the clergy in general for the vices which he imputed to them, and appears to have reprobated the greatness of the distinction which was commonly made between the clergy and the laity. Matthias was especially zealous for frequent communion of the lay people. He denied the sufficiency of what was called spiritual communion: "If we were angels", he said, "it might possibly be enough; but for our mixed nature of body and soul an actual reception of the sacrament is necessary"; and this he deduced from the doctrine of the incarnation itself. Those (he said) who receive but once a year come to the sacrament in a spirit of bondage, and cannot know the true Christian liberty. It was supposed in later times that Matthias had advocated the administration of the eucharistic cup to the laity; but this appears to be a mistake. For some of the opinions imputed to him—among other things, for insisting on daily communion of the laity—he was condemned by a synod held at Prague in 1388, and, having submitted to make a retractation, was suspended for half a year from ministering beyond his own parish church. But he appears to have continued his teaching with little change, and to have been suffered to remain unmolested until his death in 1394.

As to the orthodoxy of these men (who, although not the only Bohemian reformers of their time, were the most distinguished among them) there have been various opinions within

the Roman church, as the Bohemian writers generally maintain that they were sound in faith, and in favour of this view (which is commonly rejected by writers of other nations) are able to point to the fact that they all lived and died within the communion of Rome.

Thus far the reforming movement in Bohemia had been wholly independent of any English influence. Indeed no country of Europe might seem so unlikely to feel such influence as Bohemia—far removed as it is on all sides from any communication with our island by sea, and with a population wholly alien in descent and in language from any of the tribes which have contributed to form our nation. Yet by the accession of Charles of Luxemburg to the throne of Bohemia, and by the marriage of his daughter Anne with Richard of England, the two countries were brought into a special connexion. The princess, whose pious exercises and study of the Scriptures were afterwards commemorated in a funeral sermon by archbishop Arundel, had been so far affected by the reforming movements of her own land (where each of the three men who have been mentioned above had enjoyed the favour of her father), that she brought with her to England versions of the Gospels in the German and Bohemian tongues as well as in Latin; and when, after her death, her Bohemian attendant returned to their own country, it would seem that they carried with them much of Wyclif's doctrine. A literary intercourse also grew up between the countries. Young Bohemians studied at Oxford; young Englishmen resorted to the university which Charles had founded in the Bohemian capital. Wyclif was already held in high honour there on account of his philosophical and physical works, which were regarded without any suspicion on account of his religious teaching; thus Hus said in 1411 that Wyclif's writings had been read at Prague by himself and other members of the university for more than twenty years.

John Hus, the most famous, if not the most remarkable, of the Bohemian reformers, was born in a humble condition at Hussinecz, a village near the Bavarian frontier, in 1369, the year of Conrad of Waldhausen's death. His education was completed at Prague, where it would seem that he was influenced by the teaching of Matthias of Janow; and among the writers whom he most revered were St. Augustine and Grossetete. By such studies he was prepared to welcome some theological writings of Wyclif, which were introduced into Bohemia in 1402. In his earlier years he had been devoted to the prevailing fashion of religion; at the jubilee of 1393 he had gone through all the prescribed devotions in order to obtain the indulgence, and had given his last four groschen to the priest who heard his confession; and, although he had already adopted Wyclif's philosophical principles, he was at first so little attracted by his theology that he advised a young student, who had shown him one of the books, to burn it or to throw it into the Moldau, lest it should fall into hands in which it might do mischief. But he soon found himself fascinated; Wyclif's books gave him new light as to the constitution of the church and as to the reforms which were to be desired in it, and from them his whole system of opinion took its character. It would seem, however, that on the important question of transubstantiation he never adopted Wyclif's doctrine, but adhered throughout to that which was current in the church. When, at a later time, the testimonial in favour of Wyclif, under the seal of the university of Oxford, was produced in Bohemia by Peter Payne and Nicolas von Faulfisch, Hus eagerly caught at its supposed authority; but in this he seems to have been a dupe, not an accomplice, of the forgery.

Hus became noted, as even his enemies allow, for the purity of his life, his ascetic habits, and his pleasing manners. In 1402 he was chosen as rector of the university, and in the same year he was ordained to the priesthood, and was appointed preacher at a chapel which had been founded eleven years before with an especial view to preaching in the vernacular tongue, and to which the founders—a merchant and one of the king's councillors—had given the name of Bethlehem (the house of bread), on account of the spiritual food which was to be there distributed. Soon after this, Hus became confessor to the queen, Sophia, and acquired much influence at the court of Wenceslaus. He was also appointed synodal preacher, and in this character had the privilege of frequently addressing the clergy, whom he rebuked with a

vehemence which was more likely to enrage than to amend them. He charged them with ambition and ostentation, with luxury and avarice, with contempt and oppression of the poor and with subserviency to the rich; with vindictiveness, which is said to have given rise to a proverb, "If you offend a clerk, kill him, or you will never have peace"; with usury, drunkenness, indecent talking, concubinage, and incontinency; with gaming, betrayal of confession, and neglect of their spiritual duties. He denounced them for exacting fees, for simoniacal practices, for holding pluralities : thus, on one occasion, when requesting the prayers of his hearers for a deceased ecclesiastic, he said, "Saving the judgment of God, I would not for the whole world choose to die with so many and valuable benefices". It was a natural result of such preaching that Hus raised up against himself much bitter enmity on the part of his brethren.

In 1403, Zbynko of Hasenburg was appointed to the see of Prague, which, through the influence of king John, had been detached from the province of Mayence, and invested with metropolitanical dignity by Clement VI. The new archbishop, although a man of the world, so that he took part in warlike enterprises, was desirous of reforming ecclesiastical abuses; and for a time Hus enjoyed his favour. It was by Zbynko that the office of synodal preacher was conferred; and he even invited Hus to point out any defects which he might observe in his administration.

The archbishop's confidence in Hus was especially shown by appointing him, with two others, to investigate an alleged miracle, which had raised the village of Wilsnack, in Brandenburg, to a sudden celebrity. The church there had been burnt by a robber knight, and the priest, in groping among the ruins, had found in a cavity of the altar three consecrated wafers of a red colour, which was supposed to be produced by the Saviour's blood. The bishop of Havelberg and the archbishop of Magdeburg, within whose jurisdiction Wilsnack was situated, took up the tale; innumerable cures were said to have been wrought by the miraculous host; by making vows to it, prisoners had obtained deliverance, and combatants had gained the victory in duels; and the offerings of the pilgrims whom it attracted were enough to rebuild the whole village, with a new and magnificent church. The Bohemian commissioners, however, detected much imposture in the alleged cures; and Hus set forth a tract, "On the glorified Blood of Christ", in which he combated the popular superstitions as to relics and the craving after miracles, and strongly denounced the frauds of the clergy, who for the sake of money deluded the credulous people. In consequence of this archbishop Zbynko forbade all resort from his own diocese to Wilsnack, although the miraculous hosts continued to attract pilgrims until they were burnt by a reforming preacher in 1552.

But it soon became evident that the archbishop and Hus must separate. Hus's attacks on the clergy were renewed, and charges of Wyclifism were formally brought against him. The archbishop complained to the king; but Wenceslaus is said to have replied, "So long as Master Hus preached against us laymen, you rejoiced at it; now your turn is come, and you must be content to bear it."

In the university also Hus became involved in quarrels. The founder, Charles IV, had divided it, after the example of Paris, into four nations—Bohemians, Saxons, Bavarians, and Poles. But as two of these were German, and as the Polish nation, being more than half composed of Silesians, Pomeranians, and Prussians, was under German influence, the Bohemians found that in their own university they were liable to be overpowered in the election of officers, and in all sorts of other questions, by the votes of foreigners. Hence a feeling of hostility grew up, and extended itself even to matters of opinion, so that, as the Germans were nominalists, the Bohemians were realists, and were inclined to liberal principles in religion. Into these differences Hus eagerly threw himself, and he found his most zealous supporter in a layman of noble family, named Jerome. Jerome was a man of ardent and impetuous character, restless and enterprising, gifted with a copious eloquence, but without discretion to guide it. He had travelled much—to England, to Russia, to Jerusalem—

sometimes affecting the character of a philosopher and theologian, sometimes that of a knight and man of the world, and in many places meeting with strange adventures; he professed to have graduated as a master of arts at Prague, Heidelberg, Cologne, and Paris. He himself states that, when in England, he was induced by the celebrity of Wyclif's name to make copies of the Dialogue and of the Trialogue; and he was zealous for the English reformer's doctrines.

It was a law of the Bohemian university that, while doctors and masters were at liberty to lecture without restraint, bachelors were required to use as texts the lectures of some reputed teacher of Prague, Oxford, or Paris; and in this manner Wyclif's writings came to be much employed and known there. But this naturally excited opposition, and in forty-five propositions ascribed to Wyclif—partly derived from the council of the earthquake, and partly a new selection—were condemned by the nations which predominated in the university. Hus declined to join unreservedly in this condemnation; he called in question the genuineness of the propositions, and declared that, although no devoted follower of Wyclif, he believed the Englishman's writings to contain many truths. Others took a similar part, and the impugned articles found a defender in Stanislaus of Znaym, who afterwards became one of Hus's bitterest enemies. The contest went on. In 1405 the archbishop was desired by Innocent VII to be zealous in suppressing the heresies which were said to be rife in Bohemia; and in consequence of this he uttered denunciations against the adherents of Wyclif, especially with regard to his eucharistic doctrine. In 1408 Stephen, a Carthusian, and prior of Dolan, put forth a formal treatise against Wyclif's opinions, and in the same year the forty-five propositions were again condemned by the university.

Wenceslaus, although deeply angered at the part which the popes had taken as to his deposition from the empire, was unwilling that his kingdom should lie under the imputation of heresy, more especially as such a charge would have interfered with the hope which he still cherished of recovering his lost dignity. In 1408, therefore, he desired the archbishop of Prague to inquire into the state of religion; and the result was that the archbishop, with a synod, declared Bohemia to be free from the taint of Wyclifism. But he ordered that all copies of Wyclif's writings should be given up for examination and correction—an order, which, even if seriously meant, appears to have been ineffectual; and it was forbidden that Wyclif's propositions should be taught in the university in their heretical sense (for as to the real meaning of some of them there was a dispute), and that any one should lecture on his Trialogue or on his work on the eucharist.

The part which the university had taken in the late proceeding incited Hus and Jerome to attempt an important change in its constitution; and their plans were favoured by the circumstances of the time. The council of Pisa was about to meet. Wenceslaus, influenced by France and hoping to recover the empire, took part with it, while the university, under the dominating influence of the German nations, adhered to Gregory XII. Hence the king was disposed to fall in with Hus's scheme; and in January 1409 he decreed that the Bohemian nation should for the future have three votes in the university, while the other three nations collectively should have but one vote; in like manner (it was said), as the French had three votes at Paris, and the Italians at Bologna. It was in vain that the Germans petitioned against this; and, after having solemnly bound themselves by an engagement that, if the decree should be carried out, they would withdraw from Prague and would never return, they found themselves obliged to fulfil their threat. Out of more than 7000 members of the university, only 2000 were left; of the 5000 seceders, some attached themselves to existing universities, such as Cracow, while others founded the universities of Ingolstadt and Leipzig. Hus was again chosen rector of the Bohemian university; but, while stories to his discredit were sedulously spread in foreign countries by those who charged him with having expelled them from Prague, he found that his success had also raised up against him many enemies at home, especially among those citizens of Prague whose interests had suffered through the withdrawal of the foreign students.

Hus had been zealous for the council of Pisa, as promising a better hope of reform than any that was to be expected from a pope, and he exerted himself actively in detaching those whom he could influence from the party of Gregory XII. By this he drew on himself, in common with others who had opposed Gregory, a sentence from the archbishop of suspension from preaching and from all priestly functions; while, on the other hand, many of the clergy who adhered to Gregory were severely treated by the king. The prohibition of preaching was unheeded by Hus, who seems to have believed that his ordination gave him a privilege as to this of which he could not be deprived. The chapel of Bethlehem resounded with his unsparing invectives against the vices of all classes of men; and cardinal Peter d'Ailly seems to have had reason for telling him, long after, that he had done wrong in denouncing the faults of cardinals and prelates before audiences which were not qualified to understand or to judge of such topics, and could only be inflamed by them. Fresh charges were now brought against him—that by his preaching he fomented quarrels between the Bohemians and the Germans; that he abused the clergy and the archbishop, so that a mob excited by him had once beset the archiepiscopal palace; that he persisted in his attacks notwithstanding all warnings, and drew people from their parish churches to listen to them; that he had spoken of Wyclif as a venerable man, who had been called a heretic because he spoke the truth, and had expressed a wish that his soul might be with that of Wyclif; that he denied the power of the church in punishing; that he mocked at the authority of the church and her doctors; that he denied the validity of ministrations performed by one who was in mortal sin; and that, without distinguishing between exactions and free gifts, he condemned as a heretic any priest who received money in connexion with the administration of a sacrament. As to some of these points it would seem that he was not really chargeable with anything more than the indiscretion of using language which was almost certain to be misunderstood. Thus he declared that in his words about Wyclif's soul he had not taken it on himself positively to affirm the English doctor's salvation; and he admitted that God's sacraments are validly administered by evil as well as by good priests, forasmuch as the Divine power operates alike through both.

Archbishop Zbynko at length found himself obliged to yield as to the council of Pisa, and to acknowledge his pope, Alexander V. The change was unfavourable to Hus, as the pope was now more likely to listen to the archbishop's representations. In consequence of these, Alexander addressed to Zbynko a bull, stating that the errors of the condemned heresiarch Wyclif were reported to be rife in Bohemia, and desiring him to forbid all preaching except in cathedral, parochial, or monastic churches. In compliance with this bull, the archbishop ordered that preaching in private chapels should cease, and it was understood that Bethlehem chapel was especially aimed at. The bull was received with great indignation by the Bohemian nobles. Hus declared that it had been surreptitiously obtained; that he could not, out of obedience either to the archbishop or to the pope, refrain from preaching; he appealed "from the pope ill-informed to the pope when he should be better informed"; he contended that Bethlehem chapel did not fall under the prohibition, and, in reliance on the deed of foundation and on his appeal, he continued to preach as before.

A fresh order was issued by the archbishop that all copies of Wyclif's writings should be delivered up; and a commission of doctors, being appointed to examine them, condemned not only the Dialogue and the Trialogue, with the treatises on the Eucharist, on Simony, and on Civil Dominion, but a work on the Reality of Universals, and other writings of a purely philosophical nature. It was announced that there was to be a great bonfire of Wyclif's books. The university petitioned the king against this, and Zbynko assured him that it should not be carried out without his consent. But in violation of this promise, and under the pretence that Wenceslaus had not expressly forbidden the burning, the archbishop soon after surrounded his palace with guards, and caused about two hundred volumes of Wyclif's writings, with some works of Militz and others,—many of them precious for beauty of penmanship and of

binding—to be committed to the flames, while *Te Deum* was chanted and all the bells of the churches were rung “as if for the dead”. Two days later Hus and his associates in the late protest were solemnly excommunicated. Yet the condemned books had not been all destroyed, and fresh copies were speedily multiplied.

By these proceedings a great excitement was produced. The archbishop, while publishing his ban in the cathedral, was interrupted by a serious outbreak; and there were fights in which some lives were lost. The archbishop was derided in ballads as an “alphabetarian”, who had burnt books which he could not read. Hus, in his sermons, condemned the burning in a more serious strain. It had not, he said, rooted out any evil from a single heart, but had destroyed many good and holy thoughts; it had given occasion for disorder, hatred, even bloodshed. He also set forth a treatise in which he maintained, on the authority of fathers and ecclesiastical writers, that the books of heretics (under which name he would not include any one who did not contradict Holy Scripture “by word, writing, or deed”), ought not to be burnt, but read. He declared, with reference to the archbishop’s prohibitions and censures, that he must obey God, and not man; and he, with some friends, announced that on certain days they would publicly defend certain of Wyclif’s books against all assailants.

On the election of John XXIII as pope, Hus renewed his appeal; and the king and queen wrote letters in his favour, requesting that the prohibition of preaching except in churches of certain kinds might be withdrawn, so that there should be no interference with Bethlehem chapel. Commissioners were appointed to inquire into the case, and Hus was cited to appear at Bologna; but he was advised by his friends that his life would be in danger, as plots were laid to cut him off by the way. It seemed to him that to expose himself to death without any prospect of advantage to the church would be a tempting of God; he therefore contented himself with sending advocates to plead his cause, while the king, the queen, and the nobles of Bohemia, the university of Prague and the magistrates of the city, entreated the pope by letters that he might be excused from obeying the citation in person, and might be allowed to carry on his ministry as before. The representatives whom Hus sent to Bologna were unable to obtain a hearing; some of them were imprisoned and otherwise ill treated; and Cardinal Brancacci, the last commissioner to whom the affair was referred, pronounced against him—excommunicating him with all his adherents, and decreeing that any place in which he might be should be interdicted. Archbishop Zbynko soon after uttered an interdict against Prague, whereupon Wenceslaus, in anger, punished some of the clergy for obeying it, while both he and his queen continued their intercessions with the pope in behalf of Hus, and entreated that the orthodoxy of Bohemia might not be defamed through misrepresentations. After a time, the archbishop, finding that he was unable to make head against the opposing influences, and that pope John was not likely to give him any effective support, became desirous of a compromise. A commission of ten persons, appointed by the king to consider how peace might be restored, advised that the archbishop should report Bohemia to be free from the infection of heresy, and should request the pope to recal the citation of Hus with the excommunication which had been pronounced against him. To this Zbynko consented; but, although a letter to the pope had been prepared, the execution of the plan was prevented by the archbishop’s death, when on his way to invoke the support of the king’s brother, Sigismund of Hungary, in the religious distractions of Bohemia.

In September 1411 Hus addressed to the pope a letter which was intended to vindicate himself against the misrepresentations which had been made of his opinions. He denies having taught that the material bread remains in the sacrament of the altar; that the host, when elevated, is Christ’s body, but ceases to be so when lowered again; that a priest in mortal sin cannot consecrate; that secular lords may refuse to pay tithes, and may take away the possessions of the clergy. He also denied that he had caused the withdrawal of the Germans from Prague; it was, he said, the effect of the resolution which they had taken in the belief that

without them the university could not subsist. He maintained that Bethlehem was not a private chapel, explained his reasons for not complying with the citation to the papal court, and entreated that he might be excused on this account, and might be released from the consequences which had followed.

The successor of Zbynko was Albic of Uniczow, who, before entering into holy orders, had been the king's physician. The dean of Passau, who conveyed the pall for the new archbishop, was also the bearer of a papal bull, by which a crusade was proclaimed against Ladislaus, king of Naples, as being excommunicate, with large offers of indulgences and other privileges. Wenceslaus allowed this bull to be published in Bohemia, although he was soon disgusted by the impudent pretensions and proceedings of those who undertook the publication, as well as by the serious drain of money which was paid for commutation of personal service. The German clergy of Prague obeyed the papal orders; but Hus and Jerome vehemently opposed the bull, denouncing it as an antichristian act that, for the non-fulfilment of the conditions on which the kingdom of Naples was held under the papacy, a crusade should be proclaimed against a Christian prince, and that indulgences should be prostituted by the promise of absolution as a reward for money or for bloodshed. A new and formidable commotion arose. Some who had hitherto been associated with Hus—especially Stephen of Palecz, an eminent doctor of theology—now took the papal side; and thus a breach was made in the party which had until then been bound together by community of national feeling and of philosophical and religious opinion. Palecz became one of the bitterest among the opponents of Hus; he and other doctors of the university wrote against him, and denounced all opposition to the bull; but Hus persisted in his course, and, when some preachers inveighed against him in the churches, they were interrupted by the laity, who in general favoured the reformer. Hus offered to maintain his opinions in disputation, on condition that, if proved to be wrong, he should be burnt, provided that the other party would submit to the same fate in case of defeat. But as they offered to sacrifice only one out of the many who were banded against the solitary champion, he declared that the terms were unequal, and nothing came of his strange challenge.

The exciting discourses of Hus and Jerome were heard with enthusiasm by the students, who showed their zealous sympathy by escorting them home at night. But this was not enough for some of their friends, who caused the bull to be paraded about the city, fixed to the breasts of a prostitute who was seated in a cart, and afterwards to be burnt at the pillory. The chief contriver of this scene was Woksa of Waldstein, one of the king's courtiers; but the impetuous Jerome was so far favourable to it that it was generally ascribed to him, and afterwards became the foundation of one of the charges against him at Constance.

Wenceslaus now forbade all language of insult against the pope, and all resistance to his bulls, under pain of death. But Hus continued his preaching, and the excitement became more alarming. One day, as a preacher of the crusade was setting forth his indulgences in a church, he was interrupted by three young men, belonging to the class of artisans, who told him that he lied, that master Hus had taught them the vanity of such privileges, and that the pope was antichrist for proclaiming them. The three were carried before the magistrates of the city, and next day were condemned to die, in accordance with the king's late decree. Hus earnestly interceded for them, declaring that, if any one were to be put to death, he was himself more guilty than they; and the council appears to have promised that their lives should be spared. But when the popular agitation had been thus calmed, the young men were hastily executed. The passions of the multitude were now stirred to the uttermost. When the executioner proclaimed, in the usual form, "Whoso doth the like, let him expect the like!", a general cry burst forth, "We are all ready to do and to suffer the like!" Female devotees dipped their handkerchiefs in the blood of the victims, and treasured it up as a precious relic; some of the crowd even licked the blood. The bodies were carried off by the people, and were borne with solemn pomp to interment in the chapel of Bethlehem, which thence took the name

of the Three Saints or Martyrs. Hus himself did not hesitate to speak of them as martyrs in sermons and writings; and, although he had not even been present at the funeral procession, he continued to the end of his life to be charged with having been the author of the movement.

The agitation at Prague continued. Hus combated the abuse of indulgences with untiring zeal, in sermons, disputations, and tracts; he denied that any human judge could with certainty forgive sins, and maintained that an excommunication unjustly uttered was no more to be dreaded than the ban of the Jewish synagogue. The parties became more violent and exasperated; the Germans were for pulling down Bethlehem chapel, while, on the other side, Hus had often to lament the discredit brought on his cause by partisans whose zeal was neither tempered by discretion nor adorned by consistency of life. Archbishop Albic, feeling himself unequal to contend with the difficulties of the case, exchanged his see for a lower but more tranquil dignity, and was succeeded by Conrad of Vechta, a Westphalian, formerly bishop of Olmütz, who, after having acted as administrator of the diocese for some months, was enthroned in July 1413.

The university of Prague had again condemned the forty-five propositions ascribed to Wyclif in July 1412; the clergy of the city had addressed to the pope a letter against Hus; and on the festival of the Purification, 1413, it was decreed by a council at Rome, under John XXIII, that all Wyclif's works, of whatever kind, should be burnt, inasmuch as, although there might be truth in some of them, it was mixed with error. Hus was excommunicated and anathematized for his disregard of citations to the papal court. Every place in which he might be was to be interdicted; all who should countenance him were to be partakers in his condemnation; and it was ordered that the sentence should be everywhere published with the most solemn forms of the church. The new archbishop proceeded, with the king's consent, to carry out these decrees, pronouncing an interdict on all Prague except the royal quarter, and ordering that Bethlehem chapel, as being the centre of the reforming movement, should be demolished. Hus protested against his condemnation; he set forth an appeal to the Saviour, in very earnest terms, and, after having caused a protest to be engraved on the walls of Bethlehem chapel, he withdrew from the tumults of Prague, at the king's request, and with an assurance that Wenceslaus would endeavour to bring about a reconciliation with the clergy. For a time he lived in retirement, partly in the castles of nobles who favoured his opinions, but chiefly in the neighbourhood where the Hussite town of Tabor was afterwards founded. He kept up a lively correspondence with his followers at Prague, whom he exhorted not to allow the old place of his ministrations to be destroyed; and, notwithstanding the sentences which had been pronounced against him, he continued his preaching, which, wherever he went, aroused a strong indignation against the system of the Roman church, with its corruptions of doctrine and of practice. His pen, too, was actively employed in the production of writings in Latin, Bohemian, and German; and to this time belongs the treatise 'Of the Church', which is the most important of his works.

Resting on the rigid doctrine of predestination, Hus says that to be in the church is not the same as to be of the church. Some are in the church both in name and reality; some neither in the one nor in the other, as the foreknown heathen; some in name only, as the foreknown hypocrites, some in reality, although nominally they are without, as those predestined Christians whom the officers of antichrist profess to exclude by ecclesiastical censures. No one can be assured of his predestination, except through special revelation, so that it is surprising how the worldly clergy can have the confidence to claim the true membership of the church. Christ alone is head of the church; St. Peter was not its head, but was chief of the apostles. The pope is the vicar of St. Peter, if he walk in his steps; but if he give into covetousness, he is the vicar of Judas Iscariot. The pope and cardinals are not the body of the church; but they are the chief part of it as to dignity, if they follow Christ in humility. The pope owes his pre-eminence to Constantine, whose alleged donation Hus believes as firmly as he believes the tale of pope Joan. He reprobates the flattery which was commonly used

towards the pope, and denounces the luxury and other corruptions of the cardinals. He disowns the charge of disobedience to the church, justifies himself as to the matters which had brought him under censure, and declares that excommunications, interdicts, and other sentences, if unjustly pronounced, are of no effect, and are not to be regarded. God alone, he says, knows to whom sin is to be forgiven; and Christ is the only true Roman high-priest, whom all are bound to obey in order to salvation.

This treatise was written in consequence of the proceedings of a synod at Prague, where Hus was represented by John of Jessnitz, a doctor of canon law; but there was no definite result; and it was followed up by other writings against the chiefs of the ecclesiastical party. While Hus had been compelled to leave Prague, Jerome, too, withdrew, probably of his own accord, and betook himself again to travel—in the course of which he made his way into Russia. Before his return, Hus had already set out to present himself before the council of Constance.

CHAPTER VIII.

FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE ALEXANDER V TO THE END OF THE
COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

A.D. 1409-1418.

THE hopes of union and of reformation which had been connected With the council of Pisa were not to be realized. Both Gregory XII and Benedict XIII continued to maintain their claims to the papacy, so that instead of two popes there were now three, or, in the language of a writer of the time, the church had received a third husband in addition to those who already claimed her affections. Soon after the election of Alexander V, Gerson addressed to him a discourse on the duties of his office; but Alexander was not inclined to benefit by this advice. Although a learned theologian, he was altogether without the strength of character which is requisite for government. His easiness of disposition led him to grant all that was asked of him. Himself careless as to matters of business, he advanced many Franciscans to places for which they were unfitted by their want of practical habits; in order to provide for the multitude of applicants, he increased the offices of his court to such a degree that they fell into contempt; and although, having no kindred, he was free from the temptations of nepotism, he was lavish in gifts, especially to the order of which he had been a member, and in whose society he continued to live. Such was his profusion in his new dignity, that he spoke of himself as having been rich as a bishop, poor as a cardinal, but a beggar as pope. Instead of attempting at once the work of reform, he professed to reserve it for a council which was to meet in 1412; and on the 7th of August 1409 he dissolved the council of Pisa. Soon after this Alexander displayed his partiality for his associates, and added to the subjects of discord which already existed in the church, by a bull, in which he authorized the members of the mendicant orders to receive tithes, and not only to hear confessions and to give absolution everywhere, but to administer the other sacraments, without regard to the rights of bishops or of parish priests; and the parochial clergy were charged to read in all churches this annihilation of their own rights, under pain of being punished as contumacious and obstinate heretics. Immediately a great ferment was excited. While the Augustine friars and the Franciscans took advantage of it, and the latter especially displayed much elation on account of their new privileges, the Dominicans and the Carmelites disowned it, as something which they had not asked for and of which they had no need. The university of Paris, headed by Gerson, sent envoys to the papal court for the purpose of inspecting the original document, as if nothing less than such evidence could be enough to warrant its genuineness; and, as it professed to be issued with the consent and advice of the cardinals, the envoys waited on the members of the college individually, whom they found unanimous in disavowing all concern in it. By this bull were rescinded no less than seven bulls of former popes. The papal privilege was met in France by the expulsion of the Franciscans and Augustinians from the university of Paris, and by a royal order, issued at the request of the university, forbidding the parochial clergy to let the mendicants hear confessions or preach in their churches.

Gregory XII, after his attempt to hold a council at Cividale, had withdrawn to Gaeta, where he lived under the protection of Ladislaus, to whom it is said that he sold his rights to the sovereignty of Rome and the papal states. Ladislaus got possession of the city; but after a time it was regained for Alexander by the legate of Bologna, Balthazar Cossa, who was aided by Lewis of Anjou, by the Florentines, and by an insurrection within Rome itself. Alexander was driven from Pisa by a pestilence; but instead of complying with the invitation of the

Romans, who sent him the keys of their city, he was constrained by Cossa, whose ascendancy over him was absolute, to make his way across the Apennines through snow and ice to Bologna, where he arrived on the Epiphany, and died on the 3rd of May 1410. His end was generally explained by the ready supposition of poison, and this was supposed by many to have been administered through the contrivance of the legate.

On the 16th of May—the third day after the conclave had been formed—Cossa was chosen as pope by seventeen cardinals, and took the name of John the Twenty-third. The accounts of his earlier life are such that we can hardly conceive how, if they may be believed, he should have been able to gain influence as an ecclesiastic, and eventually to attain the papal chair by the votes of his brother cardinals; yet all contemporary writers agree in the substance of the story, and the very blackest parts of it were brought against him without contradiction at the council of Constance. Born of a noble Neapolitan family, Cossa had early entered into the ranks of the clergy; but his clerical profession had not prevented him from engaging in the piratical warfare between Naples and Hungary; and in this stage of his life he acquired a habit, which afterwards adhered to him, of waking by night and sleeping by day. After having resided for some time at Bologna, where he affected the character of a student, he was made archdeacon of that city by Boniface IX, who afterwards transferred him to Rome and appointed him papal chamberlain. In this office Cossa exercised his genius in devising new forms of corruption for the benefit of the ecclesiastical revenues. To him is ascribed the system of sending out preachers to vend indulgences with the most impudent pretensions, while he himself was notorious for enriching himself by simony and bribes. In 1403 he was sent back to Bologna as cardinal-legate—partly, it is said, with a view of removing him from the neighbourhood of his brother's wife, with whom he carried on a scandalous intercourse.

At Bologna he established a despotic and tyrannical power. The people were ground by taxation, monopolies, and plunder: licenses were sold for the exercise of infamous occupations—of usury, keeping of gaming-houses, prostitution. His cruelty towards those who offended him was so widely exercised, that it is said to have visibly thinned the population of the city; his lust was so inordinate, that within the first year of his legation two hundred maidens, wives, or widows, and a multitude of consecrated nuns, are said to have fallen victims to it. He is charged with having bribed the cardinals to desert Gregory, whose arms he defaced on the public buildings of Bologna before setting out for the council of Pisa; and in that council he took a prominent part, although, on being proposed for the papacy, he found it expedient to put forward Alexander, as one whom he might make his tool, and who was not likely to stand long in his way. At Bologna, the conclave was subject to the legate's control, and various stories are told as to the manner in which he carried his own election, by the use of bribery and of terror; but as, in the course of the later proceedings against him, no charge was brought on this point, these stories may perhaps be safely rejected.

John began his pontificate by promulgating rules for his chancery which sanctioned the worst of the existing corruptions, and by uttering curses, according to usage, against his rivals Gregory and Benedict. The growing power of Ladislaus gave just ground for alarm; and John had a personal cause of dislike against him for having condemned two of the pope's own brothers to death as pirates—from the execution of which sentence they had with difficulty been rescued by the intercession of Boniface IX. John declared the king to be excommunicate and deposed, and proclaimed a crusade against him with those offers of indulgences which, as we have seen, excited a commotion in Bohemia; and, in conjunction with Lewis of Anjou, he carried the war against Ladislaus into southern Italy. At Rocca Secca, near Ceperano, the pope and his allies gained a victory; but Lewis was unable to follow up this advantage, and found himself obliged to return to Provence, from which he made no further attempt on Italy.

After a time John found it expedient to enter into negotiations with Ladislaus, who agreed to abandon Gregory XII, but exacted heavy conditions—that the pope should disallow the claim of Lewis of Anjou to Naples, and that of Peter of Aragon to Sicily; that he should

acknowledge Ladislaus as king of both territories, should declare him standard-bearer of the Roman church and empire, and should pay him a large sum of money. Gregory, finding himself obliged to leave the king's territories, made his way from Gaeta by sea—not without danger from hostile ships—to Rimini, where he found a refuge with Charles Malatesta, the only potentate who still adhered to him; and through this friend he carried on for a time negotiations with pope John—each of the rivals endeavouring to persuade the other to resign by liberal offers of compensation.

As if in fulfilment of the engagements into which his predecessor Alexander had entered, John affected to summon a council to meet at Rome in 1412, with a view to the reform of the church. But the number of bishops who attended was very scanty, and the only result seems to have been a condemnation of Wyclif's writings, which were burnt on the steps of St. Peter's. The council broke up without any formal dissolution, in consequence of the troubles in which the pope was involved.

At Rome John had been received with acclamations and festive displays; but he soon made himself detested by the heaviness of the taxation which he imposed. The richer citizens were drained of their money; officials of all kinds were compelled to pay largely for their places; a rate was levied on trades and mechanical occupations; the coin was debased; the duties on wine were increased to such a degree that the growers found themselves driven from the Roman market. On this account, and because Ladislaus did not support the pope in an attempt to extort a second payment of fees from prelates and others who had held office under Gregory, a fresh rupture took place. The king got possession of Rome by surprise, while John fled to Viterbo and thence to Florence and Bologna. The palaces of the pope and cardinals were plundered; many of the churches were turned into stables. The castle of St. Angelo, after having held out for some time, was treacherously surrendered; and Ladislaus overran the whole country as far as Siena.

In the distress to which he was now reduced, John found himself obliged to turn, as his only resource, to Sigismund, the emperor-elect. At the death of Rupert, in May 1410, it had seemed as if the empire, like the church, were to be distracted between three claimants; for, while some of the electors wished to bring forward the deposed Wenceslaus again, one party chose his brother, king Sigismund of Hungary, while another party chose Jobst or Jodocus, marquis of Moravia. But Jodocus, who is said to have been ninety years old, was speedily removed by death, and Sigismund received the votes of those who had before stood aloof from him—among others that of Wenceslaus himself, with whom he was formally reconciled. For a time Sigismund's energies were chiefly occupied by a war with the Venetians for the possession of Dalmatia; but a truce of five years, concluded in 1413, set him free to attend to the affairs of the empire and of the church. Sigismund was the most powerful emperor since the days of Frederick II, and at this time his influence was the stronger because France and England were about to renew their great struggle, and France, in addition to its dangers from the foreign enemy, was a prey to the bloody feuds of the Burgundian and Orleanist factions. The emperor's noble presence, his accomplishments and knightly deportment, his love of splendour and magnificence (although this was continually restrained by pecuniary difficulties arising out of the imprudence of his youth), procured him general popularity. The faults of his earlier days—among which faithlessness, harshness, and excessive love of pleasure are noted—appeared to have been abandoned as the great dignity which he had attained brought with it a deep feeling of duty and responsibility. Most especially he was desirous to heal the schism of the church. As king of Hungary, he had acknowledged John, and at his election to the empire the archbishop of Mayence had exacted from him an oath that he would not accept the crown from any other pope than John or a successor of the same line. With regard to Ladislaus, Sigismund's interest was one with that of John; for Ladislaus, in addition to the ambitious projects which he had formed as to Italy, directly claimed Sigismund's kingdom of Hungary, and even had views on the imperial dignity.

With a view to the reunion of the church, Sigismund urged on John the necessity of a general council. If such an assembly were to meet, the question as to the place of its meeting was important for John's interest. He himself told his secretary, Leonard of Arezzo, that it must not be in any place where the emperor was too powerful; that, while professing to give full powers to the commissioners whom he was about to send to Sigismund, he intended secretly to limit their choice to certain Italian cities : but at taking leave of the commissioners, acting on a sudden impulse, he professed entire confidence in them, and destroyed the list of places. On finding that they had agreed to fix on Constance, a town beyond the Alps and within the imperial dominions, he burst out into bitter reproaches against them, and cursed his own folly in having departed from his first resolution. At Lodi he had a meeting with the emperor, and urged on him that the council should be held in some city of Lombardy; but Sigismund, who had already issued his summons, was not to be diverted from his purpose. The plea that the patriarchs and cardinals would be unwilling to cross the Alps was met by the answer that the ecclesiastical electors of the empire would be equally unwilling to do so in the opposite direction.

Sigismund, in respectful terms, exhorted the pope to amend the courses by which he had scandalized Christendom, especially as to simony; and John promised compliance. The emperor accompanied him as far as Cremona on his return towards Bologna. The French reformers, finding that the influence of their own nation had been insufficient to heal the schism, had now turned their hopes towards the emperor, and Gerson had urged the assembling of a council on him as a duty of his office which could not be neglected without mortal sin. In accordance with this view, Sigismund, as temporal head of Christendom, had sent forth his citation for a general council, while John, as pope, was persuaded to do the like. The time fixed in both documents, as if by independent authority, was the first of November in the following year. The emperor invited both Gregory XII and Benedict to attend, with their adherents, but refrained from giving to either of them the title of pope.

John was already committed to the council, when he was informed that Ladislaus, against whom he was endeavouring to enlist troops, had suddenly died at Naples. By this event his position was rendered easier, and less dependent on the alliance of Sigismund, so that he entertained the idea of taking up his abode at Rome instead of fulfilling his promise to appear at Constance. Some of his friends endeavoured to alarm him by telling him that, if he should go to Constance as pope, he would return as a private man. But the cardinals, fearing lest he should plunge into hazardous schemes for recovering the whole of the church's territory, insisted on the fulfilment of his promise, and he unwillingly set forth from Bologna. In passing through the Tyrol, he had an interview with duke Frederick of Austria, whom he knew to be hostile to Sigismund; and it was agreed that in case of necessity the pope might reckon on the duke's protection. As John was descending the Arlberg he was upset in the snow, and vented loud curses on his own folly in having set out on such an expedition; and when he arrived in sight of Constance, its appearance drew from him the exclamation, "So are foxes caught".

Almost from the beginning of the schism the cries for a reform of the church had been loud and frequent. Nicolas of Clemanges, then rector of the university of Paris, had led the way in 1394 by a forcible appeal to the king of France; and about 1401 appeared a tract 'Of the Corrupt State of the Church,' which has been usually, although perhaps wrongly, ascribed to him. In this the condition of things is painted in very dark, and perhaps somewhat exaggerated, colours. The writer enlarges on the decay of the church from the simplicity of its primitive days. The three great vices of the clergy he declares to be luxury, pride, and greed; vices which prevail among every class from the pope downwards. He censures the popes for their usurpation of patronage, for the unworthy bestowal of it on ignorant and useless men, whereby the whole order of clergy had fallen into contempt, and for the exactions by which they oppressed the clergy. He is severe on the corruptions of the Roman court; on the pride of

cardinals, their monstrous pluralities, their simony and venality, their unedifying manner of life. Bishops neglect their dioceses and hang about the courts of princes, under the false pretence of being needed as their counsellors; they are intent on getting money by discreditable means, and spend their time in frivolous and indecent amusements. Canons imitate in their degree the faults of the bishops. Monks are so much worse than others as by their profession they ought to be better; and mendicants vitiate the good deeds which they claim by their unseemly boasting of them, so that they are the Pharisees of the church, and our Lord's condemnations of the Jewish Pharisees are applicable to them. In conclusion the writer warns of dangers which are at hand, and declares that the only safety for the church is in humiliation and amendment. Peter d'Ailly, now cardinal and archbishop of Cambrai, agreed with other writers in desiring reform, but saw greater practical hindrances in the way; and in 1410 he put forth a tract, 'Of the Difficulty of Reformation in a General Council', urging the vacancy of the empire, the disorganized condition of the church, and the danger that the cardinals might not agree in an election, or might increase the existing perplexities. To this a reply was made in a treatise 'On the Ways of Uniting and Reforming the Church in a General Council,' which has been commonly (but perhaps incorrectly) attributed to Gerson. The writer is strongly opposed to the assumptions and to the corruptions of the papacy. He considers that the necessity of the case is so strong as to overpower all ordinary difficulties. The pope, he says, is not above the gospel; he received his office for the general good, and for the general good he ought to resign it, if necessary. The popes should be urged to cession; and if this cannot be obtained, it would be legitimate to pursue the great object even by the use of fraud, violence, bribery, imprisonment, and death. In such a question all Christians, even to the lowest in station, are interested; all, and more especially those in high authority, are entitled to interfere. The emperor, as general advocate of the church, ought to call a general council, and a new pope ought to be chosen, who must neither be one of the existing claimants, nor a member of the college of cardinals; for cardinals ought, in the writer's opinion, to be always regarded as ineligible on account of the danger of collusion, which might lead to the choice of unsuitable men. And the work concludes with suggesting some reforms which the future council ought to take in hand.

The influence of the school to which these writers belonged had been apprehended by John, and he had endeavoured to gain them by bestowing large privileges and other benefits on the university of Paris, and by raising Peter d'Ailly, as one of its most eminent members, to the dignity of cardinal.

The eyes of all Christendom were now turned with intense interest to the expected council. It was not merely to decide between the claims of rival popes, but was to settle the question whether a pope or a general council were the highest authority in the church. As the time of meeting drew near, multitudes of every class poured into Constance, and the arrivals continued for some months after the opening of the council. Of the ecclesiastical members, some appeared in plain and simple style, and others in pomp which displayed the union of secular wealth with ecclesiastical dignity. Among the latter class John of Nassau, the primate of Germany, distinguished himself by entering the city in complete armour, attended by a splendid train of 352 men, with 700 horses. The whole number of ecclesiastics present, with their attendants, is reckoned at 18,000. During the sittings of the council there were usually 50,000 strangers within the walls of Constance; sometimes twice that number, with 30,000 horses. Among those who were attracted to the great ecclesiastical assembly by the hope of gain were persons of all sorts—merchants and traders, lawyers in great numbers and in all their varieties, artists and craftsmen, players, jugglers, and musicians to the number of 1700, and no less than 700 avowed prostitutes.

John had obtained from the magistrates of Constance certain privileges as to jurisdiction. He ordered the arms of his rival Gregory to be torn down from the lodgings of Gregory's representative, the cardinal of Ragusa; and when this act was afterwards called in

question, the majority of the council justified it on the ground that such a display ought not to have been made within the territories where John was acknowledged, nor unless Gregory himself were present.

On the 5th of November the council was opened with a solemn service; and on the 16th the first general session was held. Among the members of the council (of whom, however, many did not arrive until later) were the titular patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem, twenty-two cardinals, twenty archbishops, nearly a hundred bishops and thirty-three titular bishops, a hundred and twenty-four abbots, and two hundred and fifty doctors, with many secular princes or representatives of princes.

Of the Italian prelates, the most active in the council was Zabarella, cardinal-archbishop of Florence; of those from the northern kingdoms, the leaders were Peter d'Ailly and the bishop of Salisbury, Robert Hallam, who had already borne a conspicuous part in the council of Pisa.

The treasures which John had at his disposal enabled him to exercise much influence. He contrived, by underhand movements, to divide the interests of the various nations, and to distract them from an agreement in action; and it is said that he made himself master of secrets through informants who resorted to him by night, and whom he was accustomed to absolve formally from the guilt of perjury which they incurred by their revelations.

Very early in the proceedings of the council there were indications of a spirit which it was impossible for John to misinterpret. Thus, when it was proposed by some Italians, on the 7th of December, that the council of Pisa should be confirmed—a step by which the new assembly would have bound itself to the pope of the line there established—it was resolved, in opposition to this proposal, that the council should be regarded as a continuation of that of Pisa, and therefore could not confirm its acts; and it was evident that the intention was not to decide between the rival claimants of the papacy, but to persuade all three to a cession of their claims, and to elect a new pope to the vacant office.

On the morning of Christmas-day, before dawn, Sigismund, who had lately received the German crown at Aix-la-Chapelle, arrived at Constance, having crossed the lake in a boat: and forthwith he proceeded to assist at a solemn mass which was celebrated by the pope. Habited in a dalmatic, and with the crown on his head, he read (according to the privilege of his office) the gospel of the decree which went out from Caesar Augustus; and the words were heard as betokening an assertion of the imperial superiority over the papacy. John put into his hand a sword for the defence of the church: and the emperor swore that he would always labour for that end to the utmost of his power. But, although this engagement was sincerely made, Sigismund was firmly resolved to pursue his own policy, instead of lending himself to the pope's schemes; and it was in vain that John, knowing the necessities by which he was encumbered in the attempt to maintain the state of imperial dignity, endeavoured to propitiate him by presents or loans of money.

Three days later, cardinal d'Ailly preached before the emperor, from the text, "There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars". The sun he interprets as representing the papacy, the moon as the imperial power, the stars as the various estates of the church. There can, he holds, neither be real reform without union, nor real union without reform. The pope, if he deviate from the likeness of the sun by entering ill, by living ill, by ruling ill, is but a false image of the sun. There cannot be three suns, but only one true sun. The emperor attends the council, not that he may be over it, but that he may benefit it; not to define spiritual and ecclesiastical matters by royal authority, but to maintain by his power those things which the synod shall determine. The members of the council—the stars—are assembled by the call of the supreme pontiff, who alone has the right to convoke general councils. The stars are to have their share of influence, as well as the sun and the moon. The power of decreeing and defining belongs, not to the pope alone, but to the whole general

council; and to assert the contrary is a flattery of the pope which deserves to be severely reprobated.

In order to avoid disputes as to precedence, it was arranged that the members of the council should sit promiscuously, and that this should not be regarded as infringing on the privileges of any one. But questions arose as to the right and as to the manner of voting. In earlier councils the power of voting had been restricted to bishops and abbots; but d'Ailly argued that it ought now to be extended to other classes; that the precedents of ancient councils showed much variety; that as the present questions did not relate to the church's faith or to the sacraments, the examples of former times were not binding; that the titular bishops, of whom many were present at the council, were not entitled to be held of the same account with the bishops of the earlier church; that the learning possessed by doctors of theology and of civil and canon law—a class which had arisen out of the universities, and had, therefore, been unknown in the days of the older councils—was of such value as to render them fitter to be members of a council than an ignorant bishop or abbot; and that the representatives of princes, of absent prelates, and of capitular churches, ought also to be admitted. Fillastre, cardinal of St. Mark, in arguing on the same side, maintained that many parish priests were, both by the weight of their character and by the importance of their charges, more to be regarded than some bishops; and he declared “that an ignorant king or prelate is but a crowned or mitred ass”. The arguments for extending the right of voting prevailed, to the disadvantage of John, who had relied on the numbers of his titular bishops. But his interest was yet more seriously affected by a novelty which was introduced as to the manner of voting. Hitherto the decisions of councils had been determined by a majority of the whole body. But as John had at his command a host of insignificant prelates—titulars, officials of his court, and needy occupants of petty Italian sees—it was proposed, in order to counteract this undue influence, that each nation should debate by itself, and that the final decision should be given by the representatives of the several nations, which were thus to be on an equality. This proposal, derived from the arrangements of the university of Paris, was carried by the emperor's influence; and the four nations—Italian, French, German, and English—proceeded to their separate deliberations. Their meetings were held in the refectories and chapter-houses of the various convents in the town, while the general sessions of the council took place in the cathedral.

Cardinal Fillastre, who, as dean of Reims, had formerly been a zealous champion of the papacy, sent forth a paper, in which, after a consideration of other expedients, it was proposed that each of the rival popes should cede his claims, and should receive valuable preferment in the church by way of consolation. On becoming acquainted with this scheme, John is said to have been violently angry; but stronger measures were at hand.

A paper of charges against John was produced before the council—it is supposed, by an Italian. These charges were in part so dark and monstrous that it was said that they ought to be kept secret, out of reverence for the papal office, and in order to avoid the general scandal of Christendom. John, who through his secret informants became aware of the movement, was inclined to admit some of the accusations, to deny others, and to take his stand on a supposed principle that a pope could not be deposed except for heresy; but he was persuaded by his confidential advisers to await the progress of events. In the meantime the German, French, and English nations, without knowing that he had any suspicion of the charges, resolved that he should be advised to resign his dignity; and John, alarmed by intelligence which he had secretly gained, agreed to the proposal, with the condition that his rivals should also resign. Immediately after having entered into this engagement, he began to attempt an escape from it; he rejected two forms of cession which were proposed by the council, and the council rejected a form of his proposing; but at length he was induced, at the second general session, to swear before the high altar of the cathedral, after having himself celebrated mass, that he would freely resign the papacy if the other claimants would also resign, or if in any other way his

resignation might extinguish the schism and restore peace to the church. This promise was received with unbounded joy; the emperor kissed John's feet, and thanked him in the name of the council, and the patriarch of Antioch added the thanks of the whole church. *Te Deum* was sung, and the bells of the cathedral announced the happy event to the world. When, however, John was asked to put his engagement into the form of a bull, he refused with vehement anger; but on being requested by Sigismund in person, he saw that further resistance would be useless, and on the 7th of March he issued a bull of the desired tenor.

It was Sigismund's wish that the council should settle the religious difficulties which had arisen in Bohemia, as well as the great schism. He therefore requested his brother Wenceslaus to send Hus to Constance, and promised him a safe-conduct. Hus, who had always professed to desire the opportunity of appealing to a general council, willingly accepted the summons. He presented himself before a synod held by the archbishop of Prague in August 1414, and publicly challenged any one to impugn his faith, on condition of suffering, in case of defeat, the same penalties which would have fallen on Hus if convicted. The challenge was not accepted, and Palecz describes the Hussite party as so exasperated that it was unsafe to call them by their leader's name. The archbishop, on being questioned by the nobles who befriended Hus, declared that he had no charge of heresy to bring against him, but that as he had been accused by the pope, he must make his excuses to the pope; and they wrote to Sigismund, requesting that Hus might be allowed to defend himself freely, lest Bohemia should be unjustly discredited. Hus obtained certificates of his orthodoxy from the king, from the archbishop, and from the papal inquisitor for Bohemia—Nicolas, bishop of Nazareth, to whom he had submitted himself for examination. Yet in truth his position was one which it is now hardly possible to understand; for while he believed himself to be a faithful adherent of the system established in the church, his opinions were, in some respects, such as later experience has shown to be altogether subversive of it.

On the eve of setting out for the council he showed some signs of misgiving. He was warned by friends not to trust the promised safe-conduct; and some letters which he wrote by way of farewell indicate a foreboding that he might never be allowed to return. On the 10th of October, without waiting for the arrival of the safe-conduct, Hus began his journey under the escort of three noblemen appointed by the Bohemian king, John and Henry of Chlum, and Wenceslaus of Dubna. As he passed through the towns of Germany, he offered to give an account of his faith, and engaged in frequent discussions. Notwithstanding the old national quarrel as to the university of Prague (which was afterwards revived as a charge against him), he was well received everywhere, especially at Nuremberg; nor was there any attempt to enforce the interdict which had been pronounced against any place in which he might be.

On the 3rd of November Hus arrived at Constance, and two days later (on the very day of the opening of the council) he received the promised safe-conduct, which Sigismund had granted at Spires on the 14th of October. In answer to an application by John of Chlum, John XXIII declared that Hus should be safe at Constance if he had slain the pope's own brother; and he suspended the interdict and ban, although he desired that Hus should refrain from attendance at mass, lest some excitement should arise. But Hus never ceded his right to perform the priestly functions, and he continued to celebrate mass as before. In the meantime two of his bitterest enemies arrived at Constance,—Stephen of Palecz, whose breach with him has been already mentioned, and one Michael of Deutschbrod, who, after having been a parish priest at Prague, had become a projector of mining speculations, but had since been appointed by the pope to the office of proctor in causes of faith, and thence was commonly styled *De Causis*. These and other adversaries posted upon the doors of churches bills denouncing Hus as an excommunicated and obstinate heretic; they supplied the pope, the cardinals, and other members of the council with extracts maliciously selected from his writings; they circulated tales and rumours against him, representing his errors as of the darkest kind, and yet as so

popular in Bohemia that, if he were allowed to return, the lives of the clergy would not be safe there.

Proposals were made by which Hus might probably have been allowed to escape easily; but he had always insisted on a public hearing, and he looked for the expected arrival of the emperor. By the industrious exertions of his enemies, and by a false report that he had attempted a flight from Constance, the authorities were persuaded to place him under restraint. On the 28th of November he was decoyed into the pope's residence, and was thence removed for custody to the house of the precentor of the cathedral; and on the 6th of December he was transferred to a dungeon in the Dominican convent, where the stench and other inconveniences soon produced a serious illness, so that his medical advisers prescribed a removal. Meanwhile his friend John of Chlum protested loudly against his imprisonment as an insult to the emperor, who had granted a safe-conduct. He reproached the pope to his face, and, by an appeal to Sigismund, procured an order that Hus should be set at liberty; and as this was disregarded, he affixed to the church doors on Christmas-eve, when the emperor was approaching the city, a protest in Latin and in German against the treachery which had been practised towards Hus, and the neglect of the emperor's warrant for his liberation.

While confined in his noisome prison, without access to books, and almost at a loss for the means of writing, Hus composed some tracts on religious subjects, at the request of his keepers and for their instruction, and was required to draw up answers to a set of charges brought against him by Palecz and Michael de Causis, the pope having on the first of December appointed certain commissioners for the investigation of his case. These charges were partly grounded on extracts unfairly made from his treatise 'Of the Church' and other books, partly on the evidence of unguarded letters which had been intercepted. On being questioned as to the articles, he explained the sense in which he believed them; but on being asked whether he would defend them, he answered "No," and added that he stood at the determination of the council. He declared his wish to adhere to the church, to the tradition of the fathers, and to the canons, except where these were opposite to Scripture; and he professed himself willing to retract any errors, and to be instructed by any man—of course, with the secret condition that the instruction should agree with his previous convictions. As being accused of heresy, he was not allowed the assistance of an advocate; whereupon he told the commissioners that he committed his cause to Him who would shortly judge them all, as his advocate and proctor.

With regard to the treasury of the merits of the saints, their intercession, and the power and dignity of the blessed Virgin, he expressed himself in accordance with the current theology of the time. As to the eucharistic presence, he held that it was enough for a simple Christian to believe the verity of the Saviour's body and blood; but for himself he acknowledged the change denoted by the name of transubstantiation, and made use of the term itself. This change he held to be wrought by Christ himself through the medium of the priest; and therefore that a wicked priest might consecrate effectually, although to his own condemnation. One of the charges against him related to the administration of the cup to the laity. The necessity of this had been maintained by one James (or Jacobellus) of Misa, a parish priest of Prague, after Hus had set out for Constance; and Hus, on having his attention drawn to the question, declared the practice to be scriptural, primitive, and desirable, but would not affirm the necessity of it.

Unfortunately for Hus, the liberal or reforming party in the council was not disposed to favour him. The Parisian school, while bent on limiting the power of the papacy, insisted on strictness of orthodoxy, and regarded Hus as likely, by opinions which to them seemed extravagant and revolutionary, to bring danger and discredit on their own projects of reforms; moreover, as nominalists, they were opposed to the realism of his philosophical tenets. Gerson had written to the archbishop of Prague, urging him to use severe measures against the errors which had arisen in Bohemia, and, if ecclesiastical censures should be insufficient, to have

recourse to the secular arm. He had obtained from the Theological faculty of Paris a condemnation of twenty propositions extracted from Hus's writings; and in forwarding this condemnation to the Bohemian primate, he had spoken of the doctrine that one who is in mortal sin has no dominion over Christian people as one against which "all dominion, both temporal and spiritual, ought to rise, in order to exterminate it rather by fire and sword than by curious reasoning". From Gerson and his party, therefore, no sympathy was to be expected by the Bohemian reformer.

Sigismund, on receiving from John of Chlum the first notice of Hus's imprisonment, was indignant at the violation of his safe-conduct, and threatened to break open the prison. After reaching Constance he was still so much dissatisfied on this account, that he even withdrew for a time from the city; but it was represented to him that, if he persisted in such a course, the council must break up, and he shrank from the thought of not only endangering his own reputation for orthodoxy, but rendering all his labours void and perpetuating the division of Christendom. He was plied with arguments and with learning from the canon law, urging that his power did not extend to the protection of a heretic from the punishment due to his errors; that the letter which he had granted ought not to be used to the injury of the catholic faith; that he was not responsible, inasmuch as the council had granted no safe-conduct, and the council was greater than the emperor. It would seem, too, that his feelings with regard to Hus were altered by the reports which reached him, so that he came to regard the Bohemian reformer as a teacher of mischievous errors, both in politics and in religion. The king of Aragon wrote to him that "faith is not broken in the case of one who breaks his faith to God"; and unhappily the emperor consented to violate truth, honour, and humanity by declaring that the council was at liberty to take its own course as to inquiries into charges of heresy. At a later time he attempted to palliate this concession by alleging the importunities with which he had been assailed, and the difficulties of his position.

The consent which pope John had given to the violation of the imperial safe-conduct in the case of Hus was to recoil on himself; and it was in vain that, when the council proceeded against him, he appealed to the promises which had been made to him. In the hope of propitiating the emperor (of whom it is said that he habitually spoke in very contemptuous terms), he bestowed on him the golden rose, which was the special mark of papal favour; but Sigismund was not to be diverted from his purpose by this gift, which, instead of keeping it, he dedicated to the blessed Virgin in the cathedral of Constance. Strict orders were issued that no one should be permitted to leave the town; and John, after some urgency, was brought to promise that he would not depart until after the council should have ended its sessions. Some differences of opinion now began to show themselves between the nations. The Germans and the English were bent on sacrificing John for the unity of the church; Hallam, bishop of Salisbury, told him to his face, in the emperor's presence, that a general council was superior to the pope, and the speech met with no rebuke from Sigismund, to whom John complained of it. But the Italians had always been with John, and the French now began to show a milder disposition towards him—chiefly, it would seem, from a spirit of opposition to the English members, whose king was at this very time preparing to carry his arms into the heart of France.

In the hope of effecting some diversion, John proposed that the council should remove to Nice, or some place in its neighbourhood, or that he himself should repair to the same region for a conference with his rival Benedict; but these schemes met with no favour, and he found himself driven to another course. On the evening of the 20th of March, while the general attention was engrossed by a tournament given by duke Frederick of Austria (whom, as we have seen, John had before engaged in his interest), the pope escaped from Constance in the disguise of a groom, and fled to Schaffhausen, which was within the duke's territory. Thence he wrote to the council that he had no intention of evading his engagements, but had left Constance in order that he might execute them with greater liberty and in a more healthful air; and he declared that duke Frederick had not been privy to his flight.

On the 23rd of March, when the council was about to send envoys to the fugitive pope, Gerson delivered a discourse in which the principles of the reforming party were strongly pronounced. The Head of the church, he said, is Christ; the pope is its secondary head. The union between Christ and the church is inseparable, but the union of the church and the pope may be dissolved. As the church, or a general council which represents it, is directed by the Holy Ghost, even a pope is bound to hear and to obey such a council under pain of being accounted as a heathen and a publican. A pope cannot annul its decrees, and, although it may not take away the pope's power, it may limit that power. A general council may be assembled without the consent or mandate of a lawfully elected and living pope—among other cases, if he should himself be accused, and should refuse to call a council; and also if there be a doubt between rival claimants of the papacy. And the pope is bound to accept the decisions of a council with a view to the termination of a schism.

About the same time the university of Paris sent two papers of conclusions, which, although not fully adopted by the council, were of great use to it. In these papers it was laid down that the pope could not dissolve the council, and that any attempt to do so would bring him under suspicion of schism, if not of heresy; that the church is more necessary, better, of greater dignity, more honourable, more powerful, more steady in the faith, and wiser than the pope, and is superior to him; that the pope holds his power through the church and as its representative; and that the council may judge and depose him, even as it may be necessary to take a sword out of the hand of a madman.

The language of Gerson's sermon became known to John on the same day by means of the envoys to whom it had been addressed. In the hope of breaking up the council, he immediately summoned his cardinals, with the members of his household and the officials of his court, to join him; and seven cardinals, with many of the inferior persons, obeyed the summons. Yet it would seem that the pope was made a coward by his conscience; for, instead of hurling anathemas at his opponents in the lofty style of Hildebrand, he could only have recourse to complaints and evasions. He wrote to the king of France, to the duke of Orleans, to the university of Paris, and others, querulously setting forth his grievances against the emperor and the council.

There was indeed reason to fear that the council would be unable to continue its sessions; some were even afraid that it might end in a general tumult and plunder; but Sigismund, by firmly exerting his authority and influence, succeeded in keeping the great body of the assembly together, and in holding them to the pursuit of the object for which they had met. At the third general session, on the 26th of March, it was affirmed that, notwithstanding the withdrawal of the pope, or of any others, the sacred council was not dissolved, but remained in its integrity and authority; that it ought not to be dissolved until it should have effected the extirpation of the schism and a reform of the church in faith and morals, in head and members; that it was not to be transferred to any other place; and that none of the members should leave Constance without its permission until its proceedings should be duly concluded.

In a general congregation, on the 29th of March, Gerson proposed a strong censure against John on account of his flight; but the cardinals succeeded in averting it. At the fourth session, on the following day, it was resolved that the council's power, derived immediately from Christ, was superior to all dignities,—even to that of the pope, who was bound to obey it in matters relating to the faith and to the extirpation of the schism. When this document came to be read aloud by cardinal Zabarella, he was persuaded by his brother-cardinals to leave out such parts as were most strongly antipapal; but, as the nations complained loudly of this, the omitted passages were at the next session read out by the archbishop of Posen. At the same session it was resolved that Sigismund should be requested to bring back John, who, in alarm at the intelligence which he daily received as to the proceedings of the council, had removed on Good Friday from Schaffhausen to the castle of Lauffenburg. There, in the presence of

witnesses, he executed a written protest, declaring that his concessions had been made through fear of violence, and therefore were not binding; and he wrote to the council, alleging the same motive for his flight. From Lauffenburg he withdrew further to Freiburg, in the Breisgau, where a deputation from the council, headed by two cardinals, waited on him, with a request that he would appoint proctors to carry out the promised act of resignation. The pope received them in bed, and answered roughly, but promised to send proctors after them. From Freiburg he sent to the council a statement of the terms on which he was willing to resign—that he should be legate throughout all Italy for life, and should have a like authority in the region of Avignon, with an income of 30,000 florins, and a share with the other cardinals in the emoluments of the *capella*. But the council regarded the proposal as a proof that John intended to trifle with them by requiring extravagant and impossible conditions. Frederick of Austria was cited to answer for his complicity in the pope's flight, and, as he did not appear, was put under the ban of the empire as a traitor to it, the council, and the church. His neighbours, both ecclesiastical and secular, were summoned to chastise him, and, in conjunction with the imperial forces, they overran his territories, so that he was compelled to sue at the emperor's feet for forgiveness, to promise that he would give up the pope, and to receive submissively by a new investiture a portion of his former dominions, to be held at the imperial pleasure.

From Freiburg John, still wishing to be at a greater distance from the council, proceeded to Breisach and to Neuenburg, but Frederick, in fulfilment of his engagement to bring him back, desired that he would return to Constance; while the papal officials, finding no prospect of advantage in adhering to John, deserted him and rejoined the council.

In the meantime argument ran high in that assembly. The patriarch of Antioch, although hostile to John personally, asserted the papal pretensions in their extremest form—quoting from Gratian a dictum that if the pope, by his misconduct and negligence, should lead crowds of men into hell, no one but God would be entitled to find fault with him. But to this d'Ailly replied in a tract, which was afterwards embodied in his larger treatise 'Of Ecclesiastical Power', maintaining the authority of the general council over the pope, and taxing the patriarch with having been one of the flatterers who, "by feeding John with the milk of error, had led him to his ruin". Wearied and irritated by John's evasions and artifices, the council, at its seventh session, cited him to appear in person within nine days, in order to answer charges of heresy, schism, simony, maladministration, notorious waste of the property of the Roman and other churches, and diminution of their rights; of incorrigibly scandalous life; and of having attempted, by his clandestine flight, to hinder the union and reformation of the church. John proposed that, instead of appearing, he should appoint three cardinals as his proxies; but those whom he named declined the task, and the council resolved that in a criminal case proxies could not be admitted. Witnesses were examined in support of the charges. On the 13th of May, there seemed to be a chance of a diversion in John's favour, as Sigismund received letters informing him that the Turks were ravaging Hungary, in alliance with the Venetians; but his answer was that, even if he should lose the whole kingdom, he would not forsake the church and the council. On the 14th the pope was cited, and, as he did not answer, was pronounced contumacious; on the following day sentence of suspension was publicly pronounced against him; and the council resolved to proceed to deposition, if it should be necessary. A fresh examination of witnesses—thirty-seven in number—was then undertaken, and some of John's wrongful bulls and grants were put in evidenced. The heads of accusation were seventy-two, but there was much of iteration among them. Some of them were not read aloud, out of regard for decency and for the reverence due to the papacy. Carrying back the inquiry to his earliest years, the indictment charged him with having been rebellious to his parents, and given to all vices from his youth. He was said to have got his preferments by simony; to have been guilty of gross maladministration as legate; to have contrived the death of Alexander V. As pope, he was charged with having neglected the duties

of religion; with rape, adultery, sodomy, incest; with corruption of every sort in the bestowal of his patronage. He was styled a poisoner, a murderer; he had denied the resurrection of the dead and eternal life; he had intended to sell the head of St. John the Baptist, from the church of St. Sylvester, to some Florentines for 50,000 ducats. It was alleged that his misconduct was notorious and scandalous to all Christendom; that he had obstinately neglected the admonitions which had been addressed to him from many quarters; that he had dealt deceitfully with the council, and had absconded from it by night in the disguise of a layman. The evidence was considered to be so strong that his deposition was resolved on, as being guilty of simony, maladministration of his office, dilapidation of the church's property, and scandalous life. His seal was broken; all Christians were released from allegiance to him; and he was condemned to be kept in custody until the election of a new pope, to whom the further disposal of him was to be left. It was decreed that no election should take place without the consent of the council, and that no one of the existing claimants should be eligible.

John had been brought back by duke Frederick to Radolfzell, near Constance, whence, on the 26th of May, he addressed a letter to the emperor, reminding him of favours which the pope professed to have done to him in helping him to the crown, in seconding his wishes as to the council, and in other ways, and imploring him to observe his promise of a safe-conduct. But Sigismund, instead of being softened by this letter, appears to have been rather irritated by the contrast between its tone and that which he knew to be employed by John in speaking and writing of him to others. On the second day after the sentence of the council had been passed, it was announced to John by a deputation of five cardinals. He listened to it with submission and calmness, begging only that regard might be had to his dignity in so far as might be consistent with the welfare of the church. He voluntarily swore that he would never attempt to recover the papacy, and, stripping off the insignia of his office, he declared that he had never known a comfortable day since he had put them on.

The ex-pope was made over to the care of the elector palatine; for it was considered that the iniquities which had been proved against him, and his attempt to escape, had annulled the imperial safe-conduct. For some years he was detained as a prisoner, chiefly at Heidelberg; and this continued even after the council, at its first session under Martin V, had decreed that he should be transferred by the emperor and the elector to the pope. At length, however, by the payment of a large sum to the elector, he obtained leave to go into Italy, where at Florence he made his submission to the new pope, and from him received the dignity of cardinal-bishop of Frascati. But within a few months he died at Florence, without having taken possession of his see.

The council had, after John's flight from Constance, again directed its attention to the case of Hus, who, having been discharged from the custody of the pope's servants, was made over to the bishop of Constance, and by him was kept in chains at the neighbouring castle of Gottheben. The Parisian reforming party, as has been already said, was resolved to assert its own orthodoxy by disavowing all sympathy with one whose ideas it regarded as crude, unsound, and revolutionary; and when a new commission was appointed for the examination of his case—the flight of pope John having vitiated the authority of the earlier commissioners—d'Ailly, as a member of it, took a strong part against him. Reports of James of Misa's practice as to administration of the Eucharist in both kinds were received from Prague, and were circulated in exaggerated forms. It was said that Hus's principles as to endowments had been carried out by the spoliation of many Bohemian churches. The bishop of Leitomyšl, one of Hus's bitterest and most persevering enemies, represented that in Bohemia the sacramental wine was carried about in unconsecrated bottles, and that the laity handed it to each other; that laymen of good character were considered to be better authorized to administer the sacraments than vicious priests; that cobblers presumed to hear confessions and to give absolution.

The Bohemian and Moravian nobles protested strongly and repeatedly both against the treatment of Hus and against the imputations which were thrown on the faith of their nation. They urged that Hus might be allowed a free hearing, while he himself made requests to the same purpose, and declared that he was willing to be burnt rather than to be secluded; and as the proposal of a hearing was supported by Sigismund, the reformer was transferred from Gottlieben to the Franciscan convent at Constance, and on the 5th of June was brought before the council. Worn by long imprisonment, by the severities by which it had been aggravated, and by serious illness of various kinds, he was called on to answer the questioning of all who might oppose him, while, as being suspected of heresy, he was denied the assistance of an advocate. An attempt had been made, before his admission, to get him condemned on account of certain passages which his enemies had extracted from his writings; but this had been defeated by the exertions of John of Chlum and Wenceslaus of Dubna, who requested the emperor to intervene.

On the first day of Hus's appearance, the uproar was so great that he could not find a hearing; on the second day, Sigismund himself attended, to preserve order—a task which was by no means easy. Of the charges brought against him, Hus altogether denied some, while he explained others, and showed that his words had been wrongly construed. In the doctrine of the eucharistic presence, he agreed with the current teaching of the church, and differed from that of Wyclif, with whom it was sought to connect him. D'Ailly, a zealous nominalist, endeavoured to entrap him by a scholastic subtlety as to the ceasing of the universal substance of bread after the consecration; to which Hus replied that, although the substance ceases to be in the individual piece of bread, it remains as subject in other individual pieces. An English doctor suggested that the accused was equivocating like Berengar and Wyclif; but Hus declared that he spoke plainly and sincerely. Another Englishman protested against the introduction of irrelevant philosophical matters, inasmuch as Hus had cleared his orthodoxy with regard to the sacrament of the altar.

Much was said as to the connexion of Hus's doctrines with those of Wyclif, which the council had lately condemned under forty-five heads; indeed an English Carmelite, named Stokes, with whom Hus had formerly been engaged in controversy, sarcastically told him that he need not pride himself on his opinions as if they were his own, since he was merely a follower of Wyclif. Hus explained that he had found himself unable to join in the late condemnation on all points; thus, he would not say that Wyclif erred in censuring the donation of Constantine, or in regarding tithes as alms and not as an obligatory payment. On being pressed as to having expressed a wish that his own soul might be with that of Wyclif, he explained that he had said so in consequence of the reports which had reached him as to Wyclif's good life, and before his writings were known in Bohemia; nor had he intended to imply a certainty of Wyclif's salvation. As to the opinion that a priest in mortal sin could not consecrate, he stated that he had limited it by saying that one in such a state would consecrate and baptize unworthily. But when he was charged with holding that a king, a pope, or a bishop, if in mortal sin, was no king, pope, or bishop, his answers were such as to provoke from Sigismund an exclamation that there had never been a more mischievous heretic, as no man is without sin. Much was said on predestination and the subjects connected with it; as to which Hus seems to have drawn his opinions from Wyclif.

The question of the papal supremacy brought out the uncritical nature of Hus's views. He traced the pope's pre-eminence to the supposed donation of Constantine; and, although D'Ailly told him that he would do better to refer it to the sixth canon of Nicaea (as that canon was then commonly understood), he still adhered to his belief in the donation. In answer to a charge of having urged his followers to resist their opponents by force of arms, Hus denied that he had recommended the material sword; and it would seem that some words of his as to the spiritual armour of the Christian had been misinterpreted.

The affair as to the expulsion of the Germans from Prague was brought forward, and was urged by Palecz and by another Bohemian doctor; but as to this it appears that Hus was able to satisfy his judges. He was also questioned, among other things, as to having said that, unless he had voluntarily come to Constance, he could not have been compelled to do so by all the authority of the council and of the emperor. In explanation of these words he said that he might have been safely concealed among the many castles of the nobles who were friendly to him; and this was eagerly confirmed by John of Chlum, while cardinal d'Ailly angrily cried out against Hus's audacity. D'Ailly told him that he had done wrong in preaching to the people against cardinals and other dignitaries, when there were no such persons to hear him; to which Hus could only reply that his words had been meant for the priests and learned men who were present.

At the end of a trial which lasted three days, Palecz and Michael de Causis solemnly protested that they had acted solely from a sense of duty, and without any malice towards the accused; and d'Ailly then again repeated an opinion which he had often expressed in the course of the proceedings—that Hus had been treated with much consideration, and that his opinions were less offensively represented in the charges than they appeared in his own writings. Exhausted by illness and fatigue, Hus was led back to prison, receiving as he passed a pressure of the hand and some words of comfort from John of Chlum. The emperor, who had in vain urged the prisoner to retract, then declared that any one of the errors which had been brought home to him would have been enough for his condemnation; that, if he should persist in them, he ought to be burnt; that his followers ought to be coerced, and especially that his disciple who was then in custody—Jerome of Prague—should be speedily dealt with.

After his third appearance before the council, Hus was in prison for nearly a month. During this time attempts were made by many persons—among them by cardinal Zabarella—to persuade him to abjure the errors which were imputed to him. It was urged on him that by so doing he would not admit that he had ever held the errors in question; that in England excellent men who were wrongly suspected of Wyclifism had made no scruple as to abjuring it. But Hus regarded the matter in a more solemn light, and thought that to abjure errors which were falsely laid to his charge would be nothing less than perjury. He regarded his fate as sealed, although he still professed himself willing to renounce his opinions if any others could be proved to be truer; and he wrote pathetic letters of farewell to some of his Bohemian friends. On the 30th of June he was visited by Palecz, to whom, as having been his chief opponent, he expressed a wish to confess; but another confessor, a monk and doctor, was sent, who behaved with great tenderness to him, and gave him absolution without requiring any recantation of his opinions. At a later interview, Palecz wept profusely, and Hus entreated his forgiveness for any words of reproach which he might have used against him.

On the 6th of July, at the fifteenth session of the council, Hus was again brought forward—having been detained outside the church until the mass was over, lest his presence should profane the holy action. The bishop of Lodi, James Arigoni, a Dominican, preached on the text, "Our old man is crucified with Him that the body of sin might be destroyed" (Rom. VI. 6), applying the words to the duty of extirpating heresy and simony. The acts of the process against Hus were then read, ending with an exhortation to Sigismund to perform the sacred work of destroying the obstinate heretic by whose malignant influence the plague of error has been so widely spread. To the charges was now added a new article—that he had supposed himself to be a fourth person in the Godhead; but this he disavowed with horror as an idea that had never entered his mind. He declared that he had come to Constance freely, in order to give an account of his faith, and under the protection of the imperial safe-conduct; and as he said these words, he turned his eyes on Sigismund, who blushed deeply. He frequently interrupted the reading of the charges against him, in order to protest his innocence; but the cardinals d'Ailly and Zabarella reduced him to silence. He appealed to the Saviour, and it was stigmatized as an attempt to overleap all the order of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. But

Hus continued to protest and to appeal, and he added a prayer for the forgiveness of his enemies, which called forth derision from some members of the council.

The ceremony of degradation from the priesthood followed. Hus was arrayed in the vestments of the altar, and the various articles symbolical of the priestly authority and of the inferior orders of the ministry were severally taken from him by bishops, while at every stage he made some remark by way of protest. As to the tonsure, a question arose whether it should be obliterated by shaving, or by clipping the surrounding hair. "Lo", said Hus, addressing the emperor, "these bishops cannot agree even as to the way of mocking me!" When the degradation was completed, a tall paper cap, painted with hideous figures of devils, was placed on his head, and a bishop said to him, "We commit thy body to the secular arm, and thy soul to the devil." "And I", said Hus, "commit it to my most merciful Lord, Jesus Christ". As he was led away to death, he passed a spot where a heap of his books, which had been condemned by the council, was burning amidst the merriment of the crowd. At this sight he smiled, and repeated a remark which he had before made as to the condemnation of his Bohemian writings by persons who could not read them. In answer to a question, he professed a wish to confess; but, as the confessor insisted that he should begin by acknowledging and renouncing his errors, Hus said that confession was not necessary, as he was not in mortal sin.

On reaching the place of execution, he entreated that the bystanders would not believe him guilty of the errors which were imputed to him. After he had been bound to the stake, he was once more asked by duke Lewis of Bavaria whether he would recant; but he remained firm and suffered with unshaken constancy, uttering to the last cries for mercy, professions of faith in the Saviour, and prayers for the forgiveness of his enemies. His ashes and the scorched remnants of his clothes were thrown into the Rhine, lest they should be venerated as relics by his adherents.

The death of Hus has usually been regarded as a deep stain on the reputation of the council which decreed it, and of the emperor who, notwithstanding the assurance of protection which he had given to the reformer, consented to his doom. But attempts at exculpation have often been made in the interest of the Roman church; and even very lately it has been argued, by a writer whose moderation and candour are usually no less to be admired than his ability and learning, that there was no breach of faith in prosecuting Hus to the death, notwithstanding the safe-conduct which he had received. The name of safe-conduct, indeed, appears to have been used in two senses—sometimes signifying the escort which accompanied Hus from Bohemia, and sometimes the passport which, although promised, did not reach him until after his arrival at Constance; and this double meaning will explain some difficulties which have been raised as to the emperor's proceedings. It is pointed out that the passport did not profess more than to secure for Hus an unmolested journey to and from Constance; that Sigismund did not undertake, and could not have undertaken, to assure him against the consequences of an accusation of heresy; that the violation of the safe-conduct amounted to nothing more than the arrest of Hus before trial or conviction; that the Bohemians do not charge the emperor with breach of a written engagement, but only with having taken part against Hus, whereas they had reckoned on him as a friend. Yet even according to this view, the arrest of Hus, which is admitted to have been a breach of the safe-conduct, instead of being followed by his liberation, in compliance with the protests of his friends and with Sigismund's own declarations, led to his being immured in one loathsome dungeon after another, to his being loaded with chains, ill fed, and barbarously treated; and, when reduced to sickness and debility by such usage, and deprived of all literary means of defence, he was required to answer to the capital charge of heresy. Even on this supposition, therefore, the wrong by which the safe-conduct was violated was one which, in its consequences, subjected the accused to cruel sufferings, and destroyed the fairness of his trial.

But in truth it seems clear that the safe-conduct was supposed to imply much more than is here allowed. The excitement which arose on Hus's arrest is not to be accounted for by

the mere informality of that act, nor is it easy to reduce the complaints of his Bohemian partisans within the limits which the apologists of the council mark out. Hus himself plainly declares his understanding of the matter to have been, that, if he should decline to abide by the sentence of the council, the emperor would remit him in safety to Bohemia, there to be judged by the king and the ecclesiastical authorities; he complains that the safe-conduct had been violated, and mentions warnings which he had received against trusting to it—warnings which were suggested, not by any idea that the instrument itself might be defective, but by the apprehension that it might be treacherously set aside.

That this must be explained away by speaking of Hus as inconsistent, is, like the denial of Sigismund's having blushed on being reminded of the safe-conduct, a necessity of the cause which is to be defended. And how, unless there was some deception in the case, should the king of Aragon and the council have asserted principles which would justify the blackest perfidy towards one who was accused of heterodoxy? Why should it have been necessary to urge that a safe-conduct could not protect a heretic, unless Sigismund, as well as Hus, had supposed that the document in question would avail? Why should the council have attempted to get over it by the false and unsuccessful assertion that Hus had not received it until a fortnight after his arrest? Why, if the safe-conduct was not supposed to assure the safety of Hus at Constance, as well as on the way, were such efforts made to extort the recal of it from the emperor?

But, although the means by which his condemnation was brought about were iniquitous, and although there was much to blame in the circumstances of his trial, we can hardly wonder at the condemnation itself, according to the principles of his age. Hus set out from Bohemia with a confident expectation of being able to maintain his soundness in the faith; yet it is not easy to suppose such a result possible, if the nature of the tribunal be considered. The attestations of orthodoxy which he carried with him were probably in part influenced by the desire of the authors to clear their country from the imputations which had been cast on it, and were therefore not likely to tell strongly in his favour. In every point, except that of the eucharistic doctrine, Hus was but an echo of Wyclif, whose opinions had long been proscribed—whose English followers had been condemned to the stake by the church and the state alike. He did not, seemingly, understand how greatly his principles were opposed, not only to the system of the Roman court, but to the very being of the hierarchy. Much of his language sounded very dangerous : and if the sense, when explained by him, was more harmless than it seemed, it might reasonably be asked what likelihood there was that this sense would be understood by the simple hearers to whom the words had been addressed. It would seem that his demeanour had in it something which suggested the suspicion of obstinacy or evasion; and his continual professions of willingness to renounce his opinions, if he could be convinced that they were wrong, must have appeared to his judges as merely nugatory; for no one surely would avow that he deliberately prefers error to truth.

JEROME OF PRAGUE

At the time when Hus set out from Prague, his old associate Jerome was absent on one of those expeditions in which his religious zeal and his love of adventure alike found a frequent exercise. On learning, at his return, the fact of his friend's imprisonment, Jerome resolved to join him at Constance, where he arrived on the 4th of April 1415. Finding that Hus had as yet been unable to obtain a hearing, he withdrew to a little town in the neighbourhood, and publicly announced by a placard his readiness to defend his faith, if the council would grant him a safe-conduct for going and returning; and he added that, if he should be convicted of heresy, he was willing to bear the punishment. But as his petition was refused, he complied with the solicitations of his friends, and set out towards Bohemia, carrying with him letters testimonial from his countrymen who were at Constance. The council, however, at its sixth

session, cited him to answer for himself; he was arrested, and was carried back in chains to Constance, where at length the council granted him a safe-conduct, but with the significant reservation, “as much as is in us, and as the orthodox faith shall require, yet saving justice”. On the 23rd of May, Jerome, immediately after his arrival, and laden as he was with heavy chains, was examined before a general congregation of the council. Men who had been acquainted with his old adventures at Vienna and Heidelberg, at Paris and Cologne, gave evidence against him; among them was Gerson, who told him that at Paris his conceit of his eloquence had led him to disturb the university by many scandalous propositions as to universals and ideas. At the end of the day he was committed to the care of the archbishop of Riga, and was imprisoned in a tower, where he was chained more cruelly than before, and for two days was kept on a diet of bread and water. At the end of that time, however, Peter Mladenovicz discovered the place of his confinement, and was allowed to supply him with better nourishment.

After having been subjected to several examinations, Jerome, worn out by the hardships of his imprisonment, was brought on the 11th of September to condemn the errors imputed to Wyclif and Hus—with the reservation that, although mistaken and offensive, they were not heretical—that he did not commit himself to the truth of the imputations, and that he intended no disrespect to the characters of the teachers, or to the truths which they had delivered. This qualified submission, however, was not enough for the council; and at the nineteenth general session, on the 23rd of September, a fresh declaration was extorted from him, in which he more explicitly abjured the tenets of Wyclif and Hus, and even included in the abjuration an opinion as to the reality of universals. At this same session it was decreed, with an exact reference to the circumstances of Hus’s case, that no safe-conduct granted by any secular prince, by whatsoever sanction it might have been confirmed, should prejudice the catholic faith or the church’s jurisdiction, so as so hinder the competent spiritual tribunal from inquiring into and duly punishing the errors of heretics or persons charged with heresy, even although such persons might have been induced to present themselves at the place of judgment by reliance on the safe-conduct, and otherwise would not have appeared; and that the granter of such a document, if he had done his part in other respects, was in no way further bound. By another document (which, however, may perhaps have been nothing more than a draft) it is declared that in the matter of Hus the king of the Romans had done his duty, and that no one should speak against him under pain of being held guilty of favouring heresy and of treason. Jerome, by abjuring the opinions which had been imputed to him, had entitled himself to liberty; but, although cardinal d’Ailly and others insisted on this, suspicions as to the sincerity of the prisoner’s recantation arose, and were strengthened by a tract which Gerson put forth on the subject of “Protestation and Revocation in Matters of Faith”. Fresh charges, derived from Bohemia, were urged against him by Palecz and Michael de Causis; and when d’Ailly, Zabarella, and others, indignantly resigned their office as judges, a new commission was appointed, before which Jerome was again April—May, examined. He was accused of various outrages against monks and friars; of having denied transubstantiation; of having caused the canon of the mass to be translated or paraphrased into Bohemian verse, so that mechanics supposed themselves able to consecrate by chanting it; of having in the course of his travels allied himself with the Russian schismatics in opposition to the Latins; of having lived luxuriously and riotously while in prison. Some of these charges Jerome denied; and in his answers he showed much dexterity and readiness, not unmixed with asperity and contempt towards his opponents. At his final examination, being allowed to defend himself, he delivered an eloquent speech. The display of authorities which he produced for his opinions excited admiration in those who considered that for 340 days he had been immured in a gloomy dungeon. He related the course of his life and studies. He explained the case of the university of Prague, and the unfair influence which the Germans had exercised in it. He declared that no act of his life had caused him such remorse as his abjuration of Hus and

Wyclif, with whom he now desired to make common cause in all things, except Wyclif's doctrine of the Eucharist. He professed himself ready to share the fate of Hus, whose offence he represented as having consisted, not in any deviation from the faith of the church, but in his having attacked the abuses and corruptions of the hierarchy. He replied with courage and readiness to the many interruptions with which he was assailed; and the speech concluded with a commemoration of worthies, both heathen and scriptural, who had laid down their lives for the truth.

Urgent attempts were still made to persuade Jerome to fall back on the recantation which he had formerly made; Zabarella especially showed a friendly interest in him, and visited him in prison for the purpose of entreating him to save himself. But all such efforts were fruitless, and Jerome suffered at the stake on the 30th of May 1416, enduring his agony with a firmness which extorted the admiration of men so remote from any sympathy with his character as the scholar Poggio Bracciolini (who was himself a witness of the scene) and the ecclesiastical politician Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini.

On the 4th of July 1415, two days before the death of Hus, Gregory XII, the most sincere of the rival popes in desiring the reunion of the church, resigned his dignity. For this purpose he had given a commission to Charles Malatesta, lord of Rimini, whose labours at Pisa and elsewhere for the healing of the schism have already been mentioned; and, in order to avoid an acknowledgment of the council as having been called by John XXIII, he affected to regard it as assembled by the emperor alone, and to add his own citation as pope, that it might entertain the proposed business. Malatesta accordingly appeared at the fourteenth session, and formally executed the act of resignation whereupon the council decreed that no one should proceed to choose a pope without its sanction, and that it should not be dissolved until after an election should have been made. The ex-pope became cardinal-bishop of Porto, and legate for life in the Mark of Ancona, with precedence over all the other members of the college. His cardinals were allowed to retain their dignities; and two years later, while the council was yet sitting, Angelo Corario died at the age of ninety.

Benedict XIII was still to be dealt with. Aragon and Scotland continued to adhere to him, and his pretensions were unabated. He had proposed a meeting with Sigismund at Nice, and John XXIII had endeavoured to avert this by offering to confer in person with his rival; but the council, remembering the failure of the conference of Savona, had refused its consent. It was now resolved that the emperor, as representative of the council, should treat with Benedict. On the 15th of July, Sigismund, kneeling before the high altar of the cathedral, received the solemn benediction of the assembly; and three days later he set out with four cardinals for Perpignan, where he had invited Benedict to meet him. At Narbonne he was joined by Ferdinand of Aragon, whose ambassadors had been in treaty with the council. But at Perpignan he found himself disappointed. Benedict had taken offence at being addressed as cardinal, whereas he held himself to be the sole legitimate pope; nay, even as a cardinal, he asserted that, being the only one who had been promoted to the sacred college before the schism, he was entitled to nominate a pope by his own voice alone. In accordance with the letter of an agreement, he remained at Perpignan throughout the month of June; but when the last day of that month came to an end at midnight, he immediately left the place, and pronounced Sigismund contumacious for having failed to appear. On the 19th of August he was at Narbonne, where he condescended to state his terms to the emperor's representatives. But these and other proposals on the part of Benedict were so extravagant that it was impossible to accept them; and Benedict, after some movements, shut himself up within the rocky fortress of Peñiscola, in Valencia, where the archbishop of Tours and others sought an interview with him, but were unable to persuade him to resign. Sigismund succeeded in detaching from him the king of Aragon, with other princes who had thus far supported him; and these, in person or by their representatives, formally renounced him at Narbonne on the 13th of December 1415. The act was publicly declared at Perpignan on the Epiphany

following by the great Dominican preacher St. Vincent Ferrer, in whose reputation for sanctity the cause of the Spanish pope had found one of its strongest supports, but who now, in disgust at Benedict's obstinacy, turned against him, and zealously exerted himself to promote the reunion of the church.

Sigismund then proceeded to visit the courts of France and of England, endeavouring to reconcile the enmity which had lately arrayed the nations against each other on the field of Agincourt (Oct. 25, 1415), and to unite western Christendom in a league against the Turks; and on the 27th of January in the following year he reappeared at Constance, where he was received by the council with great demonstrations of honour. In the meantime the representatives of the Spanish and Portuguese kingdoms had been admitted, into the council as a fifth nation the agreement of Narbonne was confirmed, and measures were urged forward against Benedict Articles were drawn up, in which the charge against him was grounded chiefly on his breach of his engagements as to resignation, and he was cited to appear within a certain time. The envoys who were intrusted with the delivery of the citation at Peniscola found him angry and obstinate, and brought back nothing but evasions and pretexts for delay. After having been repeatedly cited in due form at the door of the cathedral, he was pronounced contumacious on the first of April. Further articles were drawn up, and, after long formal proceedings, sentence of deposition was pronounced against him, as having been guilty of perjury, of scandal to the whole church, of favouring and nourishing schism, and of heresy, inasmuch as he had violated that article of the faith which speaks of "one holy catholic church." The delivery of this judgment was followed by a jubilant chant of *Te Deum*; the bells of the churches were rung, and the emperor ordered that the sentence should be proclaimed with the sound of trumpets throughout the streets of Constance.

Thus the papacy was considered to be entirely vacant, as the three who had pretended to it had all been set aside. But the question now arose, whether the council should next proceed to the election of a new pope, or to discuss the reformation of the church, which had been much agitated during the time of the emperor's absence. On the one hand it was urged that, as the church had long been suffering from the want of an acknowledged head, the papacy should be filled without delay. On the other hand it was represented that the reforming designs of the council of Pisa had been ineffectual because reform had been postponed to the election of a pope; that, since a reformation of the church ought to include the head as well as the members, a pope, by exerting his influence on those who naturally desired to stand well with him, might be able to put a stop to any movement for reform; that the chair of St. Peter, after the pollutions which it had lately undergone, ought to be cleansed, before any man, even the holiest, could sit in it without fear of contamination. The emperor, supported by the German and English nations, urged that the council should enter on the question of reform. The cardinals, with the Italians in general, pressed for the election of a pope, and drew to their side the Spaniards, who were new to the affairs of the council, and the French, whose eagerness for reform was now overpowered by their enmity against the English. The contest was keenly carried on, both with tongue and with pen. Prayers were put up for the good success of the council in its designs, sermons were preached in exposition of the various views, and from each side a formal protest was made against the course which was proposed by the other; while invidious imputations were freely cast on the emperor and his adherents, as if, by maintaining that the church could be reformed without a head, they made themselves partakers in the heresy of Hus.

Still Sigismund stood firm, notwithstanding the taunts and insults which were directed against him, until at length he found his supporters failing him. Such of the French and Italians as had been with him fell away. By the death of Hallam, bishop of Salisbury, on the 4th of September, he lost his most esteemed auxiliary, while the English were deprived of a leader whose wisdom and moderation had guided them in the difficulties of their circumstances; and—partly, it would seem, in obedience to an order from their sovereign—

they joined the growing majority. Two of the most important German prelates were bribed into a like course;—the archbishop of Riga, who, having been hopelessly embroiled with the Teutonic knights, was to be translated by the council to Liege; and the bishop of Chur, to whom the see of Riga offered at once an increase of dignity and an escape from his quarrels with Frederick of Austria. Finding that any further resistance would be useless, Sigismund yielded that the choice of a pope should precede the discussion of reform; but it was stipulated by him and the German nation that the future pope should, in conjunction with the council, make it his first duty to enter on a reform of the church, and that until this should have been effected the council should not be dissolved.

At the thirty-ninth session, October 9, 1417, it was decreed that a general council should be held within the next five years, and another within the following seven years ; that within every period of ten years for the time to come there should be a general council; that the pope might shorten the interval, but might not prolong it; and that for a sufficient cause (such as the occurrence of a schism) a council might be convoked at any time. But when the Germans desired that the future pope should be pledged to the observance of these rules, they were told by the cardinals that a pope could not be so bound.

Dissensions still continued to vex the council. The Aragonese, on joining it, had objected to the acknowledgment of the English as a nation—maintaining that they ought to be included with the Germans; and in this they were aided by cardinal d'Ailly, whose patriotism showed itself on all occasions in a vehement opposition to the English; while these stoutly asserted the importance of their nation and church by somewhat daring arguments, and put forward the venerable name of Joseph of Arimathea in opposition to that of Dionysius the Areopagite. The Castilians had contests of their own with the Aragonese; and they had even left Constance, in the belief that the council was hopelessly entangled, when they were brought back by the emperor's command. The cardinals asked for leave to withdraw, and met with a refusal; Sigismund is said to have intended to arrest some of the most troublesome among them; and the members of the college displayed themselves in their scarlet hats, as a token of their readiness to become martyrs in the church's cause. In the midst of these difficulties it was announced that Henry Beaufort, bishop of Winchester, and uncle to the king of England, was at Ulm, on his way to the Holy Land; and the English representatives suggested that by his reputation and authority, by his known influence with the emperor, and by his zeal for the peace of the church, he might be able to appease the differences which had arisen. The emperor with his own hand wrote to invite the bishop to Constance, where he was received with great honour; and by his mediation and advice he succeeded in effecting a reconciliation between the parties.

Beaufort had recommended that the election of a pope should at once be taken in hand; and new questions arose as to the right of sharing in it. Some wished to exclude the cardinals altogether, as having abused their privilege in time past; while the cardinals asserted that the right of voting belonged to them exclusively, but were willing to concede that, on this occasion only, representatives of the nations should be associated with them, and that the choice should be subject to the final approbation of the council. In the meantime there were discussions as to the points in which a reform was desired. Among them were the duties of the pope, and the limits of his authority; the prevention of double elections to the papacy; the composition of the college of cardinals, in which it seemed desirable that the Italians should not be too strong reservations, annates, expectancies, commendams, simony, dispensations, non-residence ; the qualifications and duties of bishops; the abuses of the monastic and capitular systems ; the nature of the causes that should be treated in the Roman court; the question of appeals; the offices of the papal chancery and penitentiary; indulgences; the alienation of church property; the cause, for which a pope might be corrected or deposed, and the manner of procedure in such cases.

Of these subjects, that of annates caused the greatest difference of opinion. The cardinals were in favour of the exaction, while the French nation denounced it as a novelty which dated only from the pontificate of John XXII. On this question, cardinal d'Ailly, who had formerly been opposed to the tax, now took part with his brethren of the college. With regard to the question of papal collation to benefices, it was remarked that, while many bishops, who were usually supporters of the papal interest, opposed it in this case from a wish to recover patronage for their own order, the representatives of universities sided with the pope, as being more likely than the bishops to favour the claims of learning in the bestowal of preferment. In the course of these discussions much heat was occasionally displayed. At one meeting, the wish to delay the election of a pope was denounced as a Hussite heresy, and the emperor, in disgust at the pertinacity of the opposition, arose and left the hall. As the patriarch of Antioch and others of his adherents followed, a cry arose, "Let the heretics go!", and Sigismund, on being informed of the insult, knew that it was intended against himself.

At length, on the 30th of October, the preliminaries of the election were settled : that six representatives of each nation should be associated with the cardinals as electors; and that a majority of two-thirds among the cardinals, and in each nation should be necessary to the choice of a pope. The day was fixed for the 8th of November, when high mass was celebrated, and the bishop of Lodi (whose eloquence had been less creditably displayed in the cases of Hus and Jerome) preached from the text, "Eligite meliorem"—descanting on the qualities requisite for the papacy, and exhorting the electors to make choice of a pope different from those of the last forty years—one worthy of the office and bent on the reform of the church. The electors—twenty-three cardinals and thirty deputies of the nations—swore to the emperor that they would perform their duty faithfully, and were then shut up in conclave within the Exchange of Constance, under the guardianship of the master of the knights of Rhodes. Their deliberations lasted three days, during which companies of people—Sigismund himself, and the highest ecclesiastical dignitaries, among them—frequently gathered round the building, imploring with prayers, and with hymns chanted in low tones, the blessing of God on the election. At first, each nation was disposed to set up a candidate of its own; but gradually this was abandoned, and on St. Martin's day an overwhelming majority, if not the whole body of electors, agreed in a choice, which was forthwith announced through an aperture made in the wall of the Exchange—"We have a pope—Lord Otho of Colonna!". The news spread at once throughout the city, and produced an enthusiasm of joy; at last the schism which had so long distracted Christendom was ended. All the bells of Constance sent forth peals of rejoicing. A multitude, which is reckoned at 80,000, flocked from all quarters to the scene of the election. The emperor himself, disregarding the restraints of state, hurried into the room where the electors were assembled, and fell down before the pope, who raised him up, embraced him, and acknowledged that to him the peaceful result was chiefly due. For hours together crowds of all classes thronged to the cathedral, where the new pope was placed on the altar and gave his benediction. In honour of the day on which he was elected, he took the name of Martin V; and, after having been ordained deacon, priest, and bishop on three successive days, he was anointed and crowned as pope on the 21st of November.

Martin was now about fifty years of age. He belonged to the highest nobility of Rome, had been trained in the study of canon law, and had been created cardinal of St. George by Innocent VII. He had held to Gregory XII until the council of Pisa declared against that pope, and he had been one of the last to forsake John XXIII. His morals were irreproachable, and the prudence and moderation of his character were much respected. It is, however, said of him by Leonard of Arezzo, that whereas before his elevation he had been noted rather for his amiability than for his talents, he showed, when pope, extreme sagacity, but no excess of benignity.

Very soon Martin began to give indications that those who had chosen him in the hope of reform were to be disappointed. Almost immediately after his coronation he set forth, as

was usual, the rules for the administration of his chancery; and it was seen with dismay that they differed hardly at all in substance from those of John XXIII; that they sanctioned all the corruptions which the council had denounced—such as annates, expectancies, and reservations ; nay, that this last evil was even aggravated in the new code. And now that western Christendom had one undoubted head, a man in whom high personal character was added to the dignity of his great office, the authority of the council waned before that of the pope. The emperor himself was superseded in the presidency of the assembly, and Martin's power over it increased, while his address was exerted to prevent all dangerous reforms. He set forth a list of matters as to which a reform might be desirable; he constituted a reformatory college, made up of six cardinals, with representatives of the various nations, and at the forty-third session of the council some decrees were passed as to exemptions, simony, tithes, the life of the clergy, and other such subjects. But it was found that the several nations were not agreed as to the changes which were to be desired; and Martin skilfully contrived to take advantage of their jealousies so as to break up their alliance by treating separately with each for a special concordat. When the French urged Sigismund to press for reformation, he reminded them that they had insisted on giving the election of a pope precedence over the question of reform, and told them that they must now apply to the pope, since his own authority in such matters had ended when the election was made.

The Germans had presented two petitions for reform; among other points they urged that the cardinals should be fairly chosen from the various nations, and that their number should be limited to eighteen, or at the utmost should not exceed twenty-four. They also desired that means should be provided for the correction of a pope, so that popes might be punished and deposed by a general council, not only for heresy, but for simony, or any other grave and notorious offence. On this it would seem that no new enactment was considered to be necessary. Martin, however, put forth some proposals for a reform of the curia, in which, while he eluded some of the chief points in the German scheme, he agreed that the number of cardinals should be reduced, so as not to exceed twenty-four, that a regard should be paid to their qualifications, and that the dignity should be distributed in fair proportions among the various nations. He promised also an improved disposal of his patronage, and a redress of various crying grievances. To the Germans the promise as to the cardinalate appeared to hold out an important boon; for the instances in which Germans had been admitted to that dignity were exceedingly rare; but the hopes excited by Martin's concession were very imperfectly realized, as the number of German cardinals has never been great.

The Spaniards, in ridicule of the faintness with which reform was taken in hand, put forth a satirical 'Mass for Simony'. The piece was composed in the usual form of such services, and included prayers for the removal of the evil, with a lesson from the Apocalypse, descriptive of the woman sitting on the scarlet-coloured beast.

The concordats into which Martin had entered did not find much acceptance with the nations for which they were intended. That with England appears to have passed without notice. In France, although the kingdom was then in the depth of the weakness caused by internal discords and by the English invasion, the spirit of ecclesiastical independence, hallowed by the saintly renown of Lewis IX, and strengthened by the policy of Philip the Fair, and by the ascendancy of later French sovereigns over the court of Avignon, was strongly manifested. The king was made to declare himself desirous to obey the council, but with the limitation "so far as God and reason would allow". The concordat was rejected by the parliament of Paris; the principles of the pragmatic sanction were maintained; and the dauphin, who governed in his father's name, refused to acknowledge Martin, whose election he supposed to have been carried by the hostile influences of Germany and England, until after the pope's title had been examined and approved by the university of Paris.

Among the subjects which engaged the attention of the council, was a book in which John Petit, a Franciscan, had some years before asserted the right of tyrannicide in

justification of the treacherous murder of the duke of Orleans by John “the Fearless”, duke of Burgundy. Petit himself had died in 1410, and is said to have professed on his death-bed regret for the doctrines which he had published; but his book had been examined, and eight propositions extracted from it had been condemned by an assembly of theologians, canonists, and jurists, under the presidency of the bishop of Paris, in 1414.

The matter was brought before the council of Constance in June 1415 by Gerson, who had taken an active part in the earlier stages; and it occupied much time, during which he and cardinal d’Ailly exerted all their powers to obtain a condemnation of the atrocious opinions which Petit had enounced. The contest was obstinately and hotly waged, with the pen as well as with the tongue; Petit’s defenders were stigmatized as Cainites and heretics, while they retaliated by comparing Gerson to Judas, Herod, and Cerberus, and by taunting him with favours which he had formerly received from the Burgundian family. The influence in favour of Petit was so powerful, that his book escaped with the condemnation of only one especially outrageous proposition, while his name was unmentioned in the censure; and even this sentence was afterwards set aside on the ground of informality. It is noted that among the defenders of Petit’s book was Peter Caucher, vidame of Reims, who afterwards, as bishop of Beauvais, gained an infamous celebrity by his part in the condemnation of the Maid of Orleans.

Another book, the work of a Dominican, John of Falkenberg, was brought before the council, on the ground that the author, who wrote in the interest of the Teutonic knights, had grossly attacked the king of Poland, and had declared it to be not only lawful, but highly meritorious, to kill him and all his people. Before the election of Martin, this book had been condemned to the flames by the committee on matters of faith; but the sentence had not been confirmed in a general session, and the Poles found that Martin, although he had himself subscribed the earlier condemnation, was resolved as pope to do away with its effect. Being thus denied redress, they appealed to a general council, but Martin declared that no such appeal from a pope could be allowed. On this Gerson put forth a tract in which the new pope’s declaration was shown to be opposed to the principles on which the council had acted. But Martin, whether acquainted with Gerson’s tract or not, proceeded in direct opposition to his views. In answer to the allegations of the Poles, that the book contained “most cruel heresies” and therefore ought to fall under the censure of an assembly which had for one of its chief objects the extirpation of heresy, he declared that he approved of all that the council had done as to matters of faith. He enjoined silence on the complainants, under a threat of excommunication, and, although they still persisted, even to the last session of the council—styling Falkenberg’s opinions a “doctrine of devils”—their struggles to obtain a condemnation were fruitless.

At the forty-fourth session, Pavia was named as the place where the next general council should be held. The French representatives, who disliked this proposal, absented themselves from the meeting at which it was to be brought forward.

The forty-fifth and last session was held on the 22nd of April 1418, when the pope bestowed his absolution on all the fathers of the council, with their followers, and on all other persons who had been present on account of business connected with it. The emperor had been rewarded for his labours by a grant of a year’s ecclesiastical tithe from his dominions; and, although some German churches engaged a Florentine lawyer, Dominic de Germiniano, to oppose this grant as informal, illegal, and oppressive, such was the ascendancy of the pope over the council that the advocate, instead of carrying out his commission, was fain to conclude his pleading with a proposal that the impost should be collected in a way less burdensome than that which had been originally intended.

Although Sigismund had endeavoured to prolong the pope’s stay in Germany, and the French had urged him to settle at Avignon, his answer to such solicitations had been that Rome and the patrimony of St. Peter required his presence. On the 16th of May, he left

Constance with a magnificent display of pomp. Arrayed in his most splendid robes of office, he rode under a canopy which was supported by four counts, while the emperor and the elector of Brandenburg walked beside him, and held his bridle on either side. Frederick of Austria, with other secular princes and nobles, twelve cardinals, and a vast train of ecclesiastics of all grades, followed; and it is said that the whole cavalcade amounted to 40,000. The scene might be regarded as symbolical of the victory which the papacy had gained. The council which had deposed popes had been mastered by the pope of its own choosing; the old system of Rome, so long the subject of vehement complaint, had escaped untouched; and no mention had been made of any reform in doctrine.

While the pope was thus triumphant, Gerson, the great theologian of the council, withdrew from it to obscurity and exile. Paris was in the hands of the English, and of the ferocious duke of Burgundy, to whom he had made himself obnoxious. The university of which he had been the glory, and which had sent him forth at the head of its representatives, could no longer receive him; and he was glad to accept an asylum from the duke of Bavaria. The offer of a professorship at Vienna drew from him a poem of thanks to Frederick of Austria; but he remained in his seclusion until, after the assassination of the duke of Burgundy on the bridge of Montereau, in September 1419, he removed to Lyons, where he spent the last ten years of his life in devotion, study, and literary labour. The latest of his works was a commentary on the Canticles; and three days after having completed it he died, at the age of sixty-six, on the 12th of July, 1429.

CHAPTER IX.

THE GREEK CHURCH—CHRISTIANITY IN ASIA— CONVERSIONS.

During the last period of the Byzantine empire, the relations of the Greek church with the papacy were mainly governed by political circumstances. The emperors, in their need of assistance against the Mussulmans, who pressed continually more and more on them, made frequent solicitations to the Christians of the west, and, in order to recommend their cause, they professed a zeal for the reconciliation of the churches. But in this they were supported only by a small courtly party, while the mass of the Greeks held the Latins in abomination; and, as the material aid, for the sake of which the desire of unity had been professed, was not forthcoming, such concessions as were made by the emperors or their representatives were usually disavowed with abhorrence by their people. Such, as we have seen, had been the result of the reconciliation which had been formerly concluded at the council of Lyons in 1274; and, in their resentment on account of the subsequent breach, Benedict XI and Clement V encouraged Charles of Valois to assert by arms a claim to the throne of Constantinople, in right of his wife. Clement gave to the enterprise the character of a crusade, bestowed the privileges of crusaders on all who should take part in it, and assigned to Charles a tenth of the ecclesiastical revenues of France in order to furnish him with means. But nothing came of this project.

At a later time, Andronicus II and his grandson of the same name (who, after having been his colleague, assumed the whole government in 1328) were driven by fear of the Ottoman Turks to make overtures to the popes and to the western princes. In 1333 the younger Andronicus sent a message to John XXII by two Dominicans who were returning from the east; and in consequence of this two bishops were sent from Avignon to the court of Constantinople. But the Greeks, in distrust of the sophistical skill which they attributed to the western theologians, refused to have anything to do with what they styled the Latin novelties; and the mission had no effect. In 1337 Benedict XII, wrote to Andronicus for the purpose of confirming him in his desire of ecclesiastical unity; and two years later, Barlaam, a Basilian monk of Calabria, who had acquired great favour in the Byzantine court, appeared at Avignon with a knight named Stephen Dandolo, bearing recommendations from the kings of France and Sicily. The instructions of these envoys charged them to labour for the reunion of the churches, while the need of assistance against the Turks was mentioned as a secondary and comparatively trifling matter. But it was requested that the aid might be sent at once, because the emperor would be unable, so long as the war should last, to assemble the eastern patriarchs for the general council which was proposed as a tribunal for the decision of the questions by which east and west were divided. Even the Jews, said Barlaam, although the most ungrateful of mankind, after having been miraculously fed by the Saviour, wished to make Him a king; and, in like manner, assistance of this kind would prepare the minds of the Greeks to welcome the proposals of religious union. The pope, however, declined the project of a general council, on the ground that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's procession had already been settled by some of the greatest councils—even including (he said) the general council of Ephesus—and that he could not allow it to be again brought into question. The proposal of a compromise, by which each party should for the present be allowed to hold its own opinions, was rejected, on the ground that the faith of the catholic church could be but one. Other expedients suggested by Barlaam found no great favour; nor was any hope of aid held out, except on condition that

the Greeks should first renounce their errors, and should send some of their number to be instructed in the west.

Barlaam, on returning to the east after this fruitless mission, became involved in a strange controversy with some monks of Mount Athos and their supporters. These monks, who were styled hesychasts (or quietists), imagined that by cultivating an ascetic repose they might attain to behold the light of the Godhead. They are described as fixing their gaze on the central part of their own persons, in the hope that through the contemplation both their spiritual and their bodily eyes would be enlightened by the divine radiance. Barlaam, it is said, designedly chose out one of the more simple monks, whom the imperial chronicler John Cantacuzene describes as little superior to an irrational animal, and, by affecting the character of a disciple, drew from him answers which showed a very gross apprehension of spiritual things; whereupon he denounced the whole community, as if the views in question were shared by all its members. At Thessalonica, where he first broached the subject, he was confronted by Gregory Palamas, a monk of Mount Athos, who enjoyed an extraordinary reputation for ascetic sanctity; and, having fled in fear of the rabid monks to Constantinople, where he persuaded the patriarch John to assemble a synod for the consideration of the matter, he there again found Palamas his opponent. The question of the light which the mystics of Mount Athos supposed themselves to see brought on a discussion as to the light which shone around the Saviour at His transfiguration. This light Palamas maintained to be uncreated; while Barlaam argued that, if so, it must be God, forasmuch as God alone is uncreated. But, he continued, since no man hath seen God at any time, the hesychasts must hold the existence of two Gods—one, the invisible maker of all things; the other, the visible and uncreated light. The decision of the council was adverse to Barlaam, who, according to John Cantacuzene, when he saw that the case was going against him, consulted the grand domestic (Cantacuzene himself), acknowledged himself to have been in error, and was joyfully embraced by Palamas. But if this account be true, his submission must have been insincere; for he soon after removed to Italy, where he joined the Latin church, and wrote some letters in its behalf, which contrast strongly with his arguments of an earlier time as a champion of the Greeks. Through the interest of Petrarch, whom he had assisted in the study of Plato, he was promoted to the bishopric of Gerace in 1342; and his equivocal reputation as a divine is combined with a more creditable fame as one among the chief revivers of Greek letters in the west.

The controversy begun by Barlaam was kept up by his pupil Gregory Acindynus; but repeated judgments were pronounced against their opinions, and at a great synod, held at Constantinople in 1350, it was declared, with a show of patristic authority, that the light of Mount Tabor was uncreated, although not of the substance of God, while Barlaam and Acindynus were cut off from the body of the church, and were declared to be incapable of forgiveness after death.

The death of Andronicus III, in 1341, left the empire to his son John Palaeologus, a boy nine years old, who was under the guardianship of the grand domestic, John Cantacuzene. After a time Cantacuzene, alarmed by the intrigues of a party which included the empress-mother and patriarch John of Apri, endeavoured to seize the empire, as the only means of securing his own safety; but he was driven into exile, from which he delivered himself by the fatal measure of calling the Turks into Europe as his allies—giving his daughter in marriage to their leader Orkan, on condition that she should be allowed to preserve her religion. The empire was now shared by John Palaeologus, his mother, Anne of Savoy, and Cantacuzene, who became the father-in-law of the young prince and held the chief power in his own hands. While Cantacuzene was in exile, the empress-mother had addressed a letter to Clement VI, expressing a strong desire to unite her subjects with the church in which she had herself been brought up, and entreating the pope to send her assistance in the meantime. Cantacuzene now sent ambassadors to the court of Avignon; and the reception which they met with from Clement led him to believe that a reconciliation was certain, and that a crusade was to be

undertaken in his behalf. But, although he repeatedly protested to the envoys whom Clement sent to Constantinople that he would gladly give his life for the re-union of the churches, he declared that the guilt of the separation lay on the Latins, who had caused it by their innovations and assumptions; and that he would not submit his conscience to any less authority than that of a council fairly gathered from the whole church. The pope is said by Cantacuzene to have expressed his willingness to try this course; but the negotiation was broken off by the death of Clement, and by the forced abdication of the emperor, who spent his last years as a monk on Mount Athos, where he employed himself in composing an uncandid history of his own time.

But John Palaeologus, when thus rid of his guardian, was of all Greek emperors the most inclined to make concessions to Rome. As the son of a western princess, whose influence over him still continued, he felt nothing of the bigoted prejudice with which the Greeks in general regarded the Latins; and his dangers both from the Turks and from Cantacuzene's son made him ready to seek for assistance from the west on any terms. In 1355 he made overtures to Innocent VI, offering to send his son Manuel to the pope, to have him instructed in Latin under the superintendence of a legate, and to establish schools for teaching Latin to young Greek nobles; and promising, if he should fail as to any of these proposals, to abdicate in favour of his son, who should then be wholly under the control of the pope. A Carmelite, Peter Thomasius, was thereupon sent to the Byzantine court, and made an easy convert of the emperor. In 1366 John subscribed in Hungary a form of faith agreeable to that of the Latin church, and professed homage to the pope; he renewed his assurances to Urban V; and in 1369, while Constantinople was under siege by Amurath, the pope's return from Avignon was adorned by the presence of the eastern emperor as well as by that of the emperor of the west at Rome. John acknowledged the Roman supremacy, and the double procession of the Holy Spirit; he did homage to the pope in St. Peter's by bending the knee, and by kissing his feet, hands, and mouth; he assisted at a mass celebrated by Urban; and he performed that "office of a groom" which the Christians of the west had been persuaded to connect with the memory of Constantine the Great. But all these compliances were ineffectual as to the object for which they were made. The pope's exhortations to the knights of Rhodes, to the king of Cyprus, to the Venetians and the Genoese, that they should help the emperor against the enemies of Christendom, were unheeded. It was in vain that John endeavoured to enlist the great condottiere Hawkwood in his service. He himself, on his way homewards, was arrested for debt at Venice; and he found himself at last obliged to conclude a humiliating treaty with the Turks.

The advance of these assailants continued without check. In 1395 Bajazet, who from the brilliant rapidity of his movements acquired the name of Ilderim (*lightning*), penetrated into Hungary, and boasted an intention of subduing Germany and Italy, and of feeding his horses with oats at the high altar of St. Peter's at Rome. The princes and nobles of France were roused by an embassy from king Sigismund of Hungary to hasten to his aid against the infidel invaders; and a brilliant array of 100,000 men set out, vaunting that, if the sky should fall, they would support it on the points of their lances, and indulging in visions of carrying their victorious arms even to the deliverance of Jerusalem. But the foolhardy confidence of these crusaders—their luxury, licentiousness, and want of discipline—proved fatal to the enterprise. Disdaining the advice of Sigismund, which was founded on his knowledge of the Turkish mode of warfare, they were utterly defeated at the battle of Nicopolis. Some of their leaders were slain; others, among whom was the count of Nevers (afterwards noted as John the Fearless, duke of Burgundy), were made prisoners, and were detained for ransom, before the arrival of which not a few of them had perished under the cruel usage of their captors. The failure of this expedition roused much indignation against the rival popes, whose pretensions distracted western Christendom, and made any combined action of its nations impossible.

In 1391 John Palaeologus was succeeded by his son Manuel, who was able to obtain the services of John le Maingre, one of the most distinguished soldiers in the late unfortunate crusade, and afterwards famous under the name of Boucicaut. By his advice Manuel, who had already applied by letter both to Boniface IX. and to the French king, undertook in 1400 a journey into western Europe for the purpose of begging assistance. Both in France and in England he was received with great honours; but although Charles VI, in addition to bestowing a pension on him until his fortunes should improve, promised him 1200 fighting men for a year, and although Henry IV vowed a crusade, and taxed his people as if for the relief of the Greek empire, no effective aid was to be gained. Manuel, by adhering to his own religion, by refraining from all interference in the controversy between the popes, and by passing through Italy in the year of jubilee without visiting Rome, offended Boniface IX, who charged him with irreverence towards an image, and discouraged the idea of assisting him. He had been forced to submit to terms dictated by Bajazet; and but for the overthrow of that conqueror by Timur, at the battle of Angora, while Manuel was yet in the west, the fall of the Byzantine empire would probably have been no longer delayed.

During this time there was frequent correspondence between the popes and the Armenian church, and projects of union were entertained with a view to an alliance against the Mussulman power. But the Armenians failed to satisfy the popes entirely as to their orthodoxy; and the help which they obtained from the west was insufficient to protect them against their assailants. In 1367 Armenia fell under the yoke of the Mamelukes; and the Christians were soon after exposed to persecution at the hands of the conquerors.

In other quarters also, where the Mahometans extended their conquests, the Christians suffered severely, and many were put to death for their religion, while others apostatized.

The period which we are surveying was disastrous for the Christianity of the further east. Although the popes continually flattered themselves with the hope of gaining the Mongols, who were now pushing their conquests far and wide, these for the most part embraced the religion of Islam; and the hopes of conversion which from time to time were held out by the envoys of Asiatic princes, on condition of an alliance against their Mussulman or other enemies, invariably proved to be delusive.

In China, where, as we have already seen, the Franciscan John of Monte Corvino laboured until about the year 1330, the propagation of the gospel was carried on with much success, chiefly by other members of the same order. But in 1369 the Chinese drove out the Mongols, and established a system of jealous exclusion of all foreigners; in consequence of which the Christianity of China soon became extinct.

The great Asiatic conqueror Timur (or Tamerlane) appears to have observed an equivocal policy in matters of religion, and is described by some as friendly to Christians; but, whatever his own belief may have been, he outwardly, and as a matter of policy, at least, conformed to Islam. At the end of the period, a few scattered communities, chiefly Nestorian, were all that remained to represent the Christianity of Asia.

In Europe the end of the fourteenth century witnessed the conversion of the last considerable people which had until then professed heathenism. Lithuania, under its great-prince Jagello, had by conquests from Russia become a kingdom in all but name. In 1382 Jagello, whose mother had been a Christian, made proposals of marriage to Hedwig, who by the death of her father, Lewis, king of Hungary and Poland, had become heiress of the latter kingdom. He offered that he and all his people should be baptized, and that his territories should be united with Poland. The advantages of this arrangement outweighed both the contract into which she had already entered with an Austrian prince, and her personal dislike of Jagello. Jagello was baptized by the name of Ladislaus. Bishoprics were established at Wilna and in seven other towns; and the king set vigorously about the fulfilment of his promise as to the conversion of his people. These were at first unwilling to change their religion; but when they saw temples and altars overthrown, the sacred groves cut down, and

the serpents which had been objects of worship killed, their faith in their old gods was shaken, and they rushed to baptism in such multitudes that it was found necessary to lead them in companies to the bank of the river, where a whole band was sprinkled at once, and all the members of it received the same baptismal name. Ladislaus himself travelled about the country, teaching the Lord's prayer and the decalogue; and the work of conversion was forwarded by the white woollen dresses, of Polish manufacture, which were bestowed on the neophytes. Although, however, the profession of Christianity thus became general in Lithuania, Aeneas Sylvius cites a Camaldolese monk, named Jerome of Prague, who visited the country in the beginning of the fifteenth century, as testifying that the worship of fire and of serpents was still widely kept up in it.

The conversion of the Finns and of the Laplanders is also referred to this period; but it would seem to have hardly reached more deeply than to the reception of baptism, and of the priestly benediction in marriage.

CHAPTER X.
SECTARIES—MYSTICS.

While the church was agitated by thereforming movements of Wyclif and Hus, some of the older parties which had incurred its condemnation continued to exist, and to draw on themselves fresh censures and penalties.

The Cathari, although almost extinguished in southern France by the wars of the thirteenth century, and by the relentless vigilance of the inquisition, were very numerous in Bosnia and the neighbouring regions; and the popes found little inclination on the part of successive kings of Hungary to exert themselves for the suppression of the sect.

The Waldenses also, as appears from the records of the inquisition of Toulouse, were among the victims of that tribunal. They are found in other parts of France, as also in Germany, where many of them suffered death as heretics; and it appears to have been in the beginning of this time that they made their way in considerable numbers into the valleys of Piedmont, where fanciful history and impossible etymology represent them as having lived even from the time of the apostles. In the years 1402-3, the famous Spanish Dominican Vincent Ferrer was employed in that region for the conversion of the sectaries, among whom he says that there were Cathari as well as Waldenses; but, although his eloquence is said to have been accompanied by miraculous circumstances—that the most distant persons in his audience heard him as distinctly as the nearest, and that his preaching was understood by all, although they might be ignorant of the language in which he spoke—its force was not sufficient to root out the opinion against which it was directed. There were much persecution of the Waldenses in Northern Italy during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and in consequence of this many fled to Apulia and Calabria, where their settlements continued to exist, until in 1560 they were exterminated by a massacre which is one of the blackest crimes connected with the suppression of the reformation in Italy.

BEGHARDS

Other parties of separatists from the church were spoken of under the general name of beghards, which in Italy, Spain, and southern France, commonly designated fraticelli, but in Germany and Flanders the sectaries of the “Free Spirit”. Of these Cologne was the chief seat, and many of them suffered there and in other towns of the Rhine country. The secret progress of their pantheistic and immoral doctrines was favoured by the difficulty of distinguishing between such beghards and the harmless devotees who were confounded with them under a common name; while the more dangerous class studied to conceal their peculiarities by affecting a likeness in dress and manners to those beghards and beguines whom the popes by repeated declarations endeavoured to preserve from molestation. It is, indeed, probable that societies of beghards which were originally orthodox became gradually corrupted by the secret introduction of unsound opinions. The name of Lollards, which eventually marked the followers of Wyclif, is found as early as 1309, when it seems to be applied to the sect of the Free Spirit in Holland and Brabant, and was used indifferently with that of beghard. Another name given to sectaries of the same kind was that of turlupins; those who were so styled in the Isle of France, about the year 1372, are described as having held that nothing which is natural is matter for shame; and a woman of the sect, Mary of Valenciennes, is spoken of by Gerson as having written a book “with almost infinite subtlety” on the text, “Have charity, and do what thou wilt.”

The popes laboured to secure the co-operation of the secular power for the suppression of heresy. We have seen how, in a former age, the emperor Frederick II attempted to rescue his own reputation for orthodoxy by the severity of his laws and proceedings against sectaries; and in other cases the opposite motive of a desire to stand well with the papacy led to a course which was practically the same. Thus the emperor Charles IV, in the code which has from him the name of Carolina, ordered that obstinate heretics should be made over by the secular to the ecclesiastical authorities, in order to be burnt, and that receivers of heretics should forfeit their property; but the opposition of the Bohemians was so decided that these severe laws could not be put into execution.

The inquisition was now extended in Germany, France, Spain, Poland, and other countries. Boniface VIII had endeavoured to regulate its proceedings, and Clement V, at the council of Vienne, found himself obliged to admit that in many cases the inquisitors had given just cause of complaint. He therefore decreed that the bishops should be associated with these, who had until then been independent of the episcopal power; and while each of the orders was authorized to proceed in some respects without reference to the other, the cooperation of both bishops and inquisitors was in some cases required. In some countries, such as England, however, the inquisition was never able to establish itself; and elsewhere, as in the south of France, it found itself hampered by the unwillingness of the secular authorities to assist, by their interference with its sentences, or even by their direct opposition. To the questions of heresy which had engaged the labours of the inquisitors was added in Germany the duty of inquiring into the practice of witchcraft. The belief and the fear of this unhallowed art became rife, and secular authorities, as well as those of the church, concerned themselves with discovering and punishing those who were supposed to be guilty of it. Multitudes of wretches suffered in consequence—many of them after having confessed the commission of monstrous and impossible crimes. One writer reckons the number of sorcerers who were burnt within a century and a half at 30,000, or more, and believes that but for this wholesome severity the entire world would have been ruined by magical practices.

The practice of associating for penitential flagellation, which had been suppressed in the thirteenth century on account of the fanatical excesses connected with it, was still revived from time to time. In seasons of public calamity, when trust in the ordinary resources of the church was shaken, this exercise was again and again taken up by multitudes as a more powerful means of propitiating the wrath of heaven. The appearance of a flagellant party after the ravages of the Black Death, and the condemnation of flagellancy by Clement VI, have been already related. One Conrad Schmidt, a Thuringian, on finding the principle of flagellation thus discountenanced by the church, developed it into a system hostile both to the clergy and to their doctrines. He taught that flagellation was a baptism of blood; that it superseded the sacraments and other rites of the church, which were said to be ineffectual on account of the vices of the clergy; that salvation was possible for such persons only as should flog themselves at least on every Friday at the hour of the Saviour's passion; that this was the new faith which saved all, whereas the old faith of the gospel condemned all; that the Saviour, by changing water into wine, had signified that in the last days the baptism of water was to be superseded by the baptism of blood. The party claimed to represent the flagellants of sixty years before, from which time it was that they supposed the ministry and sacraments of the church to have lost their power. They had wild prophetic fancies—that Conrad Schmidt himself and one of his associates, who was burnt as a heretic, were Enoch and Elijah—the souls of those ancient saints having been infused into them at their birth; and that at the last day, which was fixed for the year 1364, Schmidt was to be the judge of the quick and the dead. With these and other strange opinions were combined the principles of dissimulation and evasion which are imputed to many kinds of sectaries; the flagellants were confounded with other parties under the general name of beguards; and their rule required them to conform outwardly to the church, and to punish themselves by stripes in secret for this

compliance.¹ In 1372 Gregory XI. instructed an inquisitor in Germany that these people should be treated as heretics on account of their denial of the sacraments; and this order was carried out at various times by burning many of them. Perhaps the most remarkable persecution was that of 1414, when about ninety of Schmidt's adherents were burnt at Sangershausen in Thuringia, and many others in other German towns.

In Italy also the same fanaticism appeared from time to time. And in 1399 a great movement—excited by two priests who are variously described as having come from Spain, from Provence, and from Scotland—began in Lombardy, whence it proceeded southwards to Florence, Rome, and Naples. The penitents professed to have received a revelation from the blessed Virgin that her Divine Son's wrath was provoked by the sins of mankind. They were dressed in white, and the numbers of their various companies, in which persons of all ranks were mixed, are reckoned at from 10,000 to 40,000. They chanted the *Stabat Mater* with vehement supplications for mercy; they declined all sustenance except bread and water, fasted much, and refused to make use of beds during the time of their pilgrimage. When one company had finished its devotions at Rome, it was succeeded by another. Multitudes were drawn to join the penitents; there was a profuse show of contrition in confessing of sins, enemies were reconciled, and in other ways there was much amendment of life. But Boniface IX condemned the movement as being opposed to the discipline of the church; and its good effects soon passed away. About the same time there was a fresh outbreak of flagellation in Flanders, and Henry IV of England issued a proclamation by which it was ordered that, if any of the party should arrive in an English port, they should not be suffered to land.

A few years later, St. Vincent Ferrer appeared as the leader of a party of flagellants; and from the fact of his countenancing such a movement we may infer that it was free from the fanatical excesses, and from the enmity to the clergy, which had marked the flagellants of earlier days. He seems, however, to have been convinced by the arguments of Gerson, and he wrote to the council of Constance that he submitted to the authority of that assembly in all things, and abandoned the manner of devotion which had been called in question.

Very different in character from these wilder movements was the mysticism which now appeared as prevailing widely in Germany. The origin and growth of this may be in no small degree referred to the peculiar troubles of the time. The clergy sank in estimation, and hence many persons of a religious disposition, as well as others, became inclined to disparage the outward forms of religion. The abuse of the sentence of interdict, which was now often pronounced for reasons merely political—a sentence which involved multitudes of innocent persons in suffering for the alleged guilt of their superiors, and which, by denying the ordinary means of grace, drove the awakened cravings of the soul to seek for sustenance elsewhere—contributed greatly to foster the mystic tendency. And the expectation that the end of all things would speedily come, the eager study of such prophecies as those of St. Hildegard and abbot Joachim, the readiness to believe in visions and new revelations, affected the mind in a similar way.

Some of these mystics styled themselves "Friends of God"—a name derived from the Saviour's words "Henceforth I call you not servants; but I have called you friends." They abounded chiefly on the upper Rhine, especially at Basel and Strasburg; but they had also correspondence with brethren in Switzerland, Italy, and Hungary, at Cologne, and in the Low Countries. It has been disputed whether the name designated an organised society, connected with the Waldenses or other sectaries who were avowedly separated from the church; but this idea seems to be now abandoned. The "friends of God" were not a sect, although liable to be mistaken for sectaries, and involved by the vulgar in the general odium of beghardism. The visions and revelations on which they relied are foreign to the character of the Waldensian system. While judging the clergy freely, they did not venture to question the doctrine of the church. They were devoted to the blessed Virgin, they revered saints and relics, they held the current belief in purgatory. Their love of symbolism enabled them to reconcile the

ordinary faith and worship with the peculiarities of their own system, which they regarded as additional, but not contradictory, to that of the church.

In this society were included monks and clergy, nobles, merchants, men and women of all classes, even down to tillers of the soil. They had priests to administer the Eucharist, but in other respects they did not attach importance to ordination. Thus Nicolas of Basel, a layman, who had founded the party, was regarded as its chief, and as its most enlightened member; and one of its characteristics was the principle of submission to certain men whose superior sanctity had raised them to the highest class, and invested them with oracular authority, "as in God's stead". The "friends," while professing to be purely scriptural, interpreted the Scriptures allegorically and mystically, and some parts of their system were concealed from the lower grades of believers by being disguised in a symbolical form. They denounced the subtleties and the dryness of scholasticism, and regarded the mixture of philosophy with religion as pharisaical. Their preachers were distinguished by the warmth, the earnestness, and the practical nature of their discourses; instead of contenting themselves, as was then common, with warning against the grossest sins by the fear of hell, they rather dwelt on the blessedness of heaven, and exhorted to the perfection of the Christian life, and to union with God. They taught that these objects were to be sought by entire resignation to the Divine will; if such resignation were attained, men would pray neither for heaven nor for deliverance from hell, but for God Himself alone. Hence they did not, like the monks, break away from their earthly ties, but regarded these as the providential conditions under which their work was to be carried on; and although some of them gave themselves to contemplation, the principle of resignation to God's will became an incentive to action for others, whom it taught to regard themselves as instruments for the fulfilment of that will. It was held that the highest reach of love was to prefer the salvation of another to our own.

On the same principle of resignation, it was taught that all temptations ought to be welcomed; even sensual temptations were to be regarded as a check on spiritual pride, and to be without temptation was a token of being forsaken by God. All bodily discipline was represented as designed for spiritual purposes, and as marking a stage after passing through which such things would not be necessary for the believer. But sufferings of God's sending were always to be gladly accepted.

NICOLAS OF BASEL

The history of Nicolas, the founder of this remarkable society, is for the most part very obscure. His very name is discoverable by inference only, and in his accounts of himself there is so large a mixture of visionary, marvellous, and allegorical matter, that it is impossible to determine how much is intended to be accepted as literal truth. He was born about 1308, the son of a merchant, to whose business he succeeded; but the companionship of a young knight induced him to withdraw from trade, and for a time to engage in the amusements of the world. On the eve of the day appointed for his marriage, he prayed for direction before a crucifix; when it seemed to him that the figure inclined towards him, and, in obedience to this sign, he resolved to give up the world and to follow the Saviour. He did not, however, renounce his wealth, but keeping it in his own hands he devoted it to religious purposes. He appears to have had at first four associates, and eventually the number of those admitted to the highest grade was thirteen. From Basel the headquarters of the party were removed in 1374-5 to a mountain within the Austrian-Swiss territory, where he built a house on a site which is said to have been miraculously indicated by a vision, and by the leading of a dog; and thence Nicolas kept up, by means of correspondence and of secret intelligencers, a watchful superintendence over his widely-spread connection. "The great friend of God in the Hill-country," as he was styled, threw around himself an air of mystery; and when he went forth to work on persons who had been marked out as fit subjects for his influence, he was able, by means of his private

information, to astonish and awe them by a knowledge of their concerns which they readily believed to be supernatural. In 1377, when the return of Gregory XI from Avignon appeared to open prospects of reform, Nicolas and one of his brethren repaired to Rome, and sought an interview with the pope, whom they urged to heal the evils of the church. On Gregory's professing himself unequal to such a work, Nicolas threatened him with death within a year, and foretold the coming schism; and his predictions were, of course, fulfilled. At length Nicolas, after many years of labour, was burnt as a beghard at Vienna, probably in the year 1393.

ECKART

It was from the Dominican brotherhood that most of the great teachers of mysticism came forth. The first of them, Henry Eckart, became provincial of the order for Saxony in 1304, and lived at Cologne. With Eckart, the great object of endeavour is represented to be the union and identification of the soul with God, whom he speaks of as the only being. By contemplation, he says, the divine part of the soul may become one with God, and son to Him; the soul is transformed into God even as the eucharistic bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of the Saviour. The word which Eckart used to denote the desire of this union was poverty, by which was expressed the fact that man has nothing of his own in order to attain to the pure knowledge of God, all joy and fear, all confidence and hope, must be laid aside; for all these are of the creature, and are hindrances to union. Eckart's mysticism was largely indebted to the works of the pretended Dionysius the Areopagite, and had much in common with Neoplatonism. His language often runs into manifest pantheism; but, although in this respect he bears a likeness to the sectaries of the Free Spirit, he was in no way connected with them, but differed essentially from them in his ardent desire for the salvation of the soul, and in his freedom from the impurity which stained their teaching. There was, however enough to draw on him the suspicion of heterodoxy; and, after a previous examination by the authorities of his order in 1324, the matter was taken up by the archbishop of Cologne, who in 1327 censured twenty-eight propositions extracted from his writings. These Eckart retracted in so far as they might be contrary to the doctrine of the church; but a more special retractation was required, and against this demand he appealed to the pope. By this step he appears to have secured himself from further trouble, until his death in 1329; but in that same year he was condemned by John XXII, as having held twenty-eight erroneous propositions. It would seem, however, that the Dominicans exerted themselves in favour of his memory; for although the pope, in the following year, by the bull 'In agro Dominico', renewed his censure of the propositions, it may be supposed that by omitting to connect the name of Eckart with them, he intended (in so far as retractation was possible for a pope) to withdraw the charge against him.

TAULER

Notwithstanding the suspicions which had been cast on Eckart's orthodoxy, his writings continued to be the chief study of the later mystics, among whom John Tauler was the most famous. Tauler was born at Strasburg in 1294, and at the age of eighteen entered the Dominican order. He studied for some time at Paris, although it is not known whether it was to that university that he owed his degree of doctor in theology; and in the course of his studies he showed a preference for the mystical and spiritual writers—the pseudo-Dionysius, the school of St. Bernard, and, above all, St. Augustine—over the scholastic authors who were then of greatest authority. On returning to his native city he fell under the influence of Eckart and other mystics, which was then powerful at Strasburg; yet, unlike Eckart, he was inclined rather to practical work than to speculation, and he often denounces the mistaken

contemplativeness and the passive quietism which he regarded as perversions of the true mysticism; for in this he held that love for man ought to go hand-in-hand with the aspiration after union with God.

Strasburg was then agitated by the differences between the pope and the emperor Lewis, so that, while the bishop adhered to the pope, the citizens, by siding with the emperor, incurred the sentence of interdict. In consequence of this, the clergy were divided: while some shut up their churches, others, in defiance of the interdict, deemed it their duty to continue their pastoral labours. In such circumstances it was natural that persons of all classes should be drawn together by the desire of finding some satisfaction for their spiritual needs, to which the church appeared to deny the means of support; and thus the association of the "friends of God" became greatly increased in numbers. Among the clergy who remained at their posts was Tauler, although the brethren of his order in general left the town. The circumstances of the time gave him prominence; he became famous as a preacher, and in that character he extended his labours on the one side to Basel (where, as at Strasburg, the imperialist citizens had been laid under an interdict by the bishop), and on the other side to Cologne; the fame of his eloquence even made its way across the Alps into Italy.

In 1346 he was visited by a layman, who had listened to several of his sermons and expressed a wish to confess to him. Tauler heard the confession, and administered the sacrament of the altar to the stranger, who afterwards visited him again, and requested him to preach on the manner of attaining the highest perfection which is possible in this life. Tauler complied, although reluctantly, and addressed to a crowded audience an earnest exhortation to renunciation of self and of self-will. Once more the layman, who had taken notes of the sermon, appeared, and told Tauler that he had come a distance of thirty miles, not so much to hear him as to give him advice; that he, the famous preacher, who had already reached his fiftieth year, was still but a man of books, a mere Pharisee. Tauler, although startled and shocked by such words, warmly thanked his monitor for having been the first to tell him of his faults, and entreated his further counsel. The stranger prescribed some ascetic exercises; he himself, he said, had gone through such things, but had now outgrown them, so as to need them no longer; and he further charged Tauler to abstain for two years from preaching, from hearing confessions, and from study, shutting himself up in the seclusion of his cell. Submission to the dictates of those who were supposed to possess spiritual experience was, as we have seen, a characteristic of the "friends of God", and Tauler obeyed. The monitor was no other than Nicolas of Basel, who, in his watchful observation of all who might be supposed likely to sympathize with him, had marked Tauler during a visit which the preacher had lately made to Basel, and had undertaken the journey to Strasburg for the purpose of gaining him. Tauler struggled through the prescribed exercises, being upheld by the counsels of Nicolas, and even assisted by his money, while his former friends mocked at him for the change which had taken place; but when, at the end of the two years, he attempted to resume his preaching, and his fame had drawn together a great audience, his utterance was choked by his feelings; he burst into tears, and found himself unable to proceed. It was supposed that he had lost his senses, and his superiors forbade him the pulpit. Nicolas of Basel, on being consulted, told him that perhaps he had not yet overcome his love of self, and advised him to remain silent for some time longer; after which, by the direction of Nicolas, Tauler asked and obtained leave to preach in Latin before the brethren of his order. In this he acquitted himself so as to raise general admiration, and the late prohibition was taken off. He resumed his public preaching, which was now marked by a warmth and a depth unknown in his earlier time: such was the effect of his first sermon that twelve persons were struck down as if dead. He strenuously urged reformation, nor did he spare the faults of the clergy, so that with them he became unpopular, and he and his associates were stigmatized as beghards. In addition to labouring as a preacher, Tauler wrote some German tracts, of which the most celebrated is one on 'The Imitation of the Saviour's Life of Poverty'; and he acted as the spiritual director of many

persons—among whom Rulman Merswin, a wealthy retired merchant, and author of a book entitled ‘The Nine Rocks’ is especially mentioned.

The great pestilence of 1348 raged with such violence at Strasburg that 16,000 persons died in the city alone. The interdict was still in force, and the clergy in general, professedly out of obedience to it, refrained from the exercise of their ministry. In these circumstances, Tauler and a few others, among whom was Ludolf of Saxony, prior of the Carthusian convent, stepped forward, arguing that it was contrary to Scripture and to reason that, for the political offence of one man, multitudes of innocent persons should be excluded from the means of grace and from the benefit of the Redeemer’s sufferings. They tended the sick, aided them with spiritual counsel, administered the last consolations of religion, and buried the dead with the offices of the church. But by these and other things the bishop of Strasburg was offended, so that when Charles IV visited the city, and reconciliation with the church was offered to the inhabitants, Tauler was required, as a suspected beghard, to give an account of his faith before the emperor. The result is not recorded; but it was probably in consequence of this that he withdrew to Cologne, where he laboured zealously to correct the prevailing habits of luxury, and to counteract the teaching of the professors of the Free Spirit. The time of his return to Strasburg is unknown; but he was there in 1361, when, feeling the approach of death, he invited Nicolas of Basel to visit him. In compliance with this request, Nicolas repaired to Strasburg, and during an illness of many weeks Tauler was sustained by the comfort of intercourse with the man whose influence had determined the course of his maturer spiritual life, and whom he now desired to draw up a narrative of their early intercourse, from notes which Tauler had made long before. Tauler died on the 16th of June 1361, in a garden-house of the convent in which his sister was a nun, and he has been blamed by a severe mystic for the weakness of indulging his human affections by allowing himself her society.

Tauler was styled by his admirers the Illuminated (or Enlightened) Doctor. His sermons, which are the most important part of his remaining works, are characterized by deep earnestness and by an evangelical tone which, as Luther mentions, was symbolized by his monument, on which he was represented as pointing to the Lamb of God. He taught that outward austerities were to be regarded not for their own sake, but as a discipline for beginners, and would fall away of themselves from the believer in proportion as his faith became matured; that without a right heart, penance, confession, absolution, with all the intercessions of the blessed Virgin and the saints, are of no avail. While he would have all the laws of the church observed, he attaches no importance to the outward works, and even says that the believer must sometimes appear to break the laws—a principle which was, of course, liable to be perverted, as it was by the sectaries of the Free Spirit. And, while he regards the holy Eucharist as the chief means of union between the believer and his Lord, he teaches that in this also the inward feeling must be regarded rather than the outward form. Although fond of recondite meanings, he is free from all parade of learning; in one sermon, he announces his intention of giving up the practice of using Latin quotations, except in discourses addressed to learned hearers. The writings of Tauler had much influence on the mind of Luther, who warmly expressed his obligations to them. It has been said by Herder, that to read two of Tauler’s sermons is to read them all; yet, as has been well observed, even the monotony which unquestionably runs throughout them may have tended in practice to deepen the impression of his teaching.

SUSO

Another famous mystic, Henry von Berg, who is more generally known by the name of Suso, was a Dominican of Constance, and died in 1365, in his seventieth year. In an autobiography, which is probably in part imaginary, he tells us that from the age of eighteen to that of forty he disciplined himself by strict observances of devotion, by severe ascetic

exercises, and even by tortures, such as that of wearing under his dress a wooden cross studded with thirty nails, of which the points were turned towards his flesh. At length, when he had reduced himself by this treatment to such a degree that a continuance of it must have been fatal, he was told by an angel that he had studied long enough in the lower school, and was to be transferred to the higher, in which his sufferings would not be of his own infliction, but would come on him plentifully from men and devils. The object of all he represents as being an entire abandonment and resignation of self to the Divine will, in imitation of the Saviour's example. On expressing a wish to set to work, he is told that the less one does, the more hath he really done—that men ought not to act for themselves, but to cast themselves wholly on God's promises. There are stories not only of visions, but of miracles. The book was drawn up by Suso for the instruction of a "spiritual daughter", whom he warns that she is soon to die; and he relates that, after her death, he had a vision of her as "passing gloriously into the pure Divinity." The principle of self-abandonment is again inculcated in Suso's book 'Of the Eternal Wisdom', where the Saviour is introduced as conversing with His servant, and recounting the bodily and spiritual sufferings of His passion. Suso is without the manly strength of Tauler, and is distinguished chiefly by the poetical and figurative tone of his writings.

RUYSBROEK

The mystically speculative tendency of Eckart revived in the anonymous author of the 'German Theology', which is supposed to be a work of this time, and in John Ruysbroek, who was distinguished by the title of *Ecstatic Doctor*. Ruysbroek, who is characterized by John of Trittenheim as "a man reputed to be devout, but of little learning", had been a secular priest at Brussels until the age of sixty, when he withdrew to the monastery of Grontal, of which he became prior. He professed that he never wrote a word except by inspiration of the Holy Spirit and in the especial presence of the Divine Trinity; and it is related that, when he found the influence of divine grace strong on him, he used to retire to write in the depths of a wood—where his canons, uneasy at his long absence, once found him surrounded by a supernatural light, imperfectly conscious, but "inebriated by the glow of the divine sweetness." Ruysbroek died in 1381, at the age of eighty-eight. His works were written in Flemish, but were translated into Latin. Gerson, who, as a nominalist, was alarmed by their mystic realism, denounced them as pantheistic, and on this account became involved in a controversy with John of Schonhofen, a canon of Grontal, who, among other things, charged him with having too much relied on the Latin translation.

Gerson himself endeavoured to unite mysticism with scholasticism, so as to exclude the dangers of unrestrained imagination and fanaticism; and to him has been attributed by some writers the authorship of the most celebrated devotional book of the middle ages—the treatise 'Of the Imitation of Christ'. But this supposition appears rather to have been suggested by the patriotic desire of French writers to claim for one of their own countrymen a work so justly admired than to rest on any solid basis of facts. And the slightly different name of John Gerson, which has been put forward by other writers on the ground of inscriptions in some manuscript copies of the book, would seem to be really nothing more than a mistake for that of the famous chancellor of Paris. The popular opinion, which ascribes the 'Imitation' to Thomas Hamerken of Kempton, a canon regular of Zwoll, who died in 1471, appears, therefore, to be the most probable. The tone of the 'Imitation' is strongly mystical, yet no less practical—setting forth religious practice as the way to insight into divine things. Thoroughly monastic in spirit, it has the characteristic excellences and defects of monastic piety; while it is full of wise guidance for the soul in the ways of humility, purity, and self-renunciation, the religion which it inculcates is too exclusively directed towards the perfecting of the individual in himself, too little solicitous for his relations with the brotherhood of mankind. Its

conception of the way of life is too limited, and does not enough regard the endless variety of circumstances in which men are placed, with the task before them of working out their salvation under the conditions assigned to them by the divine providence. Yet the vast and unequalled popularity of the book has not been confined to those who would sympathize with its monastic peculiarities, but has extended to multitudes of persons remote in feeling and in belief from all that is specially distinctive of medieval religion.

The teaching of the mystics, by leading men from a reliance on outward observances to an inward spiritual life, prepared the way for the Reformation, and Luther speaks with warm admiration of Tauler and of the German Theology. But between the two systems there was the important difference, that whereas the mystics sought after immediate union with the Saviour through conformity to him in humility and spiritual poverty, the characteristic doctrine of Luther was that of free justification by faith, while his system insisted on the necessity of those sacramental means which the mystics regarded as comparatively unimportant.

CHAPTER XI SUPPLEMENTARY.

The Hierarchy.

IN the earlier part of the time which we are now surveying, the pretensions of the papacy, although they could not in substance be carried higher than before (inasmuch as they already included supremacy both in spiritual and in temporal things), were more extravagantly developed in detail. For this questionable service the popes were indebted to the flattery of curialist writers, and of friars specially devoted to their interest, such as Augustine Trionfi and Alvar Pelayo,—who maintained, for example, that the pope could not sin by corruption or simony in the bestowal of preferment, forasmuch as he is above law, so that actions which are sinful in others are not so in him.

In their relations with secular powers the popes were often gainers. The claim advanced by John XXII in the case of Lewis of Bavaria—that an elected emperor should not have authority to govern until after having been examined and approved by the pope—was something even beyond the pretensions of Boniface VIII; but in the contest with Lewis the popes had the advantage, and their candidate, Charles IV, succeeded peacefully on his rival's death. The right to bestow kingdoms had been already asserted as to Hungary on the extinction of the Arpad dynasty, although the Hungarians would not allow that the pope was entitled to do more than to confirm the national choice; and in other cases, princes who were desirous to secure themselves in the possession of a doubtful crown requested the papal sanction, as was done by the great Robert of Scotland shortly before his death.

But on the whole the popes lost more than they gained. Their claims to domination, after having been carried beyond endurance by Boniface VIII, began immediately afterwards to recede by the withdrawal of the bulls which had offended Philip the Fair; and that line of investigation into the sources of the papal rights which was begun in the imperial interest by such writers as Marsilius of Padua and William of Ockham, was afterwards forced by the great schism on churchmen whose natural feeling would have been averse to it. Even such men were compelled, by the inextricable confusion which arose out of the pretensions of rival popes, to ask whether there might not be some means of arbitrating between them. In these

circumstances the universities—especially that of Paris—gained an authority which was very dangerous to the papacy; and in various quarters new and startling opinions were propounded. By some, it was maintained that the pope was not essentially necessary to the church; others denied him the possession of the “two swords”, referring to the benefits which the church had derived from the intervention of Theodoric the Goth and of Otho I, and tracing the schism, with all the other evils of the time, to the secularity of the popes. And whereas the popes had endeavoured to absorb the rights of the whole episcopate, the episcopate was now set up as an aristocracy, in opposition to the monarchy of the pope. There was a tendency to limit the papal power; and the circumstances of the time appeared to force on the other members of the church the task of judging those who claimed to be its head. The notions that popes could not be deposed except for heresy—that the occupant of the chief see was exempt from earthly judgment—were denied and refuted. If, argues the writer of a treatise which has been commonly ascribed to Gerson, an hereditary king may be deposed—for this he assumes as a thing beyond question—much more may a pope, who is chosen by cardinals—one whose father and grandfather were perhaps unable to find beans to fill their bellies. When, he adds, the case of a pope is in question, it is not for him, but for cardinals, bishops, and secular princes to assemble a general council; and such a council is superior to the pope and may control him, while he has no power to dispense with its canons. The church, according to Gerson and others of the same school, may compel a pope to resign. These principles were, as we have seen, carried into effect at the council of Constance.

On the other hand, the power of the empire had never recovered itself since the time of Frederick II. Dante, at the beginning of the period, speaks of one of the two suns by which Rome had formerly been enlightened as having been extinguished by the other. The endeavours of Henry VII to restore the ancient rights of his crown were cut short by an untimely death; and all that he had achieved was forfeited by the faults or the misfortunes of his successors. The transfers of the empire from one family to another, while they added strength and importance to the electoral princes of Germany, weakened the imperial authority; the emperor or king of the Romans, who had paid dearly for his office and had no assurance as to the succession, was under the strongest temptation to regard his own immediate interest alone, and to sacrifice the permanent interests of his crown. At Constance, indeed, Sigismund was able to exercise influence as advocate of the church; but the decline of the imperial authority from its former greatness was shown by the fact that he found it necessary to call in the aid of John XXIII for the assembling of the council, as the European kingdoms had ceased to acknowledge the supremacy of the empire.

In France the opposition between the papacy and the crown was removed by the settlement of the popes at Avignon, which rendered them subservient tools of the sovereign. But this subserviency, in addition to the degradation of the papacy, had the effect of exciting the jealousy of the English, which was shown in many forms of resistance, while the popes found themselves obliged to meet it by compromise, lest the nation should be provoked to throw off their authority.

To this time belongs the completion of the Canon Law. Clement V ordered the determinations of the council of Vienne, with other decrees which he had issued, to be collected into five books, which from him derive the name of Clementines. Among these it is noted that under the head of Oaths he takes the opportunity of declaring the oath sworn to the holy see by Henry VII to be a real oath of fealty; and that under the head of the Liberty of the Church he withdraws the bull *Clericis Laicos*. After having published these books in a consistory of cardinals, Clement sent them in 1313 to the university of Orleans, which he had founded; but, although he lived a year and a half longer, he did not communicate them in the usual manner to the other universities, and it is said by a writer who lived two centuries later, that, from a feeling of their contrariety in many respects to Christian simplicity and to the freedom of religion, he gave orders on his death-bed that they should be abolished. If it be true

that Clement had such scruples, they were not shared by his successor, John XXII; for this pope sent the Clementines to Paris and Bologna in 1317, that they might serve as a text for lectures.

The Clementines were the last addition to the body of ecclesiastical law which was put forth with the fulness of papal sanction. At an earlier time such decretals as did not appear in Gratian's compilation had been styled *Extravagants*. After the publication of Gregory IXth's five books, the same name was used to designate such more recent decretals as had not yet been included in any authorized collection; and it has since become the general title of the decretals issued by John XXII and his successors, as these were never collected or communicated to the universities by papal authority. The selection of the documents which are classed under this head is attributed to Chapuis, who edited the Canon Law in 1500.

The new legislation was in the same spirit with that which had gone before it. Although strong assaults were sometimes made on portions of the false decretals, no one ventured to attack them as a whole; and so long as these retained their authority, any attempts of councils to limit the power of the pope were likely to be nugatory.

ANNATES

The popes of this time not only maintained their older claims as to money, patronage, and the like, but endeavoured to enlarge on them. Thus John XXII imposed the tax of annates Or first-fruits—a payment for which there had been some shadow of precedent in the demands made by bishops (sometimes with papal sanction), from those who were presented to benefices by them; although in earlier times such exactions had been condemned by the church and its most eminent teachers, such as Chrysostom in the east and Gregory the Great in the west. John in 1319 extended it to ill benefices, both elective and non-elective, fixing the amount at half the income of the first year, and professing that the law was to be for three years only; but it appears to have been renewed, and the exaction was yet further enforced by Boniface IX. The popes also claimed the income of bishoprics, etc., during vacancy (*fructus medii temporis*), and, although Alexander V and Martin V professed to give up this claim, they still retained the first-fruits. The "right of spoils", which had been denounced by popes when claimed by temporal sovereigns, was now asserted for the papacy, and with a view to this and other purposes their collectors and spies were sent into various countries. Fees of all sorts were raised in amount, and new occasions for exacting them were invented. A writer of the time speaks of the papal court as drawing gold even out of flint; and an English chronicler describes the charges on appointments as so heavy that in many cases the payers never recovered from them. The luxury of the court of Avignon required an increase of means, while the popes were unable to collect the revenues of their Italian states; and when, in consequence of the schism, western Christendom was burdened with the cost of two papal establishments, the exactions became more exorbitant than ever. All the old means of raising money were strained to the uttermost; new devices were invented for the same purpose, and each of the rival courts was glad to borrow the ideas of the other in this respect. Every pope at the beginning of his pontificate set forth a code of chancery-rules, in which, adopting the devices of his predecessors for extracting money from the benefices of the church, he usually added such further orders of the same tendency as his own ingenuity or that of his advisers could suggest. The censures of the church were prostituted as means to compel the payment of money. While there was an affectation of checking pluralities in general, an exception was made in favour of the cardinals, so that a cardinal might enjoy the monstrous number of four or five hundred benefices.

Such things were not allowed to pass without remonstrance. In England, where the patience of the nation was most severely tried by them, there were frequent and indignant manifestations of discontent, and statutes were enacted with a view of checking the practices

of the papal court. The laity cried out loudly, in parliament and elsewhere, charging the depopulation and impoverishment of the country on the Roman exactions, and on the draining of the wealth of English benefices by foreigners. It was complained that such persons were in many cases enemies of the English crown, that they betrayed the secrets of the realm; and on such grounds the foreign holders of English benefices were frequently deprived, and if they were found in the country (which they rarely honoured with their presence) were obliged to quit it. Laws were passed to prevent the holding of English preferment by aliens. Complaints were made by parliament that the money drawn from England under the name of annates and other papal dues was employed in the interest of the national enemies; and in 1404 an act was passed by which bishops were forbidden to submit to the increased rate of payments which the Roman court had begun to exact. Papal collectors were required, on landing in England, to swear that they would do nothing to the prejudice of the crown or of the kingdom; and sometimes, when returning with the spoil of England, they were compelled to disgorge it before embarking. There were frequent orders against the introduction of papal documents injurious to the dignity of the crown, especially of such as assumed the disposal of patronage; and the statutes of provisors and praemunire were enacted in order to check the Roman aggressions in this kind. The first act of provisors, passed in 1350-1, after setting forth the manner in which the popes had usurped patronage, and the ill results which had followed, decrees that elections to bishoprics and other elective dignities shall be free, agreeably to the grants of the founders; that no reservation, collation, or provision of the court of Rome to the contrary shall take effect, but that in such cases the king shall present, as his progenitors did before free election was granted; forasmuch as such election was granted on condition that it should be preceded by the royal licence and followed by the royal assent, and, if these conditions fail, the right of presentation reverts to the original state. By the statute of praemunire, in 1353, it was enacted that any one who should carry to a foreign tribunal matter which was cognizable in the king's court, or who should try to impeach in any foreign court a judgment which had been pronounced by the king's court, should be cited to answer before the king or his representatives, and in case of non-appearance should be outlawed, should forfeit his property, and be committed to prison. The provisions of these two acts were repeatedly enforced by later legislation; and the headship of religious houses was placed on the same footing as other dignities with regard to the king's right of presentation. The popes affected to set such laws at nought, and to maintain their claims to patronage; Boniface IX went so far as to order that the antipapal acts should be erased from the English statute-book, and there were continual attempts to evade the force of the prohibitions. But the parliament, the clergy, and the whole nation, stood firm in their union against the papal encroachments; and at last the utmost that the popes could do, by way of saving appearances, was to accept the English king's nomination of the persons in whose behalf the pretended rights of the papacy were to be exercised. The resistance of the English to the papal pretension to confer the temporalities of sees has already been mentioned. But in the weaker kingdom of Scotland this pretension seems to have been unopposed. Thus John XXII in 1323 presented John of Lindsay, a canon of Glasgow, to the bishopric of that see, professing to give him the temporalities as well as the spiritual charge; and he nominated an Italian to the prebend which had been formerly held by the new bishop. But Lindsay, on returning from the papal court to Scotland, was required to admit a nominee of the king to this prebend; and he submitted, both he and the nominee protesting that the admission should not interfere with the papal rights. Yet while in this lesser matter the crown prevailed, it is remarkable that no objection was raised against the pope's claim to bestow the temporalities of the bishopric.

In other countries also sovereigns sometimes imitated the English example of resistance to the papacy. Thus Philip of Valois seized the revenues of ecclesiastical absentees, although at the entreaty of his queen he afterwards restored so much of them as belonged to cardinals. Alfonso XI of Castille endeavoured to withstand the papal claim of provisions; and

Sigismund (afterwards emperor), provoked by Boniface IX's acknowledgment of his rival, Ladislaus, as king of Hungary, forbade all exercise of patronage by the popes in that kingdom.

The exaggerated pretensions which the clergy had set up as to rights of jurisdiction, and of exemption from secular authority, tended to react to their own disadvantage. In Germany, where the ecclesiastical class feeling of the prelates was modified by their position as great secular lords, it was established that in temporal matters the appeal should be to the emperor alone : and this was declared, not only by Lewis of Bavaria, but by Charles IV in his golden bull.

In France, where the liberties of the national church had been affirmed and secured by the pragmatic sanction and by the "establishments" of St. Lewis, and where the popes were controlled in some degree by the fact of their residence at Avignon, the crown was able to hold its ground against the ambition of the papacy. The sovereigns were in general disposed to favour the hierarchy as far as possible, in order to secure the influence of the bishops; but the nobles were always at strife with the clergy, and on both sides there were continual complaints of aggression and encroachment. Thus, at a session of the parliament of Paris, held under Philip of Valois in 1329, Peter of Cugnieres, a knight and one of the king's counsellors, after discoursing on the text, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's", brought forward sixty-six articles as to which he asserted that the clergy had encroached on the rights of the laity. These articles related to such things only as could show no warrant of law or privilege; for example, there was no complaint as to the exemption of the clergy from secular judgment, but it was complained that the tonsure was so bestowed as to confer this exemption on unfit persons—on boys and on married men, on some who were illiterate, and on others who were disqualified by character. At a second session of the same body, Peter Roger, archbishop elect of Sens (afterwards pope Clement VI), stood forward as the champion of the clergy, and replied to the articles in order, declaring that, although there are two swords—the spiritual and the temporal— both might be in the hands of one and the same person. Thus, he said, it was in ancient Israel; thus it was in the case of Melchizedek, and in Him who is a priest after the order of Melchizedek; and so, too, it was in St. Peter, as appeared from the punishment of Ananias. Our Lord would have both swords in the possession of the church; He did not charge the apostle to cast away his sword, but to sheathe it; by which was meant that the church, although having all jurisdiction, should refrain from the exercise of it in cases of blood. The king, hampered by his fear of the danger which threatened him from England, was unable to carry out with firmness the policy which his wishes suggested. At a later session it was declared in his name, and by the mouth of Peter of Cugnieres himself, that Philip was resolved to maintain the rights of the church unimpaired. The king was content with the promise of the bishops that they would redress the grievances which were alleged; but when the bishop of Autun, Peter Bertrandi (who had answered Cugnieres's articles at great length), insisted on the grievances of the clergy, and asked for a clearer declaration in their favour, he was told that the clergy had a certain time allowed them for reform, and that, if they neglected this opportunity, the king would apply such remedies as should please God and the people.

The parliament of Paris strongly opposed the hierarchical claims, not only restraining the bounds of the ecclesiastical judgments, but asserting a sort of oversight of them, and assuming to itself the right of judging in some kinds of cases which had hitherto been regarded as belonging to ecclesiastical cognizance; and the clergy continued to complain that laymen inflicted grievances on them, especially by interfering with their supposed rights of jurisdiction.

In England there were frequent collisions as to the rival claims of the ecclesiastical and the secular courts. When the clergy complained to Edward II, in 1309, that clerks arrested on suspicion of crime were not immediately made over to their ordinaries, "as of right ought to be done", but were kept in the secular prison, the king replied that such clerks should be given

up to their ecclesiastical superiors on demand, but with the condition that they should be brought before the king's judges for trial "as heretofore hath been customary". So, in answering the petition known as *Articuli cleri* Edward says that, when a matter should come before both the spiritual and the temporal courts—as in the case of violently laying hands on a clerk—the king's court shall treat it "as to that court itself shall seem expedient, the ecclesiastical judgment notwithstanding". Even that weak prince found it necessary to remonstrate again and again with the popes on account of encroachments in this and in other respects; and, under his successors, such remonstrances were both frequent and forcible.

In 1344, Edward III, in consideration of a large subsidy from the clergy, granted that no archbishop or bishop should be impeached before the king's justices for any crime, unless by special order from the crown—a concession which, while relaxing the exercise of the royal authority for the time, implies an assertion of its right. In the end of the century, Richard II condemned archbishop Arundel to perpetual banishment and to forfeiture of his property, and Henry IV, although desirous to keep well with the clergy on account of the defect in his title to the crown, proceeded without hesitation against such of the order as opposed him. He put to death, by secular judgment, some Franciscans and other priests who had plotted in behalf of a pretender to the name of the dethroned Richard. Merks, bishop of Carlisle, was deprived of his see, and had difficulty in escaping with life. The king brought Scrope, archbishop of York, to trial for high treason, and when the chief justice, Sir William Gascoigne, refused to act as judge, saying that the king himself had no right to condemn a bishop to death, a less scrupulous person, Sir William Fulthorpe, was found for the work, and the archbishop, having been found guilty, was beheaded. Archbishop Arundel, who had been restored to Canterbury on the change of dynasty, had contented himself with urging that his brother primate should be reserved for the pope's judgment; and although Innocent VI anathematized those who had been concerned in the archbishop's death, the sentence was ineffectual, so that Gregory XII found it expedient to release them on condition of their expressing sorrow for their offence.

In 1354, archbishop Islip complained in parliament that the secular judges frequently exceeded their authority by trying and condemning to death "the Lord's anointed"—clergymen, and monks in holy orders. To this the king himself and others replied that the privileges claimed by the clergy were an encouragement to crime; that when criminal clerks were made over to their bishops, their prison life, instead of being a punishment, became a time of relaxation and good living, with all the temptations which arise out of idleness; and that the sight of such things incited others to crime. The primate seems to have found these statements irresistible, and gives orders that the treatment of clerical delinquents in prison shall be more severe, especially as to diet, which, even on Sundays, is never to be more luxurious than bread, vegetables, and small beer. But the clergy still found that their claims were not respected. The convocation of Canterbury, in 1399, while it admitted that the privilege of the clergy ought not to avail them in cases of treason, complained that for offences of other sorts they were sometimes hanged like laymen, and petitioned that the king would order them, if convicted in secular courts, to be made over to the custody of the bishops, according to their rights.

In other countries also the assumed immunities of the clergy were controlled by the secular power. Thus in France, when Guichard, bishop of Troyes, was charged with having poisoned or enchanted the king of Navarre's mother, he was long imprisoned in the Louvre, without any regard to the privileges of his order. Even as to the monastic bodies, the French kings firmly asserted their rights of jurisdiction. Thus in 1350, king John, having received complaints of cruelties exercised on delinquent monks by their superiors, ordered that redress should be made; and when the Dominicans and Franciscans objected to this, as an invasion of the pope's authority, they were told that they must either submit or leave the kingdom. Again, in 1412 a royal commission was appointed to inquire into the affairs of the black monks of

Languedoc ; and when the archbishops of Narbonne and Toulouse, with a council, charged the commissioners to desist under pain of excommunication, the king's council refused to hear the representatives of the two archbishops, because they had assembled their council without the royal license.

The papal judicature was so extended as in great measure to supersede all other tribunals of the church. The Roman curia now entertained all sorts of cases in the first instance, often where one only of contending parties wished to resort to it, and in disregard of the protests of the other party; and it frequently happened that cases, while pending, were transferred to the papal judgment from the episcopal courts in which they had been commenced. By this the authority and estimation of the bishops was much diminished; and other things, such as the enormous extension of the system of dispensations and exemptions, tended to the same effect. By arrogating to themselves the functions of the bishops, the popes reduced these to what a writer of the time describes as the condition of mere painted images; and many of them, finding themselves without the honour and the influence which had formerly belonged to their order, were tempted to neglect of duty and to selfish enjoyment, while they endeavoured to indemnify themselves for their degradation by behaving tyrannically to their clergy.

In France the independence of the bishops appeared to have been secured by the pragmatic sanction of St. Lewis; but it was again sacrificed by the concordat of Constance, and the authority which they had seemed likely to acquire, by means of the councils in which they sat in judgment on popes, was frustrated by the policy of the popes, who contrived to entangle them in differences with their sovereigns.

The popes, too, had in their hands the power of reconciling the bishops to much loss of dignity by means of the system of commendams. The practice of "commending" vacant preferments—such as the headship of a monastery—instead of filling them up with proper incumbents, was as old as the eighth or ninth century, but had then been forcibly exercised by secular princes in favour of laymen or others, and had been reprobated by the ecclesiastical authorities. At a later time, however, it came to be largely used by popes, who found in it a means of attaching to their interest persons who might otherwise have been inclined to insubordination. At first, vacant preferments, if there were some hindrance to filling them up immediately, were commended to the care of some competent person, and the abuse of the system was guarded against by limitations of the time for which such commendations might be granted. But afterwards such restrictions were set aside, so that the commendation might be for the whole lifetime of the receiver; nor were the popes bound by any limits as to the number of the preferments which might thus be accumulated on a single person. If an archbishop complained of the cost of his pall, or a bishop of the amount of his first-fruits, they might be indemnified at the expense of the church by receiving the commendation of wealthy sees or abbacies. In the case of some of the more important prelates, this system was carried to a great excess. Thus Baldwin of Treves held at different times the sees of Spires and Worms *in commendam* with his archbishopric, and for nine years (during a part of which he was also administrator of Worms) even the archbishopric of Mayence, the seat of the German primacy, was commended to him. The cardinals held much preferment in this way, and in some cases even women received the commendation of benefices.

Clement V, who had used this system largely, was touched with compunction in a dangerous illness, and on his recovery put forth a bull revoking and annulling all such grants; but it would seem, from the complaints of the younger Durandus and of another bishop, at the time of the council of Vienne, that little practical amendment followed. John XXII endeavoured, by his bull *Execrabilis* (a.C. 1318), to check the practice of commendation and other abuses of pluralities; but later popes again had recourse to it, and it furnished the means of evading various laws of the church. Thus a benefice with cure of souls might be bestowed *in commendam* on a person who would have been incapable of holding it as incumbent—a

boy, for example, or one who had not been ordained to the priesthood. Or by the union of benefices the laws against pluralities might be defeated—the holder being presented to one as the “principal benefice”, and the others being “commended” to him with it. Or a cure of souls was united with a sinecure, and, when the sinecure was bestowed on a person unqualified for a charge of souls, the cure followed it by virtue of the union.

In consequence of such practices, chiefly, the inequality between different grades of the clergy now became especially glaring. Theodoric of Niem tells us that, while some of them were greater than secular princes, others were in a condition more abject than that of the common people. And Nicolas of Clemanges renews the old complaint of Agobard, that members of the priesthood are employed in low offices under secular masters—as cooks, butlers, stewards, as waiters at table or as ladies’ footmen, “not to say worse.”

There was a general disposition to put some restraint on the increase of ecclesiastical wealth. In England the statutes of mortmain were directed to this purpose, as we have seen in an earlier period. In Germany there were various local enactments—as that clergymen should not acquire real property, or should hold it only for a limited time; and that they should not be employed to draw up wills, as it was supposed that they might unduly influence the minds of the testators. At Paderborn it was decreed in 1379 that any citizen who at a funeral should offer more than the price of one mass should be fined—an order which seems to imply not only a wish to limit the receipts of the clergy, but a doubt of the efficacy of such services for the benefit of departed souls.

But the attacks on the wealth of the clergy were not limited to such measures as these. Marsilius of Padua and William of Ockham, whose rigour of principle was exasperated by their feeling that, as imperialists, they had the great force of the clergy against them, proposed to take away all endowments; and the principle of such endowments was afterwards denounced by Wyclif and Hus. The wealth of the English hierarchy, contrasting strongly with Wyclif’s ideal, became a mark for frequent attacks. When Henry IV, in 1404, was urgently in want of money, the house of commons represented to him that the clergy held a third part of the English soil, and yet lived in idleness while the laity shed their blood for their country. On this, archbishop Arundel threw himself at the king’s feet, and reminded him that the clergy had given a tenth for the national service oftener than the laity had given a fifteenth that they contributed the services of their retainers to the royal forces, and that, instead of being idle, they also contributed their prayers. By this speech the attack was defeated; and the king assured the clergy that he intended to leave the church in as good a condition as he had found it, or better. Two years later, a scheme of church-reform was drawn up, setting forth on one hand the amount of land and revenues held by the clergy, and on the other hand the number of earls, knights, esquires, and hospitals that might be maintained out of these resources, with a proposal for reducing the clergy to such a number as might be necessary for the performance of their functions. But again the king took part with the clergy, and the attack was unsuccessful.

The nobles had in earlier times endeavoured to get exclusive possession of the preferment in some chapters, and such attempts were continually carried further. Thus, at Strasburg, no one was admissible to a canonry unless he could show sixteen quarterings of nobility; and, although Gregory IX had reprobated this system, other popes allowed it, and may have found their account in thus securing the support of the nobles who benefited by it. The claim of high birth, indeed, was commonly admitted, even by reforming churchmen, as a ground for preferment; and an English satirist, while complaining that persons of low origin are advanced to ecclesiastical dignities which lift them above the secular nobles, adds that these ought rather to secure such preferments for their own kindred or for gentlemen. The canonries being regarded merely as sources of income, were very commonly held by persons who declined to proceed beyond the minor orders of the ministry, and who were utterly unlearned. In order to guard against such evils, Clement V decreed that no one below the

order of subdeacon should have a voice in a chapter, and that those who were promoted to canonries should enter into the “holy” orders within a year, under certain penalties. And a council at Lucerne, in 1351, ordered that no one ignorant of grammar should be appointed to such preferments. The reforming committee of the council of Constance described the canons who owed their position to their birth as being rather like soldiers than ecclesiastics, and ordered that academic doctors should be mixed with them in certain proportions and it did away with another abuse by ordering that no one under eighteen years of age should be capable of such preferments.

Throughout this time there are continual outcries as to the faults of the clergy, partly continued from former ages, and partly provoked by the development of new evils. In all grades there are complaints of rapacity, luxury, and neglect of duty, while it is said that many of the clergy devote themselves to secular affairs, and become altogether laic in their habits. The cardinals are taxed with extravagant pride, which regards not only bishops (whom they commonly styled *episcopelli*), but primates and patriarchs, with contempt; their life and that of their households is described as unedifying, and they are accused of utterly neglecting the monasteries and other preferments which they hold in plurality—sometimes even to the number of 400 or 500. The bishops are charged with want of learning and of other qualifications for their office, with non-residence, secularity, simony; it is said that for the sake of money they bestow orders on a multitude of men who are utterly illiterate, lax in their habits, and unfit for the sacred ministry; and if the text “Freely ye have received, freely give”, be quoted to them, their reply is that they had not received freely. It is said that those of Germany devolved their work on titular bishops, who paid for their appointments and “gnawed” the clergy and people by their exactions. Similar complaints are made of the archdeacons; and the canons are described as worthy of their bishops—as sunk in voluptuousness and vice. There are, as before, decrees of councils against the fighting and hunting propensities of the clergy, against indecencies in the celebration of the Divine offices; prohibitions of secular occupations¹ and diversions; with unsavoury evidence as to the results of enforcing celibacy, and continued re-enactments of the canons which had been found so ineffectual for good. Some of the more enlightened divines, such as Zabarella, began to suggest the expediency of removing the restrictions on marriage; but even Gerson was strongly against this, and the old laws, with the evils which resulted from them, continued.

Notwithstanding the impulse given to learning by the universities, the great mass of the clergy was still grossly ignorant, and this is a frequent subject of complaint. Cardinal d’Ailly suggested at the council of Constance that, in order to remedy in some degree the ignorance which was common among the priesthood, some plain instructions as to faith and morals, the sacraments, and the mode of confession, should be drawn up both in Latin and in the vernacular languages.

In all varieties of shapes a desire for reform was expressed—in the treatises of such theologians as Gerson, d’Ailly, and Nicolas of Clemanges; in the writings of those Franciscans, such as William of Ockham, who were driven into the imperial interest by the contrast between their ideas of apostolical simplicity and the corruptions of the court of Avignon; in the solemn verse of Dante, and in the indignant letters of Petrarch; in popular poems, stories, and satires, such as the ‘Songe du Vergier’, in France, the free tales of Boccaccio, the downright invectives of Piers the Ploughman, and the living pictures of Chaucer; in the critical spirit which grew up within the universities; in the teaching of Wyclif, Hus, and their followers; in the utterances of men and women whose sanctity was believed to be accompanied by the gift of prophecy. The cry for a general council, which in former times had been raised only in the way of appeal from the papacy by its opponents, was now taken up by the truest members of the church, not only with a view to ending the schism which had long distracted western Christendom, but in order to that reformation of which the necessity was felt by all but those whose interest was bound up with the corruptions of the existing

system. Yet even among the many who sincerely wished for reform, there were some who believed that it would come better from the pope than from a council; and the hopes which had been fixed on the council of Constance met with scanty fulfilment in its decrees, and with still less in the execution of them.

Monasticism.

Although during this time a feeling was often expressed that the number of persons professing the monastic life was already too great, and although restrictions had been placed on the indefinite multiplication of orders, some new communities were now formed, such as the Jesuates, the congregation of the Blessed Virgin of Mount Olivet, the Alexians or Cellites, the order of St. Bridget of Sweden, the brotherhood of Canons-regular of the Common Life (founded at Deventer by Gerard Groot, which was distinguished by the care which it bestowed on the education of students intended for the priesthood), and no less than four orders which took their name from St. Jerome. But no one of these societies was so remarkable either for its constitution or for the extent of its success as to require a more particular detail.

The older orders, which possessed endowments, and had already shown themselves affected by the temptations of wealth, continued to decline more and more from the rigour of their original profession. Thus the Benedictines gave themselves up to enjoyment—resting on their historical fame, and careless to add to the long list of popes and bishops and learned men who had already adorned their brotherhood. They contributed nothing to the intellectual movements of the time; the few writers whom the society now produced, instead of attempting to distinguish themselves in scholastic philosophy, were content to employ their labour on subjects of morality or practical religion. Even in the mother-monastery of the order, the great and venerable abbey of Monte Cassino, Boccaccio is said to have found the library without a door, herbage growing through the windows, the books thickly covered with dust, and the volumes cruelly mutilated by the monks, who, for the sake of some trifling gain, erased the writing from the leaves, and turned them into little books of devotion, or pared away the ample margins and made them into charms for sale to women. And when Urban V, on a vacancy in the headship, attempted to introduce a better system into the house, he found himself obliged to borrow a fit instrument either from the Camaldolites, or from the reformed brotherhood of Mount Olivet. Attempts to revive the Benedictine rule were made by Clement V, and by Benedict XII, who had intended to carry his reforms into other monastic orders; but Clement VI, in the first year of his pontificate, absolved them from the penalties which had been imposed by his predecessor.

In other monastic societies a similar degeneracy was noted. Thus, at the council of Pisa, bishop Hallam, of Salisbury, complained of the bad state of discipline into which the English Cistercians had fallen; and the abbot of Citeaux, unable to deny the fact, alleged the schism of the church as the cause of it. At the same council, the prior of Canterbury, while speaking well of the Cluniacs of England, described those of some French monasteries which he had visited as ignorant, as neglectful of discipline and of the monastic habit, as having no proper vestments even for use in the services of the church, and as being altogether more like mere cultivators of the soil than monks; and from many quarters there is a concurrence of evidence as to a general decay of discipline and learning, with an increased love of selfish and sensual enjoyments. In some cases the monastic rule which forbade individual property was openly violated; the common life of the refectory and of the dormitory fell into disuse; the monks had their separate dwellings, and any abbot who attempted to bring them back to a better observance of their rule was met by violent opposition. So generally did laxity of morals prevail among the monastic communities, that, according to the writer of the tract "On the corrupt State of the Church", any monk who led a correct life became the laughing-stock of the rest. The same writer describes nunneries as abodes of the grossest profligacy; he adds

that, on account of the degeneracy of the monkish societies, the promise, "All these things shall be added unto you," is no longer fulfilled to them; and we meet with strong dissuasives against that liberality in gifts and bequests on which the monks of earlier days had securely relied. In England, both William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester in the end of the fourteenth century, and William of Wayneflete, who held the same see in the middle of the fifteenth, allege the prevailing degeneracy of the monks as their motive for bestowing their wealth on the foundation of colleges rather than of convents.

The system of commendation was very mischievous in its effects on monastic discipline. The popes, by assuming the power to bestow abbacies *in commendam* on their cardinals, deprived many monasteries of a resident head. In such cases the revenues were diverted from their proper objects, the number of monks was reduced to a very few, who, instead of being bound to the observance of their rule, received a small stipend, and were allowed to spend it wherever they pleased; and the poor were deprived of their accustomed alms. In some cases it is complained that a monastery was burdened with an abbot who was disqualified by his previous training—a secular priest, or a member of some other order; and charges of simony are as rife with regard to monastic appointments as to the other promotions of the church.

The exemption of monasteries from episcopal control was continually a matter of complaint, especially on the part of bishops, who represented it as destructive of ecclesiastical discipline. The subject was discussed at the council of Vienne, where it was argued (somewhat unfairly as to the question of monasteries) that the crimes which were then imputed to the templars had arisen out of their exemption from episcopal authority. To this an abbot of the diocese of Senlis replied, that exemptions were necessary for the protection of monks against the tyranny of the bishops; and he commended his cause to the pope by dwelling on the closeness of the connexion between the exempt monasteries and the apostolic see. Clement was not disposed to embroil himself with the monastic orders; and the proposal for the abolition of exemptions, which had been made by Giles Colonna, archbishop of Bourges, was defeated. At the council of Constance a very small measure of reform was conceded by Martin V, in abolishing such exemptions as had been granted since the beginning of the schism.

The mendicant orders did not escape the accusations which were directed against the professors of the monastic life in general. We meet with invectives against them as luxurious and assuming, as indulging in a splendour of buildings inconsistent with the spirit of their rules; and the collisions between their privileges and the rights of the parochial clergy were incessant. Council after council, and other authorities in various countries, endeavoured, but seemingly with very imperfect success, to limit the friars in their claims to act as preachers and confessors everywhere, and to bury the dead without restriction in their cemeteries, and thus to deprive the secular clergy of respect, authority, and income. Yet the mendicants continued throughout this time to enjoy more of influence and of reputation than any of the other orders. The great brotherhoods of St. Dominic and St. Francis were stimulated by their rivalry; but yet a division of objects and of labour was in a manner established between them. The Dominicans especially studied scientific theology; their Albert and their Thomas were regarded as next in authority to the ancient doctors of the church. They were preachers and controversialists, were much employed as confessors and confidants of princes, and had the inquisition almost entirely in their hands. The Franciscans, although they too had their theologians, who were unsurpassed by any in subtlety, were on the whole more given to popular teaching and ministrations; and they sought by all means—even by unscrupulous impostures—to gain an influence over the great mass of the people.

The universities of Paris and of Oxford were much disquieted by the mendicants. At Paris, in 1321, John of Poilly, a doctor of the Sorbonne, was required to retract certain opinions which he had uttered against the claim of the friars to act as confessors. He held that

confession to a friar did not dispense with the necessity of again confessing the same sins to the parish priest; that so long as the canon of the fourth council of Lateran should be in force, the pope could not excuse from the duty of yearly confession to the parish priest; nay, that even God himself could not do so, inasmuch as it would involve a contradiction. Against these opinions a treatise was written by Peter Paludanus, a Dominican, and John of Poilly, after pope John himself had condescended to argue with him, submitted to retract in the presence of the cardinals.

In 1409, John of Gorel, a Franciscan, had gone so far as to deny that curates had, by virtue of their office, authority to preach, confess, administer extreme unction, to bury, and to receive tithes—maintaining that the work of preaching and of hearing confession belonged more especially to the friars. He was compelled by the Sorbonne to subscribe certain propositions of a directly contrary tenor, and to acknowledge that the duties in question belonged essentially to curates, and to the friars only by accidents

Attempts were repeatedly made to check the pretensions of the mendicants. Thus the continuator of William of Nangis relates that in the pontificate of Clement VI the cardinals and other prelates urged that the mendicant orders should be abolished, or that, at least, the friars should be restrained from invading the rights of the parochial clergy; but that the pope defeated the attempt by asking them whether, if the labours of the mendicants should be withdrawn, they themselves would be able to make up for the loss of them. The failure of Fitzralph, bishop of Armagh, in his suit against the mendicants, a few years later, has already been noticed. The bull of the Franciscan pope, Alexander V, in 1409, which appears to have been solicited by his order in consequence of the condemnation of Gorel, the opposition of the university of Paris, and the revocation of the bull by John XXIII—have also come before us in the course of the history.

The divisions which arose among the Franciscans out of the extreme ideas of apostolical poverty maintained by those who arrogated to themselves the name of spirituals have already fallen under our notice. In consequence of the condemnation which John XXII had passed on such ideas, the spirituals declared him to be the mystical antichrist, the forerunner of the greater antichrist; that all later popes, as they had not repudiated his opinions, were heretics, and that those who adhered to them could not be saved. On the other hand, Gerard, the master who was appointed on the deprivation of Michael of Cesena, attempted to procure an abrogation of the founder's precept that the Franciscans should not receive gifts of money; but to this John sternly refused to consent. In consequence of these dissensions, many members forsook the order, and joined the parties which were known as *fraticelli*, *beghards*, and the like. Many of them ran into errors which were considered to be heretical, and suffered death at the stake.

But besides these more violent differences, the order came to be divided into various classes—one of which was styled *zoccolanti*, from wearing wooden shoes like the peasantry. At length was established the great division into *conventuals*—those who lived together in their societies—and *observants*, who professed especial regard for the integrity of the Franciscan rule. This latter section, although it had undergone some persecution at an earlier date, was acknowledged by the council of Constance; but we find in later times many manifestations of jealousy and enmity between the two parties.

The Franciscans, partly perhaps by way of compensation for their departure from the founder's rule, carried their reverence for him into greater and greater extravagances. Among other things, it was said that St. Francis once a year went down from heaven to purgatory, and released all who had died in the habit of his brotherhood. And it was in this time that the notorious 'Book of Conformities' was produced, and was approved by the authorities of the order.

The Dominicans, too, while they departed from the mendicant ideal, so that some of their writers maintained their right to hold property, were excited by the rivalry of the

Franciscans to set up for their founder pretensions which are clearly blasphemous. Thus in the Life of St. Catharine of Siena, written by her confessor, Raymond of Capua, who was afterwards general of the order, the almighty Father is represented as producing from his head the coeternal Son, and from his breast St. Dominic, declaring that his adopted son Dominic stood on an equality with the only-begotten Son, and carrying out a parallel between the eternal Word and the founder of the order of preaching friars.

Rites and Usages.

In matters which concerned the worship of the church, the same tendencies which had appeared throughout many former ages were still continued, and it was in vain that the more enlightened teachers protested against the further developments of popular superstition and of exaggerated ceremonials

The festival of Corpus Christi was established by Clement V, and further privileges were connected with the celebration by Urban VI and Boniface IX. The doctrine embodied in this festival was supposed to be confirmed by fresh miracles, although some of these were not unquestioned, or were even admitted to be impostures.

The number of masses was multiplied, partly as a means of securing fees for the clergy. Alvar Pelayo says that St. Francis had especially wished to preserve his order from this temptation, by prescribing that no one should celebrate more than one mass daily, forasmuch as a single mass “filled heaven and earth”, but that the minorites, in disregard of their founder’s wishes, eagerly caught at the opportunity of gain.

The withdrawal of the eucharistic cup from the laity had become general, although a special exception was sometimes made by popes in favour of royal personages; as was the case with the kings of France—who, however, availed themselves of this privilege only at their coronation and on their death-bed. In England both the king and the queen at their coronation received the sacrament in both kinds; and it is recorded that Henry V did so when dying. The story of the emperor Henry VII’s death, whether true or false as to the alleged poisoning, implies that the emperors were then accustomed to communicate in the eucharistic cup.

In Bohemia, the older practice remained to a late period. But the collisions between Bohemians and Germans in the university of Prague tended to discountenance it, and when (as we have seen) the usage was revived by Jacobellus of Misa, the question was brought before the council of Constance by the bishop of Leitomyšl. Gerson was strongly opposed to the administration of the chalice. A committee drew up conclusions on the question, allowing that according to the Saviour’s institution the chalice ought to be administered, but maintaining that the church had both authority and reason for departing from the original method; and in accordance with this report, the council condemned Jacobellus, and forbade the practiced

The doctrine of indulgences, as it had been stated by Thomas of Aquino, was for the first time sanctioned by papal authority in the bull by which Clement VI proclaimed the jubilee of 1350, and from that time might be regarded as generally established in the church. The use of these privileges, which the popes dispensed at will, was rapidly developed. Small indulgences were to be gained every day, and by the performance of very trivial acts; and the greater indulgences, which had originally been granted for the holy war against the Saracens, were now bestowed on more ordinary considerations. The institution of the jubilee had contributed greatly to advance the popularity of indulgences; and this effect became still greater when Boniface IX professed to extend the benefits of the jubilee to those who, instead of going to Rome in person, should visit certain churches in their own neighbourhood, and should pay into the papal treasury the sum which a Roman pilgrimage would have cost them. The abuse was carried yet further by allowing the privileges of a jubilee-year at other times, and by sending into all countries “stationers” or “quaestuaries” to offer the benefit of

indulgences at every man's door; and from these practices a general corruption of ideas as to morality naturally resulted. Gerson endeavoured to expose the mistakes of the system; he declared that the Saviour done was entitled to grant some of the privileges which were usually proclaimed by His ministers on earth; but the popular belief was commonly proof against enlightenment on a matter in which the papal doctrine was so well adapted to the desires of coarse and superstitious minds.

While the church was lavish of its graces, it was no less prodigal of its censures; and from the excessive employment of these arose a general disregard of them. Froissart mentions an incident which is evidence at once of the contempt into which such sentences had fallen through abuse, and of the independent spirit of the English—that when the Flemings had been laid under an interdict of the most terrible kind for siding with Edward III in 1340, the English king told them that they need not be uneasy, “for as soon as he should again cross the sea, he would bring them priests of his own country, who would chant masses to them, whether the pope willed it or not; for he was well privileged to do so”. The monastic orders, although usually leagued with the papacy, did much to nullify the force of interdicts, by leaving doors or windows open while the services of the church were performed in their chapels, so that the people standing without might have the benefit of their privileged offices. Clement V, in order to prevent this evasion, charged the members of religious societies to conform to the practice of the principal church in every place.

In former times, popes had sometimes chosen the Thursday before Easter as a day for pronouncing curses against persons who had specially opposed or offended them. Towards the end of the thirteenth century it became usual to repeat on that day such sentences as had been uttered against particular offenders; and hence in the following century grew a custom of denouncing on Maundy Thursday a general anathema against all enemies of the church.

The multiplication of saints and of festivals continued, although not without protests against the evil consequences of the excess to which it had been carried. Archbishop Islip of Canterbury, in 1362, complained of the bad effects which resulted from the observance of too many holy-days, and put forth a list of festivals, which, although reduced from the number before observed, amount to about fifty in addition to the Sundays of the year. And the archbishop describes the manner of keeping these days as marked by coarse debauchery and misrule. Cardinal d'Ailly, at a later time, complains that the festivals were turned into occasions of dissipation, whereas the working-days were not sufficient for a labouring man to earn his bread; and he suggests that, except on Sundays, it should be allowed to work after having attended the religious service of the day. In like manner Nicolas of Clemanges speaks of the number of festivals as excessive, and denounces the idleness, drunkenness, and other vices to which they were commonly perverted. He also criticizes severely the services which had been drawn up for some of the newer festivals, and complains that the worship of God was neglected for that of the saints—that the reading of legends had superseded that of Scripture in the offices of the church. Cardinal Zabarella, Henry of Hesse, and other divines of the age, bear evidence to the manner in which festivals were abused, and urge that the number of them should be reduced. On the other hand, however, Gerson proposed that a festival should be instituted in honour of St. Joseph, the husband of the Saviour's mother; and thus to him is due the origin of a celebration which has in later times been raised into greater importance by the overflow of the reverence directed to the blessed Virgin.

To the festivals in honour of St. Mary were added those of the Visitation and the Presentation—the former commemorating her visit to her cousin Elizabeth; the latter, a supposed presentation or dedication by her parents at the age of three months, from which time it was imagined that she was brought up in the Temple until her espousal to Joseph at the age of eleven. Thus the number of festivals consecrated to the blessed Virgin was extended to seven.

The festival of her Conception made way continually. In England it was established in 1328 by archbishop Mepham, who wrongly referred the origin of it to his predecessor St. Anselm; in France, the observance of it was decreed by the French "nation" in the university of Paris in 1380. The doctrine of the immaculate conception became almost universal, except in the Dominican order. The Franciscans had at first been divided as to this doctrine, some of them (as Alvar Pelayo) denying it; but the opposition of the Dominicans decided the course of the rival order, who became enthusiastic advocates of the Immaculate Conception. At Paris, the university was swayed in behalf of this doctrine by the authority of the great Franciscan, Duns Scotus; and when John of Mongon (or de Montesono), a Spanish Dominican, disputed against it at Paris, in 1387, he was condemned as heretical by the university, as well as by the bishop of Paris. On appealing to Clement VII, he found himself opposed at Avignon by a deputation from the university, headed by Peter d'Ailly; and, finding that his cause was going against him, he pretended to submit, but secretly withdrew to his native kingdom of Aragon, where he joined the obedience of the rival pope, and wrote in support of his claims. His excommunication by Clement followed; but while the Franciscans maintain that this was on account of his doctrine, the Dominicans contend that it was wholly caused by his defection from the party of Clement. The university took up the matter strongly; it was decreed that no one should be admitted to a degree except on condition of swearing to the late decision, which, although directed only against the absolute denial of the doctrine, was soon interpreted as positively favourable to it. The academics compelled William of Valence, a Dominican, who was bishop of Evreux and confessor to the king, to give up the defence of John of Moncon, and to subscribe their formula; and the king resolved to have no more Dominican confessors. The Dominicans were shut out of the university for fourteen years; they were persecuted by the bishops and by the secular authorities; and, in consequence of having taken the unpopular side, they were unable even to walk the streets without being molested, while verses in ridicule of them were publicly placarded. Miracles were alleged in behalf of the immaculate conception: as that a Dominican of Cracow was struck dead while preaching against it; and that as Scotus was on his way to maintain the honour of the blessed Virgin in the schools, an image of her, which he passed, was accustomed every day to bend its head in token of favour. St. Bridget brought to the same cause the support of her revelations; but on this point her authority was confronted by that of the other great prophetess of the age, St. Catharine of Siena, who held that the cleansing of the Virgin's nature did not take place until the soul was infused into the body.

Arts and Learning.

The fourteenth century saw the perfection of Gothic architecture and the beginning of its decline, although as yet this decline had not advanced far. But in the meantime the other arts were springing into a new life. Italian painting advanced at one step from the elementary rudeness of Cimabue to the schools of Giotto, Orcagna, and the masters whose combined labours embellished the Campo Santo of Pisa; and while the productions of Italy were carried into other lands, to excite the devotion of believers and to serve as examples for imitation, a native style of art, admirable for religious feeling and for sober richness of colour, began to appear in the Netherlands, under the leadership of the brothers Van Eyck. In sculpture, too, attempts were now successfully made to shake off the stiffness of Gothic art; perhaps the best known example of the newer style is to be found in the bronze gates of the Baptistery at Florence, which were begun by Andrew of Pisa in 1330, and completed by Ghiberti in the following century.

The number of universities was greatly increased during the fourteenth century. Among those then founded were Orleans, Erfurt, Prague, Vienna, Heidelberg, Cracow, Pisa, Perugia, Florence, Pavia, and Ferrara. In some of these there were at first the faculties of arts,

medicine, and law, to which theology was afterwards added; and in some of the older universities, as at Bologna, a like addition was now made to the original foundation. The university of Rome was dormant throughout the time of the Avignon papacy; and, although revived for a time by Innocent VII, it again fell into decay, until Eugenius IV. restored it in 1431.

In consequence of the erection of universities in Germany and other northern countries, the resort of students to Paris was much diminished, so that few foreigners were now to be found among them. But the great French university continued to maintain its reputation as a school, and was led by the circumstances of the schism to exercise such an influence in the affairs of the church as was altogether without example. Oxford had greatly advanced in importance, and there William of Wykeham introduced a new architectural character into collegiate buildings, and furnished an example of a society more clerical and monastic than the colleges which had before existed.

The decree by which Clement V, at the instance of Raymund Lull, prescribed the teaching of Oriental languages in certain places, has already been mentioned. But in whatever degree it may have been carried out, the schools which it contemplated, as they were intended only for missionary purposes, did not promote the interpretation of Scripture. The fourteenth century, however, could boast Nicolas de Lyra, the first man who for many hundreds of years had endeavoured to bring Hebrew learning to bear on this. It has been supposed that Nicolas (whose surname was drawn from his native place, a village in Normandy) was a Jew by descent; but for this there seems to be no foundation except the fact of his acquaintance with Hebrew. He became a Franciscan in 1291, taught theology for many years at Paris, was provincial of his order in Burgundy, and died in 1340. His Postills extend over the whole Bible, and were greatly prized. He held that in Holy Scripture there are four senses—the literal, the allegorical, the moral, and the anagogical; that the literal sense is presupposed in the others, and must be the foundation of them; that from it alone proofs should be drawn, and that any mystical interpretation which is inconsistent with the letter is unbecoming and worthless; and he strongly blames those expositors who had smothered the literal sense under their figurative interpretations. These principles were called in question, about a century later, by Paul, bishop of Burgos, a convert from Judaism and a member of the Dominican order, who blamed Nicolas for preferring his own interpretations and those of the Jewish writers to the authority of the fathers and of the great Dominican St. Thomas; but Nicolas did not lack defenders, and his commentaries continued to be highly esteemed.

The study of Greek was now revived, and became common in the west, where it was promoted by learned Greeks, such as Barlaam, Leontius Pilatus (who taught both Petrarch and Boccaccio at Florence), and at a later time Manuel Chrysoloras, the master of Leonard of Arezzo. The first professorship of Greek in the west was established at Florence about 1360, through the influence of Boccaccio, and Pilatus was appointed to the chair, which in 1396 was held by Chrysoloras. The study of the classical Latin authors was also pursued with a new spirit, and great exertions were made for the recovery of writings which had long been unheeded. In the writing of Latin, attempts were made by Petrarch and others, instead of following the traditional style of the middle ages, to imitate the refinement of the classics; and this study was afterwards carried further by Poggio Bracciolini. Albertin Mussato wrote Latin tragedies on the ancient model—one of them having Eccelino da Romano for its principal character.

The scholastic philosophy is considered to have entered on a new stage with Durandus of St. Pourçain, bishop of Meaux, and William of Ockham, the famous English Franciscan, whose political treatises have been already mentioned. Durandus (who, from his readiness in solving all questions, was styled the Most Resolute Doctor) was a Dominican, and as such was originally a zealous, adherent of Thomas Aquinas, but afterwards strongly opposed his authority, especially with regard to the manner in which Divine grace operates; for while

Aquinas holds that this is through the sacraments, Durandus maintains that it is by the immediate action of God.

These teachers were noted for their want of reverence for authority; and they revived the philosophical opinion of nominalism, which had been dormant from the time of its unsuccessful originator, Roscellin. Ockham rejected the idea which St. Anselm and others had cherished, of finding a philosophical basis for the doctrines of the church, which he regarded as matters of pure revelation; and this revelation he supposed to be still exerted in behalf of doctrines which had not been known to the primitive church. Thus, in discussing the question of the Eucharist, he states three opinions, of which one is “that the substance of bread and wine remains, and that in the same place, under the same appearance, is the body of Christ”; and he says that this theory “would be very reasonable, unless there were a determination of the church to the contrary, because it salves and escapes all the difficulties which follow from the separation of the accidents from the subject”. Yet he prefers the current opinion, that “the substance of bread and wine ceases to be, while the accidents only remain, and under them the body of Christ beginneth to be”; and he adds, “This is made certain to the church by some revelation, as I suppose, and therefore it hath so determined”. The philosophy of Ockham was condemned and prohibited at Paris in 1339; but this sentence increased its fame, and before the end of the century the nominalism which had at first been so strongly denounced had come to be generally accepted.

The unbelieving philosophy which from the beginning of the thirteenth century had existed in secret, began to appear more openly. Petrarch mentions some votaries of this kind of philosophy whom he had met with at Venice, and describes them as regarding all learning except their own, whether sacred or profane, with contempt.

The science of casuistry now came into favour as a branch of theological study. The cases of John Petit and of John of Falkenberg, which involved the defence of tyrannicide, afforded much exercise for the subtleties of the casuists; and in the case of Petit it is said that the doctrine of “probability” occurs for the first time— a doctrine which, as it was afterwards developed by the Jesuits, supplied Pascal with matter for some of his most effective assaults on that order. The complaints which had been made in former times as to the unprofitable nature of the studies which were most popular, and of the pursuit of learning for low and unworthy ends, are renewed by Gerson and others in this age. The great work of rendering the Holy Scriptures into the vulgar tongue, with which Wyclif’s name is associated, engaged the labours of many others in the different western countries; so that there were translations, more or less complete, into French, Italian, German, and Flemish. These translations were, indeed, all in so far defective that they were made from the Latin Vulgate; but they tended to prepare for the more satisfactory works which were to result from that revived study of the original languages which had already begun. It is remarkable that Gerson, in censuring “vain curiosity”, recommends that vernacular translations of the Bible should be forbidden, at least with the exception of the moral and historical portions.

The same age which produced these attempts to bring the meaning of the sacred writings within the reach of the less educated classes, was also distinguished by the rise of a brilliant vernacular literature in various countries, especially in Italy and in England. To this day, Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and Chaucer hold their place among those great authors whose writings need no antiquarian considerations to recommend them to our study, but live by their own enduring vigour and interest. In the fourteenth century, also, John Villani produced the first important historical work which was composed in the modern language of Italy; and Wyclif, by the treatises which he addressed to the unlearned classes of his countrymen, earned a title to be regarded as the earliest master of English prose.

BOOK IX.
FROM THE END OF THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE TO THE END OF THE
FIFTH COUNCIL OF THE LATERAN, A.D.. 1418-1517.

CHAPTER I.

MARTIN V. BOHEMIAN WAR.
A.D. 1418-1431.

The hopes with which those who desired a reform in the church had looked to the council of Constance were to be disappointed. The measures which the council took with a view to reform were scanty, and were too likely to prove illusory in practice; nor, although it professed to limit the power of the papacy, was there anything to prevent the popes, if so disposed, from continuing to maintain their old assumptions, and to act on their own authority, as if the decrees of the council had no existence.

Martin V, after his triumphant departure from Constance, proceeded slowly towards the south, remaining for a considerable time in some of the principal cities. At Milan he was received with great magnificence by the duke, Philip Mary Visconti. Avoiding Bologna, which, on the deposition of John XXIII, had declared itself independent, he arrived on the 26th of February 1419 at Florence, where he was lodged in the Dominican convent of Santa Maria Novella. The state of Rome was not yet such as to invite the pope's return. Braccio of Montone, a condottiere who had been in the service of John XXIII, had made himself master of the city after John's deposition, professing an intention of holding it for the future pope. A sickness which broke out among his troops, and the approach of a stronger Neapolitan force, commanded by Sforza Attendolo, had soon afterwards compelled him to withdraw; but he had made himself lord of his native city, Perugia, and had extended his sway over a large portion of the papal states.

Through the intervention of the Florentine magistrates Braccio was persuaded to meet the pope at Florence, where he was received with extraordinary honours. He was reconciled to the church, and undertook to reduce the turbulent Bolognese to obedience—a task which, with the countenance of cardinal Condolmieri as legate, he was able to accomplish. But at Florence the splendour and the profuse expenditure which the condottiere displayed were unfavourably contrasted in the popular estimation with the close economy and the ungenial manners of the pope; and the boys of the streets sang under Martin's own windows a jingle in which he was said to be not worth a farthing.

By these indications of unpopularity it would seem that the pope was determined to leave Florence, after having taken leave of the magistrates in a complimentary speech, and having rewarded the hospitality of the citizens by erecting the see into an archbishopric. He arrived at Rome on the 28th of September 1420, and two days later went in solemn procession from the Flaminian gate to the Vatican. Although an attempt had been made to put on a festive appearance by means of hangings and other decorations, the eye was everywhere met by evidences of the misery to which the city had been reduced by the long absence of the popes at Avignon, and by the calamities of later years—decaying houses, streets choked by rubbish

and filth, the monuments of antiquity barbarously mutilated, dismantled and desolate churches; and beyond the Tiber, the ancient Burg of the English appeared in ruins, having been laid waste by the artillery of the castle of St. Angelo.

Amongst the citizens themselves, the unquiet years of the schism had greatly increased that rudeness of manners which had been already remarkable when pope Gregory XI returned from Avignon. It seemed, says Platina, as if all the citizens were either sojourners or the confluence of the lowest dregs of mankind; and soon after the pope's arrival, the sufferings of the people were brought to a height by a violent flood, which caused much damage and produced a scarcity of food. Beyond the walls of the city, all way disorder throughout the papal territory. The Campagna was distracted by the feuds of town against town, of one baron or family against another. Robbers, assassins, and soldiers of predatory habits, committed violence without any check, so that it was unsafe for pilgrims to approach the capital of Christendom.

From this depth of anarchy and wretchedness it was Martin's work to deliver Rome. Churches were restored—and in this the pope's example was followed by the cardinals, who repaired the churches of their respective titles. The erection of public and private buildings marked the beginning of a new era in the varied and eventful history of the city. The vigour and the justice of Martin's administration restored order and security, such as had been long unknown, in the surrounding territory; and his subjects in general, feeling the benefits which they owed to him, regarded him with reverence and affection, which expressed themselves in styling him the third founder of the city—the “happiness of his times”. But his cardinals, whom he reduced to a degree of subjection before unknown, were on uneasy terms with him, and, while the old corruptions of the curia were unabated, the pope himself was charged with excessive love of money, with a sordid parsimony, and with an undue care for the interests of his relations, whom he endowed with castles and lands at the expense of the church.

While Martin was labouring to restore the material fabric of his city, two popular saints—one of either sex—were zealously labouring there for religious and moral reformation.

1420-31. ST. FRANCES OF ROME.

Frances of Rome, born in 1384, showed in early years a wish to devote herself to virginity, but was constrained to marry a noble Roman, Lorenzo de' Ponziani, with whom she lived more than twenty-eight years. But even while in the married state her life was very strict, and she founded the order of “Oblates of the blessed Virgin”, which had its headquarters in the Tor de' Specchi at Rome. These oblates were not bound by a vow of celibacy, but were at liberty to leave the order for marriage; and they were under the superintendence of the monks of Mount Olivet, whose order (as we have already seen) had been founded about a century earlier. Frances, after her husband's death, became the head of the oblate sisterhood, and gave herself wholly up to mortification, devotion, and charity. The biographies of this saint are full of miracles, prophecies, and visions. Among other things we are told that an archangel was specially assigned to attend on her in the form of a boy nine years old; that to this guardian another angel of a lower order was afterwards added; and that she saw the Saviour place a crown on the head of her archangel, as a reward for having well kept her soul.

The death of Frances took place in 1440; she was canonized by Paul V in 1608 and the church founded on the site of the temple of Venus and Rome, which was formerly known as Santa Maria Nuova, and in which she is buried, is now dedicated to her honour.

1420-40. ST. Bernadine of Siena.

The other great saint of the time, Bernardine of Siena, was born in 1380, and entered the Franciscan order. Desiring a greater rigour than that which he found around him, he may have

been tempted to run, like many of his brotherhood, into the extravagances of the fraticelli; but instead of this he undertook a reform which was styled “of the strict observance,” and the number of convents founded by him in Italy is said to have exceeded 500. As a preacher he attained great eminence, which is said to have been foretold by the most famous preacher of the preceding generation, St. Vincent Ferrer; and it is added that, from the time when he entered on his work, he was freed from a hoarseness of voice with which he had been before afflicted. His eloquence was effectually exerted against the prevailing evils—a disregard of the outward duties of religion, a neglect of the holy communion, a fondness for gaming and other idle amusements, a reliance on arts of divination and magic. He reconciled enemies, composed the feuds by which the Italians had been distracted for generations, and expressed his abhorrence of worldly vanities in a way at once symbolical and practical, by committing to a great bonfire on the Capitoline hill, pictures, instruments of music, the implements of gaming, false hair, and the extravagances of female attire in general. Many miracles are ascribed to Bernardine, and he refused several bishoprics. But his career excited much envy, and he was assailed by charges of heresy and idolatry on account of an ornament which he invented as a help to devotion. The question was discussed before the pope, who, although in general he heartily supported Bernardine, pronounced against the use of the symbol; and the saint dutifully obeyed. His death took place at Aquila in 1444; and at the jubilee of 1450 he received the honour of canonization, for which he had been especially recommended to Nicolas V by the influence of Alfonso of Naples.

NAPLES

The state of the Neapolitan kingdom contributed to the difficulties of Martin’s position. Joanna II, who succeeded her brother Ladislaus in 1414, had been the wife of an Austrian prince, after whose death she gave herself up to the unrestrained indulgence of her passions, while the government was made over to the rivalries of courtiers and favourites. From among the princes who sued for her hand, Joanna, who had reached the age of forty-six, chose James, count of La Marche, a member of the royal family of France, and after some delay she bestowed on him the title of king. But the new husband, wishing to guard himself against a repetition of her former irregularities, placed her in a state of seclusion, from which she was delivered by a popular insurrection. The king was imprisoned in his turn; but after a time he obtained his release, and withdrew from Naples to become a Franciscan in his native country, while Joanna relapsed into her old course of life. Having resolved to adopt an heir, she at first chose Lewis III of Anjou, then discarded him in favour of Alfonso V of Aragon, and again set aside Alfonso for Lewis, whose death soon after gave occasion for further difficulties. Martin was suspected of an intention to set one of his own nephews, whom he had created prince of Salerno, on the throne at the queen’s death. Braccio of Montone had again broken with the pope, and had threatened to reduce him to such straits that he would be glad to say masses at a halfpenny each.

The south of Italy was continually distracted by contests which arose out of these affairs, and was a battle-ground for the mercenary forces of Braccio and Sforza Attendolo, until in 1424 Sforza was drowned in the Pescara, and Braccio died of wounds received in action. In consequence of the difficulties as to Naples, it seemed at one time likely that the king of Aragon might return to the obedience of Benedict XIII, who, although deserted by almost all his scanty college of cardinals, continued to maintain his claims to the papacy on the rock of Peñiscola. But Martin was able to avert this danger, and to draw off from Benedict Scotland and such other powers as had hitherto adhered to him. On the death of Benedict, in 1424, attempts were made to set up successors of his line; but by the aid of Alfonso, with whom Martin was at length fully reconciled, these attempts were easily frustrated, and the phantom antipopes were glad to secure the reality of less exalted dignities which Martin

bestowed on them. Two cardinals, who obstinately held out, were seized and imprisoned by the count of Foix; and their further history is unknown.

In his dealings with the kingdoms of Latin Christendom, Martin was careful to maintain the highest views of the papal prerogatives. The concordat of Constance was ill received in France, where the parliament of Paris rejected it; and, although an attempt had been made to conciliate the French by remitting half of the annates, in consideration of the English war, a royal ordinance was issued in 1418, and again in 1422, renewing the former prohibitions of sending money to the Roman court. On the death of Charles VI, which took place in 1422, Martin attempted to entice his young successor, Charles VII, into a surrender of the liberties which had been asserted for the national church; it was said that the pastor's judgments must be revered, even although they may be unjust. Against this Gerson wrote a treatise, in which, among other things, he referred to the oath by which the French kings at their coronation bound themselves to defend the liberties of the church. Martin, however, succeeded in gaining the king's mother and brother; and through their influence Charles was persuaded to order, in 1425, that the papal authority should be obeyed as it had been in the times of Clement VII and Benedict XIII, notwithstanding any ordinances of the crown, decrees of the parliament, or other orders or usages to the contrary. And as Charles himself, when dauphin, had sworn to observe the national laws, the pope absolved him from his oath.

With regard to England, Martin outdid his predecessors in maintaining the abuses of which the nation had long and justly complained. He appointed bishops by provision, in contempt of the electoral rights of chapters; and of this encroachment it is said that thirteen instances occurred in the province of Canterbury within two years. He usurped patronage, and abused it, as in the case of his nephew Prosper Colonna, whom he made archdeacon of Canterbury at the age of fourteen; and in this and other instances he continued to sanction the crying evil of non-residence. But these practices were not always allowed to pass without resistance. Thus the church of York refused to accept the nomination of Robert Fleming to the archbishopric; and Fleming was glad to fall back on the see of Lincoln, which he had previously held. When the English representatives at Constance found the pope hesitating and unsatisfactory in his reply to their statement of grievances which needed redress, they told him that their mission was merely a matter of courtesy, and that the king would take the matter into his own hands, according to his right.

The death of Henry V, whose strength of character and warlike successes had made him formidable, the infancy of his successor, and the discords between the young king's ambitious kinsmen, Henry Beaufort bishop of Winchester, and Humphrey duke of Gloucester, encouraged the pope to aggression. He designed to supersede the ordinary jurisdiction of the English metropolitans by establishing a resident legate *a latere*; and for this purpose the services which Beaufort had rendered at the council of Constance were to be rewarded with the dignity of cardinal, and with a legatine authority over England and Ireland. Against this legation archbishop Chichele had protested in a letter to Henry V, on the ground that no legate *a latere* had ever been sent into England except on special business; that such legates had not been admitted without the sovereign's licence: and that their stay had been only for a short time. In consequence of the primate's letter, the king forbade the bishop to accept the intended appointments.

In 1426 Beaufort was declared cardinal of St. Eusebius; and in September 1428 he ventured to appear in England as legate. But he was compelled to promise, before the king's council, that he would refrain from all acts which might be against the rights of the crown or of the people. Attempts were made to deprive him of Winchester, on the ground that it could not be held with his new dignity; and although, after a struggle of four years, he was allowed to retain his see, and to resume his place in the council, it was under conditions which restrained him from acting as an instrument of the papacy in opposition to the national interests.

To such a pope as Martin the statutes of provisors and praemunire were not likely to be acceptable. In 1426 he wrote to the king, to the parliament, and to the archbishops, urging a repeal of these statutes, which he characterized as execrable, pernicious to souls worse than the laws by opposing which St. Thomas Canterbury had become a martyr and a saint; worse than y thing enacted against Jews or Saracens. He speaks of the king of England as arrogating to himself the office of Christ's vicar. To Chichele (who had offended him by opposition to papal exemptions) he writes with extraordinary violence; throwing out against him charges of indifference to his pastoral duty, and of caring only for money; and urging him to oppose the obnoxious laws in parliament, to threaten their supporters with the censures of the church, and in the meantime to treat them as a nullity. He even went so far as to suspend the archbishop, who replied by appealing to a general council.

Yet his attempt failed of the expected success. Chichele contented himself with recommending matter to the serious consideration of parliament, and representing the dangers of the pope's anger and of the interdict which he was likely to issue; and the parliament did nothing beyond petitioning the king that he would obtain; through his ambassador a cessation of the proceedings against the primate, and his restoration to the pope's favour.

As the time which had been appointed at Constance for the meeting of the next general council approached, the pope was urged by the university of Paris and from other quarters to take the necessary steps for assembling it; but although he affected, in his answer to the Parisians, to clear himself from suspicions of wishing to elude the decree of Constance, he showed no eagerness in the matter, and it became evident that, instead of allowing the council liberty, he intended to keep the control of it in his own hands. Only a few bishops and others had assembled at Pavia, the appointed place, when, in consequence of a pestilence which was raging, the pope transferred the sessions to Siena. On the 21st of July the council opened, under the presidency of papal commissioners, with a sermon by Fleming, bishop of Lincoln; but, although it continued until the spring of the following year, hardly anything was done beyond renewing the condemnations of Wyclif, Hus, and Peter de Luna, and granting an indulgence to those who should serve against the heretics. Something was also said as to a reunion with the Greeks, with a view to which communications had lately taken place; and some proposals for ecclesiastical reform were made by the French. But it was evident that nothing was to be expected from the assembly, which dwindled from its originally small numbers, and was distracted by differences among its members. On the 8th of March 1424 the council of Siena broke up, and the hopes of Christendom were turned to the next general council, which was to meet at Basel seven years later—an interval which the reforming party, on finding themselves disappointed at Siena, had vainly attempted to shorten.

BOHEMIA

In the meantime Bohemia had been a scene of frightful confusion. The tidings of Hus's death were received there with unbounded indignation. He and Jerome were celebrated as martyrs with a yearly festival. Medals were struck in honour of Hus; his image or picture was placed over the high altar in churches, and the zeal of some of his partisans went so far as to declare that of all the martyrs no one had approached so near to the Saviour's example .

At the council of Constance (as we have seen) some articles on the question of administering the Eucharist in one or m two kinds were drawn up by a committee, who argued that, as the church had without question changed the hour of celebration, so it had authority to deviate from the original institution of the sacrament by withholding the cup from the laity; and on this the council, June 15, about three weeks before Hus's death, passed a decree in condemnation of the opposite practiced. In answer to the arguments and to the decree of Constance, Jacobellus of Misa, the author of the movement for administration in both kinds, put forth a vehement defence of his opinion; and to this, by desire of the council, replies were

written by Gerson and by Maurice, a doctor of Prague. King Wenceslaus and the archbishop of Prague united in ordering that the administration in both kinds should be relinquished; but throughout Bohemia and Moravia the order was generally disregarded. There were daily and nightly conflicts between the opposite parties in the Bohemian capital. There were continual disputations, in which Hussite laymen of mean occupations—tanners, shoemakers, tailors, and the like—were forward to engage against the clergy.

In September 1415, a letter, to which four hundred and fifty-two nobles and knights of Bohemia and Moravia attached their seals, was addressed to the council, protesting vehemently against the iniquity of its proceedings against Hus, against its treatment of Jerome (who was still in prison), and against the imputations which had been cast on the orthodoxy of Bohemia. And three days later the Hussite leaders bound themselves by an engagement for six years to maintain the doctrine which they regarded as true and scriptural. Some churches had already been given up for the administration of the Eucharist in both kinds; but Nicolas of Hussinecz, the patron of Hus, appeared before the fortress of the Wissehrad, close to Prague, at the head of an armed multitude, demanding of the king that a greater number of churches should be made over to the party. The council, which had already announced the punishment of Hus to the Bohemians, and had sent the bishop of Leitomysl into Bohemia with a commission for the suppression of heresy, replied severely to the Hussite manifesto; while Sigismund wrote from Paris in a conciliatory tone, assuring the Bohemians that he had wished to protect Hus, but had found it impossible, and earnestly exhorting them to avoid the danger of a religious war.

In March 1417, the university of Prague, of which Hus's friend John Cardinal had been elected rector, published a resolution in favour of administering the chalice to the laity; but the council was still resolved to make no concession, and drew up twenty-four articles with a view to the suppression of the Hussite doctrines. In accordance with this course of policy, pope Martin, on the 22nd of February 1418, sent forth a bull requiring all authorities, ecclesiastical and civil, to labour for the suppression of the heresies of Wyclif, Hus, and Jerome.

Immediately after the end of the council, cardinal John of Ragusa (formerly a partizan of Gregory XII) was sent into Bohemia as legate. The choice was unfortunate. John had before talked of reducing the country by fire and sword, and, in his character of legate, he committed acts of great violence, such as the burning of a priest and a layman who opposed him in one place. By such means the Bohemians were roused to fury, and the cardinal, having utterly failed to accomplish the object of his mission, withdrew into Hungary, to report his ill-success to Sigismund. His death took place soon after his arrival in that country.

With Nicolas of Hussinecz, the political chief of the Hussites, who is described as a man of deep counsel and of somewhat unscrupulous policy, was associated a leader of a different stamp—John of Trocznow, known by the name of Ziska. Ziska had in boyhood been a page in the household of Wenceslaus, and had since distinguished himself in the Polish wars, to which his loss of an eye has been commonly referred. He had sworn to avenge the death of Hus, and it is said that he obtained a patent from the king, under which he raised a number of soldiers. At the head of a powerful force he moved about the country, everywhere enforcing the administration of the sacrament in both kinds; and, in token of his devotion to the cause, he displayed the eucharistic cup on his banners, and added the words "of the chalice" to the signature of his name.

On St. Mary Magdalene's day 1419, a great meeting of Hussites was assembled on a hill near Aust, in the circle of Bechin, where the holy communion was celebrated in the open air. There was no previous confession; the clergy (among whom were John Cardinal and Jacobellus of Misa) wore no distinctive vestures; the chalices were of wood, and the 300 altars were without any covering. Forty-two thousand persons—men, women, and children—communicated; and the celebration was followed by a love-feast, at which the rich shared with

their poorer brethren; but no drinking or dancing, no gaming or music, was allowed. The people encamped in tents, which, in the Bohemian language, were called *Tabor*; and out of this celebration grew a town which received that name, with reference at once to the circumstances of the meeting, and to the mount of the Saviour's transfiguration.

From this great assembly Ziska and his followers proceeded to Prague, where they arrived by night. On the following day they attacked and plundered some convents. The magistrates of the city, who had met in the town-hall, were butchered or driven to flight; some of them were thrown from the windows, and were caught by the Hussites on pikes and pitchforks. A fierce struggle took place between the insurgents and the people of the Old Town, who were in favour of the church. Wenceslaus, whose deposition had been threatened, was agitated by these scenes to such a degree that he was seized with apoplexy, which, in a few days, put an end to his life. Such was the fear of the popular excitement, that his body was hastily thrust into the tomb, without the usual ceremonies of royal interment.

As the late king had left no children, Bohemia fell by inheritance to his brother Sigismund; and this change became the signal for increased exasperation on the part of the Hussites. Wenceslaus, although personally vicious and despicable, had in some measure directly favoured Hus and his followers, while they had benefited in a much greater degree by his indolence and apathy; whereas Sigismund was execrated by them, as the traitor by whose safe-conduct Hus had been lured to Constance, and by whom he had there been abandoned to the enemies of the true faith. At once the reformers broke out without restraint. On the very next day after the death of Wenceslaus, some convents at Prague were attacked, and many of the monks were slaughtered; and the movement soon spread to other places. Churches and monasteries were plundered and reduced to ruin, images were mutilated and broken to pieces, organs were demolished, pictures and other ornaments were defaced and destroyed; and in these outrages the lust of spoil mingled with the rage of religious fanaticism.

Sigismund, being fully occupied by war with the Turks on the east of his dominions, was unable to take such measures with regard to Bohemia as might have checked the reforming movement at an early stage; and when at length he turned his especial attention to the state of his newly-inherited kingdom, he found that the Hussites had developed fresh extravagances of opinion, and that they were no longer to be appeased by concessions which, at an earlier time, they would have gladly accepted.

The popular assemblies, of which the example had been given on the hill of Tabor, became a part of the Hussite system. Men, women, and children flocked to them by tens of thousands, in defiance of the will of their landlords. The spirit of the party was strengthened on such occasions by the joint reception of the Eucharist in both kinds, and by exciting denunciations of the simony, the greed, the luxury, and other vices, which were freely imputed to the clergy of the church; and at every meeting of this kind the place and time of the next meeting were fixed.

The Bohemians were much divided among themselves. A small proportion—more considerable among the nobles than in any other class—adhered to the Roman church, as did also the German inhabitants of the kingdom, with the exception of some in the capital. Among those who were in favour of reformation, the name of Utraquists or Calixtines was given to the more moderate section, who would have been content with the liberty of communicating in both kinds, and other such concessions, and desired to remain, if possible, in the unity of the Roman church. The utraquists were supported by the authority of the university of Prague; and among them were included the people of the capital in general, with the reforming nobles. The fiercer zealots, who were known by the name of Taborites, professed to rest on Scripture only, rejecting everything of a traditional kind, and many of the externals of religion. They condemned all occupations for which no scriptural authority could be shown; they denounced all worldly amusements, and even all human learning. Their political opinions tended to republicanism, and, while they were strong among the population of towns, and yet more

among the peasantry, the party had few adherents among the nobility. Its chiefs belonged to the class of knights or gentry—such as the politician Nicolas of Hussinecz and the warrior John Ziska, who, on the death of Nicolas, became the acknowledged head of the Taborites.

Ziska fixed his head-quarters, and established a government, at Tabor; and to him it is probably to be attributed that Hussitism was able to surmount the dangers which threatened it at the outset. His genius for war is described as marvellous. The tactics which he had learned in the Polish campaigns were varied by his original invention, and skilfully adapted to the special circumstances of his followers. The peasantry whom he led had at first no other offensive weapons than clubs and flails; but Ziska taught them to arm these with iron, and to make them instruments of terrible power. He taught them to range their rough carts together in the battlefield, and to connect them in such a manner as to present to the assailants an impregnable fortress; and the novelty of these contrivances increased the terror with which they were regarded by the enemy, who sometimes fled in panic alarm at the very sight of the Hussites with their strange equipments.

The eucharistic chalice was not only represented on the banners of the party, but was carried by priests at the head of their forces; and on reaching a town, the priests, in their ordinary dress, worn and stained by travel, hurried to the altar of some church, said a short form of consecration, and administered the sacrament in both kinds to all who would receive it.

Fierce and pitiless, Ziska carried fire and sword in all directions—massacring clergy and monks, burning and demolishing churches and convents. However overmatched in numbers by his enemies, and although obliged to form his armies out of unpromising materials, he was never defeated in battle; and after he had been reduced to utter blindness, in March 1421, he still continued to direct the operations of war with the same skill and success as before. Yet, although Ziska was animated by a fury which may remind us of the early warriors of Islam, and which might seem possible only for the most exalted fanaticism, it is said that in opinions he rather agreed with the Prague party than with the more extravagant sectaries; that he may be regarded as faithfully representing the principles of Hus himself, apart from the developments which these had undergone among the martyr's followers.

Among the more advanced Hussites, apocalyptic ideas were zealously spread. It was said that the persecution of the faithful showed the nearness of the second advent; that the ungodly were to be consumed by the seven last plagues; that safety was to be attained only by “fleeing to the mountains”; that with the exception of five towns, which were pointed out as places of refuge, all cities—including Prague itself—were to be destroyed, like Sodom and Gomorrah, by fire from heaven: and in consequence of such teaching multitudes flocked from all parts of Bohemia and Moravia to the cities of refuge, selling their all for such prices as could be got, and laying the money at the feet of the clergy. A community of goods was established, and it was taught that the Saviour would speedily come to set up his kingdom on earth—a new state of paradise, in which his subjects would be free from pain and from all bodily necessities, and would need no sacraments for their sanctification.

The reforming movement of Bohemia had drawn thither persons from other countries whose opinions were obnoxious to the authorities of the church. Among these, the most remarkable were known by the name of Picards,—apparently a form of the word beguards, which, as we have seen, was then widely applied to sectaries. These Picards appear to have come from the Low Countries, and to have been akin in opinions to the sect of the “Free Spirit”. They declared the eucharistic elements to be mere bread and wine, and on this account were expelled from the Bohemian capital. Some of them, through fasting immoderately in the hope of seeing visions, went mad. Those who carried their extravagances furthest were styled Adamites, from maintaining that the use of clothes was a slavery. They are said to have affirmed that everything is holy so long as it is held in common, and to have extended this principle to women to have asserted the lawfulness of incest; to have renounced all books and

all law; and to have believed that the Spirit within them would preserve them from dying. These fanatics got possession of an island in a river, and spread terror far around by their ravages and bloodshed, until Ziska attacked them, overcame them after a furious defence, and burnt all whom he was able to seize, with the exception of one, who was reserved that he might give information as to the sect.

Greatly as the Bohemians differed among themselves, and bloodily as they carried out their quarrels, the various sections were all united for common defence. In the same spirit which led them to give to their parties the names of Taborites and Horebites, they spoke of Bohemia as the promised land, of the Germans and other enemies as Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites, and the like; and all rose together in resistance to those who had included them all in the common reproach of heresy.

The university of Prague had been consulted by Nicolas of Hussinecz as to the lawfulness of a resort to arms—not from any scruples of his own, but for the satisfaction of his followers, who professed a rigid adherence to Scripture; and the answer was, that, although it would be wrong to enforce the truth by the sword, yet in case of extremity the sword might lawfully be employed for the defence of the true religion.

The war of Bohemia was carried on with an atrocity which has probably never been equalled. On the taking of a town all the inhabitants were slain, with perhaps, the exception of a few women and children. Churches, were burnt, with those who had taken refuge in them. The churches and convents, which Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini describes as more numerous, more magnificent, and more highly adorned than those of any other European country, were demolished, so that, with the exception of the incomplete cathedral in the Hradschin at Prague, no specimen of the ancient splendour now remains. Ziska professed to destroy all churches which bore the names of saints, on the ground that they ought to be dedicated to God alone. He is said to have reduced to ruin more than 500 churches and monasteries and with the buildings perished their precious ornaments, which were regarded as instruments of idolatry. By these acts of fanatical barbarism the Taborites not only vexed their enemies, but practically enforced their principle that for true believers no material buildings for worship were necessary; that the use of such buildings was superstitious, inasmuch as every believer ought to carry God's living law in his own breast. Nor was the destroying rage of the Hussites confined to things which might be regarded as superstitious : thus, we are told that, on the taking of Rabic by Ziska, treasures which had been placed there with a view to safety were burnt, with the captive monks and clergy, while nothing but arms, horses, and money was exempted from the flames. On both sides excessive cruelty was displayed, not only towards prisoners taken in war, but towards others. Ziska was in the habit of burning priests and monks in pitch, and after his death this and other barbarities continued to be practised by his partisans. Nor were the Catholics slow to emulate the ferocity of their opponents; and to this they sometimes—on the principle that no faith was due to heretics—added a treachery from which the Hussites were free. Thus, when some Taborites surrendered at Chatebor, on the assurance that their lives should be spared, the promise was shamelessly set aside. Sigismund caused a merchant of Prague to be dragged at the heels of horses, and afterwards burnt, for speaking disrespectfully of the council of Constance and maintaining the necessity of communion in both kinds; and many other cruelties are recorded against him. The men of Kuttenberg, then the second city of the kingdom, who were mostly Germans, employed in mining, and violent in their zeal for the church, offered a reward for all Hussites who should be put into their hands—one florin for a layman and five for a priest. In consequence of this, the Hussites were hunted and entrapped like beasts; and it is said that 1600 of them were put to death at Kuttenberg, either by burning, beheading, or being cast into the depths of mines.

In addition to the ecclesiastical buildings, castles, palaces, even whole towns, were destroyed. By the ravages of contending hosts, and by the neglect of tillage, the country was reduced to a desert. Manufactures and foreign commerce were annihilated. The manners and

habits of the people became ruder and less civilized than before. On both sides the lust of spoil gradually mixed with the religious purposes with which the war had been undertaken; and by the enlistment of foreigners—Poles, Prussians, and others, including even Germans—in the Taborite forces, the character of “God’s warriors”, on which Ziska had insisted, became lost.

On the 1st of March 1420, pope Martin, at the emperor’s request, issued a bull, *Omnium plasmatoris Domini*, summoning the faithful to rise for the extirpation of Wyclifism, Hussitism, and other heresies, and promising full indulgences to those who should take part in the enterprise either personally or by substitute. Sigismund, after a great diet at Breslau, collected an army, which is estimated at from 100,000 to 150,000 men, not only from every part of Germany, but from all other European countries except Italy and Scandinavia. The Bohemians flew together for mutual defence; oaths were taken that they would spend their property and their blood to the utmost for the principle of utraquism, and fierce language was uttered against the Roman church. At midsummer, the crusading host invaded the land, but proved unequal to cope with the exasperated zeal of the people in behalf of their country and their religion, and with the genius of Ziska, who on the 14th of July defeated the invaders with great slaughter on a hill near Prague, which still bears his name. Sigismund, although he was crowned as king of Bohemia by archbishop Conrad in the Hradschin, found himself unable to gain possession of that part of his capital which lies on the other side of the Moldau, and withdrew from the country, leaving behind him a strong feeling of hatred in the hearts of the Bohemians, while his German allies regarded him as a favourer of heresy for having entered into negotiations with the Bohemian nobles. On the 31st of October, the great fortress of the Wissehrad, which included within its walls a palace and a monastery, was surrendered to the Hussites; and its splendid buildings, with the precious contents, accumulated during several centuries, were ruthlessly destroyed.

1420. FOUR ARTICLES OF PRAGUE.

The moderate party among the Hussites, which was represented by the magistrates and the great mass of the citizens of the capital, drew up in July 1420 a document, which was the result of many conferences, and is known as the Four Articles of Prague. The substance of these articles was: (1) that the word of God should be freely preached; (2) that the holy Eucharist should be administered in both kinds to all faithful Christians; (3) that the clergy should be deprived of their secular lordship and temporalities, as being contrary to Christ’s law, hurtful to them in their duty, and detrimental to the secular power; (4) that all deadly sins, especially those of a public kind, and other disorders—including not only the recognised breaches of morality, but the exaction of fees by the clergy—should be forbidden and extirpated by those to whom it belongs.

But, wide as was the difference between these articles and the system of the Roman church, they were far from satisfying the Taborites, who proposed twelve additional articles as terms of union, requiring among other things a more rigorous moral discipline, the confiscation of church-property for the common benefit, the establishment of the divine law as the only rule of government and justice, the destruction of “heretical” monasteries and superfluous churches, with altars, images, rich vestments, church plate, “and the whole idolatrous plantation of Antichrist”.

After a time, a compromise between the parties was effected by the English preacher Peter Payne, who had been received among the masters of the university, and had acquired much influence in Bohemia. Sigismund was brought to tolerate the articles of Prague until the matter should be more formally determined. Conrad, archbishop of Prague, accepted the articles, and while for this he was anathematized by the pope, and the canons of his cathedral renounced obedience to him, on the other hand the revenues of the see were secularized, agreeably to the third article, and utraquists were put into all ecclesiastical dignities.

For a time Prague was under a theocratic republican government, in which the greatest authority was wielded by a priest named John of Selau, who had formerly been a Premonstratensian monk. This John, in sermons which were eagerly heard by excited multitudes, declared Sigismund to be the great red dragon of the Apocalypse; and all the emperor's attempts to conciliate his Bohemian subjects—his apologies and explanations as to the past, his offers of concession—were received with scorn and derision. A second and a third time Sigismund invaded the country at the head of vast forces—in one case, it is said, of as many as 200,000 men; but each time the invaders recoiled in confusion and disgrace before the invincible Ziska.

In the meantime many of the nobles, disgusted by the democratic and fanatical excesses of the Hussite parties, returned to the obedience of the emperor and of the pope, and there were negotiations with Poland and with Lithuania, which led to an attempt by a Lithuanian prince, Sigismund Corybut, to establish himself as king of Bohemia. In consequence of a change of the popular feeling, John of Selau was beheaded in March 1422, and on this removal of the link by which the party of Prague had been connected with the Taborites, the old hostilities of these parties broke out with a violence which was the greater because for the time no foreign enemy was to be feared. The quarrel of aristocracy and democracy was now mixed up with their religious enmities. On the 8th of August 1423, Ziska inflicted a crushing defeat on the men of Prague; and he would probably have punished their opposition by the destruction of their city, but for the remonstrances of some of his chief associates, and the entreaties of a deputation headed by John Rokyczana, an ecclesiastic of great eloquence and ability, who played an important part in the later history. Within a month after this, on the 11th of October 1424, Ziska died of a pestilence which was raging in Bohemia. The last year of his life had also been the fullest of violence and bloodshed; but immediately before his death he had been engaged in negotiations with the emperor.

The loss of the great commander who had taught his countrymen the art of war, and had always led them to victory, was deeply felt. A large portion of his followers (towards whom his behaviour had commonly been marked by a kindly familiarity, which strongly contrasted with his ruthless ferocity to his enemies) took the name of Orphans, as if in Ziska they had lost a father who could never be replaced. As to principles, this section took up a middle position between the extreme parties, adhering to the doctrine of transubstantiation and the use of vestments and ceremonies, while they rejected the Roman church and hierarchy.

1424-6. THE PROCOPII.

But within no long time two other leaders became conspicuous among the Hussites—the great and the little Procopius. It is said that the former of these had been recommended by Ziska as his successor; and he was accepted by the Taborites, while the lesser Procopius was at the head of the orphans. The great Procopius was also designated as the Shaven, from the circumstance that he had unwillingly entered the priesthood at the instance of an uncle, to whom he had been indebted for education and for the means of travelling widely. Although he had married, he still continued to perform priestly ministrations; and, while zealously discharging the functions of a general, he did not himself engage in fight, or carry offensive weapons. Procopius was distinguished from the other Taborite leaders by mental culture and a love of learning. He had at one time been suspected of an inclination to the extravagances of the Picards; and, although his opinions had more lately been in some degree mitigated, they were even now more remote from the Roman system than those of Ziska, while Procopius was less fanatical and intolerant, and was guided in a greater degree by political prudence, than the earlier leader.

By the death of Ziska, the Prague party gained strength. Some of the older excesses, such as the destruction of churches, were blamed; the more extravagant opinions were

discountenanced; and it even seemed as if a reconciliation with the Roman church might be effected. But the more advanced Hussites refused to consent to articles which favoured transubstantiation, prayers for the dead, purgatory, and the ecclesiastical ceremonies, with other such points of doctrine and practice; and the conferences which had been opened with a view to union ended in divisions wider than before. On this occasion Peter Payne, taking offence at some calixtine articles which asserted the presence of the Lord's body in the Eucharist, joined the Orphans, from whom he afterwards passed to the Taborites.

Notwithstanding their violent differences among themselves, the Bohemians continued to be successful against external enemies. After having defeated a German force at Aussig in 1426, with a slaughter which is estimated at from 9,000 to 15,000 men, while the Bohemians lost only fifty, they advanced as far as Magdeburg, and, following the example which had been given by Ziska, they often invaded the neighbouring countries on all sides. In these outbreaks, to which they were partly urged by the necessities which arose out of the desolation of their own land, they everywhere committed extraordinary acts of cruelty and wanton devastations.

In February 1427, Martin gave the commission of legate for Bohemia, Germany, and Hungary, to cardinal Beaufort, who at that time was not unwilling to withdraw for a season from the political contests of England. Preparations were made for a crusade on a very great scale. Throughout the empire a tax was raised for the suppression of Hussitism. Four large armies, amounting (it is said) to 200,000 in all, were to enter Bohemia from different quarters at midsummer. Strict rules of discipline, befitting the religious nature of the enterprise, were laid down; all gaming and other such irregularities were forbidden; every soldier was bound to frequent confession and communion; and in their manner of warfare the crusaders were to adopt something of the system which the genius of Ziska had taught his countrymen. Although the various parties of Bohemians united for the common cause, it is said that the force which they were able to oppose to this vast host amounted only to 15,000 horse and 16,000 foot; but the great enterprise speedily ended in disgraceful failure. At Mies, the Germans, on coming in sight of the enemy, were seized with a panic; and the cardinal, as he was advancing, met his troops fleeing in abject terror. It was in vain that, with the crucifix in his hand, he entreated them, by the most solemn considerations of religion, to rally. He himself was reluctantly carried away with the multitude, and in this scandalous flight the Germans lost 10,000 men, besides the loss of many more, who, in their retreat, were pursued and slain by the peasantry.

In 1428 and the following year, fresh expeditions were projected and heavy taxation was imposed, which, in some parts of Germany, excited discontent and open resistance. Attempts were also made to come to an agreement by means of conferences; but, although Sigismund professed to be tired of the weight of empire, and willing to content himself with his original kingdom of Hungary, the Bohemians had acquired such confidence from their successes, that they insisted on terms which he was unable to yield. And the internal divisions of the Hussites continued. A divine named John of Przibram violently assailed the doctrines of Wyclif, and did not spare even Hus; while Payne strongly opposed him, and Rokyczana took a middle part, adhering to the doctrine of transubstantiation, but in other things generally agreeing with Payne.

The cardinal of Winchester was withdrawn from Bohemian affairs in consequence of the change produced in the relations of France and England by the appearance of the Maid of Orleans; and the force which he had raised for the Hussite war was employed against the French. But the pope was still bent on the suppression of Hussitism, and in January 1431 despatched as his legate Julian Cesarini, who had lately been created cardinal of St. Angelo. Julian was a Roman, of a family whose poverty is more certain than its nobility. He had risen to eminence by his merits, was esteemed for ability, morals, and learning, and, from having been in Bohemia, in attendance on a former legate, Branda of Castiglione, was supposed to

have special qualifications. for the office. A bull was drawn up, authorizing a new crusade, and bestowing extraordinary powers on him; but before the bearer, cardinal John of Olmütz (formerly bishop of Leitomyśl) arrived at Nuremberg, tidings were received there that Martin had died on the 20th of February.

CHAPTER II.
EUGENIUS IV.—THE COUNCILS OF BASEL AND FLORENCE.
A.D. 1431-1447.

IMMEDIATELY after the death of Martin, the feeling of the cardinals towards him, which had been suppressed during his lifetime, began to show itself in a significant form. The first day of the conclave, which met in the church of St. Mary *sopra Minerva*, was spent in drawing up certain terms to which the future pope was to bind himself by oath, and which he was to confirm by a special bull after his election. By this compact every cardinal promised, in case of his being chosen pope, to reform the court in head and members, and to undertake such reformation whenever he should be required by the cardinals; not to remove the seat of the papacy from Rome, except with the consent of the cardinals; to celebrate a general council at the place and time which the cardinals should recommend, and in it to reform the whole church, including the monastic and military orders, in faith, life, and morals; to make no cardinals except according to the rules of the council of Constance, unless a majority of the college should judge otherwise; to admit freely the advice of the cardinals, to respect their privileges, to preserve the rights of the Roman church, and in his letters to name those cardinals who had counseled him, as had been the practice until the time of Boniface VIII.

Although under the late pope the Italians had regained their old predominance in the college—which now, in defiance of the reforms of Constance, consisted of eleven or twelve Italian cardinals, and only eight of all other nations—a French and a Spanish bishop were put forward as the most likely to be chosen; but, by one of those unexpected turns which have often decided the result of elections to the papacy, the choice fell on Gabriel Condolmieri, cardinal of St. Clement, who took the name of Eugenius IV. The new pope was a Venetian, a nephew of Gregory XII, and had attained the age of forty-eight. He had distinguished himself in early life by giving at once twenty thousand ducats to the poor, and by entering, with his cousin Antony Corario, a society of canons which they founded under the title of St. George *in alga*, on one of the islands of Venice. He had been advanced to the dignity of cardinal by his uncle, and under the late pope had been employed as legate for the reduction of Bologna. Both his virtues and his faults were chiefly those of a monk. In his own person he was abstinent and severe, although his household expenses were equal to the dignity of his station; he loved and encouraged men of letters, although his own learning was but moderate; he was obstinate, narrow-minded, possessed by an ambition which refused to consider the limits of his power, little scrupulous in the pursuit of his objects, open to flattery, filled with a high idea of the papal greatness, and implacably hostile to all deviation from the established doctrines of the church. Under him the Romans found reason to look back with regret on the prosperous government of Martin; and to his mistaken policy are chiefly to be ascribed the troubles by which the church was agitated throughout his pontificate.

Eugenius had been assisted by the influence of the Orsini, and showed himself hostile to the great rival family of which his predecessor had been a member. He demanded from Martin's nephews, cardinal Prosper Colonna, the prince of Salerno, and the count of Celano, the treasures which the pope had collected for a religious war against the Turks, and he refused to be content when they gave up a part as if it had been the whole. The prince of Salerno surrendered the castle of St. Angelo; but Eugenius was still unsatisfied, and demanded the restoration of other places which Martin had put into the hands of his kindred. The Colonnas, with their allies, gathered a force in the Campagna, assaulted Rome, and penetrated into the heart of the city, where Stephen Colonna fortified himself in his palace. But they did

not find the expected support among the people. Although for more than a month the prince of Salerno held possession of the Appian gate, they were compelled to retire, and the pope, in alliance with the Orsini, took from them all the strong places which they held in Umbria and the ecclesiastical states. Martin's treasurer was tortured, in the hope of drawing from him information as to concealed wealth. A bull was issued, setting forth the offences of the Colonnas, and ordering that all their possessions should be confiscated; that their houses should be pulled down, and should never be rebuilt; that their arms should be erased from buildings, and that they should for ever be incapable of ecclesiastical or secular office : and this was carried into effect by the destruction of the late pope's palace, and of all monuments of his pontificate. Two hundred Romans of the Colonna party, who had been employed in office under Martin, were put to death on various charges. Joanna of Naples deprived the prince of Salerno of his principality, which was held under the Neapolitan crown; and at length, with aid from Naples, Florence, and Venice, Eugenius reduced the Colonnas to an unreserved submission, and to a surrender of all their fortresses, with so much of pope Martin's wealth as they had until then retained.

The time had now arrived for the meeting of the general council at Basel; but, although men looked anxiously to an assembly which was expected to determine whether the papal authority should continue in the fullness which it had attained, or should be reduced within more reasonable bounds, the gathering of the members was slow and gradual. The opening had been announced for the month of March, but the abbot of Vezelay was the only one who had then appeared, and two months later he had been joined by hardly any others, except some representatives of the university of Paris. It seemed as if the council of Basel might have no greater result than that of Siena. The late pope, who disliked and dreaded such meetings, had shown no alacrity to forward it; but he had authorized cardinal Julian Cesarini to preside, and the commission was renewed by Eugenius, who at the same time charged the cardinal to attend to the affairs of Bohemia if he did not find the fathers assembled at Basel. But Julian was more deeply interested in Bohemia than in the council. He begged that he might be excused from presiding at Basel; he wrote to stir up princes, prelates, and others to the holy war; and, while the members of the council were slowly arriving, he zealously preached the Bohemian crusade along the course of the Rhine, and even as far as Liege and Flanders. In the meanwhile he sent two Dominicans—John of Palomar, auditor of the sacred palace, and John of Ragusa, procurator-general of the order, to act as his deputies at Basel, and to entreat that the assembled fathers would await the issue of affairs in Bohemia; and by these commissioners the council was opened on the 23rd of July. At the same time Julian and others were active in endeavouring by urgent letters to procure a fuller attendance at Basel.

The danger with which the Bohemians were again threatened became, as in former instances, the means of uniting their factions. All were animated by a common zeal to withstand the invaders of their native land. Those who were engaged in expeditions into the neighbouring countries were recalled, and Procopius the Great was for a time invested with an almost absolute authority.

A diet was held at Eger in May, under the presidency of Sigismund. Some representatives of the Bohemians appeared, and endeavoured by negotiation to avert the threatened crusade; but the emperor was persuaded by John of Ragusa and others, who had been sent to him by cardinal Julian, to refuse all further treaty with them, unless on condition that they should submit in all their opinions to the determination of the church and the general council. To their request that they might be heard at Basel, Sigismund replied that this would interfere with the council's freedom; whereupon the Bohemians put forth an indignant letter, addressed to kings, princes, and Christians of all classes, stating the four articles of Prague as the points on which they insisted, protesting against the emperor's behaviour to them, denouncing the clergy severely, and declaring themselves determined, with the help of the Lord of hosts, to repel any invasion of their country.

Before resorting to arms cardinal Julian addressed to the Bohemians a letter, in which he declared himself earnestly desirous of their good, and even ready to give his life for them. He denies that the crusading force is intended for the destruction of their country; he sets forth the outrages and excesses which the Bohemians had committed in their own land and in those around it, and tells them that the crusaders are not to be regarded as aggressors, but as having taken arms for the deliverance of the pious, for their defence against the lovers of confusion and anarchy. They offer peace, and if war should follow, the guilt of it will lie on the other party. As to the great mass of the Bohemians, he expresses confidence that they are not in favour of disorder. He ridicules the notion that a few uneducated men—soldiers, artisans, peasants, and the like—could be wiser than the church, or than her multitude of trained preachers, both in past generations and now. The church has received from Christ the promise of the Holy Spirit to lead her into all truth, to protect her and to abide with her for ever; she is ready to receive the Bohemians, like the repentant prodigal; to bring forth the new robe, to kill the fatted calf, to call together the friends and neighbours that they may rejoice over the recovery of the lost.

The Bohemians rejoined in a letter which was mostly, if not wholly, the work of the “great” Procopius. In this letter the articles of Prague are set forth as principles founded on Scripture and held by the ancient church. To the restoration of these, which had in later ages been suppressed by a corrupt clergy, the Bohemians had devoted themselves for years, and for this cause they had borne labours, insults, expenses, and even the danger of their lives. They profess to refer all questions to Scripture, and to the ancient doctors who are agreeable to Scripture; they protest against force as a means of conversion, and tell the cardinal that St. Peter’s manner of visiting Cornelius might have supplied him with an example of a better method.

The crusading army, which ought to have been ready at midsummer, was, as in former expeditions, behind its time. The enterprise was inaugurated with great solemnity in the church of St. Sebald, at Nuremberg; where the emperor, kneeling before the altar, presented his sword to the legate, by whom it was delivered, together with the consecrated banner of the empire, to Frederick, elector of Brandenburg, who had been appointed to the chief command. The whole force is estimated at from 90,000 to 130,000 men, and on the 1st of August it entered Bohemia. But the same ignominious fate which had attended the earlier armaments of the same kind was now more signally repeated. Many of the invaders, scared by the mere sight of the Hussite manner of fighting, were seized with panic and fled at the approach of the Bohemians; and in an engagement near Taus, the legate, who had ascended a hill in order to see the combat, was compelled to witness the utter rout of his army. By extraordinary efforts he succeeded in rallying a few of them as they were about to plunge into a forest; but it was only that they might be cut to pieces or driven back by the advancing enemy. The troops fled in utter confusion, hurrying the cardinal along with them; while the Hussites pressed on them, and slew great numbers without resistance. The spoil taken was very great; and the Hussites were especially elated by the capture of the legate’s silver crucifix, of his bell, the ensigns of his dignity as cardinal, and the papal bull which had given authority for the crusade. Julian himself was in danger from the fury of some of the crusaders, who threw on him the blame of the disaster; and he was obliged for safety to disguise himself as a common soldier in the train of the bishop of Wurzburg. The other divisions of the great crusading host fell utterly to pieces.

The Hussites had now attained their greatest height of success and reputation. For twelve years they had not only held their ground against the united efforts of Latin Christendom, but had carried the terror of their arms far into the countries which bordered on Bohemia. Their enthusiastic courage, directed by the genius of Ziska and Procopius, had defeated the most famous generals of the age; and vast armies, collected under the highest religious sanction from almost every nation which acknowledged the spiritual authority of

Rome, had fled before them without awaiting their onset. And among the multitudes who openly or secretly rejected that authority, sympathy was widely felt with them. Thus we meet with casual mention of a community (probably Waldensian) among the mountains of Dauphiny which is said to have shared their opinions, and to have raised a tribute for their aid. But from the time of their greatest triumph disunion began to work its mischiefs. The several parties, being no longer banded together against a common enemy, fell asunder, and sought for foreign alliances in order to subdue each other. And this was the effect rather of political than of religious differences. The democratic spirit, which had been strongly developed in connexion with the reforming doctrines—a spirit which had been fostered by John of Selau and by Ziska, and had displayed itself in the disregard of family influence, and of everything but personal merit, in the choice of generals and officers—alienated the higher nobility, and tended to throw them back into the arms of the Roman church.

Cardinal Cesarini, on making his escape from the country which he had so confidently entered, repaired to the emperor at Nuremberg, and complained to him loudly of the German princes as wanting in spirit and enterprise. The legate had now been convinced by experience that negotiation was more hopeful than force as a means of reducing the Hussites; and his observations in Germany had taught him that the cause of the church was lost in that country unless a reform were carried out. He looked to the general council as the instrument of such a reform, and as the best remaining hope of a solution of the Bohemian difficulties; and to it he referred the emperor and the German nobles, who, in indignation at the late behaviour of their princes, urged the undertaking of a new crusade, in which the princes should not be admitted to share, and the leader should be one chosen by themselves for his capacity and experience.

On the ninth of September the legate arrived at Basel, where he was received with great solemnity, but found that only three bishops and seven abbots were as yet assembled. In order that the council might become, more worthy of its pretensions, he addressed many letters to princes, bishops, and others, urging them to send representatives. And agreeably to the resolution of a congregation of the council, he wrote in its name to the Bohemians, professing great affection for them, exhorting them to peace and unity, and inviting them, with a view to these objects, to appear at Basel, with an assurance that they should have unrestrained liberty of speech, and a full safe-conduct for their stay as well as for their journeys. This letter was sent by the council to the emperor, and by him was forwarded to Bohemia.

To Eugenius the idea of inviting to a free conference those who had been condemned as heretics at the councils of Constance and Siena, and who had since appeared in arms against the church, was altogether intolerable; and on the 12th of November he wrote to the legate, desiring him to break up the council of Basel, and to announce another general council, which was to meet at Bologna after an interval of a year and a half. But Cesarini, unwilling that the schemes on which he had set his heart should be ruined through the pope's mistaken action, ventured, instead of obeying, to send a canon of Besançon to report the state of affairs to Eugenius, and addressed to him a long and forcible letter of remonstrance.

After having entreated that the critical position of affairs may excuse his freedom, the legate relates the recent events in Bohemia, so far as he had been concerned in them. He expresses his belief that a conference between the council and some representatives of the Bohemians would be the most hopeful expedient for the pacification of Bohemia; and that such a council is urgently needed as a means of reformation. He speaks of his late experience as having shown him the deep disgust which had been produced in the minds of the German laity by the dissoluteness and disorders of the clergy; so that, unless these would reform themselves, it seemed likely that the laity would attack them in the manner of the Hussites; nay, unless these evils were remedied, the extinction of the Hussite heresy would probably be followed by the rise of some other. If the council should be dissolved, it would appear as if the church were afraid to meet the Hussites, who had been invited to it—as if the clergy were incorrigible, and were mocking God and man; the pope will risk the discredit of his name and

incur dangers to his soul. A dissolution would involve political difficulties, which would surely redound to the disadvantage of the clergy. For himself, the legate is resolved to vindicate his honour by placing himself in the hands of the secular nobles. The apprehensions of danger to the pope's power, whether spiritual or temporal, are chimerical; nor is any danger to his temporal power to be put in comparison with the peril to souls. The temper of the assembled fathers is alarming, and suggests the likelihood of a schism if the dissolution be carried through. The pretence of difficulty of access to Basel on account of a war between the dukes of Burgundy and Austria is vain; inasmuch as a truce has been concluded between these princes. The hope of gaining the Greeks (on which the pope had insisted) is no sufficient reason for risking the loss of Germany. The legate expresses his willingness to be superseded in his office, but earnestly begs that his engagements may be kept, and that the council may be continued—that the pope, as he had acted on insufficient knowledge, would now, after fuller information, revert to the original design.

Without waiting for the papal sanction, the council held its first session on the 14th of December, when mass was said by Philibert, bishop of Coutances. The subjects for discussion were defined as being three—the extinction of heresy; the restoration of peace and unity among Christians; and the reformation of the church. The system of voting by nations, which had been established at Constance, was now set aside,—partly, it would seem, on account of the jealousies which had there arisen between the Spaniards and the English, and partly because the separation of the cardinals, as a body distinct from the nations, had rendered them eager for the pope's authority rather than for the general good of the church. Instead of this arrangement, the council was divided into four “deputations,” each composed of members belonging to all degrees of the hierarchy, from patriarchs and cardinals down to monks and secular clergy. These deputations were severally charged with the consideration of— (1) General business; (2) Reformation; (3) The Faith; and (4) Peace. They met thrice a-week, and no subject could be proposed in a general congregation until after it had been discussed in the deputations.

The council was increased considerably in numbers; but of prelates there were comparatively few, nor did the representatives of universities form so important an element as at Constance. Italy had sent but a small number of members; England had as yet sent none. The mass of the council was drawn from the two nations which were nearest to Basel: the French and the Germans.

Eugenius, alarmed by the opening of communications with the Bohemians, issued, on the 18th of December, and on the 12th of February in the following year, fresh documents for the dissolution of the council, alleging, as before, the difficulties of access to Basel on account of the war between Austria and Burgundy, the state of his own health, which must prevent his attendance, the smallness of the numbers assembled, and the expiration of the seven years which had been fixed as a term at the council of Siena; and again he announced another council, to be held at Bologna. But the council, remembering that the meeting at Siena had been rendered ineffectual through the late pope's contrivances, and inferring from the proceedings of Martin and of Eugenius that the papacy was hostile to such assemblies, resolved to continue its sessions. On the 5th of June, Cesarini addressed a second letter of remonstrance to the pope. He reports the hopeful state of his negotiations with the Bohemians, who had agreed to send deputies to Basel. He dwells on the immeasurable superiority of spiritual over temporal interests. He speaks of the growing numbers and influence of the council. He rests its legitimacy on the same foundation with the papacies of Martin and Eugenius—the general council of Constance. He exposes the futility of the pretence as to the expiration of the appointed seven years from the time of the last council. He represents the views of persons who deny that the pope had power to dissolve a council, in contradiction to the decree of Constance, and he intimates that he himself agrees in that opinion.

But although the legate expressed himself thus plainly, he thought it well, out of regard

for the papal authority, to resign the presidency of the council, to which Philibert, bishop of Coutances, was elected in his room and in a synodal letter, addressed to all faithful Christians, the assembled fathers declared their resolution to remain at Basel until the purposes of their meeting should be accomplished.

About this time Sigismund suddenly announced an intention of going to Rome for the purpose of receiving the imperial crown. It would seem that the difficulties, disappointments, and reverses which he had experienced, both in his secular and in his ecclesiastical policy, had suggested the idea of endeavouring by this means to render his authority more venerable in the eyes of men; and perhaps he may have thought more especially that in the general council a crowned emperor would have greater influence than a king of the Romans. But circumstances were greatly changed from the times when earlier emperors had repaired to Rome for coronation. Italy, which had formerly been regarded by the imperialist lawyers as the special domain of the crown, was no longer subject to it except in name; and the necessities by which Sigismund had been cramped throughout his life—necessities chiefly caused by the alienations and other improvident expenses of his predecessors—prevented his appearing with such a force as might have overawed the princes and the republics of Italy. At Milan, where he had been led to expect from the duke, Philip Mary Visconti, not only a welcome, but supplies of money and a force sufficient to make his authority respected by the Italians, he found himself treated with outward ceremony indeed, but with mortifying coolness and distrust. The duke absented himself from the solemnity of his receiving the iron crown, and altogether avoided a meeting with him. Eugenius, fearing that the title of emperor would render Sigismund more powerful as against the papacy, deferred July the Roman coronation under one pretext after another, and for ten months Sigismund fretted in impotent expectation at Siena, where the cost of his maintenance pressed heavily on the citizens. At length he was allowed to go on to Rome, after having sworn by his ambassadors that he would never forsake the interest of Eugenius; and on Whitsunday, 1433, he received the imperial crown in St. Peter's from the hands of the pope. But there was little of splendour in the ceremony, and, as Sigismund was suffering from gout, the pope was obliged to consent that his mule should be led only three steps by the emperor—a symbol rather than a performance of the traditional homage of Constantine.

After a short stay at Rome, Sigismund set off for his northern dominions, where, in the meanwhile, his subjects had been tending to a state of anarchy. On the 11th of October he reached Basel. He had throughout been earnest for the council, which, after the failure of the crusade, he had regarded as the only means of pacifying Bohemia; he had written to assure it of his support; he had urged on the pope, both by letters and by ambassadors, the expediency of allowing it to continue; and he had requested all Christian princes to aid it by their influence. An assembly of the French clergy at Bourges, under Charles VII, had also taken up the cause of the council, and had petitioned the king to send an embassy to the pope, in order to procure his consent to its continuance. Sigismund, as we have seen, had forwarded the invitation of the council to the Bohemians in October 1431, and he had exerted himself to procure their appearance by deputies at Basel. But much of the distrust caused by the fate of Hus still remained; and, while the Calixtines and even the Orphans were willing to negotiate, the Taborites declared that it would be a folly to submit to their enemies as judges. The opinions of this party were set forth in a letter addressed to the council at Martinmas 1431, and supposed to be chiefly the work of Procopius. The letter dwells on the corruptions of the ecclesiastical system—the faults of the clergy, the mischievous effects of wealth on them, their pomp, luxury, incontinence, and rapacity; on the use of lying legends, on the prohibition of Holy Scripture, on the abuses of private mass and of confession, on the breach of the Saviour's commands as to administration of the Eucharist in both kinds, as to the persecution of the reformers, and other such matters. To this the council replied on the 28th of December; and it continued its attempts to conciliate the Bohemians. At length, after conferences at Eger

between representatives of the two parties, it was agreed that the Bohemians should send deputies to Basel. One of them had bluntly said, "Lo, you have laws which allow you to break all promises and oaths; what security then can you give us?". The safe-conduct was therefore elaborately drawn up, so as to allow no repetition of the treachery to which Hus had fallen a victim, and it included permission for the Bohemians to hold their services in their own fashion within their lodgings at Basel. The pope at last gave a qualified assent to the attempt which the council desired to make at reconciliation.

On the 4th of January 1433, Bohemian deputies, thirty in number, arrived at Basel, where their foreign dress, with the wild and fierce looks of some among them, produced a great excitement. Procopius the Great was regarded with peculiar interest and awe for his combined character of priest and general—as the skilful and terrible commander before whom so many thousands had fallen. The strangers were received with much respect by the council and by the magistrates of the city; and notwithstanding the utter unlikeness of the men, a friendly relation was speedily established between Cesarini and Procopius, who was often a welcome guest at the legate's table.

On the Epiphany, the various sections of the Bohemians celebrated their religious services, and the curious spectators who were admitted to witness those of the Taborites and Orphans were astonished at the absence of an altar (for which a table covered with a towel was the substitute), of special vestments, and of the usual ceremonies. For some days there was so much curiosity as to these services, that the legate thought of forbidding all resort to them; but the interest in them declined, when their novelty had passed away.

On the 10th of January, the deputies were formally received by the council, when Cesarini, who had resumed the presidency, addressed them in an eloquent speech which lasted two hours, and by the pathos with which, in the name of the mother church, he entreated them to unity, drew tears from the eyes of many on both sides. Rokyczana, who for some years had been regarded as the leader of the Calixtines, replied by expressing thanks for the kindness with which he and his companions had been received, and by requesting an opportunity of setting forth their opinions.

On the 16th of January the discussion began. The Bohemians had agreed to insist upon four points, which were substantially the same as the four articles of Prague; and when these were stated, some members of the council expressed their surprise that the differences which had produced so much agitation were not more considerable.

The disputation which followed, between four champions on each side, was of enormous length—some of the speeches extending to eight or nine days, and the whole occupying not less than fifty days. For the Bohemians, who spoke first, appeared Rokyczana, Procopius, a Taborite bishop named Nicolas, and Peter Payne, who took up time by relating the troubles which he had undergone in his own country, and was frequently contradicted by English members of the council. On the part of the council the argument was begun by John Stojkovic, of Ragusa, the Dominican already mentioned, who spoke from the 1st to the 11th of February, and was followed by Giles Carlier, dean of Cambray, Henry Kalteisen, a Dominican and inquisitor of Mayence, and John of Palomar. Rokyczana then extorted the right of replying to John of Ragusa, and discoursed from the 2nd to the 10th of March, with the exception of two days. John of Ragusa wished once more to rejoin, and his opponent did not object to this; but the council had heard enough, and at last the debate came to an end. The parties had throughout had different designs; for the Bohemians hoped that their articles might be accepted and generally enforced, while the council had no thought of any further concession than possibly that of allowing the Bohemians to hold their peculiarities by way of indulgence and exception.

In the course of these discussions, Rokyczana excited much admiration by his eloquence, and by a readiness of wit which often enlivened the more serious arguments. Procopius, although he showed much knowledge of Scripture, excited frequent laughter by the

roughness of his manner. Thus, when the legate mentioned that some Hussites were reported to have ascribed the origin of the mendicant orders to the devil, Procopius started up and exclaimed that this was quite true; “for,” said he, “if neither the patriarchs nor Moses, our Lord nor his apostles, instituted the mendicants, what can they be but the work of the devil and of darkness?” The enormous length at which John of Ragusa spoke, and his frequent divergences into irrelevant subjects, provoked (as he himself candidly informs us) complaints on the parts of the Bohemians.¹ He was also charged by Rokyczana with unfairness in his quotations; although against this charge he defends himself. But the chief offence which John gave was by using the word heretic sixteen times within a few minutes. The Bohemians took this as an insult to themselves. Procopius, with furious contortions of his face, and his eyes suddenly bloodshot, exclaimed that it was a violation of the safe-conduct; that he and his companions would not have come to Basel if they had expected to be branded as heretics. It was in vain that the legate attempted to restore peace. The Bohemians absented themselves during the remainder of John’s discourse; and the matter was carried further after the meeting had broken up. John disavowed, even with imprecations, any intention of offending the Bohemians, and his apologies were admitted; but Procopius still refused to meet him at the legate’s table.

The great debate was followed up by the appointment of committees, in which the discussion of the Bohemian differences was continued; and it was agreed that the council should send envoys into Bohemia. After a solemn leave-taking, therefore, on the 13th of April (Monday after Easter), the Bohemian deputies set out homewards on the following day, with Philibert of Coutances, the bishop of Augsburg, Palomar, Carlier, an English archdeacon, named Alexander, and some others, as representatives of the council. These representatives were secretly instructed to work on the differences which existed between the Bohemian parties; and they found the task easy. They drew into their interest Meinhard of Neuhaus, a powerful baron, who from that time was the leader of the Bohemian catholics, and entered into an agreement with other nobles to rescue the management of public affairs from the hands of the democratic and tyrannical faction, whose interests were all on the side of war.

The proposals of the council were embodied in four articles, which afterwards became known by the name of *Compactata*, and, after much discussion and some modifications, were agreed on as terms of peace on the 30th of November :—

(1.) The clergy were allowed to administer the Eucharist in both kinds to such adults as should desire it; but always with the explanation that under each kind is the Saviour whole and perfect.

(2.) The punishment of sins is declared to belong, not to private persons, but to those who are in authority—clergy over clergy, and laymen over laity; and regard must always be had to right and justice.

(3.) As to the demand for free preaching, it is said that preachers must be authorized by their superiors, and that the power of the bishops must be regarded.

(4.) The church may possess lands and temporal property, and may have private and civil lordship over them. The clergy are bound to administer its property faithfully, and others may not invade or detain such property.

These terms were granted on condition that in all other points the Bohemians should conform to the church as to faith and ceremonies. But although the more moderate among them were willing to agree to this, the Taborites continued to hold out. The discords between the various parties became more open and more violent; and on Sunday, the 30th of May 1434, they came to a head in a great battle at Lipan. The fight lasted all day, and even through the night until dawn. The slaughter was immense, and among those who fell were both the Great and the Lesser Procopius. No quarter was given; and it is said that, after the battle, Meinhard of Neuhaus—by proclaiming that the war was to be carried on until the neighbouring nations should be reduced, and that for this purpose the veteran followers of the

Procopii were invited to serve with increased pay—induced a large number of Taborites and Orphans to enter some barns, as if by way of separating themselves from the less experienced soldiers; after which the doors were closed, the buildings were set on fire, and the victims of the treachery were burnt alive. By this defeat and its consequences, the Taborites and Orphans were greatly reduced in numbers, and their power was effectually broken.

NICOLAS OF CUSA.

During the emperor's absence in Italy, the council of Basel had risen more and more decidedly into an attitude of opposition to the pope, and had manifested a desire, not only to triumph over Eugenius personally, but to humble the Roman see. In this course they were urged on by the influence of two cardinals—Branda and Capranica—who had special grievances against Eugenius, and had hurried to Basel in the hope of making the council an instrument of their vengeance. But still more important than these cardinals was Nicolas Chryfftz or Krebs, who, from his birthplace, Cüs, on the Moselle, is generally known by the name of Cusanus. Cusanus, born in 1401, had raised himself from a very humble station; he was now dean of St. Florin's, at Coblentz, and enjoyed a great reputation for character, ability, and learning. In his treatise "Of Catholic Agreement", sent forth during the sitting of the council, he strongly maintains the superiority of general councils over popes; he holds that the decrees of councils do not derive their force from the papal sanction; that the pope has no such superiority over other bishops as was supposed by the extreme papal party; that infallibility is not promised to one member of the church, but to the whole; that the council may depose a pope, not only for heresy but for other causes; that the church has the power freely to choose its own chief; and that, if the archbishop of Treves should be so chosen by the assembled church, he, rather than the bishop of Rome, would properly be the successor of St. Peter's principality. Cusanus also, after investigating the alleged donation of Constantine and the story connected with it, declares them to be fabulous; he expresses an opinion that some of the decretals had been forged for the exaltation of the Roman see to the detriment of the church; he denies the truth of the belief that the empire had been transferred from the Greeks to the Germans by the authority of the pope; and, with regard to the convocation of councils, he is decidedly opposed to the papal pretensions.

The council, at its second session, renewed the decree of Constance, by which general councils were declared to have their power immediately from Christ, and to be superior to all other authority, even that of the pope.

At the third session, the fathers declared that the dissolution of the council by Eugenius was null; they prayed him to recall it, to appear at Basel within three months, if his health would allow, or otherwise to send representatives with full power; and they added that, if this should be neglected, they would, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, take care for the necessities of the church.

At the fourth session (besides writing to the Bohemians) they decreed that, if the papacy should become vacant during the continuance of the council, the succeeding pope must be chosen in the place where it was assembled. They forbade the promotion of any new cardinals during the existence of the council. They appointed a cardinal to be governor of Avignon and of the Venaissin, where a nephew of Eugenius had been unable to get himself acknowledged in that character and they ordered a special seal to be prepared, with the symbolical dove on one side and the title of the council on the other.

Eugenius had endeavoured to treat with the council by sending to Basel the archbishops of Rhodes and Taranto. These prelates, in speeches addressed to the assembly, dwelt on the necessity of harmony and cooperation with a view to the reconciliation both of the Greeks and of the Hussites; and on the superior convenience of Bologna as a place of meeting, whereas they represented Basel as at once exposed to the Hussites and inaccessible for both the Greeks

and the pope. But the council, in a written reply, vindicated their course with regard to the pope, and their negotiations with the Bohemians. They combated the objections which had been made to the position of Basel, and prayed that the pope would not grieve the Holy Spirit by interfering with the important work which was before them as to the Greeks, the Hussites, and the reform of the church.

At the sixth session, the promoters of the case against the pope requested that, as having failed to appear, he should be pronounced contumacious and obstinate; he was thrice cited at the high altar of the cathedral, and thrice at the principal door; but, as might have been expected, no response was made.

At the eighth session, sixty days were granted “*ex abundantia cautela*” to the pope, within which time he was required to revoke the bull of dissolution, and entirely to join the council.

At the twelfth session, the term was extended by sixty days more, within which time any promotions or other exercises of patronage which the pope might make were to be null; and at the end of it, if he should not have obeyed the order, the cardinals and clergy were required to leave the Roman court within thirty days.. In the meanwhile Eugenius, on his part, was employed in preparing two bulls for the dissolution of the council, denying the validity of all its acts, and forbidding all obedience to it.

At the thirteenth session, it was again proposed that, in consequence of his disregard of citations, the pope should be declared contumacious. But duke William of Bavaria, as the emperor’s representative, with the local magistrates and others, intervened, and obtained a further delay of thirty days, as Sigismund was expected at Basel. The emperor (who had been formally acknowledged by the council as its protector) had repeatedly written from Italy, for the purpose of moderating its proceedings, and had also endeavoured, although vainly, to persuade the pope to concession. On the day after his arrival, he presented to some deputies of the council a document which he had at length obtained from Eugenius, revoking the dissolution, and acknowledging the council. But this was not considered sufficient.¹

At the fourteenth session, where Sigismund appeared in state, ninety days more were granted to the pope, and three forms were proposed to be submitted to him, that he might choose which he would subscribe—all of them, however, containing a declaration that he annulled his bulls of dissolution, and acknowledged the beginning and continuation of the council as valid.

In the meantime the intrigues of the duke of Milan, the arms of the rival condottieri, Sforza, Piccinino, and Fortebraccio, and the hereditary factions of the Colonna and Orsini families, distracted Italy, and endangered the temporal dominions of the pope, who felt himself insecure even in his capital. By these distresses Eugenius was disposed to seek a reconciliation with the council. By a bull dated on the 15th of December 1433, and amended from that which the emperor had formerly produced, he revoked his bulls for dissolution and all sentences which he had uttered against the council; and this revocation was accepted by the council at its sixteenth session, on the 5th of February 1434. At the seventeenth session, where the emperor was arrayed in all the ensigns of his dignity, the pope’s legates were incorporated with the council, and admitted to the presidency of it, on swearing, in their own names, that a general council has its authority immediately from Christ, and that all men, including even the pope, are bound to obey it in matters relating to faith, to the extinction of schism, and to the reform of the church in head and members. By this adhesion Eugenius was supposed to sanction all the former proceedings of the council, as they did not fail afterwards to remind him.

Sigismund, although he had throughout been friendly to the council, found many things to offend him when brought into personal intercourse with it. He shrank from the idea of a new schism, and declared that he would die rather than allow the church to be divided. He was disappointed at finding that a body of pretensions so imposing was so scanty in numbers. He felt himself slighted by its entering into negotiations with other potentates without due

reference to him for his approval; and especially he was disgusted by the disposition which it showed to meddle with the politics of Germany, as in a case of an appeal from him by the duke of Lauenburg. On the 19th of May 1443, the emperor left Basel.

The troubles by which Eugenius had been induced to submit to the council were soon after increased by an insurrection of his own subjects. On the 29th of May, a multitude of the Romans, provoked by the contempt with which their complaints had been received by his nephew, cardinal Francis Condolmieri, rushed to the Capitol with shouts of "Liberty!" and demanded that Eugenius should make over the government to bannerets who should be chosen by the people. On his refusing to give up his nephew as a hostage, the cardinal was torn from his side. Eugenius himself was placed under the care of a guard at St. Mary's in the Trastevere, but escaped in the disguise of a monk, with one companion, to the Tiber, where they found a boat ready to receive them. But the speed with which the boat was urged down the stream excited suspicion, and multitudes both on horseback and on foot made their way direct along the Ostian road to St. Paul's, while the pope's progress was delayed by the windings of the river. Showers of arrows, javelins, and stones were aimed at his boat from the bank, and attempts were made to pursue and to intercept it on the water. Eugenius, however, reached Ostia in safety, and thence, by way of Leghorn and Pisa, he made his way to Florence, where he was lodged in the monastery of Santa Maria Novella. Among the reforms which he undertook in the monastic system during his residence at Florence was a restoration of discipline in that convent, which he transferred to the Friars Observant of St. Dominic.

The council, after its reconciliation with Eugenius, had greatly increased in numbers; and for a time it devoted itself to questions of reform, with a diligence which has missed somewhat of its due estimation on account of the assembly's later proceedings. Decrees were passed for entire freedom of elections in churches; against simony, expectancies, usurpations of patronage, reservations, annates, and many exactions by which the Roman court drained the wealth of western Christendom; against frivolous appeals, against the abuse of interdicts, the concubinage of the clergy, the burlesque festivals and other indecencies connected with the service of the church. Rules were laid down as to the election of popes, and as to their conduct in office. The pope was to make his profession with some additions to the form prescribed at Constance; and at every celebration of his anniversary, it was to be read over to him by a cardinal during the service of the mass. The number of cardinals was limited to twenty-four: they were to be taken from all Christian countries, and to be chosen with the consent of the existing cardinals. A very few of royal or princely families might be admitted, but the nephews of the pope were to be excluded from the college.

But it was natural that measures of reform which touched the privileges and the income of the papacy should excite alarm and jealousy in Eugenius. He sent envoys to beg that the decree against annates—a payment which he ventured to describe as of immemorial antiquity, and as sanctioned by the general council of Vienne—might be suspended, or that by some other means he might be enabled to support his dignity, and to bear the many charges to which he was liable; but, although his suit was strongly urged on the council, the answer was that no provision could be made for him until he should have submitted himself to its authority. On this point Cesarini separated himself from the other legates, by speaking and voting with the majority of the assembly. Eugenius vented his grievances against the council in letters and messages to kings and princes; among other things he complained that, with a view to meeting the costs of an expected mission from the Greek church, it had taken on itself to issue an indulgence resembling those which had been usual for crusades.

The Greeks had been invited into the west both by the council and by the pope, with a view to confer on the reunion of the churches; but as to the place of the conference it was impossible to come to any agreement. The pope was resolved that it should be south of the Alps, while the council, at a very stormy session, pronounced, by a majority of more than two-thirds, in favour of Basel, Avignon, or some town in Savoy. But at the same session the

minority of the council, headed by the legates, passed a decree in recommendation of Florence, Udine, or some other safe place in the south; and while the decree of the majority was being published from the pulpit of the cathedral, one of the other party in a distant part of the building read out that of the minority, which, through the contrivance of the archbishop of Taranto, was fortified with the seal of the council (as the decree of the majority had also been), and was forwarded to the pope. Eugenius gave his sanction to the decision of his partisans, and on the 18th of September he issued a bull for transferring the council of Basel to Ferrara, although he allowed a stay of thirty days more at Basel for the purpose of conferring with the Hussites.

But before this his relations with the council had become such as to provoke a resumption of the proceedings against him. At the twenty-sixth session Eugenius was charged with many offences, and was summoned to appear, in person or by proxy, within sixty days. At the following session his promotions of cardinals were annulled; and, as it was reported that he intended to sell Avignon and the Venaissin, in order to pay for the expected visit of the Greeks, the council forbade this alienation of property belonging to the Roman see. At the twenty-eighth session his neglect of the citations was reported, and he was declared to be obstinately contumacious. A renewal of the schism appeared to be at hand, and Sigismund was labouring to avert such a calamity, when his efforts were cut short by death, at Znaym, in Hungary, in the beginning of December 1437.

The pope's council opened at Ferrara on the 8th of January 1438; but from among the fathers of Basel the only defections to it were those of Cesarini, Nicolas of Cusa, and two others. Cesarini found it impossible to remain at Basel, as the council became more entirely antipapal, and seemed likely even to fix on himself as the head of a new schism. He had ceased to attend the sessions of the council since that at which the proceedings against Eugenius had been resumed; and in the beginning of 1438 he left Basel.

The council, however, held on its course, undeterred by the condemnations uttered against it by the pope and by the rival assembly, who declared the men of Basel to be excommunicate and deprived, and all their acts to be annulled. At the thirty-first session, it pronounced that the pope was suspended, and that his powers both in spiritual and in temporal things had devolved on itself; and it forbade all obedience to him. The next meeting pronounced the assembly at Ferrara to be a schismatical conventicle, and cited all its members to appear at Basel within thirty days. In these proceedings the leaders were Lewis Allemand, cardinal-archbishop of Arles (the only cardinal who still remained at Basel)—a man who combined in a rare degree eloquence, temper, firmness, and tact; and Nicolas de Tudesco, archbishop of Palermo (Panormitanus), the most famous canonist of the age.

In the vacancy of the empire it was natural that the rival ecclesiastical parties should endeavour to gain the favour of the German electors. With this view the archbishop of Palermo was sent on the part of the council to Frankfort, where he was confronted with representatives of the pope. The electors, however, declared themselves resolved to stand neutral for the time; and March 7, when Albert of Austria, a son-in-law of Sigismund, had been chosen as his successor, the neutrality was continued, notwithstanding the exertions of further missions from both sides. But in another way the council was able to draw encouragement both from Germany and from France. Charles of France refused to send representatives to Ferrara. In an assembly of the French estates, held at Bourges under the presidency of the king, the reforms of Basel were adopted, and were embodied in a document known as the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges; and at a great diet at Mayence, in March 1439, where envoys both from the pope and from the council appeared, the reforming decrees of Basel were accepted by the Germans, while those which related to the process against the pope were set aside.

The resolutions of these assemblies were evidently guided by a wish to secure the benefits of reform, and at the same time to avoid the danger of a new schism. But the council,

misconceiving their effect, began to over-estimate its strength, and to flatter itself with the hope that the French and the Germans would soon formally array themselves on its side. And thus it continued (as it had before done) to disregard the intercessions, the warnings, and even the threats, of princes and others who endeavoured to persuade it to moderation in its proceedings against the pope.

Bishops, in alarm at the headstrong course on which the council appeared to be resolved, for the most part stayed at home, or absented themselves from its meetings; but the members of lower rank went on without hesitation. In April 1439, the question was discussed whether Eugenius, in consequence of having disregarded the council's citations, and of having made a second attempt to dissolve it, were a heretic. Some were for voting him so simply; some thought that his heresy was aggravated by relapse, while others were for acquitting him; but at length, after a stirring debate, the matter was compromised by the ingenious device of voting him a heretic *prolapsed*. A violent discussion took place on the question whether presbyters should have the right of voting. Many of the bishops, from a wish to gain the assistance of the other order as allies against the papacy, were disposed to allow this. But the archbishop of Palermo maintained that they had only a consultative voice; he spoke of the great body of the council in very contemptuous terms, and inveighed against the president, the cardinal of Arles, as wishing, with the assistance of such a rabble, and of two or three titular bishops, to do away with the rights of the prelacy. At the thirty-third session, on the 16th of May, the more moderate part of the council, backed by strong representations from the ambassadors of various powers, was able to obtain that, of eight articles which had been brought forward against Eugenius, three only, which bore on the relations of a pope and a council, should be affirmed, and that the others, which were of a personal nature, should be withdrawn.

The thirty-fourth session of the council, on the 25th of June, was fixed for the final act. As the attendance of bishops was expected to be scanty, the cardinal of Arles caused all the relics of noted sanctity which could be found in Basel to be collected, and, after having been carried in solemn procession about the streets, to be placed on the vacant seats; and such is said to have been the effect of this strange device, that, when the invocation of the Holy Spirit was pronounced, the whole assembly burst into tears. The number of mitred prelates was small; but the clergy of inferior dignity amounted to more than three hundred, and their demeanour was marked by a gravity and a decorum which had not appeared in the late meetings. Eugenius was once more cited by two bishops; and, as he made no answer, the decree of the council was pronounced—declaring him to be deposed as notoriously, manifestly, and obstinately contumacious, a violator of the canons, guilty of scandal to the whole church, as simoniacal, perjured, incorrigibly schismatic and obstinately heretical, a dilapidator of the church's rights and property, and unfit to administer his office. All faithful Christians were forbidden to adhere to him, and were discharged from all obligations to him. And after the delivery of this sentence, the council chanted a jubilant *Te Deum*.

A few days later, at a general congregation, the ambassadors of the emperor and of the French king, to the surprise of the council, expressed their concurrence in the acts of the late session, and made excuses for having absented themselves from it.

In the meantime the temporal affairs of Eugenius had been prosperous. Within a very few months after having expelled him, the Romans found that the government which they themselves had set up was more intolerable than that of the pope; that without him their city was a desert; and having put down the republican magistrates, they requested Eugenius to resume his authority. For the time he preferred to remain at Florence, although they entreated him to return in person; and he employed as his lieutenant John Vitelleschi, bishop of Recanati, whom, in reward of his military services, he afterwards raised to the dignities of cardinal-archbishop of Florence, and titular patriarch of Alexandria. But, notwithstanding these high spiritual preferments, Vitelleschi was little else than a mere condottiere—rough,

ferocious, lustful, cruel, treacherous. In order to establish the pope's authority by depressing the hostile family of Colonna, he laid the Campagna desolate, reduced Palestrina to a ruin more entire than that which had befallen it in earlier destructions, and compelled the inhabitants to seek a refuge elsewhere. Yet the Romans, over whom for five years he exercised a despotic power, willingly bore with his vices and his oppression in consideration of the blessings of peace and steady government, to which they had long been unaccustomed.

At length, however, Vitelleschi's enemies, by representing him as guilty of ambitious designs for himself, succeeded in awakening the pope's suspicions; and by orders from Florence the soldier-cardinal was treacherously arrested on the bridge of St. Angelo. In attempting to escape, he received severe wounds; and it is possible that his death, which took place in prison a fortnight later, may have been caused by these, although he himself suspected poison, and public opinion charged the crime on Eugenius. The patriarch's body, half-naked, was exposed for a time to the insults of the populace in the church of St. Mary sopra Minerva; but it was afterwards removed for burial to Corneto; and the Romans, whose gratitude had outlasted his death, erected a statue to him as a new founder of their city. Eugenius afterwards disavowed all share in Vitelleschi's death, on the ground that his orders had been misunderstood. Scarampo, who had been the agent in the arrest of the patriarch, succeeded him in his power, and carried on the administration with severity.

In 1443, after an absence of nine years, Eugenius himself returned to Rome. A late increase of taxation, and especially the imposition of a duty on wine, had called forth cries of "Death to the new taxes, and to those who invented them!" and although these cries were not heard as the pope proceeded from the Flaminian Gate towards the Vatican, the silence of the streets gave token of the popular discontent. Eugenius, on being informed of this feeling, caused it to be announced that the taxes were repealed; and at once he was greeted from all sides by acclamations which accompanied him as far as his palace.

The council of Basel, at its next session after pronouncing the sentence on Eugenius, resolved to allow an interval of sixty days before proceeding to a new election. In the meanwhile a plague broke out in the town, and carried off many of the members, who are said to have professed in their last moments, while holding the holy Eucharist in their hands, their firm adherence to the cause of the council, and their conviction that, in order to salvation, it was necessary to abandon the deposed pope. The cardinal of Arles was urged to withdraw from Basel for a time, as the pestilence had shown itself among his household; it was represented to him that he ought to consult his safety for the sake of the interests which depended on his life; but he was resolved "to save the council at the peril of his life, rather than his life at the risk of the council."

After a few weeks the violence of the plague diminished and those who had left Basel on account of it gradually returned. On the 17th of September was held a session, which is remarkable as having passed a decree in favour of the immaculate conception; although, as the council's authority has been disallowed in the Roman communion, that doctrine was not established as necessary until more than four centuries later.

At the thirty-seventh session, it was resolved to form an electoral college by associating with the cardinal of Arles thirty-two other members of the council, to be chosen out of all the nations and from all classes—bishops, abbots, doctors of theology, canonists, and ordinary clergy. England, which had transferred itself to the rival council, was the only country unrepresented; but Thomas, abbot of Dundrennan, a Cistercian house in the Scottish diocese of Candida Casa, was one of three who were named by the council, and to whom the choice of the rest was entrusted. In order to an election, a majority of two-thirds was required. The arrangements for the conclave were carefully made, and, while the election was in suspense, holy relics were displayed, and solemn processions moved about the streets, in order to implore a successful issue.

On the first day seventeen candidates were brought forward : and on the sixth day the

choice of the electors fell, by a majority which had increased in the successive divisions until it included all but seven, on Amadeus, ex-duke of Savoy. This prince, after having for thirty-eight years governed his state with a high reputation, had in 1434 made over the administration to his son, although he still retained a control over the younger duke; and, under the title of dean of St. Maurice, he had become the head of a brotherhood of aged knights, which he founded at Ripaille, on the southern shore of the Lake of Geneva. The character of Amadeus, both as prince and as hermit, is highly extolled by Aeneas Sylvius; and, although it is probable that the discipline of Ripaille was of no very ascetic kind, the charges of luxury and voluptuousness which have been brought against the society appear to be exaggerations, unsupported by contemporary authority, and swollen by hatred of him as an antipope before they were eagerly turned to account by sceptical writers. There can be no doubt that the council was guided in its choice by a consideration of the duke's powerful connexions, and of the private means which would enable him to support in some degree the papal dignity, although deprived of the territorial revenues and of the other resources which had been commonly attached to it; indeed, these recommendations had been impressed on the electors by the cardinal of Arles, who had also expressed a hope that the new pope might be able, by his power as a secular prince, to recover the possessions of the Roman see. And, although wonder was generally felt that a man of such eminent position should undertake the burden of a contested papacy, it was supposed by some, even in his own time, that his withdrawal from the government of his hereditary state, and his assumption of the character of a hermit, had been prompted by a desire of the doubtful spiritual dignity which he had now attained.

FELIX V

Amadeus, on receiving a report of his election from a deputation headed by the cardinal of Arles, professed, with tears in his eyes, that he was unwilling to leave his quiet life. But his reluctance, whether real or affected, was at length overcome. He was enthroned in the church of St. Maurice; and, after having gone through other customary formalities, he was crowned at Basel on the 23rd of July 1440. The ceremony was very splendid. The tiara, which was of great magnificence, was placed on the antipope's head by the cardinal of Arles; four other cardinals, who had been promoted by Amadeus himself, assisted, and eight bishops officiated as proxies for cardinals who were absent. The knightly hermits of Ripaille were present to do honour to their chief; but the most remarkable feature in the ceremony was the appearance of the new pope's sons, the duke of Savoy and the count of Geneva, who stood on either side of him, and assisted him at the mass. Although he had stipulated that he should be allowed to retain his own name, and the beard which adorned him as a hermit, he had afterwards yielded to papal precedent in both respects, and styled himself Felix V.

It soon appeared, however, that the council could expect but little aid in the daring course on which it had ventured. It had already been deserted by many of its most important members; and, although it continued to proceed in disregard both of the violent censures which were denounced against it by Eugenius with his rival council, and of the visible decrease of its own authority, its supporters were limited to Savoy, Switzerland, queen Elizabeth of Hungary (widow of the emperor Albert), a few German princes and towns, a part of the Carthusian order, and the Franciscans of Germany, with some universities of Germany, France, and Poland. The duke of Milan, who had married a daughter of Felix, made overtures for an alliance, but the terms which he proposed were exorbitant, and nothing came of the negotiation. Alfonso of Aragon, who, after much politic hesitation, had given in his adhesion to the council, sided with it for a time in the hope of making good his claim to Naples through its influence. The countenance which the imperial and the French ambassadors had professed to give to the deposition of Eugenius was found to be fallacious. The emperor had written to

the council, strongly reprobating the measure, and desiring them to refrain from any attempt to choose a successor; and among the Germans in general the deposition and the election were regarded as acts done in contempt of their own neutrality. The king of France, on receiving at Bourges a missive from the council, expressed disapproval of its late proceedings; he spoke of Felix by his secular title, and exhorted both him and the council to study the peace of the church. Yet he did not disown the council, nor adhere to the rival assembly of Ferrara. The popularity of the council was not increased in France by its imposing a tax of a fifth for five years, and a tenth for the following five years, on all ecclesiastical benefices which should become vacant; for in this way it was intended to provide Felix with an official income until he should recover the patrimony of the church.

FREDERICK III, EMPEROR

The emperor Albert died on the 5th of November 1439, and in his room was elected, as king of the Romans, his cousin Frederick, duke of Styria, a prince of dull and unenterprising character, whose reign extended to fifty-three years. Before his promotion Frederick had been favourable to the council, so that both the members of it and pope Felix had hopes of drawing him into their interest by the offer of the imperial crown. The question between the pope and the council was discussed at three German diets by representatives of the opposite parties. At the second of these diets, in 1441, the archbishop of Palermo exerted himself with all his powers to show that the council was still of full authority, and that it had been justified in all its measures. But Nicolas of Cusa asserted the cause of Eugenius with great force. Only seven bishops, he said, had voted for the deposition of the pope, whereas not less than twelve were requisite to depose a simple bishop. And he was able to allege the success of Eugenius in reconciling the Greeks and other orientals—a success which, however unsubstantial and transitory (as we shall see hereafter), told powerfully for the time as a token of the Divine favour. It was proposed that another general council should be summoned and in the meantime Germany was to persevere in its neutrality.

The council continued to decline in numbers and in authority. The members wasted much of their time in discreditable squabbles. At the forty-third session, where Felix presided, a decree was passed for celebrating the Visitation of the blessed Virgin (July 2)—a festival which had been instituted by Urban VI and confirmed by Boniface IX, but had never been sanctioned by the popes of the Avignon line. As a motive for this decree, it was said that the Virgin's intercession was especially needed in the disunited condition of the church.

On the 11th of November, Frederick appeared at Basel. He was received by Felix (with whom he had before had an interview at Susa), and by nine of his cardinals; but, although he behaved with great respect to the antipope, his treatment of him was marked by an avowed reserve. Instead of the titles of *Holiness* and *Beatitude*, the bishop of Chiemsee, who spoke in the emperor's name, was instructed to address Felix as *Your Clemency* and *Your Benignity*; and he explained that the emperor refrained from showing the usual marks of reverence, in order that he might preserve his neutrality, and so might be better fitted to act as a mediator and a peacemaker. To this Felix replied that he took all in good part, and he protested that he had not accepted the papacy from motives of ambition, but solely in the hope of comforting the church in her affliction.

Felix, under the plea of illness, withdrew from Basel to Lausanne, promising to return in the following spring; but he never fulfilled this promise, nor perhaps was he ever asked to fulfil it.

The council continued to sink, and was specially weakened by losing the support of Alfonso of Aragon. Joanna II. of Naples, at her death, in February 1435, had left her kingdom to René, the brother of Lewis of Anjou, who had died in the preceding year. The pope, who had affected to treat Naples as a fief which had lapsed to the Roman see, was disposed to

favour René's interest; while Alfonso still maintained his pretensions, and advanced fresh claims as the heir of king Manfred and of the Hohenstaufen. But in 1443 Eugenius found it expedient to abandon René, who, through want of sufficient means, had been unsuccessful in his attempts. After stipulations on both sides, Alfonso received from Rome a bull of investiture in the Neapolitan kingdom and in consideration of this he agreed to forsake the council of Basel, and to withdraw his bishops from it—among them the formidable Nicolas of Palermo, who thereupon gave up the insignia of the cardinalate, to which he had been promoted by Felix.

The forty-fifth session was held on the 16th of June 1443, when Lyons was chosen as the place of the next general council; and, although the council of Basel declared itself to be still in existence, it never met again.

The authority of this assembly has been variously estimated within the Roman communion. The more moderate divines in general acknowledge its ecumenical character as far as the twenty-sixth session—*i.e.*, until the time when Eugenius proposed to transfer it to Ferrara. But the advanced Gallicans maintain its authority throughout; and by the more extreme Romanists it is altogether disavowed.

We may now turn to the history of the council which had been summoned by Eugenius with a view to the union of the Greek and the Latin churches. Although the old dislike of the Greeks for the Latins had rather been increased than lessened by all earlier negotiations for this purpose, their danger from the Turks, which continually became more urgent, compelled them to fresh attempts to gain assistance from the west throughout the reign of Manuel. His son, John Palaeologus II, who succeeded to the throne in 1425, had been advised by him to look towards the west for support, and endeavoured to act on this policy. He had visited western Europe in 1423, for the purpose of begging assistance, and he appears to have even entertained the idea of succeeding Sigismund as emperor of the west, and of thus reuniting both the empire and the church.

In the course of his communications with pope Martin, the emperor signified his readiness to attend a general council (although his father had warned him against such a measure), and, in consequence of an invitation from the council of Basel, some representatives of the Greeks, headed by the protovestiary Demetrius Palaeologus, appeared at Basel in 1434. The council, in return, sent John of Ragusa and others to Constantinople; but, besides the necessary difficulties of the case, it was found that the breach between the pope and the council—authorities which the Greeks had supposed to be in unison with each other—introduced an extraordinary perplexity into the negotiations.

There was much discussion as to the place where the intended council should meet. The Greeks at Basel objected to that city as being too remote for the attendance of their countrymen, who supposed it to be beyond the Pillars of Hercules. They desired that some more accessible place in Italy or elsewhere should be fixed on; and the emperor urged this especially on the ground of the patriarch's age and infirmity, while the fathers of Basel (as has been related) suggested Avignon by way of compromise.

An indiscreet expression, that the council had endeavoured to put down the old separation of the Greeks as well as the new separation of the Bohemians, was studiously circulated in exaggerated terms, with the intention of exasperating the Greeks. The envoys of the council at Constantinople threw the blame on the mistake of a scribe; but the Greeks would not accept this explanation. The emperor, however, interposed by remarking that it did not matter what the Latins might say or boast among themselves, if they would forward the pacification of the church; that he hoped to see the expression in question, and any other faulty language, amended in the general council; and at length the Latin envoys appeased the outcry by withdrawing the offensive words.

The project of a conference with the Greeks afforded Eugenius (as we have seen) a pretext for ordering the translation of the council from Basel to Ferrara; and, as the breach

became wider, each party used the most strenuous efforts to secure the expected visitors. Missions were sent by both to the emperor and to the patriarch; rival funds were raised to meet the expenses of the Greeks, and for this purpose the council engaged in a sale of indulgences; rival fleets were hired at Venice and Marseilles, and were despatched for their conveyance; and it was not without difficulty that the emperor was able, by threats and absolute prohibitions, to prevent these from fighting within sight of Constantinople, as the pope's admiral, his nephew cardinal Francis Condolmieri, declared that he was instructed to sink and destroy the ships of the council's fleet. The two legates vied with each other in offers of money, although the patriarch Joasaph protested that, if the Latins were allowed to pay the expenses of the Greeks, these would be unable to maintain their independence. But the pope's emissaries (among whom was Nicolas of Cusa) were perhaps less scrupulous in intrigue than their opponents, and succeeded in gaining their object. On the 29th of November 1437, the emperor and the patriarch, with twenty-two bishops and a great train of ecclesiastics, set sail on board the Venetian ships provided by the pope. The patriarch, in defiance of the remonstrances of his clergy, took with him the precious gold and silver vessels of St Sophia's; the emperor and his court were splendidly equipped at the cost of the church's treasures, which he had seized for the purpose; and, with a view to controversial use, the theologians were furnished with a large collection of books. By those who expected no good result from the expedition, an earthquake which occurred immediately after the emperor's embarkation, two days earlier, had been regarded as a token of the Divine anger. After a tedious voyage, varied by occasional landings and residences on shore, the Greeks—more than 500 in all—arrived at Venice on the 8th of February, and were received with much splendour, although the ceremony was somewhat marred by rain. The magnificence of the great trading city appears to have impressed them as deeply as in an earlier age the companions of Henry Dandolo had been impressed by the glories of Constantinople: "Of it," says a Greek, "I suppose the prophet to speak, 'God hath founded it upon the seas, and prepared it upon the floods'." The riches of St. Mark's church were seen with a strong and peculiar interest, as being derived in great measure from the plunder of the Byzantine sanctuaries in that crusade which for a time had subjected the east to Latin emperors. On the other hand, a Greek tells us that the Venetians crowded to the religious services of the strangers, declaring that, so long as they had not seen Greeks, they had supposed them to be barbarians, but that they now knew them to be the firstborn of the church, and that the Holy Spirit spoke in them. At Venice, the Greeks became fully informed of the hostility which had arisen between the pope and the council of Basel. Their first inclination was to join the council, while the doge advised them to remain at Venice, so as to hold the balance between the parties. But at length they decided on accepting the pope's invitation, partly in consequence of the advice of cardinal Cesarini, who happened opportunely to pass through Venice after having forsaken Basel for Ferrara. The emperor wrote to the council of Basel, exhorting its members to join the new assembly.

On reaching Ferrara, it was found that there were deep questions of etiquette to be settled, as, indeed, the Greeks had in some degree been already apprised. The emperor was received by Eugenius standing, and, after having kissed his hand, was about to throw himself at his feet, when the pope prevented the act, and seated him at his own left hand, which the emperor reverently kissed. But the patriarch, who had declared at Venice that he would deal with the pope only as an equal in rank—as a father, a brother, or a son, according as their respective ages might determine,—was told, both on the way and by a deputation which greeted him on his arrival, that he would be required to kiss the pope's foot. His natural indignation at this was increased by the fact that the members of the deputation were not, in his opinion, of sufficient dignity to be employed by the pope on such a commission. Long and lively discussions arose; but at length the patriarch, by firmly refusing the degrading obeisance, was able to get himself excused. More, however, remained behind. The patriarch was told that he could not be allowed a higher rank than that of the cardinals, who (it was

said) took precedence even of the western emperor; and, although he had hoped that his own sovereign might receive from the spectacle of the pope's grandeur a wholesome lesson as to the relations of the spiritual and the secular powers, he was not prepared for this. At the solemn reception in the church of St. George, and afterwards at the sessions of the council, while the pope occupied the central seat, the emperor of the *Romaeans* (as he was styled), who had supposed the place of highest dignity to be due to himself, was seated at a lower level, in a chair corresponding to the vacant chair of the western emperor, and the patriarch was on an equality with the cardinals. At every possible point, and on every possible occasion, the battle of ceremony was renewed, to the irritation both of the eastern clergy and of the emperor.

The council had been opened by the cardinal-legate Albergati on the 8th of January, and the pope had been at Ferrara from the 27th of that month. But the Greeks were much disappointed by the scanty numbers of the assembly, and it was agreed that an interval of four months should be allowed to pass before the beginning of the formal sessions, in the hope that, by dispatching envoys to the princes of the west, the council might induce these to send representatives. The Greeks, in the meanwhile, indulged in the fancy that the fathers of Basel were to be added to those of Ferrara.

While waiting for the result, the emperor withdrew to a monastery some miles from the city, where he devoted himself to sporting in a style which both injured the cultivators of the soil and disgusted the owner, the marquis of Ferrara.

During this delay the ecclesiastics who were at Ferrara engaged twice a week in skirmishes on the points in dispute between the churches, and for these encounters twelve champions were selected on each side. Among the Greeks, the most eminent were Marcus Eugenicus, archbishop of Ephesus, and proxy for the patriarch of Antioch, and Bessarion, archbishop of Nicaea—both lately promoted to the episcopate, with a view to the discussion with the Latins.

Contrary to the usual custom of the Greeks, the emperor would not allow laymen of high rank to take any part in the disputation,—professing that such matters were for ecclesiastics only, but really from a wish to keep the management in his own hands, and to make the clergy answerable for any failure. Among the Latins, the most conspicuous disputants were cardinal Julian Cesarini and John, provincial of the Dominicans in Lombardy. It is said that the saintly Bernardine of Siena, by prayer for the Divine assistance, was enabled to dispute fluently in Greek, without any previous knowledge of the language. The roughness of Mark of Ephesus contrasted so unfavourably with the graceful and persuasive oratory of Cesarini, that it was sometimes necessary for the Greeks to substitute Bessarion as their advocate; yet Cesarini's copiousness was sometimes found to be wearisome, and Syropulus (who probably expresses the opinion of his countrymen) tells us that, although the cardinal was the more eloquent, the archbishop of Ephesus was the stronger and the more solid. Cesarini endeavoured, as at Basel, to employ hospitality as a means of conciliation and persuasion, but when the patriarch became aware of this, he forbade his clergy to accept the cardinal's invitations. The difficulties of language were smoothed by the skill of Nicolas Secondino, a native of Negropont, who interpreted the speeches on both sides.

The Latins supposed the Greeks to be heretical on no less than fifty-four points; but the chief subjects of discussion were limited to four—(1) The procession of the Holy Ghost; (2) purgatory; (3) the use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist; and (4) the primacy of the pope. But the Greeks felt that they were not at liberty. The emperor, in his zeal for union (or rather for the material gain which he expected from union) kept a strong hold over them. No one was allowed to leave the town without a passport; and measures were taken to prevent them from privately returning to Constantinople, and for the severe punishment of any who should make the attempt. A plague broke out, and alarmed them greatly, although the sufferers were almost exclusively either Latins or followers of the patriarch of Russia, Isidore, a Greek by birth, who reached Ferrara in August, with a great train of horses. A rumour that

the sultan Amurath was about to attack Constantinople excited them to press for immediate aid; but all that the emperor's importunity could obtain from the pope was a promise of two small vessels—a promise which was never fulfilled.

But more than all other distresses, that of subsistence pressed heavily on the Greeks. They had been annoyed by finding that, instead of an allowance in money for this purpose, rations were doled out to them; but now the supply became irregular, and the reason of this was not to be mistaken. The allowance fell more than four months into arrear, and applications or complaints were treated with rudeness. Many were obliged to sell their property, and even to pledge their clothes, for the sake of food. The pliant were supplied, while the more stubborn were reduced to misery by hunger, and when they had thus been brought to concession, they were rewarded with money and provisions.

The first question which was debated was that of purgatory. As to this, the Latins maintained that, while souls free from stain, such as those of the saints, go immediately after death into bliss, and while the souls of those who die in mortal sin go into eternal torments, the intermediate class—the souls of those who have repented, and have died in the enjoyment of the church's rites, yet whose sins, committed after baptism, have not been fully done away with in this life,—must undergo a cleansing by purgatorial fire, which will be longer or shorter according to the character of their guilt; that in this state they may be assisted by masses and alms; and that, having been thus purified, they will enter into the happiness of the saints. The Greeks, on the other hand, held that purgatory is not a place of fire, but that its suffering consists in darkness, gloom, and exclusion from the Divine presence.

On this subject the discussion was long protracted, and the arguments of Mark and Bessarion, on the Greek side, were fused into a treatise by Gemistius, under whom both the archbishops had formerly studied.

The first regular session of the council was on the 8th of October, when disputants were chosen by each side, and Bessarion made a long speech, to which the archbishop of Rhodes replied at similar length at the next meeting. At the third session, the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit was brought forward. The discussion turned mainly on the question whether the article of the procession from the Son were an addition to the creed, of such a kind as to contravene the decree of the general council of Ephesus, which had forbidden the making of any new creed other than that of the Nicene council—or whether (as the Latins contended) it were merely a legitimate explanation. On this question the dispute was carried on until the fifteenth session (Dec. 8), without any approach to agreement. The Latins were unable to trace the interpolation higher than the age of Charlemagne, although, they produced a canon of a council at Toledo, anathematizing all who should refuse it; and they wished to discuss the article on its merits. To this the Greek emperor was willing to agree, as were also Bessarion and the primate of Russia; and the great majority of the assembly voted for it, although the patriarch objected that, as the Latins were obstinate on the question of the verbal addition, they would probably be found yet more intractable on the question of the truth of doctrine.

At the fifteenth session, the pope signified his intention of transferring the council to Florence. For this the prevailing sickness gave a pretext, although it had already begun to subside. But the Greeks, supposing that the translation was intended as a means of bringing them more under the pope's control, made vehement objections; some of them, among whom was Mark of Ephesus, attempted to abscond. The emperor endeavoured to soothe them; the pope told them that in consequence of the occupation of his territory by Piccinino, he was deprived of the means of entertaining them, but that they might be assured of receiving splendid hospitality from the Florentines. As their allowance was now five months in arrear, this argument told powerfully on them; and when they consented to the removal of the council, they were rewarded by the payment of a part of what was due to them. On the 16th of January 1439, the pope left Ferrara in state—the marquis of Ferrara holding his rein; the Greeks followed, although unwillingly; and, after having been exposed to some dangers on

the way, through the disturbed state of the country, they reached Florence on the 13th of February, and were received with great demonstrations of honour.

Early in March the debates as to the procession of the Holy Ghost were resumed; and the question was now discussed on its merits. The decision, however, was to rest on the authority of the Greek fathers only, as the Greeks refused to know anything of the Latin ecclesiastical writers. But there was much suspicion as to some of the authorities which were produced on the Latin side. And a fierce dispute was carried on as to a passage of St. Basil; for the Greeks asserted that this was corrupt in the copies used by the Latins, and, although they admitted that the text was the same in some copies at Constantinople, they said that the best manuscripts were without the words on which the Latins relied.

While the Latins were united among themselves, differences of opinion became manifest among the Greeks, and a jealousy which had early appeared between the archbishops of Ephesus and Nicaea broke out into violent quarrels. Mark of Ephesus was vehement in the assertion of the Greek doctrine, and declared that all who held the double procession were not only schismatics but heretics. Bessarion was more artful and more conciliatory, maintaining that the difference between the churches was one of expression only—not of doctrine,—and drawing distinctions of meaning between the prepositions which had been used in speaking of the procession. The two became excited. Bessarion spoke of Mark as possessed and mad—an imputation which was seconded by a rumour industriously spread; while the archbishop of Ephesus retorted by styling his opponent a bastard and an apostate, and at last withdrew from the sessions.

The pope reproached the Greeks for wasting their time. The emperor exerted himself in all possible ways to put a pressure on the divines of his church. The system of withholding supplies was employed anew and with increased effect; money, skilfully given when the receivers had been reduced to actual hunger, exercised a powerful influence on their opinions; nor was more direct bribery wanting. Under these various influences, the labours of the council for union made progress. The twenty-fifth and last session was held on the 24th of March, when the emperor summed up the discussion on the question of the procession by saying that the Greeks had their creed from Scripture and the ecumenical councils, without addition or diminution, but that the Latin addition was agreeable to the teaching of the Scriptures; that, as the Greeks would not receive the addition, and the Latins refused to alter it, he would leave the pope to devise terms of union; otherwise the Greeks would return home.

Ten representatives of each side were appointed to draw up a form of union; and after much lively argument and the rejection of many proposed schemes, a definition was at length agreed on—being framed in Latin by Ambrose Traversari, head of the Camaldolite order, and rendered into Greek by Bessarion. (1.) The question as to the procession of the Holy Ghost was compromised on the ground that the Greeks, by speaking of Him as proceeding from the Father, did not exclude the Son, but only intended to guard against the opinion which they had supposed the Latins to entertain, of the Spirit's proceeding as if from two Principles; and that, as the Latins disavowed this, the two churches really held the same truth under different forms of expression. (2.) As to the question of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist, it was decreed that the sacrament may be consecrated in either kind, and that each of the churches may retain its own custom. (3.) It is affirmed that souls whose sins have not been fully expiated in this life are purified by purgatorial pains after death, and that they may be aided by masses, prayers, alms, and other works of piety; but as to the nature of purgatory nothing is defined against the opinion of either church. (4.) The Roman pontiff is declared to have the primacy of the whole world, as being the successor of St. Peter, who was chief of the apostles and true vicar of Christ; and that to him, in St. Peter, was given by the Saviour "full power of tending, directing, and governing the church, according as is contained both in the acts of the ecumenical councils and in the sacred canons." The other patriarchal sees—Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem—were to hold the same order as of old, "to wit, with all

their privileges and rights preserved.”

Although, however, the substance of the definition was settled, there remained irritating questions of form. Was the name of the emperor or that of the pope to stand first? Was the pope alone to be mentioned, or were the other patriarchs to have a like honour? And for two days the conclusion was delayed by a dispute whether the word “all” should be inserted in the reservation of the rights of oriental patriarchs. The pope was able to carry the question of precedence over the emperor, and the word “all” was at length conceded to the Greeks.

The patriarch Joasaph, who had throughout exerted himself in favour of union, died after a long illness on the 10th of June; and the Greeks became more eager than before to return to their own country.

By degrees all the Greek bishops were brought over with the exception of Mark of Ephesus, who had procured, through the emperor’s brother, a promise that he should not be compelled to sign the definition, and should be sent home in safety. “Then we have done nothing at all,” was the pope’s remark, on being informed of this exception.

Some important ecclesiastical officers were compelled, after much reluctance, to subscribe—a compulsion which they felt as an especial hardship, because they had not been allowed to vote. Among these was the chronicler of the council, Syropulus, “great ecclesiarch” (or chief sacristan) of the church of Constantinople, who satisfied his conscience by resolving to do penance, or to retract at some future opportunity. At last the definition, which ran in the name of pope Eugenius, with the “consent” of John Palaeologus and of the representatives of the eastern patriarchs, was completed by the subscriptions.

On the 6th of July—little more than a week after the day on which the council of Basel had pronounced Eugenius to be deposed,—his triumph over the Greek church was celebrated in the magnificent cathedral which he had lately consecrated. All Florence kept holiday in honour of the great occasion. A vast multitude thronged the building, and looked with curiosity and reverence on the rich attire of the Greek prelates—unaltered from the early ages of the church. The definition of the council was read in Latin by Cesarini, and in Greek by Bessarion, and was received with general acclamations. The representatives of the churches embraced each other; the Greeks kissed the pope’s knees and hand, and the act of reconciliation was followed by a solemn mass, at which the Greeks were astonished to see the pope drink the eucharistic wine through a tube.

But very soon fresh differences arose. Varieties as to ritual and other matters—among them, as to the practice of divorce—were brought forward and discussed. It was found impossible to solve in a satisfactory manner the question as to the invasion of eastern sees by Latin bishops. The Latins, having secured the victory, treated the Greeks with contempt, and when it was proposed that they should in their turn attend a Greek mass, the pope insulted the Greeks by requiring that the service should previously be rehearsed before himself or the cardinals. Moreover the Greeks still found themselves annoyed and distressed by delays and hindrances as to the payment of their allowance.

The pope wished to have the refractory archbishop of Ephesus made over to him for correction; he desired that the Greeks should elect a patriarch at Florence, and recommended for their choice the Latin patriarch, as a man who, in addition to other qualifications, was wealthy, and so far advanced in years that his riches might be expected to fall in no long time to the church. But the emperor replied that the Latins had nothing to do with the case of Mark, who, if faulty, ought to be judged by his Greek brethren; and that the patriarch must be chosen in the imperial city by the votes of the whole province, and must be consecrated in the church of St. Sophia.

On leaving Florence, the Greeks found fresh cause of complaint as to the manner in which they were conveyed homewards; for as to this the pope’s engagements were very imperfectly observed. At Bologna some of them lodged in the same inn with some English envoys, who were on their way to the papal court. The Englishmen asked what had been done

in the council; and on being informed of the result, they remarked, to the disgust of the Greeks, who had been boasting of its entire success, that, if there were no agreement as to the words of the creed, as to the doctrine of the procession, or as to the use of the eucharistic bread, the pretended union did not deserve the name. Already some of those who had conformed began to show repentance and shame. At Venice, where the bishop of Heraclea was compelled by the emperor to celebrate a Greek mass in St. Mark's, the words of the double procession and the prayer for the pope were omitted. At Corfu and elsewhere there were displays of the dissatisfaction which had been called forth by the late concessions; and at Constantinople a storm of execration and reproach arose, such as in an earlier age had greeted the representatives of the eastern church on their return from the second council of Lyons. The churches were deserted, although, in compliance with the popular feeling, the prayer for the pope and all mention of the union were suppressed. Even the emperor's own name was in some churches omitted from among those commemorated in the diptychs. The vacant patriarchate was refused by the bishops of Heraclea and Trebizond, who, with professions of deep remorse, retracted their late compliances with the Latins. There was an attempt to elect the stubborn champion of eastern orthodoxy, Mark of Ephesus, to the vacant see, although he himself refused to concur. Metrophanes, bishop of Cyzicus, who accepted the office, found that the people turned their backs on his benediction. The emperor's brother Demetrius, who had refused to subscribe the union at Florence, and had withdrawn from that city in anger, raised against John the standard of earlier orthodoxy. Bishops and others withdrew from the patriarch's communion, and high officials of the church—among them the "great ecclesiarch" Syropulus—resigned their offices, while Metrophanes endeavoured by violent means to enforce the union, ejecting bishops and others who opposed it, and even invading the jurisdiction of other patriarchs.

In 1443 the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem held a council, at which, by a slight change in his name, Metrophanes was stigmatized as a murderer of his mother, the church. They denounced the council of Florence, and declared the patriarch, with all metropolitans, bishops, and others intruded by him, to be deposed; and, emboldened by living under the rule of Mahometan sovereigns, they threatened the emperor with the extreme censures of the church if he should continue in his heterodoxy. Some of the Greek prelates went so far as to address a friendly letter to the Hussites, urging them to union with the Greek church, as the means of withstanding the common enemy.

The attempt to unite the churches by such sacrifices as those to which the Greeks had submitted at Florence, had drawn forth no effective help from the west; and the increased alienation which resulted from its failure tended to accelerate the ruin of the Byzantine empire.

The primate of Russia and the archbishop of Nicaea had been promoted to the cardinalate, in order at once to reward their past services and to secure their influence for the maintenance of the union. But the hopes which were thus rested on them were disappointed. Isidore, on returning to Russia, found that the prince, Basil, upbraided him at the public service of the church as a traitor to the orthodox cause, and that the clergy rejected him. He was even imprisoned in a monastery, and was glad to make his escape to Rome, whence he was afterwards sent to Constantinople as representative of pope Nicolas V. The more prudent Bessarion, declining either to resume his Asiatic see or to accept an appointment by the emperor and the synod to the patriarchate of Constantinople, remained in the west to enter on a new and brilliant career.

From Florence Eugenius, in April 1443, translated the council to Rome; and, about a fortnight after his return to that city he reopened the sessions in the church of St. John Lateran. Before leaving Florence he had received into communion some representatives of the Armenian church, and, to complete the supposed reunion of Christendom, he now received deputies (real or pretended) of the Copts, the Jacobites, the Maronites, and the Chaldeans,

even Prester John, whose seat had been fancifully transferred to Ethiopia, was reported by the pope to have ambassadors on their way to the council. But in the case of these remoter Christians, as in that of the Greeks, it soon appeared that the reconciliation was unsubstantial.

Eugenius had projected an expedition against the Turks in favour of his imperial ally. The Germans, English, and French were so deeply engaged in their discords at home, that no help could be expected from them as nations, although adventurers both from France and from Germany joined in the enterprise. Julian Cesarini, who had been promoted to the episcopal cardinalate of Frascati, was commissioned to exert his eloquence for the sacred cause in Hungary and Poland, and readily gained Ladislaus, an ambitious young prince, who reigned over both of these countries. A great army was collected; and at its head, under Ladislaus, was John Huniades, a general already famous for his skill in war; while arrangements were made for the co-operation of the Byzantine emperor, of the famous George Castriot, or Scanderbeg, and of fleets from Venice and Genoa. The crusaders (on whom the cardinal was careful to impress the religious character of their expedition by regular masses, preaching, and other exercises) advanced as far as Sophia, the Bulgarian capital, and gained two considerable victories, which were celebrated by a triumph at Buda. The Turks sued for peace on terms highly favourable to the Christians; and Ladislaus concluded with them a ten-years' truce, which was ratified by oaths on the sacred books of both parties. During these negotiations the cardinal had kept silence, although visibly annoyed by the course which they took. But before the conference was ended, he received tidings of the expected allies, which seemed to open a prospect of greater successes. Carried away by enthusiasm, he urgently represented to the king that the Turks had not fulfilled all their stipulations; that an engagement made with infidels without the papal sanction was of no force. He declared that, by the pope's authority, he absolved the crusaders from their oaths; and he vehemently reproached a Polish bishop who opposed the breach of faith. To these unhappy suggestions Ladislaus listened; and, with a force greatly weakened by the withdrawal of the French, the Germans, and others, who had supposed the campaign to be at an end, he again, in defiance of warnings, advanced into Bulgaria. But on reaching Varna, where the auxiliary fleets had been expected, it was found that, instead of these, sultan Amurath appeared at the head of an overwhelming force, which had been conveyed into Europe by Genoese ships; furious on account of the late perfidy, and even, (it is said) calling on the Saviour to avenge the dishonour done by His worshippers to His name. In the engagement which followed, the victory seemed for a time to incline to the side of the crusaders; but their impetuosity proved fatal to them. About 10,000 were slain—among them, king Ladislaus, who fell while charging the janissaries. The fate of Cesarini is more mysterious, and is related in various ways. The most probable story seems to be, that, in fleeing from the field, he stopped to give his horse water, and, while so employed, was killed by robbers, who stripped his body naked, and left it to be recognized by some of his followers.

In Bohemia, the result of the battle of Lipan had thrown the chief power into the hands of the Calixtines, among whom Rokyczana was now the most prominent leader. The Orphans were broken up as a party, and the remains of them were divided between the Calixtines and the Taborites, while the Taborites, although weakened, were still considerable, and continued their extreme opposition to the Roman system, both in doctrines and in the externals of religion.

During the years which immediately followed, we read of frequent conferences between various Bohemian parties, between Sigismund and the Bohemians, of communications with the council of Basel, of contests as to modifications of opinion, and of formularies drawn up with a view to peace. The national feeling was strongly displayed in the terms which the Bohemians wished to prescribe to Sigismund as a condition of receiving him for their king; and, not content with the compromise by which the use of the Eucharist in both kinds had been allowed to such adult persons as should desire it, they wished to enforce this manner of reception throughout the kingdom, and insisted on the necessity of administering the

sacrament to infants.

In October 1435, Rokyczana was elected archbishop of Prague by a body of persons chosen as representatives of all classes. But Sigismund refused to confirm the election unless on terms to which Rokyczana would not submit; and the discord became worse than before.

On the 5th of July 1436, the *compactata* were accepted by the Bohemians in a great assembly at Iglau, where all estates of the kingdom appeared in the presence of Sigismund, who was seated on a lofty throne in the market-place. On the conclusion of the agreement, Philibert of Coutances, as chief legate of the council of Basel, intoned the *Te Deum*; there were loud acclamations of joy from the multitude, while Sigismund and many others expressed the same feeling by tears; and the general rejoicing was displayed in bell-ringing, bonfires, and feasting. All ecclesiastical censures were remitted, and the emperor agreed to accept Rokyczana as archbishop of Prague. But on the following day, when a service of thanksgiving was performed, the peace was again disturbed by Rokyczana's administering the communion in both kinds at an altar of a church where the bishop of Coutances was at the same time celebrating mass in the usual Roman fashion. This act, done in a building which did not belong to the utraquists, was alleged to be in excess of the liberty allowed to them by the late agreement, and fresh differences arose in consequence.

In the same month Sigismund, after a formal negotiation, was accepted by the Bohemians as their king. But he was not disposed to fulfil loyally some of the conditions which had been imposed on him. He refused to confirm the election of Rokyczana unless he would submit to the church in all things, including the question of the chalice. The bishop of Coutances, who had been requested to remain while the other legates returned to Basel, acted as administrator of the vacant see, performing the episcopal functions and zealously exerting himself to re-establish the Roman system. The old priests returned, and refused to give the sacrament to the laity except in one kind; the canons were restored in the cathedral, and the orders of monks and friars began to reappear. On the other hand, Rokyczana was reported to have said that he would not accept institution from the legate, forasmuch as every priest had the same authority with bishops. On both sides there were complaints that the late agreement was not observed. Rokyczana, irritated at the course which things were taking, denounced the monks in a sermon as devils, and talked of shedding blood. On being informed of this, the emperor, who had been already provoked against Rokyczana by other stories of violent language, and by unfounded suggestions of treasonable designs, burst out into words which seemed to threaten the preacher's life; and Rokyczana for a time withdrew from Prague.

The council of Basel refused to sanction the election of Rokyczana, whom it regarded as the author of the late troubles; it also refused to allow the communion of infants, as being contrary to the *compactata*, and the use of the vernacular language in the epistles, gospels, and creed. But at the thirtieth session a decree was passed by which, while it is declared that the faithful laity, or clergy other than the consecrator, are not required by the Lord's command to receive the eucharistic cup; that under each kind Christ is contained whole and entire, and that no one ought without the church's sanction to change the traditional custom of communicating in one kind only—the council yet allows that the mode of administration is left to the church's discretion, and that to those who worthily communicate in either way, the sacrament is profitable for salvation.

The death of Sigismund, in December 1437, left Bohemia in confusion. His endeavours to get Albert of Austria elected as his successor had been fruitless; and when Albert was now chosen, on condition that he should observe the articles of Prague, the *compactata*, and all Sigismund's other engagements, the more violent Hussites set up in opposition to him a boy of thirteen—Casimir, brother of the king of Poland. Bohemia was invaded by a Polish army, in concert with Casimir's Bohemian supporters; but the battle of Zelenic, in July 1438, established Albert on the throne. Within little more than a year, however, the death of Albert plunged Bohemia into a long anarchy. About four months later, the emperor-king's widow

gave birth to a son, who received the name of Ladislaus. The Bohemians, unwilling to have an infant for their sovereign, offered the crown to duke Albert of Bavaria and to the emperor Frederick; but both declined it, and by Frederick's advice the young Ladislaus was acknowledged. After the death of the prince's mother, in December 1442, Frederick undertook to act as his guardian and as regent of the kingdom; but Bohemia continued to be distracted by the rivalries of religious and political factions. The breach between the council of Basel and the pope added to the discords of the Bohemians. The chapter of Prague adhered to Eugenius, while bishop Philibert was with the council, to which he owed his commission as legate. The Bohemians were angry because the council had done nothing for the vindication of their orthodoxy, and because Rokyczana and other elected prelates were unable to obtain consecration. When Philibert had been carried off by pestilence, in June 1439, the antipope Felix and the council nominated Nicolas von der Leiter, a native of Prague, as archbishop; but he failed to gain an entrance to the see. On the other hand, Rokyczana, although on the death of Albert he returned to Prague and recovered his power, was unable to obtain the pope's acknowledgment as archbishop; and in his exasperation at this, he behaved with great violence towards the partisans of Rome—even denying them Christian burial.

At a meeting at Kuttenberg, in October 1441, where about three hundred priests were present, Rokyczana produced a confession of twenty-four articles. In this document the administration of the eucharist in both kinds, the communion of infants, the use of the vernacular language in divine service, and the lawfulness of marriage for the clergy, were maintained; while at the same time it acknowledged seven sacraments, transubstantiation, the elevation of the host, and other points of Roman doctrine and ritual. In opposition to this, the Taborites (who had refused to attend at Kuttenberg) produced at a conference in 1443 a confession of fifteen articles, in which two sacraments only were acknowledged, and they condemned the doctrine of purgatory and the use of images, with all belief of a spiritual presence in the eucharistic elements, which they regarded as mere signs, unentitled to any reverence. At this conference, which was opened at Prague, and was afterwards continued at Kuttenberg, Przibram, who had been reconciled with Rokyczana, vehemently attacked the Taborites, whose opinions were more and more tending to what was styled picardism—a denial of all sacramental grace. The conference (in which Nicolas the bishop and Coranda were prominent on the Taborite side) was the last public disputation in which the Taborites took part. The result of it was to disclose more clearly than before the width of the difference between the parties. In the following year, a diet at Prague declared for the eucharistic doctrine of Rokyczana and Przibram, and rejected that of the Taborites, who found that their influence rapidly sank. The towns which had been theirs gave themselves up, one by one, to clergy of the Calixtine party, and a few years later the Taborite doctrine was confined to Tabor itself.

As the council of Basel declined, Eugenius rose higher in his pretensions. The French king had acknowledged him in 1441, and in 1444 the alliance was cemented by the appointment of the dauphin, Lewis, to be the standard bearer of the church. To the request of the Germans that a new general council might be called, the pope answered that there was no need of such an assembly, as a general council was already sitting under his own presidency at Rome, to which he had translated it from Florence, and to deny its authority was to attack the catholic faith. He offered, out of complaisance to the emperor, to ask this venerable body whether a new council were needed; but with the Germans he could settle nothing until they should have given up their neutrality—a thing unknown to the faith of Christ.

It seemed as if a decided breach were near; but Frederick hoped to come to an understanding with the pope by means of a new agent whom he had lately taken into his service, Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini.

Aeneas Sylvius was born at Corsignano, in 1405, of a Sienese family, which could trace its nobility to a great antiquity, but had become grievously impoverished, so that in early life

he was obliged to take a share in the labours of the field. He had studied law at Siena, but without becoming fond of it, as he preferred the classical literature of Greece and Rome, in which the famous scholar Filelfo was his teacher. He attended the council of Basel, at first as secretary to cardinal Capranica, from whose service he afterwards passed into that of other masters. He had been employed by the council in important affairs; among them was a mission to Scotland, in the course of which he went through some adventures which curiously illustrate the state of Great Britain in those days. He had also cultivated literature, and had produced, among other things, a Latin tale of adulterous intrigue, in which he has imitated the moral tone of Boccaccio perhaps more successfully than his skill in narrative. His manner of life had been lax; but he excused this on the plea that he was not yet in the higher orders of the ministry.

At Basel his abilities, and his determination to make his way by means of them, became conspicuous. After the return of his last patron, cardinal Albergati, to Italy, his eloquence won for him an important position in the council, and he displayed much zeal in its cause and in that of the antipope Felix. His diplomatic skill was employed in persuading the Hungarians to release Albert of Austria from an oath by which he had pledged himself that he would not accept the empire. He became secretary to the antipope, and in that character was sent to the emperor Frederick, who flattered his literary vanity by the title of laureate, and invited him to become his secretary. Having with difficulty obtained a release from the antipope's service, Aeneas accepted the office, and, professing to have overcome the levities of his former years, he was now ordained as subdeacon, deacon, and priest. In politics he became for a time a pupil of Caspar Schlick, one of the most eminent men of the age, who filled the office of chancellor under three successive emperors; and in no long time he found himself able to direct the policy of Frederick.

In 1445 Aeneas was employed by Frederick on an important mission to the pope. His enmity to Eugenius had been notorious; and as he was believed with reason to be especially obnoxious at Rome,—indeed, the pope had forbidden his approach,—his kinsmen at Siena entreated him to venture no further. But Aeneas went on to Rome, and was able to gain an interview with the pope, to whom he addressed himself very skilfully. He avowed his past hostility to Eugenius, but pleaded ignorance as his excuse for an offence in which he said he had shared with cardinal Cesarini, with the archbishop of Palermo, and other eminent persons. He professed to have learnt at the imperial court to take truer views than before, and to have welcomed his mission to Rome as holding out a hope of reconciliation with the pope. He entreated forgiveness, and at the same time intimated an opinion that his value was such as to make it expedient to treat him with consideration. Eugenius saw the importance of attaching to himself a man so able and so full of resources; and, although he did not welcome the emperor's request that he would summon a council in some German city, he skilfully impressed on the envoy that his position was one in which he might do much for the protection of the truth and for the good of the church.

In the same year, Eugenius, supposing himself to have nothing to fear from the emperor, issued orders for the deposition of the archbishops of Treves and Cologne, who had taken part with the council of Basel, and as electors of the empire had supported the neutrality of Germany; and in their stead he nominated two ecclesiastics of the Burgundian connexion. But instead of awing the Germans, this proceeding against prelates so high in dignity, and so powerful both by their office and by their family connexions, endangered his hold on Germany. The archbishops kept possession of their sees, and in March 1446 met their brother-electors at Frankfort, where a general spirit of defiance was manifested. The electors declared that unless Eugenius would withdraw the deposition of the archbishops, accept the decrees of Constance and Basel as to the authority of general councils, and appoint a council to be held in some German city in the spring of the following year, they would conclude that he wished to suppress for ever the holding of general councils, and they would thereupon summon one

by their own authority, or join the party of the antipope. An oath of secrecy was taken as to these terms; but the emperor, who had been informed of them without being bound by an oath, disclosed them to his secretary, who saw in the circumstances of the case an opportunity for exerting his political skill. The emperor had told the envoys of the Frankfort meeting that he disapproved of the deposition of the archbishops, but that the princes had done wrongly in assuming judgment over the pope and in threatening to forsake him. He now sent Piccolomini and others to the Roman court, with instructions to bring the pope, if possible, by peaceful means to revoke the deposition.

Of the secretary's colleagues in this mission, the most remarkable was Gregory Heimburg, who is described as the most eminent among the Germans for eloquence and legal learning—a man of fine person, but rough in manner and careless of his appearance, whose sturdy German patriotism regarded the Italians with dislike and contempt. The bearing of Gregory, and the tone of his language in expressing the resolution of the German princes to hold together in opposition to the papal assumptions, were new to the Roman court; while in Gregory his acquaintance with that court excited feelings of strong aversion and of injured national pride. But his more politic Italian companion used his opportunities differently, and privately assured the pope that, if he would reinstate the archbishops and would accept the decree of Constance as to the regular assembling of general councils, all Germany would abandon its neutrality. The pope, instead of giving the ambassadors a reply, dismissed them with a promise that he would answer by letter; and Piccolomini was followed in his return to Germany by an invitation to become papal secretary.

At Ulm, Piccolomini joined Caspar Schlick and others, who had been sent by the emperor to a meeting of the German princes at Frankfort. The council of Basel had sent representatives, headed by the cardinal of Arles, but the imperial ambassadors interfered to prevent the cardinal from having his cross carried before him as legate, and from pronouncing his benediction. On the pope's side were Nicolas of Cusa and Carvajal; but Thomas of Sarzana, bishop of Bologna, who had been expected as the chief representative of Eugenius, was unable to appear until later. Six of the seven electors were resolved to declare for Felix, if Eugenius would not consent to an agreement; but the emperor's policy aimed at dividing the electoral college.

The story of the late mission to Rome was told by Gregory Heimburg, who, according to Aeneas Sylvius, reported all the harsher part of the pope's sayings, and left out all that was more favourable. He represented Eugenius and the curia as irreconcilably hostile to the Germans, and indulged in strong and telling sarcasms on the cardinals, especially Bessarion, whom, on account of his beard, he spoke of as an old he-goat. In order to correct the exaggerations of his colleague, Piccolomini addressed the assembly; and when taunted with the inconsistencies of his past career by the cardinal of Arles and another of the Basel party, he replied that it was not he, but the council, that had changed. The secretary, however, did not trust to his eloquence alone, but made large use of bribery in the emperor's interest; and, although the archbishop of Mayence was not to be personally corrupted, a distribution of 2000 florins among his counsellors proved effectual. The archbishop expressed to Piccolomini the difficulties which he felt as to the manner of withdrawing from his engagements with the prelates of Treves and Cologne and with other electors; whereupon Piccolomini took the statement of terms which had been drawn up on the part of the electors, and by "squeezing out all the venom" (as he expresses it) skilfully reduced them to such a form that they might give no offence to the pope, while they might yet be subscribed by the electors as expressing their intentions. The document thus ingeniously altered was readily accepted by the majority of the electors, while the duke of Saxony, the archbishop of Treves, and the archbishop of Cologne, although dissatisfied, made no opposition.

On reaching Rome with these proposals, the German ambassadors found that the clergy of the papal court were against them. It was said that the church was sold, that the Romans

were led, like buffaloes, by a ring through the nose. The cardinals in general (although profuse in their hospitalities to the strangers) objected to the sacrifice of annates and of patronage of ecclesiastical dignities, and to the scheme for assembling general councils at regular intervals. The pope, they said, ought to be rich and powerful, in order that he may be able to protect prelates, to make peace between princes, to combat unbelief, and to extirpate heresy; there had never been so many heresies as in the time before Sylvester, because then the papacy was poor, and therefore disregarded. To this the Germans replied that they did not wish to reduce the pope to poverty, but to provide for him by less objectionable means; and Eugenius found it necessary to overpower the opposition of the cardinals by threatening to add to their body. Four new cardinals were actually created—among them, Thomas of Sarzana, bishop of Bologna, and John Carvajal, a Spaniard, who had been among the pope's chief agents in the late negotiations.

In the meantime the state of the pope's health, which had long been weak, became so alarming that the ambassadors hesitated to treat with him in the condition to which he was reduced. But Piccolomini urged on his colleagues that their obedience should be professed to Eugenius, as another pope might be less favourable, and even a new schism might break out; and John of Lysura said that it would be enough if there were life in the smallest toe of the pope's left foot, although all his other members were dead. The ambassadors were admitted to his bedchamber, where they found him still wearing an air of dignity, but evidently dying. The terms were agreed on—chiefly that the pope should accept the decrees of Constance in general, and especially that which related to the assembling of general councils; that he should sanction such of the Basel decrees as had been accepted by the Germans under the emperor Albert, until a legate who was to be sent into Germany should be able to make other arrangements; that the archbishops of Cologne and Treves should be reinstated on acknowledging Eugenius as the true vicar of Christ; and that all who had taken part in the proceedings of Basel should be forgiven on submission. On these terms the Germans consented to give up their neutrality, and adhered to Eugenius; they undertook that the emperor should withdraw his safe-conduct from the council of Basel, and should bring other potentates to do the like.

The result of the negotiations was proclaimed at a great public assembly, and there were demonstrations of joy such as were usual for the celebration of an important victory. Rome enjoyed a general holiday; bells were rung, bonfires blazed, music resounded about the streets, relics of especial sanctity were displayed; the mitre said to have been given by Constantine to Sylvester, which Eugenius had lately acquired, was carried in procession from St. Mark's to the Lateran, and at night there was a brilliant illumination. But on the day after the conclusion of the peace the pope's illness increased. He had executed four bulls for the purpose of carrying out the agreement; and by a fifth, which was grounded on the impossibility of fully considering all things in his sickness, he declared that nothing in the agreement should infringe on the privileges of the church.

It is said that Eugenius, in reliance on a prophecy made to him in early life by a mysterious hermit, believed that the end of his papacy was at hand; but he resolutely held out against the approach of death, and when the last sacraments were offered to him by Antoninus, archbishop of Florence, he said that the time was not yet come, and that he would give notice when it arrived. He took leave of the cardinals in a long speech, expressing satisfaction at the reconciliation of the church, and urging that the work should be carried out. The safety of the church, he said, would depend on their agreement among themselves. But when asked to recall the cardinal of Capua, whom he had banished, he refused: "Ye know not what ye ask; it is best for you that ye should be without him, and for him that he should be in exile." One of the pope's chamberlains, who has left an account of his last hours, speaks much of the humility and penitence which he displayed. Among his latest sayings was the expression of a regret that, instead of becoming cardinal and pope, he had not died in the safer

www.cristoraul.org

condition of a simple monk. His death took place on the 23rd of February 1447, sixteen days after the conclusion of his agreement with the Germans.

CHAPTER III.
FROM THE ELECTION OF POPE NICOLAS V TO THE DEATH OF PAUL II.
A.C. 1447-1471.

EUGENIUS, a few days before his death, had decreed that the regulations of the council of Basel as to the choice of a pope should be of no effect, but that the election should be conducted according to the laws enacted by Gregory X at the council of Lyons and by Clement V at the council of Vienne. In accordance with this decree, the cardinals met in conclave at the church of St. Mary sopra Minerva, on the 4th of March. But before that meeting an attempt to effect a revolution in the government of Rome had been made by Stephen Porcaro, a man of much literary culture, eloquent, popular, and connected by familiar friendship and correspondence with some of the most eminent among his contemporaries. Porcaro's mind had been inflamed by his classical studies with an enthusiastic desire for the restoration of the ancient republican government. He disdained the career of public office, in which he had held honourable employments under the last two popes; and, not content with the respectable dignity of a knightly pedigree, he affected to trace his descent up to the ancient Roman Porcii. Believing that the opportunity for action had come, he addressed the common council of the people when it was assembled in the church of Ara Coeli, after the death of Eugenius, denouncing in vehement language the indignity and disgrace that the children of the Scipios should submit to the yoke of priestly dominion. But, although there were some who would gladly have acted on such words, others recalled to memory the anarchy which had followed on the expulsion of Eugenius, and the citizens were held in check by the fear of Alfonso of Naples, who had occupied Tivoli and other places in the neighbourhood, and had assured the cardinals of his protection and assistance in case of need. The business of the conclave was therefore allowed to proceed, under the guardianship of the ambassadors of certain princes—amongst whom Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini appeared as representing the emperor.

The names of Capranica, Carvajal, and Prosper Colonna were brought forward, and on the afternoon of the third day it seemed as if Colonna were likely to be elected by the method which is termed *access*. The bishop of Bologna was about to vote for him, when his own name (for which some votes had been given in the morning) was suggested by the archbishop of Taranto; and it was accepted by all as that of the only one among the cardinals who was not obnoxious to any party.

The new pope, Thomas Parentucelli, was the son of a physician, and was born in 1398 at Pisa, although he was commonly styled after his mother's birthplace, Sarzana. He had studied at Bologna, and had acquired such a reputation that Aeneas Sylvius speaks of his knowledge as universal, and declares that whatever was hidden from him must be beyond the knowledge of man. Having early lost his father, and having been unkindly treated by his stepfather, he had in his youth been compelled to struggle with difficulties. But he was drawn forth from obscurity by the patronage of cardinal Albergati, in whose household he spent twenty years; he had distinguished himself in disputation with the Greeks at Ferrara and at Florence; he had been employed in important missions, such as that which was sent into Germany for the purpose of breaking up the league of the electors; and within eighteen months he had become bishop, cardinal, and pope. In grateful remembrance of his patron, Nicolas Albergati, he took the name of Nicolas V.

Nicolas is described as a man of small and spare person, as affable and unassuming, quick in temper but easily pacified; as sparing of expense on himself, but liberal to others, and munificent in his encouragement of literature and art. Aeneas Sylvius blames him for too great

confidence in his own judgment, and for disregard of the opinion of others. Although moderate in his general policy, he was zealous for the interests of the Roman see, and was bent on recovering for it, if possible, the privileges which had been assailed by the councils of Constance and Basel. When asked by Piccolomini to confirm the agreement which his predecessor had made with the Germans, he expressed himself with moderation and good sense—that the bishops of Rome appeared to him to have extended the borders of their garments too far, by leaving no jurisdiction to other bishops; while, on the other side, the council of Basel had too much shortened the pope's hands; that, for himself, he did not intend to deprive the bishops of their rights, but trusted that respect for the rights of others would be found the best means for the preservation of his own.

Piccolomini, on whom Eugenius had intended to bestow the bishopric of Trieste, received this reward of his labours from Nicolas, and returned to Germany, carrying with him a written confirmation of the late agreement, and resolved to work out the pope's design.

In June 1447 a meeting was held at Bourges, where Charles of France presided, and the archbishop of Treves represented his brother electors of Cologne, the Palatinate, and Saxony. It was agreed between the French and the Germans that no regard should be paid to the authority of either the council of Basel or that of the Lateran, although it was explained that by this nothing was intended against the observance of such decrees as had been accepted either in France or in the empire; that the king should urge the dissolution of both assemblies, and should request pope Nicolas to summon a new council for the following year, in compliance with the decree of Constance.

In July a diet was assembled at Aschaffenburg, where cardinal Carvajal appeared as legate, while Piccolomini acted at once as a servant of the emperor and of the pope. The question of a provision for the pope, which had been proposed at the council of Basel, was adjourned for discussion until the next diet, unless in the meantime it should have been settled by an agreement with the legate; and Carvajal took advantage of the interval to procure the emperor's assent to a scheme which was greatly in favour of Rome. Instead of receiving a compensation, the pope was to resume the practices of annates and reservation, on terms almost the same which had been allowed by the council of Constance, except that, instead of the alternate patronage of certain dignities, he was to have the presentation to such as should fall vacant in the alternate months of the year. By this concordat, the *acceptata* of Mayence were set aside, and Germany became again subject to those burdens against which she had for thirty years been struggling, and from which she had for a time appeared to have gained a deliverance. This triumph of the papacy was chiefly due to the art of Piccolomini, who not only swayed the mind of Frederick, but, by an unscrupulous use of bribery in the form of privileges, patronage, exemptions, and the like, induced the reluctant electors to sacrifice the interests of the national church to their own private advantage.

Nicolas in the end of 1447 proclaimed a crusade against the antipope, and authorized the French king to seize his territories. But such measures were happily not needed in order to the extinction of the schism. The submission of the Germans to Eugenius and his successor involved an abandonment of the council of Basel. The emperor, therefore, signified to that assembly that he withdrew his protection from it, and charged the citizens of Basel, under penalty of the ban of the empire, to harbour it no longer. By this the remaining members found themselves obliged to join the antipope at Lausanne; and at a meeting held at Lyons, between cardinal Allemand, as president of the council, and envoys from the kings of France, England, and other princes, it was agreed that Felix should submit to his rival. The antipope, whose supporters had fallen away from him until he found himself acknowledged only in his own duchy of Savoy, declared to the remnant of the council that, for the sake of the church's peace, he resigned his dignity; the eight cardinals of Felix's party then affected to choose Thomas of Sarzana to the papacy; and the assembly, after having lasted nearly eighteen years, formally dissolved itself. By a wise moderation on the part of Nicolas, all the sentences of

Eugenius against the council were revoked. Amadeus was made cardinal-bishop of Sabina, with the first place in the sacred college, and a commission as legate for Savoy and Piedmont; and his adherents were allowed to retain their dignities. The most prominent of these adherents, cardinal Allemand, not only continued to enjoy the archbishopric of Arles, but was able so entirely to atone for his offences against the papacy that he eventually received the honour of beatification from pope Clement VII. Amadeus himself returned to the cheerful seclusion of Ripaille, where he died in 1450 or the following year.

In his political conduct, and especially with regard to the other Italian powers, Nicolas showed himself sincerely desirous of peace; nor did he allow himself to be entangled in a contest for the duchy of Milan, which became vacant by the death of the last Visconti, Philip Mary, in 1447. Philip Mary had bequeathed his power to Alfonso of Naples; but the emperor claimed the duchy as a fief, which had lapsed to the empire through the extinction of the Visconti; while Charles of Orleans advanced pretensions which were supported by the king of France, and the Milanese themselves favoured Francis Sforza, a condottiere, who had married an illegitimate daughter of the late duke, but had alienated the jealous nature of Philip Mary by the growth of his power and renown. A war of two years and a half was concluded in February 1450 by a peace which established Sforza in possession of the duchy.

Throughout his earlier life, Nicolas had been distinguished by his love of literature; and his elevation enabled him to foster by the authority and by the wealth of the papacy the studies to which he was devoted. The time was one of extraordinary intellectual movement. Already men of letters were held in high consideration by the princes of Italy, who were proud to entertain them at their courts, and in some cases endeavoured to acquire for themselves the reputation of learning and mental accomplishments; and, under the republican government of Florence, they found such encouragement from the chief families (among which the Medici were now rising into pre-eminence) as to make that city the headquarters of the literary revival. Nicolas himself had lived there in the train of pope Eugenius, and had been intimate with the most eminent scholars. His own patronage of literature, as has been remarked, was not the condescension of a prince, but showed the interest of a genuine lover of books. He invited men of learning to settle at Rome; he collected manuscripts wherever they could be found; even the great calamity which in his pontificate befell Christendom through the Turkish conquest of Constantinople was turned to advantage in this respect, as fugitive scholars brought with them to Italy such books as each could rescue, and Nicolas employed agents to search in Greece for remains of ancient literature. The study of Greek, which had been revived in the preceding century, became now so popular in Italy, that even ladies of high rank are said to have been able to discourse in that tongue. Plato was introduced into the west by Gemisthus Pletho, and disputed the supremacy which Aristotle had long held in the schools. In the western countries, too, manuscripts which had lurked in monastic or other libraries were now brought to light, and revealed writings of classical authors which had been unknown for centuries. Through the works of Cicero and Quintilian the power of oratory rose into such estimation that Nicolas himself is even said to have partly owed his election to the admiration excited by his funeral discourse over his predecessor.

Under Nicolas the scanty library of the popes, which had accompanied them to Avignon and had thence been brought back to Rome (although not without considerable losses), was lodged in the Vatican, and was increased by 5000 manuscripts. The pope employed a large number of copyists in the multiplication of books—a work in which such labour was soon to be superseded by the art of printing, which at this very time produced its first-fruits. He engaged scholars of reputation to translate into Latin the writings of Greek classics and fathers; and a new version of the whole Bible, from the original tongues, was projected and partly executed.

Among the most eminent scholars of the age was Laurence Valla, born at Rome in 1406. About the year 1440, Valla produced his treatise on the ‘Donation of Constantine,’ a

masterly exposure of the forgery which, although not without occasional question, had been generally received for centuries. But Rome was no safe place for the author of such a work; and Valla secretly withdrew to Naples, where his critical spirit was exercised on the pretended correspondence of the Saviour with Abgarus, and on the common belief that the creed which takes its name from the apostles was formed by the contribution of an article by each of the twelve. For these writings he was arrested by the Inquisition, was condemned as a heretic, and would have been burnt, but for the intercession of king Alfonso. His entreaties that he might be allowed to return to Rome were disregarded by Eugenius; but Nicolas invited him, made him his own secretary, and furnished him with literary employment. To this employment Valla probably owed his preservation from sharing in fatal revolutionary schemes which might have been likely to enlist his sympathy; for, after having shown the worthlessness of the foundation on which the temporal power of the papacy had been made to rest, he had gone on to argue that no pretence of prescription could be admitted in behalf of that power, to exhort the Romans to rise against it, and to advise the popes themselves to abandon it. Valla was promoted by Calixtus III to a canonry of the Lateran church, and died in 1465.

Of the Greeks, Bessarion was distinguished above the rest, not only by his fame as a scholar, but by the dignities of cardinal and titular patriarch of Constantinople. He had acquired a perfect command of the Latin language, and had been able to adapt himself to the manners of his new society. For a time he administered the government of Bologna as legate with great success; he was employed on important missions, and at more than one election appeared likely to be chosen pope. He lived in splendour and bounty, and was regarded as the patron of the Greeks who had settled at Rome. His house was full of scholars, partly his own countrymen, and partly Latins who cultivated Greek literature; and, like Nicolas, he was a zealous collector of manuscripts, of which he bestowed a precious collection on the doge and senate of Venice.

The character of the new literary class in general was not without serious defects. They were too often without dignity or self-respect, indifferent to public interests, willing to bask in the patronage alike of popes, of republics, or of the princes who held in Italy a position like that of the ancient Greek tyrants; and they were always ready for the sake of advantage to transfer themselves from one patron to another. They were vain, greedy, quarrelsome, bitter in their mutual jealousies and envies, unsteady, unthrifty; and with their study of the classics they not uncommonly combined the morality of ancient paganism. Nor even in respect of literary value can their works claim the praise of originality; the minds of these scholars were exercised in the illustration and imitation of the ancients, without being able to produce anything of independent merit. And little did Nicolas and the other ecclesiastical patrons of the classical revival suspect that its results would be, on the one hand, to paganize the church, and, on the other hand, to produce a rebellion against its authority.

Nicolas was bent on renewing the splendour of his city. The whole of the Vatican quarter was to be rebuilt according to one grand plan, and in a style of unexampled magnificence. The venerable basilica of St. Peter, founded by the first Christian emperor, was to make room for a new structure, to be designed in the form of a Greek cross, and surmounted by a soaring cupola; and the work was begun by removing the ancient sepulchral chapel of Probus, at the further end of the church, in order to the erection of a new tribune, which had risen only a few feet above the ground at the time of the pope's death and was destined to be superseded by a yet more magnificent structure in the following century. Around the great church were to be grouped a palace, churches, convents, and a library, with porticoes, gardens, and a cemetery; and the rebuilding of the palace was commenced. The Pantheon was restored from a ruinous condition, and the destruction of ancient Roman monuments was checked. Many other churches of the city were restored; much was spent on repairs of the walls and on new fortifications of the Vatican quarter, with a view to protecting the popes against such tumults as that by which Eugenius had been driven from Rome; and in

many provincial towns—such as Orvieto, Viterbo, Fabriano, Spoleto, and Assisi—the short pontificate of Nicolas was marked by the erection of new and splendid public buildings. To him is also ascribed the introduction of a magnificence before unknown into the services of the church. Gold and silver plate in profusion, jewelled mitres, vestments, altar-coverings, and curtains inwoven with gold, attested the munificence of the pope and the sumptuousness of his taste.

The arts of painting and sculpture, as well as that of architecture, enjoyed the patronage of Nicolas. Under him the saintly Dominican John of Fiesole, styled Angelico, who had been invited to Rome in 1445 by Eugenius, adorned the new chapel of St. Laurence in the Vatican. But both literature and art were exotics at Rome, where the love of antiquity rarely took any other form than that of political republicanism. With the exception of Valla, no native Roman became prominent among the scholars of the time; the painters, the sculptors, the architects were brought from Florence; and while they found patrons in the popes and the cardinals, they met with no encouragement from the Roman nobles.

An attempt had been made in 1423 to celebrate a jubilee according to the calculation of thirty-three years, as that interval had elapsed since the first jubilee of Boniface IX. in 1390. This attempt, according to the expression of a chronicler, was “neither forbidden nor authorized” by Martin V, and it proved a failure. But in the pontificate of Nicolas, the term of half a century since the jubilee of 1400 was completed, and the pope took measures for celebrating the festival with the fullest effect. By some powerful persons, indeed, the pilgrimage was discouraged. Duke Henry of Bavaria told his people that forgiveness might be had of God in all places alike. The Teutonic knights of North Germany, wishing to prevent their subjects from taking a long journey which might have been hurtful to the interests of the brotherhood, refused to publish the bull for the jubilee; but they were afterwards glad to appease the pope’s anger by a present of a thousand ducats, in order that the indulgences of the jubilee might be dispensed by their own clergy to those who should give certain alms and perform certain devotional exercises in their own country. The unwonted security of the ways induced multitudes to flock to Rome, so that no jubilee since the first (that of the year 1300) had been so crowded or so brilliant. The pilgrims are compared to flights of starlings, to heaps of bees or ants, to the sand of the sea-shore; and such was the pressure one day on the bridge of St. Angelo, when the stoppage of a mule caused a confusion between those who were rushing to the display of the Veronica in St. Peter’s and those who were returning from it, that about two hundred were crushed to death, or forced into the Tiber and drowned.

The privileges of the jubilee were continued for some time after the end of the year, and the cardinal of Cusa was sent to dispense such graces in Germany. But, although he discharged this function with much success, it would seem that his own belief in their efficacy was not enthusiastic; for, on being asked whether a monk might go on pilgrimage without the leave of his abbot, he quoted pope Nicolas himself for the opinion that obedience is better than indulgences.

The wealth which the pope received through the jubilee contributed largely to support the cost of his buildings and of his encouragement of learning and of the arts. But at the very time when so vast a concourse was drawn towards Rome, a plague, which had raged with great violence in the north of Italy, reached the capital; and with the growing heat of the weather its virulence increased. Soon after midsummer, the pope withdrew, and with a party of scholars, in whose society he delighted, he shut himself up in one castle after another until the danger was over.

In 1452 Rome witnessed for the last time the coronation of an emperor. Frederick, whose territory and wealth were ill equal to the support of his great dignity, imagined that his authority might be enhanced by receiving the imperial crown according to the traditional usage, and, leaving disaffection and conspiracy behind him, he crossed the Alps with a small force. The cost of the expedition was in part supplied by the pope, in consideration of the

advantage which he had gained by the Vienna concordats. The days were past when the visit of an emperor was formidable to the Italians : “all before him”, says a contemporary writer, “had made some attempt to recover power; he was the first who gave up the hope.” Everywhere Frederick was received with honour, and was entertained at the expense of the cities through which he passed. He did not disdain to ask for safe-conducts from the local authorities; nor to gain some money by bestowing privileges of various kinds,—such as the dignities of count and knight, and even the degree of doctor or the office of notary. From an unwillingness to acknowledge Sforza, by whom he had been baffled as to the duchy of Milan, he declined his invitation to that city, alleging as his excuse the plague which had lately raged. The pope, who had been alarmed by prophecies and rumours, and by the remembrance of former troubles, had endeavoured to delay the emperor’s visit, but his objections had been overcome by the skill of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who had just been promoted to the bishopric of Siena; and Nicolas contented himself with providing against any danger from the Germans by strengthening the fortifications and the garrison of Rome. At Florence two cardinals appeared with the announcement that all was ready for the coronation, and required that Frederick, before entering the territory of St. Peter, should take an oath to the pope, which they represented to be prescribed by the Clementines, and by ancient custom. To this he truly replied that the oath had not been taken by Henry VII, that it was no older than the time of Charles IV, and that therefore the Clementine decree was of no force; yet he submitted to it at Siena, and bound himself by a second oath before entering the gates of Rome. At Siena the emperor was met by his intended bride, the princess Leonora of Portugal, who had been conducted from her landing in Italy by Piccolomini. On their arrival at Rome, Frederick was lodged in the Lateran palace, and thus had the opportunity for frequent confidential conversations with the pope by night. On the 16th of March the nuptials took place, and Frederick was crowned as king of Italy, although not with the ancient Lombard crown, but with that of Germany, which had been brought from Aix-la-Chapelle. And on the 18th, the anniversary of the pope’s own coronation, the imperial coronation was solemnized with a ceremonial which is minutely described by the chroniclers of the time. The emperor swore once more to support the Roman church, and, according to the traditional usage, he performed the “office of a groom” by leading the pope’s horse a few steps.

After a short visit to king Alfonso at Naples, where he was received with great magnificence, Frederick again spent three days at Rome; but whereas he and the Germans had pressed for a general council, to be held in Germany, he now allowed himself to be drawn into asking, by means of a long and eloquent speech delivered by Piccolomini before the cardinals, that a crusade might be undertaken. To this Nicolas, who well knew the emperor’s unfitness for the command of such an expedition, replied that he strongly desired a crusade, but that the other powers of Christendom must be consulted before anything could be determined.

Frederick, on his return to Germany, found that his coronation had not procured him any additional power. The Hungarians and Bohemians urged him to give up to them the young Ladislaus, whom he had carried with him to Italy, where attempts had been made to rescue the prince from his guardianship; and although the pope threatened them with excommunication, they extorted the surrender of their sovereign by force of arms.

The attempt of Stephen Porcaro to effect a revolution at Rome after the death of Eugenius IV has already been related. Nicolas, in accordance with his usual policy of conciliation, and in the hope of gaining this man, appointed him podestà of Anagni; but Porcaro’s restless spirit led him back to Rome, where, at the celebration of a popular festival, he again endeavoured to excite the multitude to throw off the papal yoke. In consequence of this he was banished to Bologna, where a liberal allowance was provided for him, but with the condition that he should every day present himself before the cardinal-legate Bessarion. By such restraint his republican zeal and his hatred of the hierarchical government were exasperated; he was in the habit of declaiming, with an application to himself, the famous

verses in which Petrarch had been supposed to have stimulated the energies of Rienzi. By correspondence with his relations and friends at Rome, he organized a conspiracy, which was to be carried out on the Epiphany, 1453, by forcing a way into the Vatican and setting the palace on fire, surprising the pope and cardinals while engaged in a solemn mass, and carrying off Nicolas, to be used as a hostage in order to obtain possession of the fortress of St. Angelo; after which a republic was to be established, with Porcaro at its head as tribune.

A few days before the time appointed, Porcaro, having excused himself under the plea of sickness from waiting on the legate as usual, made his escape from Bologna and joined his accomplices in Rome. But his absence was speedily discovered and reported to the papal government, while some of the conspirators also betrayed the design. Porcaro was arrested, and, after having in vain begged that he might be allowed to address the people, whom he expected to rise for his deliverance, he was hanged by night from a tower of the castle of St. Angelo. Many of his kinsmen and confederates—some of them brought from distant cities, where they had sought a refuge—were also put to death; and in order to suppress utterly the spirit which had projected the late plot, cruelty, and even treachery, were employed. Nicolas, deeply mortified by the ingratitude of the Romans, among whom much sympathy was displayed towards Porcaro and his associates, and perhaps affected by remorse for the late excesses of severity, became from this time reserved, melancholy, and distrustful. From having been accustomed to show himself familiarly in public, he rarely appeared, and was difficult of access; the gout, from which he had suffered since the time of his election, became more acute and was complicated by other disorders; and he sank into a rapid decay. To those who were admitted into his confidence he deplored the insincerity of men, declared himself to be miserable in his great dignity, and expressed a vain wish that he could again become Master Thomas of Sarzana.

Within a few months after the conspiracy of the Porcari, tidings of an overwhelming calamity were received from the east. The emperor John Palaeologus, alarmed by the discontent of his subjects, and finding little benefit from the alliance with the Latins which had been purchased by the concessions of Florence, had in his last years renounced the union of the churches. But his son and successor, Constantine, under the pressure of increased danger from the Turks, under Mahomet, the son of Amurath II, had again turned in supplication to the west, professing repentance, and offering to return to communion with the Roman church. The pope, after reproving the Greeks for their breach of engagements, expressed his willingness to receive them once more, and prepared to send some galleys to their assistance, while cardinal Isidore, himself a Greek, and formerly metropolitan of Russia, was commissioned to carry out the reconciliation. But although Isidore found some ecclesiastics and the higher laity ready to comply, the reunion was viewed with abhorrence by the great body of the clergy, and yet more strongly by the monks and female recluses; while the common people in the taverns uttered curses against it, and drank to the image of the blessed Virgin, imploring her aid against the Turks, and rejecting that of the Latins. And when, after the decrees of Florence had again been signed, a solemn thanksgiving was celebrated in St. Sophia's, the more rigid of the Greeks, disgusted by the introduction of Latin peculiarities into the service, avoided the great church as if it were contaminated, "like a Jewish synagogue". It was in vain that the more courtly party pleaded that their compliances were insincere, and were intended to last only until their country should have been delivered by the help of the Latins. The Greeks in general abjured the pope and his communion; and during the following Lent the clergy in the confessionals excited their penitents to oppose the union, and to refuse the sacraments and other rites at the hands of any who favoured it. So violent was the feeling against the Latins, that a great official declared that he would rather see a Turkish turban than a cardinal's hat in Constantinople.

Meanwhile Mahomet pressed more and more closely on the city, and on the 6th of April 1453 laid formal siege to it. The emperor, in his extremity, was obliged to despoil the

churches of their treasures for the payment of his foreign auxiliaries, with the promise of fourfold restoration: but the end was at hand. On the 29th of May—a day which had been determined by astrological calculations—the final assault was made, and the capital of eastern Christendom became the prey of the victorious Turks. The body of the emperor, who in his last days had displayed heroic qualities, was, after a long search, found beneath a heap of dead. Isidore, who for a time was supposed to have perished, escaped in disguise, and, after many adventures, was able to reach Italy in safety. Spoliation, destruction, profanity, far exceeding the outrages which had disgraced the Latin conquest of Constantinople, were committed, but might in the comparison have pleaded the excuse that the actors were not professedly Christians. The treasures of Greek learning were destroyed or dispersed; St. Sophia's, after having been the scene of gross profanations, was turned into a mosque; monasteries were given over to dervishes or to workmen of low occupations; the patriarch, George Scholaris (or Gennadius), who had retired to a monastery, but had continued to be the oracle of the party opposed to Rome, was chosen anew by some representatives of the Christian community, under an order of the sultan; and the churches of the city were shared between the Christians and the Mussulman conquerors, until this countenance of the subject religion was ended sixty years later by sultan Selim.

Among the sovereigns of the west, divided as they were by their own differences, and little interested in the Greeks, the loss of Constantinople failed to produce such a feeling as had been aroused by similar calamities in former days. The emperor Frederick wept, and again expressed his wish for a crusade; but he took no active measures. Philip, duke of Burgundy, who in power, wealth, and splendour was among the foremost princes of Europe, alone manifested a stronger zeal. At a great festival, held at Lille, a lady representing the church appeared before his court, seated on an elephant led by a giant, and in a versified speech entreated assistance. The herald of the Golden Fleece then brought in a live pheasant, richly adorned with jewels. The duke delivered to him a paper containing a vow "to God, the blessed Virgin, the ladies, and the pheasant", that he would succour the church in her distress; and he was followed by his son Charles, count of Charolois, by the duke of Cleves, and a multitude of nobles and knights, who all in like form pledged themselves to the holy enterprise. But instead of carrying out this vow as he had intended, the duke found himself obliged, in consequence of the enormous cost of the Lille festivities, to break up his household for a time, and to travel in Germany and Switzerland, where he still endeavoured to promote the cause of the crusade.

To Nicolas the loss of Constantinople appeared in all its importance. Not only had the Byzantine empire fallen, but its ruin drew after it that of many lesser Christian principalities in the east; and the insatiable ambition of Mahomet seemed to design nothing less than a conquest of all Christendom. In the end of September 1453, the pope sent forth a bull, in which he declared the founder of Islam to be the great red dragon of the Apocalypse, and, after dwelling on the conquest of Constantinople by Mahomet II and his designs against western Christendom, he exhorts all princes, by the remembrance of their baptismal and coronation vows, to take arms in behalf of the faith. Indulgences are promised, both for personal service and to those who should furnish soldiers. The pope binds himself to devote to the cause all the payments which he should receive for institution to sees and other benefices; he requires a tenth from the clergy, and he charges the Christian world to maintain peace within itself. But the popes could not now rouse all Europe for a war against the infidels, as at an earlier time.

Piccolomini was employed to stir up the princes of Germany, while John of Capistrano, an Observant friar, whose eloquence was unequalled among his contemporaries in its sway over the popular heart, was sent into the same country as a preacher of the new crusade. But although Aeneas Sylvius employed his powers of persuasion in diets at Ratisbon (where Philip of Burgundy appeared) at Frankfort, and at Neustadt, he found that the Germans were animated by a feeling of distrust, which arose out of the late sacrifice of their ecclesiastical

liberties. It was supposed that the pope intended, under pretext of the crusade, to get money for himself; and reproaches were cast on Nicolas for having spent large sums on needless fortifications, while he allowed the capital of the east to fall into the hands of the infidels. But Piccolomini represents himself as so far successful, that the diet of Frankfort, in October 1454, promised to raise 10,000 horse and 32,000 foot for a crusade in Hungary.

The death of Nicolas, which took place on the 24th of March 1455, for a time checked these attempts. In his last hours he called around him the cardinals, and took leave of them in a long address, recounting the chief events of his papacy, his acts, and his designs. He dwelt on the authority of the Roman see, he exhorted them to love and maintain the church, and, after bestowing his blessing on them, he expired.

Fifteen out of the twenty cardinals met for the election of a successor. It seemed as if Bessarion were about to be pope; but some members of the college, who felt his strictness of character as a reproach of their own laxity, objected that it would be a reflection on the Latin church if they should elect a Greek neophyte, who had not yet shaved off his beard; and the choice April 8, fell, by way of access, on Alfonso Borja or Borgia, a native of Valencia, who took the name of Calixtus III.

Borgia had been a student and a professor in the Spanish university of Lerida, and was esteemed the greatest jurist of his time. Even when pope, he retained in his mind all the details of ecclesiastical and civil law, and took pleasure in answering legal questions. He had received preferment from his countryman Benedict XIII., and was afterwards employed by Alfonso of Aragon in negotiating for the extinction of the schism which Benedict had attempted to perpetuate. For this service Martin V rewarded him with the bishopric of his native city. He became Alfonso's most trusted counsellor; and, having been sent by him to Eugenius IV, while resident at Florence, he was induced by Eugenius to attach himself to the papal court, and was raised by him to the dignity of cardinal. Perhaps his advanced age—seventy-seven—may have contributed to promote his elevation to the papacy.

Calixtus despised the elegant and costly tastes of his predecessor, whom he openly blamed for having spent on manuscripts and ornamental things the money which might have been employed in a war against the Turks. Buildings which Nicolas had begun were suspended, and the materials which had been collected for them were dispersed. To the holy war Calixtus devoted himself with a zeal which was second only to his regard for the interest of his family. Immediately on his election he recorded a solemn vow to employ all possible weapons, spiritual and temporal, against the Turks. He sent forth a bull, summoning the nations of the west to serve for half a year from the 1st of March 1456. Every day at noon the bells of all churches were to be rung, and all Christians were at the sound to pray for the success of the crusade. He freely spent the treasures which Nicolas, notwithstanding his munificent expenditure, had left in the papal coffers. He even alienated jewels and other church property for the purpose of aiding the crusade. He entered into correspondence with the oriental enemies of the Turks, in order to secure their co-operation. He equipped a fleet against the enemy, and sent aid to Scanderbeg, the chief who for a quarter of a century kept up an incessant warfare against the Turks among the mountains of Albania. Legates were sent into all countries, to appease the quarrels of Christian princes and to animate them for the holy war, while hosts of friars were commissioned to carry out a like work among the people.

In this John of Capistrano especially distinguished himself. The Turks, under Mahomet, laid siege to Belgrade; but there they encountered the valour and conduct of John Huniades, and John of Capistrano, by his eloquence, collected a force of 40,000 for the defence. These were, indeed, an undisciplined and rudely-armed multitude, as the nobles, with very few exceptions, held aloof from the enterprise; but the generalship of Huniades and the exhortations and prayers of the friar, controlled and animated them; and after a siege of forty-six days the Turks were driven off with great loss. But the nations of the west, instead of taking from this success a warning to unite for the common cause of Christendom, were

encouraged by it to think themselves secure from danger, and were confirmed in their apathy.

Charles of France forbade the publication of the pope's bulls within his dominions, lest the crusade should deprive him of strength which he needed against the English; but he allowed a collection of a tenth for the expedition. By some universities, and by a portion of the clergy, an appeal was made to a general council against the new impost; but the university of Paris, which had taken the lead in this movement, afterwards submitted to pay, with the understanding that the money should be regarded as a pious aid, and that it was given for once only. Alfonso of Aragon and Sicily promised to assist, but, after having got the crusading tithe into his hands, he turned it against the Genoese, whom he described as the Turks of Europe; and other princes limited their assistance to words. But in Germany, where Carvajal was legate, a vehement spirit of opposition was manifested. The Germans not only thought that they had been defrauded by the concordat of Vienna, but complained that the terms of that agreement had been violated. They talked of insisting on a pragmatic sanction; they cried out that they had been sufficiently drained of money under the pretext of crusading tenths, in order to feed the pope's rapacity. Some of them ventured to question whether the papacy had been founded by the Saviour; and there were threats of setting up a king of the Romans in opposition to the emperor, whose neglect of the duties of his station was loudly censured. Piccolomini, whose services to the papacy had been rewarded successively by the bishoprics of Trieste and Siena, and whose views became more and more papal as he rose higher in ecclesiastical dignity, exerted himself indefatigably for the crusade. He wrote letters, attended diets, and made speeches in a tone which contrasts remarkably with that of his earlier acts at Basel. In 1456 he was sent to convey the assurance of the emperor's obedience to the new pope, when he took the opportunity to deliver an eloquent oration in favour of the holy war, and his late exertions were acknowledged by his promotion to the cardinalate. In answer to the mutterings of Germany, Calixtus himself wrote to the emperor that all the money which had been collected was spent on the war, and that more was needed; he did not hesitate to say that the observance of concordats depended wholly on the pope's grace, although he condescended to add that for his own part he would observe them. And Piccolomini, who was probably the author of the pontifical letter, told the archbishop of Mayence, in his own name, that there could properly be no pact between a lord (such as the pope) and his subjects. In order to set forth his views of the relations between the papacy and the Germans, the cardinal wrote his book on Germany. In this he defends the conduct of the pope in the various questions which had arisen. He meets the charge of drawing money from the poverty of Germany by dilating on its wealth, as displayed in the principal cities. He contrasts the free cities of Germany, which owned subjection to the emperor alone, and enjoyed the greatest liberty anywhere known, with the Italian republics, such as Venice, Florence, and Siena, where all but the dominant few were alike slaves.

With the sovereign whose confidant he had formerly been, Calixtus was involved in serious difficulties. Alfonso, being without lawful issue, had procured from pope Eugenius a document, by which his son Ferdinand was legitimized, and was declared capable of holding the highest offices. And this privilege had been confirmed by Nicolas, so as distinctly to make Ferdinand capable of succeeding to the Neapolitan crown, which Alfonso, regarding as his own acquisition, intended to bestow on his son, while the hereditary kingdom of Aragon was to fall to his own brother John. Calixtus, however, although he had been himself Alfonso's agent in the negotiations with Eugenius, refused to confirm this —declaring that Ferdinand was not only illegitimate but supposititious, and that the consent of Eugenius had been got by surprise and under false pretences. On Alfonso's death, in 1458, the pope claimed the kingdom as a fief which had lapsed to the Roman see, forbidding the people to swear to any claimant, and absolving them from any oath already taken. It was believed that he intended to bestow the kingdom on his nephew Peter; while Charles, count of Viana, and John, a son of the old claimant Rene of Provence, on various grounds asserted pretensions to it. The

Neapolitans themselves, who desired to preserve the independence of their kingdom, were in favour of Ferdinand, who protested against the papal bull, and claimed to be king by the gift of God and by the consent of the Neapolitan estates.

The pope, old and gouty, spent much of his time in his sick-room, surrounded by friars, and by his three nephews, the children of his sisters. During the pontificates of Eugenius and of Nicolas, there had been no ground for complaint of undue family influence; but it was now found that the pope's kindred, with their partisans, who were invidiously styled the Catalans, engrossed all power, and an enormous share of office. The first cardinal made by Calixtus was his nephew Lewis John Milano, whom he appointed legate of Bologna. But his favours were yet more remarkably shown to his other nephews, Peter and Roderick Langol or Lenzuol, whose father, in honour of his marriage into a family more distinguished than his own, took the name of Borgia, and thus unwittingly gave occasion for the proverbial blackness of infamy which has become attached to that name. Among the offices heaped on Peter Borgia (who remained a layman) were those of vicar of Benevento and Terracina, captain of St. Angelo, prefect of Rome, and standard-bearer of the church; together with the dukedom of Spoleto, to which (as we have seen) it was supposed that the kingdom of Naples was to be added. The younger brother, Roderick, at the age of twenty-two, was raised to the college of cardinals, in disregard of the remonstrances of its most eminent members; he was appointed chancellor of the Roman church, legate of the Marches, and was loaded with ecclesiastical benefices. Under the administration of these nephews Rome fell into a frightful state of disorder; justice was corrupted, robbery and murder were unpunished.

Before the quarrel as to Naples had time to come to a height, Calixtus died, on the 6th of August 1458. Immediately the Roman populace, instigated by the Orsini, broke out into insurrection against the Colonnas and the Catalan party, of whom some were killed and some were committed to prison. The prefect, Peter Borgia, was driven to take flight, and, after having with difficulty escaped down the Tiber, made his way to Civita Vecchia. But in the course of his escape he was seized with a fever, of which he died in the harbour of that place, leaving his wealth to swell the treasures of his brother Roderick.

On the 16th of August, eighteen cardinals met in conclave, Capranica, whom his experience and his merits had appeared to mark out as worthiest of the papacy, had died during the solemnities of the late pope's funeral. Barbo, Estouteville, and Calandrino were brought forward, but after several scrutinies it appeared that no one had the necessary proportion of votes; and recourse was had to the method of *access*. Roderick Borgia, chancellor of the church, then stood forward, declaring himself for the cardinal of Siena; and on him—Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini—the choice of the electors fell. Bessarion, in the name of those who had voted for the French cardinal, expressed their high sense of the new pope's worthiness, and said that the weakness of his health was the only reason why they had refrained from voting for him at a time when bodily energy seemed to be necessary for the office. With an allusion, as it would seem, to the favourite Virgilian epithet of Aeneas, Piccolomini took the name of Pius, which had before been borne by only a single pope, and at a date so remote as the second century.

Of all the cardinals, Piccolomini was the most widely famous. He had served many masters, had been engaged in opposite interests, and had been trained by a vast experience of affairs. His character was not saintly, or in any way elevated; he represented the literary culture of his time, but, above all things, he was a politician. Political dexterity, variety of accomplishments, eloquence, tact, personal fascination, were the gifts by which he had risen, and on which he relied. Six years before, as he was descending the Ciminean range, near Viterbo, in attendance on Frederick, who was then on his way to the Roman coronation, the emperor had foretold to him the dignity which he had now attained. The election was popular among the Romans, who were weary of the Catalan domination; and the report of it was received with satisfaction by princes and others in foreign countries, to whom the new pope

was personally known.

At the election, the cardinals had entered into a capitulation in which there were some novel features. The future pope was bound to carry on the war against the Turks, to reform the curia, to secure a provision for the cardinals, to act by their advice, to choose them according to the decrees of Constance, without regard to the importunities of princes. Once a year the cardinals were to meet, in order to inquire as to his performance of his engagements; and they were authorized to admonish him in case of failure.

Pius was much attached to his native place, Corsignano, and to Siena, the home of his ancestors; and he showed to the Sieneese a favour which excited jealousy and animadversion. To this favour some cardinals owed their places in the college; even St. Catharine was indebted to it for her canonization. He raised the see of Siena to metropolitanical dignity, and enriched the church with relics and other gifts he made Corsignano a bishopric, under the new name of Pienza, and adorned it with a cathedral, a palace, and other buildings, which to our own day stand in remarkable contrast with the small size and scanty population of the town. But although he admired and sympathized with the tastes of Nicolas V., he did not venture to build at Rome, with the exception of some small restorations and improvements; and the hopes with which the literary class may naturally have looked to a pope who might be regarded as one of themselves, were disappointed in so far as concerned the direct encouragement of literature, although he bestowed many court-offices and benefices on men of learning. The war against the Turks engrossed his care, and left him no funds to spare for the patronage of arts or of letters. His personal tastes and habits were simple; he delighted in the pure air of the country, and intensely enjoyed the beauties of nature; and the rapidity of his movements disgusted the formal officers of the court, although these movements did not really interfere with his attention to the details of business.

Pius wisely abandoned his predecessor's policy as to Naples. He acknowledged Ferdinand on certain conditions, and sent a cardinal to officiate at his coronation; and the reconciliation was cemented by a marriage between a nephew of the pope and an illegitimate daughter of the king.

If the character of Pius was incapable of religious enthusiasm, he had yet many motives for continuing, in his new position, his endeavours to promote a crusade. The advance of the Mussulmans threatened Christendom and its civilization, and an energetic effort was required to oppose and to repel them; perhaps, too, Pius may have thought to restore the greatness of the papacy by the same means which had enabled former popes to place themselves at the head of the European nations. Within two months after his election, he sent forth an invitation to an assembly which was to be held at Mantua—a place selected as being convenient on the one hand for the pope, and on the other for the princes beyond the Alps. The meeting was not to be an ecclesiastical council, but a diet or congress of princes and so greatly was the imperial authority sunk, that no one questioned the pope's right to convoke such an assembly, or to assume to himself the presidency of it. He instituted an order of knighthood, named after "the blessed Virgin Mary of Bethlehem" for the intended enterprise; and on the 22nd of January he set out from Rome amidst the general lamentation (as he tells us) of his people. In order to assure the Romans, whose misgivings were aroused by the remembrance of the long sojourn of the popes at Avignon, he had decreed that, if he should not return, the election of his successor should take place nowhere but at Rome. When apprehensions were expressed that his enemies might take advantage of his absence to invade his territory, he answered that the temporal possessions of the papacy had often been lost and regained, but that if the spirituality should be lost, it could hardly be recovered. Although only fifty-three years of age, Pius was, prematurely broken in health; and he suffered severely from illness as he made his way over the frozen Apennines.

On arriving at Mantua, he found himself almost alone with his cardinals. A war was raging between the emperor and the son of Huniades, Matthias Corvinus, who had lately been

chosen king of Hungary; and it is probable that Frederick may have gladly availed himself of this as an excuse from paying homage to a pope whom he had long known as his own servant. He therefore did not appear in person, and the ambassadors whom he sent were so wanting in dignity and in ability that the pope sharply reproved him by letter for the deficiencies of his representatives, as well as for his absence. The French king, offended by the pope's policy as to Naples, declined the summons, and would not commit himself to the crusade. England was too deeply engaged in the wars of York and Lancaster to spare any force for the general cause of Christendom.

On the 1st of June, the pope opened the assembly. He expressed his disappointment at the scantiness of the attendance, which he contrasted on the one hand with the zeal which he himself had shown in despising the sufferings and the perils of the journey to Mantua, notwithstanding age, sickness, and the troubles which beset the Roman see, and on the other hand with the enthusiasm of the Turks in favour of their "most damned sect." And he dwelt on the ambition of the infidels, who had already made their way through Greece and Illyria into Hungary, and, unless checked, might be expected to overwhelm all Europe, to the ruin of the Christian religion. Disregarding the remonstrances which were pressed on him, and the reports which were studiously circulated that the assembly was a hopeless failure, he endeavoured to increase its numbers by addressing letters to the princes of Europe, in which he again earnestly urged them to appear at Mantua, or to send representatives. In consequence of these letters the congress gradually increased, but not to any great degree.

The duke of Burgundy, although he had been persuaded by his councillors to remain at home, sent a splendid embassy, with the duke of Cleves at its head, to express his willingness to fulfil his vow to the pheasant, if other princes could be induced to settle their mutual quarrels, and to unite in the cause of Christendom. The duke of Milan and some of the smaller Italian princes appeared in person; and at length, on the 16th of November, arrived a French legation, headed by the archbishop of Tours and the bishop of Paris.

On the 26th of September, the pope delivered a speech which lasted three hours; but, although it was much admired for its eloquence, it failed to raise any such enthusiasm as that which had vented itself in the *Diexlo volt* of Clermont. Of the cardinals who had accompanied him, Bessarion alone showed any zeal for the crusade.

Much time was wasted by the ambassadors of princes in discussing their mutual differences. The French, when asked what help might be expected from them, said that it was useless to speak of the subject while France was at war with England. To this the pope replied that the Hungarians would be destroyed by the common enemy before the French and the English were reconciled; and he suggested that both nations should contribute to the crusade in proportion to their numbers, so that the forces which remained at home might bear the same relations to each other as before. But this ingenious proposal failed to draw forth any promise of help. Of the Italian powers, some were persuaded to promise aid in money for three years; but the Venetians would promise nothing, and the Florentines afterwards disavowed the engagements which their envoys had made for them. The duke of Burgundy undertook to supply 6000 men. The Germans, after many difficulties had been raised by Gregory Heimburg, who represented the emperor's brother, Albert of Austria, and is described by the pope as having laboured to sow dissensions, were brought to renew the promise which they had made to pope Nicolas—that they would furnish 10,000 cavalry and 32,000 foot. But in order to carry out this, the sanction of two diets was necessary; and those diets the pope took it on himself to summon, while, in order to compensate for this invasion of the imperial rights, he declared the emperor leader and captain-general of the crusade, —a position for which Frederick was notoriously, and even ridiculously, unfit.

On the 19th of January 1460, the pope dissolved the congress by a speech in which he reckoned the promises which he had received as amounting to 88,000 men, besides the assurance of co-operation from Scanderbeg and others in Greece, and the confident

expectation of assistance from the enemies of the Turks on the east.

Before leaving Mantua, Pius sent forth a bull which from its first word is known by the title of *Execrabilis*, declaring an appeal from a pope to a general council to be punishable with excommunication, and, in the case of a university or of a college, with interdict. Although he tells us that he had consulted the fathers who were at Mantua, and had obtained their unanimous consent, this was nothing less than an assumption that he was entitled to overrule by his own authority the contrary decrees of Constance and Basel.

In the end of January the pope set out homewards, and, after some stay at Bologna and at Florence, and having suffered more severely than before on the frozen mountains, he reached Siena, where he was received with great rejoicings. The congress of Mantua had undeceived him in a great degree as to the prospects of a crusade; for instead of uniting the princes of Europe for the holy cause, it had served chiefly to bring to light their lukewarmness and their discords.

Pius was recalled to Rome by tidings of some disorders which had grown out of the remains of the Porcaro conspiracy and were suppressed with the capital punishment of the leaders. He arrived on the 7th of October, when he was received with a joyful welcome; and he soon after vindicated himself, in a speech of two hours before the popular council, against the charge of preferring the interests of Siena to those of the papal city.

With a view of stirring up the Germans for the crusade, and of effecting a reconciliation between the emperor and the king of Hungary, Bessarion was sent into Germany. But he was met by complaints that the imposition of a tenth by the pope's sole authority was contrary to a decree of the council of Constance; and the cardinal was so much irritated and disgusted by the turbulence of the Germans and by the backwardness of the clergy, that at leaving Vienna he gave his blessing with the left hand instead of the right.

At this time the German church was distracted by a contest for the primacy. Diether, count of Isenburg, had in 1459 been elected to the see of Mayence—not without bribery, according to his enemies, although this is strongly denied. Before confirming the election, Pius wished to bind him by engagements that he would not urge the assembling of a general council, and that he would not convoke the princes of the empire without the consent of the emperor, to whom such meetings were almost as unwelcome as general councils were to popes. Diether, with some difficulty, obtained a dispensation from appearing in person at Mantua; but his representatives at the congress submitted to a demand of 20,500 florins by way of first fruits on his appointment, and, as they were not provided with the money, they borrowed it of some Roman bankers. On these terms, and on their pledging him to appear at the papal court within a year, the pope's confirmation was granted. But the archbishop, on hearing of the affair, protested against the exaction, as being more than double the amount required of his predecessors, and as a violation of the late concordat, which Pius himself had negotiated; and, as he did not repay the loan, he was excommunicated at the instance of the creditors. This was, indeed, nothing more than a part of the regular process of some inferior court at Rome, to whose jurisdiction the matter of the debt belonged; and the pope disavowed all knowledge of the excommunication, while he justified the increase of the payment on the ground that it was destined for the crusade. But Diether maintained that the curia was in collusion with the money-lenders; and, in defiance of the late bull *Execrabilis*, he appealed to a general council. In Aug. 21, consequence of this appeal, a sentence of deposition was issued against him; and count Adolphus of Nassau, a canon of Mayence, was nominated by the pope to the see. The rivals fought, according to the usual German fashion, by their families, their dependants, and their allies, desolating the country which was the scene of their warfare, and utterly disregarding the common interest of the crusade. But at length Diether was brought to give up his pretensions to the archbishopric, on condition that he should enjoy for life certain towns, castles, and tolls, and that Adolphus should, at his own expense, procure his restoration to the church.

About the same time with the question of the German primacy, a violent quarrel as to jurisdiction, the collection of annates, and other subjects, arose between Sigismund of Austria, duke of the Tyrol, and cardinal Nicolas of Cusa, who ten years before had been appointed by pope Nicolas to the bishopric of Brixen, in preference to a candidate elected by the chapter. The duke ventured so far as to imprison the cardinal; whereupon the pope denounced him and his abettors by sentences of anathema and of other penalties, against which Sigismund appealed to a general council. A fierce controversy followed, in which the most conspicuous of Sigismund's partisans was the indefatigable enemy of the Roman court, Gregory Heimburg. Gregory was excommunicated in October 1460, but continued to employ against the papacy all the resources of his learning, acuteness, and unsparing sarcasm. Sigismund was absolved in 1564, through the mediation of the emperor, who is said, in his anxiety for the honour of his family, to have even thrown himself at a legate's feet. But Gregory Heimburg remained under excommunication, and during the following years he was found wherever there was an opposition to the papacy—with Diether at Mayence, with Albert of Austria when he besieged his brother Frederick in Vienna, with king George Podiebrad in Bohemia. At length, in 1471, feeling the approach of death, he submitted to the church, and entreated absolution; and thus the sturdy adversary of Rome died in outward peace with the papacy.

The frequent appeals to general councils forced on the pope's notice the inconsistency which was observed between his earlier and his later policy; and, in order to vindicate himself, he put forth, in April 1463, his "Bull of Retracting", addressed to the university of Cologne. In this he admits that he had said, written, and done many things which might be condemned; but he professes a wish, like St. Augustine, to retract the errors of his earlier years, rather than obstinately to adhere to them. He lays down strong principles as to the authority of the papacy, and desires that anything inconsistent with these in his writings may be rejected. "Believe an old man," he says, "rather than a young one, and do not make a private person of more account than a pontiff. Reject Aeneas; receive Pius : the former gentile name our parents imposed on us at our birth; the latter Christian name we took with our apostolic office." In order to show that this change of opinions had not been caused by his elevation, he enters into an account of his earlier career. At Basel his inexperience had been misled by the misrepresentations of cardinals and other persons hostile to Eugenius, and by the authority of the Parisian and other academics, to fall in with the general disparagement of the papacy. Thus, when he came to take an independent part in the council, it was in accordance with the spirit which prevailed there; and supposing the defections of Julian Cesarini and others to the council of Ferrara to have been prompted by a fear of losing their preferments, he remained at Basel and took part with the antipope. The emperor's refusal to acknowledge Felix staggered him; he passed into the service of Frederick, who, like the Germans generally, was neutral in the question of the papacy; and among the neutral party he learnt the falsehood of many of the charges against Eugenius. Still more, he learnt, by frequent conversations with Cesarini, who was then on his Hungarian legation, to see many things in a new light. He goes on to relate the course of his submission to Eugenius, and points out that until then he had been merely a clerk, without having proceeded even to the minor orders. Having thus explained his own career, he proceeds to dwell on the unity of the church, under the pope as its head; and he professes reverence for councils approved by the pope, whose sanction he considers necessary to their validity. Skilful as this apology is, perhaps its effect is rather to bring out than to justify the contrast between the writer's earlier and his later opinions.

With France the relations of Pius were not very cordial. He strongly desired the repeal of the pragmatic sanction of Bourges, which he spoke of to the French ambassadors at Mantua as a spot and a wrinkle deforming the national church, and a token of Antichrist's approach. And his bull *Execrabilis*, in censuring appeals to a general council, implied a condemnation of the pragmatic sanction. But so little were the French convinced by this vehemence, that in the following year the king's procurator-general, John Dauvet, put forth an answer to the pope's

speech, and appealed to the judgment of the universal church. The death of Charles VII., however, produced a change in this respect. Lewis XI., who had been on bad terms with his father, was inclined, out of hatred to the memory of Charles, to reverse his policy in this and in other matters. It is said that he looked on calmly when, at the late king's funeral, the bishop of Terni, as papal legate, insulted the memory of Charles and the reputation of the Gallican church by pronouncing an absolution over him for his concern in the pragmatic sanction; and he was persuaded by John Godefroy, bishop of Arras, a crafty politician, who conveyed to him the pope's blessing on his accession, that, by abolishing the sanction, he would do away with the influence which the great feudatories exercised in ecclesiastical promotion, and might reckon on getting the real patronage into his own hands. In the following year, the king sent Godefroy (for whom he and the duke of Burgundy had procured the dignity of cardinal) to announce at Rome the repeal of the pragmatic sanction. The tidings were received with great rejoicing. All work was suspended for three days; the city was illuminated, bells were rung, the streets were animated by singing and dancing, the sound of trumpets, and the blazing of bonfires; and copies of the obnoxious document were ignominiously dragged through the mud. The pope rewarded Lewis with a gift of a consecrated sword, which bore an inscription in verse, exhorting him to destroy the power of the Turks. But the hopes which the bishop of Arras had deceitfully held out, that the pope would declare for the Angevine interest as to Naples, were utterly disappointed. Pius offered nothing more than to arbitrate between the claimants; and he at once began to exercise his new privileges in the patronage of French dignities. Lewis in his anger was disposed to recall his late concession; and he found it had produced an indignation which he had not expected in the parliaments and in the universities of France, among the nobles and among the citizens, who regarded it as a sacrifice of the national honour. In 1467, under the pontificate of Paul II, when the king's confidant, cardinal Balue, produced before the parliament the royal letter by which the sanction was repealed, John de St. Romain, the king's procurator-general, opposed the registration of it, which was necessary to give it the force of law; and, on being threatened by the cardinal with the royal displeasure, he replied that he would rather lose his office than do anything which might endanger his soul, his sovereign, and his country. The parliament cried out that within three years 3,000,000 of gold crowns had been drawn from France by the papal court. Lewis expelled the pope's collectors, and seized the temporalities of those cardinals who held sees or abbacies in France. Without formally retracting his late act, he proceeded as if the pragmatic sanction were still in force; and this state of things continued throughout the reign.

Notwithstanding the discouragement which Pius had received as to the crusade, he was still bent on that enterprise. After the gradual extinction of the smaller Greek principalities, the work of resisting the Turks was chiefly left to the king of Hungary on the lower Danube, and to the indomitable Scanderbeg in Albania. But frequent communications were brought to Rome, as if from eastern princes, who offered to co-operate in vast force, if the Christians of Europe would attack the Turks on the west. And in 1461 a great sensation was produced at Rome by the arrival of Thomas Palaeologus, brother of the last Byzantine emperor, and formerly lord of the Morea, who had been driven from Greece, and brought with him from Patras, the traditional place of St. Andrew's martyrdom, a head which was said to be that of the apostle. The pope had eagerly entered into treaty for this venerable relic, and succeeded in obtaining it against the competition of many princes. It was brought with much ceremony from Ancona, where Palaeologus had left it, was met at Narni by Bessarion and two other cardinals, and on its arrival at Rome was received with extraordinary reverence. Invitations had been sent to the cities of Italy, with a promise of the same indulgence as at a jubilee for those who should be present; and the crowd was as great as at the jubilee under Nicolas V. The head was carried to St. Peter's in procession, attended by 30,000 torches, while the palaces and other houses along the way were hung with tapestry, and numerous altars adorned the streets. The hours occupied by the procession from the Flaminian gate were the only

interval of fair weather in a whole month, and the solemnity of the holy week, which had just begun, combined with the other influences of the scene. The Vatican basilica was splendidly illuminated ; the pope addressed the holy relic in an eloquent and affecting speech, while the vast multitude showed their sympathy by weeping, sobbing, and beating their breasts; and, after other ceremonies, to which the strains of music from instruments and voices added effect, the head of St. Andrew was deposited beside that of St. Peter.

Soon after the loss of Sinope and of Trebizond had been reported in the west, Pius ventured on the extraordinary measure of addressing a letter to Mahomet, for the purpose of urging him to embrace the Christian faith. He begins by warning the sultan not to trust in his fortune, but to seek for power and fame rather through being baptized; and in this part of the letter he partly appeals to motives of temporal interest. He then goes on to statements of Christian doctrine, with many reflections on the errors of Mahometanism and on the laxity of its morality. He argues against the assertion that the Scriptures had been corrupted, ridicules the legends of the Koran, and celebrates the great writers of the Christian church; and he concludes by again exhorting Mahomet to enter into the church by baptism. Although this letter displays much learning and ingenuity, it is difficult to conceive how a man so shrewd and so experienced as the writer could have expected it to produce conviction in the mind of the Turkish prince, even if (as was most unlikely) he were ever to listen to the reading of it.

A discovery of alum mines near La Tolfa, in 1462, added considerably to the papal revenue, and at the same time deprived the Turks of the money which the western nations had been accustomed to pay for the alum of Asia Minor; and Pius did not hesitate to give the name of miracle to an event which thus doubly tended to advance his hopes of a crusade.

Pius invited all princes to send representatives to a congress at Rome, and he addressed the cardinals in an eloquent and pathetic speech, proposing a crusade, with a truce for five years among Christians. He declared his intention of joining the expedition, not for the purpose of fighting, but that, while God's people fought, he might, like Moses, from a hill or from the elevated deck of a ship, pray for them and pour curses on the enemy. Of the cardinals, to whom he spoke in a second address, all but those of Spoleto and Arras were in favour of a crusade. But when he issued a bull for the purpose, no Christian states, except Venice and Hungary, were found to respond. In Germany the cry was rather for a reform of the church than for a war against the infidels. In England, when the pope asked the clergy to give a tenth for the crusade, a sixtieth was proposed by some, and only a fortieth was voted. Lewis of France, irritated by his disappointment as to Naples and by the consequences of his concession as to the pragmatic sanction, not only held aloof, but urged duke Philip of Burgundy to leave unfulfilled his vow to the pheasant. A few of the Italian powers, however, agreed to pay the same amounts which had formerly been promised at Mantua.

On the 19th of June 1464, the pope, although suffering from gout and fever, set out for Ancona, where he expected to find the Venetian fleet. Turning round to look on his city from the Quintian meadows, he burst out into the words "Farewell, Rome! thou wilt never again see me alive!". On account of his weak condition, he took advantage of the Tiber as far as possible, proceeding up the stream from the Ponte Molle, and after a slow land-journey by way of Loreto, he reached Ancona on the 18th of July. In the course of this journey he repeatedly fell in with parties of volunteers who had flocked into Italy for the crusade; but they were in general utterly unfit for the work—unarmed, undisciplined, without any leaders, many of them worn out and impotent, beggarly, ragged, and hungry. The pope, distressed and disgusted by the sight of such allies, gave them his blessing, and desired them to return to their homes; whereupon the better of them sold such things as they had, and obeyed his charge, while others, after having vainly waited for the beginning of the expedition, betook themselves to robbery for support.

At Ancona Pius found that the expected naval allies had not yet arrived; and in the meanwhile his illness was growing on him. On the 12th of August he had the gratification of

seeing, from the bishop's palace, where he was lodged, the entry of twenty-four Venetian galleys into the harbour, under the command of the doge, Christopher Moro; but he was too weak to receive the doge, as he had intended, on the following day. On the 14th he called to his bedside the cardinals who had accompanied him, and recommended to their care the prosecution of the war, the ecclesiastical state, and his own nephews. He asked for the last sacraments, and had a discussion with the bishop of Ferrara on the question whether he should receive extreme unction, as he had already received it when dangerously sick at Basel. He repeated the Athanasian creed, which he declared to be "most true and holy." Bessarion endeavoured to comfort him by the assurance that he had governed well; and on the following day the pope expired. However we may judge of the versatile character and of the strangely varied career of this remarkable man, the circumstances of his last days entitle him to respect, as having sacrificed his life for Christendom, even if it may be supposed that other motives mingled with those of religion.

The crusade ended with the death of the pope who had projected it. Of the money which he had collected for the expedition, a part was given to the Venetians and a part to the king of Hungary; and these powers continued to carry on war against the Turks by sea and by land.

The cardinals returned to Rome for the purpose of electing a pope; and on the 31st of August, at the first scrutiny, it was found that their choice had fallen on Peter Barbo, a Venetian, whose family pretended to descent from the old Roman Ahenobarbi. The new pope, who was forty-six years of age, took the name of Paul II; he was a nephew of Eugenius IV, on whose elevation he had exchanged a mercantile life for the profession of an ecclesiastic. He had been created cardinal of St. Mark at the age of twenty-two by his uncle, and while holding that dignity had rebuilt the church from which he took his title, and had begun the vast Venetian palace, for which the materials were chiefly derived from the plunder of the Colosseum. After the death of Eugenius, he was able to secure the favour of Nicolas and Calixtus; and he obtained from Pius a pension charged on the Cluniac priory of Paisley, although this pope was in the habit of speaking of him as *Maria pientissima* on account of his affectedly soft and tender manner, which he carried so far as to make use of tears for any purpose which could not otherwise be gained. So vain was Barbo of his handsome person, that, if we may believe Platina, he wished as pope to take the name of Formosus, and was with difficulty dissuaded by the cardinals. His love of display and show led him to spend large sums on jewels, precious stones, and other ornaments; and in order to provide the means of this expenditure, he was accustomed to keep in his own hands the income of vacant bishoprics and other offices, instead of filling them up. He was fond of exhibiting himself in splendid attire at great religious functions, and on some occasions endeavoured to heighten the effect of his appearance by painting his face. Among his other peculiarities, it is mentioned that he was accustomed to transact all business by night. It is from Paul's institution, rather than from any unbroken traditions of paganism, that the festivities of the Roman carnival derive their character; and he used to look on from the Venetian palace at the races run by old men and young men, by Jews, horses, asses, and buffaloes, along the Via Lata, which from these sports acquired the new name of Corso.

In other respects there is a conflict of testimony as to his character; for while Platina (who had special reasons for disliking him) represents him as heartless, cruel, and difficult of approach, other writers dilate on his tenderness, his universal benevolence, and his bountiful charity. Among the objects of this bounty were even the poorer cardinals and bishops, as Platina himself tells us; and he agrees with the eulogists of Paul in describing him as merciful to those who offended against the law.

Before proceeding to an election, the cardinals had been exhorted in a discourse by the bishop of Torcello, who represented the danger that all authority might pass from the college to the pope, so as to be exercised at his mere will, and advised them to choose such a pope as might remedy this evil. They had bound themselves by capitulations, slightly altered from

those which had been framed at the last papal election. The future pope was to carry on the crusade which had been begun against the Turks; to call a general council within three years; to observe certain rules as to the nomination of cardinals; to appoint no more than one cardinal from among his own kindred, and to refrain from bestowing certain important offices on these; and there were special provisions for securing to the cardinals a real influence as counsellors of the pope in the administration of his office. His promises were to be read over to him in the consistory every month, and twice a year the cardinals were to inquire as to his performance of them, and, in case of his failure, were to admonish him with filial deference. Yet Paul, although he had not only agreed to these stipulations, but had again sworn to them after his election, threw off their obligation. He declared that such engagements were unlawful; and, chiefly by wheedling, partly by other means, he induced the cardinals to subscribe, instead of the capitulations, an altered form, which he then locked up, so that it was never seen again. Bessarion was forcibly compelled to sign; the aged Carvajal alone persisted in refusing.

Paul showed little of his predecessor's zeal for the holy war, although the Turks were pressing onwards in their career of conquest, so that Italy itself seemed to be in danger. He gave, however, the produce of the alum mines for the crusade, as he had engaged to do by the capitulations. He spent large sums, with but little effect, in subsidising the king of Hungary, Scanderbeg, and other opponents of the Turks; and he endeavoured to seek for alliances and money in Germany, where his representatives found both princes and people generally indifferent to the cause.

In the end of 1468, the emperor suddenly revisited Rome, with a small train of attendants. The professed object of his journey was to fulfil a vow of pilgrimage which he had made on his deliverance, by George Podiebrad, from being besieged in his palace at Vienna, and to concert an expedition against the Turks; but it has been suspected that its real motive was different,— that he perhaps even intended to contrive the ruin of the neighbour to whom he had been so greatly indebted. He arrived on Christmas eve, was conducted by torchlight from the Flaminian gate to the Vatican, and, on the morning of the great festival, edified the congregation assembled in St. Peter's by the skill with which he chanted the gospel of the decree which went out from Caesar Augustus. The emperor communicated with the pope; but, whereas it was usual for persons admitted to that honour to receive in both kinds, the chalice was on this occasion received by the pope alone, lest encouragement should be given to the Hussite belief of its necessity. The visit lasted seventeen days, during which Frederick visited the remains of antiquity, and Paul had the gratification of entertaining the emperor by a display of his precious jewels. But even as to etiquette there were some differences; and when Frederick proposed a congress like that of Mantua, the pope replied that such meetings produced discord rather than union. Whether for avowed or for secret reasons, the two were mutually dissatisfied, and Frederick returned to Germany in displeasure.

Paul professed himself desirous of reforming the curia; but, notwithstanding these professions, offices as well as benefices continued to be offered for sale. In one instance, however, he made an attempt at reform, which, by provoking the enmity of the biographer Platina, has seriously affected his reputation with posterity. The college of abbreviators, which took its origin from the days of the Avignon papacy, had been reconstituted by Pius II, who fixed its number at seventy. These for the most part had bought their offices, with the assurance that they were permanent, and among them were many men of the literary class, including the biographer of the popes. When, therefore, Paul charged the abbreviators with simony and other corruption, and proceeded to dissolve the college, he raised against himself a host of peculiarly dangerous enemies; and the narrative of Platina, who had suffered especial hardship and persecution, has left imputations on the pope's character and conduct which, although we may not fully trust the writer, are not met by any evidence on the more favourable side. In the course of this affair, the pope attempted to connect Platina with a party which

he accused of paganism. The members of this party had formed themselves into an academy, of which Pomponius Leti, an illegitimate offspring of the counts of San Severino, was president. They are said to have disdained their baptismal names, and to have taken up instead of them fantastical substitutes, such as Callimachus and Asclepiades; but while at Florence the revival of classical learning was animated by a passion for the literature of Greece, the spirit of this party was so exclusively Roman that Leti refused even to become acquainted with the Greek language. To Paul such an association was naturally obnoxious, although we need not trace this dislike, with Platina, to his own want of literary culture alone, but may refer it with more probability to a dread of heathen and republican tendencies. He therefore proceeded against them with much rigour; some of them were severely tortured in his own presence, and were banished; one even died in consequence of the torture.

Among the events of this pontificate may be mentioned the introduction of the new art of printing into Rome by Ulric Hahn, a German, and by his more famous countrymen Schweynheim and Pannartz, who had before practised it in the monastery of Subiaco.

Paul was found dead in his bed on the 26th of July 1471. His death is attributed by Platina to indigestion; but, as he had not received the last sacraments, it was popularly believed that he had been killed by a devil, whom he was supposed to carry in his signet-ring. Although he had advanced three of his relations to the cardinalate, it is recorded to his credit that he did not give himself over to the influence of any favourite, but kept his family and servants in due subordination; and his pontificate, however little we may find in it to respect, came afterwards to be regarded as an era of purity and virtue in comparison with the deep degradation which followed.

We may now revert to the religious history of Bohemia.

In 1444, on the death of Ptacek, George Boczek, of Podiebrad, was chosen by the Calixtines to act as regent during the minority of Ladislaus, in conjunction with Meinhard of Neuhaus. But the co-regents disagreed, as Meinhard became more decidedly favourable to the Roman usage in the administration of the Eucharist; and he died not long after the capital had been wrested from him by Podiebrad in September 1448. In April 1451, Podiebrad was chosen sole regent, and he honestly attempted to deal fairly with all parties. On gaining possession of Prague he had brought back Rokyczana, who exercised almost all the rights of an archbishop, and bore hardly on the Roman party. Negotiations were carried on with Rome—the utraquists asking that Rokyczana might be consecrated, and that the *compactata* might be extended in their favour, while the Roman party required full restoration of ecclesiastical and monastic property, and wished the liberty of receiving the chalice to be withdrawn. The *compactata* laboured under the difficulty that the Bohemians had concluded them with the council of Basel alone, at a time when it was in hostility to pope Eugenius; and that, when terms were afterwards made between the council and Nicolas V, the *compactata* had not been included. Hence the curia now astonished the Bohemians by treating the agreement as if it did not exist; and cardinal Carvajal, on a mission in 1448, provoked them so much in this and in other respects, that his departure from Prague became the signal for a popular outbreak, in which he was assailed with curses and with stones.

In 1451 Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, then bishop of Siena and secretary to the emperor, was sent by Frederick to explain to the Bohemians his reasons for retaining the guardianship of their young king. He had interviews with Podiebrad, who set forth the national grievances; to which the envoy replied by complaining that the utraquists did not observe their part of the Basel agreement. And when the regent dwelt on the pope's refusal to consecrate an archbishop, Piccolomini answered that the Bohemians did wrong in insisting that Rokyczana should be the man.

But the most remarkable part of this narrative is the account of his visits to Tabor. He found the people rude, although they wished to appear civilized. They were roughly hospitable; their clothing was scanty; their houses, built of wood or clay, were arranged like

the tents out of which the town had grown, and within them was displayed a profusion of spoil brought home from marauding expeditions. As such resources were no longer available, the Taborites had betaken themselves to commerce; the principle of a community of goods, which had formerly been established, was now abandoned. On attempting to convert his host, Piccolomini found him a very questionable Taborite, who kept images for his secret worship.

In his return, the envoy again visited the place, but would neither eat nor drink there, and held a discussion with Nicolas Biscupek and others on the eucharistic usage and other points of difference. Their opinions he found to be far worse than he had expected; and he concludes his account by saying that among barbarians, anthropophagi, and the monstrous natives of India and Libya, there were none more monstrous than the Taborites. In the following year Rokyczana was able, by the aid of the regent Podiebrad, to reduce the Taborites to conformity. Nicolas and another leader were imprisoned in fortresses until they should acknowledge Rokyczana, and ended their days in confinement; and in the month of December 1452 mass was for the first time celebrated at Tabor with the vestments and rites of the Calixtines.

In 1451 John of Capistrano, the eloquent Franciscan who afterwards animated the defenders of Belgrade, was sent by Nicolas V into Bohemia and the neighbouring countries for the purpose of opposing Hussitism, with authority to absolve all who should submit to the church. His preaching is said to have been enforced by miracles, and its effects are described as prodigious. At Breslau, the people were at once subdued into repentance for their sins, and excited to enthusiastic fury against the Bohemian heretics; and they brought together playing-cards, dice, chess-boards, and other instruments of gaming or of vanity, for a great bonfire in the market-place. At Olmütz, he tells us that he had 100,000 hearers at once; and he made upwards of 3000 converts, partly by the confident assurance that all who had received the Eucharist in both kinds were lost. But his excess of zeal led him into extravagances, which were blamed even by his associate Nicolas of Cusa; and as the regent threw obstacles in the way of his entering Bohemia, the challenges which passed between the friar and Rokyczana did not result in the disputation which both professed to desire. Although the Greeks, at the time of the council of Basel, had greatly resented an incautious phrase which classed them with the Hussites, the increasing distress of the empire had reduced them to seek for aid in any quarter from which it might possibly be hoped for; and thus, in 1452, the highest personages of the Byzantine church made overtures to the Bohemians, in which they expressed themselves as willing to tolerate any rites which might be found edifying and at the same time not contrary to the laws of the church. But this negotiation was ended by the fall of Constantinople in the spring of the following year.

The emperor had at length been compelled to give up Ladislaus to his Bohemian subjects; and, as the king was only thirteen years old, Podiebrad became his tutor, and continued to act as regent. Ladislaus, under the instructions of Piccolomini, had been strongly prepossessed against the utraquists: "If the Bohemians wish to have me for their king", he said, "they must be Christians, and confess the same faith with me". But by the regent's prudent management, he was brought to confirm all that had been promised by his predecessors Sigismund and Albert, including the maintenance of the *compactata*, and an engagement to take measures for the confirmation and consecration of Rokyczana as archbishop. Thus Podiebrad succeeded in preserving peace between Ladislaus and his subjects; but a renewed application to Rome in favour of Rokyczana was ineffectual.

Ladislaus died after a short illness in December 1457. There were several candidates for the vacant throne; but the election fell on the regent Podiebrad, as being the fittest to enjoy in his own name the power, which he had successfully administered in the name of the late sovereign. For this he was partly indebted to the support of Rokyczana, who eloquently advocated the expediency of choosing a native Bohemian; "rather than elect a foreigner for king," he said, "Bohemia ought to become a republic, like Israel in the time of the judges."

The coronation was performed by two Hungarian bishops, as no Bohemian prelate could be found to officiate; and the new king bound himself by an oath, as to the interpretation of which there was afterwards much question, that he would be obedient to the Roman church, to pope Calixtus and his successors; that he would hold to the unity of the orthodox faith, and would protect it with all his might; that he would labour to recall his people from “all errors, sects, and heresies, and from other articles contrary to the holy Roman church and the catholic faith, and to bring them to obedience, conformity, and union, and to the rite and worship of the holy Roman church.”

To this time is referred the origin of a community which has lasted to our own day, and has been greatly distinguished in missionary and other religious labours—the *Unitas Fratrum*, or Moravian brethren. The peculiar ideas out of which it grew are traced to Peter of Chelcick, a layman, who was born about 1390, and lived on his own estate near Wodnian. Peter produced many writings, which are said to show an earnestness rather for the moral part of religion than for doctrines; in some points—such as the condemnation of secular dignity in the clergy and of the alliance between temporal and ecclesiastical power, of oaths, war, and capital punishment—his principles resemble those of the Waldenses, with whom he and his followers formed a connexion. One Gregory, who, although of noble family, was a tailor by occupation, on applying to Rokyczana for the satisfaction of some perplexities, was referred by him to the writings of Peter, in which he found his own thoughts anticipated; and in consequence of this he sought the author’s acquaintance. After a time, Gregory, considering himself to have acquired a higher degree of spiritual insight, attempted to make a convert of Rokyczana, and to place him at the head of a new communion; but Rokyczana was not to be so gained, although he treated the party with kindness, and procured for them from king George permission to settle at a lonely place called Kunwald. The new society attracted members from all ranks; all called each other brethren; and, having convinced themselves that the church was hopelessly corrupt, they separated from it in 1457. Ten years later, they set up a ministry of their own, independent of any theory of succession, and resting its claims on the personal piety of the ministers, who at first were chosen by lot. Rokyczana, notwithstanding his kindly feeling towards the brethren, found himself obliged to carry on an inquisition into their doctrines and practices. The settlement at Kunwald was broken up, and, in fulfilment of the oath taken by the king at his coronation, they were persecuted with great severity, so that they were driven to perform their services in the woods; while, unlike the Taborites, they professed and acted on a principle of patient endurance and submissions. But notwithstanding persecution, the party continued to increase.

The fairness with which the new king endeavoured to deal between the two great parties among his subjects has been acknowledged even by hostile writers, who also admit his great merit as a sovereign in other respects, and in the position to which he had been raised, his prudence, courage, and skill were severely tried. From the Silesians and the Moravians he met with much opposition, of which Breslau was the centre. The excitement lately produced in that city by John of Capistrano, has been already mentioned; and the people were continually stirred to disaffection by the lower clergy and friars, who persuaded them that George was a Nero, a Decius, a murderer—that he was the great dragon of the Apocalypse, and that he prayed not to God, but to Rokyczana. The Roman party in Bohemia divided its allegiance between the king and the papacy; and the emperor Frederick, who had himself been a candidate for the crown of Bohemia, regarded his successful rival with jealousy and ill-will.

At Rome, George was acknowledged as king by Calixtus; and Pius, in his eagerness to enlist so important an ally for the crusade, invited him to the congress of Mantua, although, from hesitation as to addressing him by the royal title, he sent the letter through the emperor. George took occasion from this letter to claim the allegiance of those who had held aloof from him as a Hussite; but he was unable to appear in person at Mantua, and fresh questions soon arose between him and the papacy. Pius, in disregard at once of the *compactata* and of

Rokyczana's claims, nominated the dean of Prague as archbishop; and when the king, in 1462, sent an embassy to Rome, for the purpose of asking that Rokyczana's title might be acknowledged, and that the authority of the *compactata* might be clearly established, as John of Capistrano had disowned them, the pope himself declared that they had never been admitted by the papacy—which, he said, knew nothing of such compromises. Moreover, he added, the generation to which this indulgence had been granted by the council of Basel was now almost extinct; the Bohemians, by failing to observe their own side of the *compactata*, had forfeited all right to claim the benefit of them; and, in any case, the pope might do away with the arrangement, and might substitute something better.

Fantino della Valle, a doctor of laws, was sent with the ambassadors on their return, and was commissioned to persuade the Bohemians to give up the chalice and the *compactata*. But he behaved with such insolence to the king, by publicly taxing him with breach of his coronation-oath, and threatening him with deposition and anathema as a heretic, that George was with difficulty restrained from personal violence, and committed him for a time to prison; although he declared that Fantino was thus punished, not as papal legate, but for having acted unfaithfully as the king's procurator at Rome. George indignantly disavowed the sense which the Roman party attempted to put on his oath. Was it possible, he asked, that he could have supposed his own religious opinions—founded, as they were, on the gospel and on the primitive faith—to be included among the heresies which he had bound himself to extirpate? If he had supposed the *compactata* to be heretical, was it possible that he should have asked the pope to confirm them? Rather would he sacrifice his crown than be false to his oath. And in proof of his sincerity as to the fulfilment of it, he was able to point to the severities which he had exercised against the more extreme sections of the utraquists,—the remnant of the Taborites and the new party of united brethren. The pope, instead of answering a letter from George, denounced him to the emperor as a heathen man and a publican, who had separated himself from the church; and it was in vain that the emperor attempted to intercede for him.

When about finally to leave Rome, Pius cited the Bohemian king to answer within a hundred and eighty days; and in the meantime George was labouring to form a league of princes against the Turks, which should be independent of the papacy.

The policy of Pius as to Bohemia had been dictated by his personal experience of that country and its parties; and it was continued by his successor Paul, chiefly under the influence of cardinal Carvajal, whose mission to Bohemia had produced in him an inflexible hostility to the Hussites, and who for many years had been labouring to undo the work of Constance and of Basel. The process against George was resumed and was committed by the pope to Carvajal, Bessarion, and another cardinal; and "George of Podiebrad, who styles himself king of Bohemia," was again cited to answer at Rome within a hundred and eighty days, for heresy, relapse, perjury, sacrilege, and blasphemy. In the following year an alliance of Bohemian and other nobles was formed against George. They presented a list of twelve grievances; they demanded that the king should perform his coronation oath, and should expel Rokyczana with the utraquist clergy; and they asked the pope to give them another king, declaring a preference in favour of Casimir of Poland.

At a diet which was held at Nuremberg, at Martinmas 1466, for the purpose of raising Germany against the Turks, Fantino della Valle appeared as papal legate, and insisted that the Bohemian ambassadors should be excluded, on the ground that their king was a heretic. By this insult George was deeply provoked, and at Christmas, while the tidings of a sentence of deposition passed on him at Rome two days before were on their way to him, he sent a defiance to the emperor, from whom he had met with much underhand enmity, instead of the gratitude which he had justly earned by delivering Frederick when besieged by his brother Albert.¹¹ The letter of defiance was composed by Gregory Heimburg, with all the vigour of his style, and with a hearty expression of the dislike and contempt with which he regarded the emperor.

The king had endeavoured, by ceasing to insist on the other points of the *compactata*, to gain the papal sanction for the administration of the chalice to the laity, and for the consecration of an archbishop, who might ordain clergy both for the utraquists and for the adherents of the Roman system; but such proposals met with no attention. The pope, without observing the usual forms of process, condemned George by repeated bulls, as guilty of heresy, perjury, sacrilege, and other offences; pronounced him to be deposed, and released his subjects from their engagements to him. On Maundy Thursday following, George was denounced as foremost of those who had incurred the anathema of the church; and when the sentence was afterwards repeated, it was extended to his wife and children, to Rokyczana, and to Gregory Heimburg, who gladly brought the power of his learning and of his sarcastic pen to combat the papal assumptions in this new quarrel.

A crusade was proclaimed against George, with the usual privileges for those who should take part in it. Casimir of Poland was disinclined to accept the overtures of the discontented Bohemians; but Matthias of Hungary, a prince bold, able, ambitious, and unscrupulous, on being invited by the pope and by a party election to wrest the kingdom from his father-in-law, responded with an eagerness which hardly needed the papal exhortation to disregard the ties of gratitude and of blood. Paul had allowed Matthias to enter into a truce with the Turks, that he might be at liberty to turn his arms against the Bohemians; and a war of devastation began. George, on the other hand, had appealed to a general council and to a future pope; and he endeavoured to give his cause a national rather than a sectarian character, so that he still retained in office many persons whom he knew to be zealous for the Roman side in matters of religion. The Germans in general were little inclined to move. Some of the princes and prelates had consulted universities on the question whether it were right for Christians to make war on heretics, and especially to attack the utraquists of Bohemia; and the answer had been in the negative. But when the formal condemnation came from Rome, many students of Leipzig and Erfurt, excited at once by the ill-repute of Bohemia as a nest of heresy, and by a youthful love of adventure, sold their books, and even their clothes, to fit themselves out for the new crusade.

Although opposed to Matthias, to the catholic league of nobles, and to hosts of crusaders from foreign countries, George was for the most part successful in the war; and he was able to drive Matthias out of Bohemia. But at length the weight of years and weariness of conflict induced him to seek a compromise with Rome. Before the effect of this application could be known, the king died on the 22nd of March, 1471, having survived exactly a month after the death of Rokyczana.

CHAPTER IV.
SIXTUS IV. AND INNOCENT VIII.
A.D. 1471-1492.

WHILE the popes were endeavouring, with but little success, to rouse the nations of Europe for the recovery of the east from the Mussulmans, important changes were in progress, which tended to strengthen the power of the crown in various western kingdoms. In England, this was the effect of Henry VII's policy, following on the destruction which had been wrought among the ancient nobility by the long and bloody wars of the Roses. In France, Lewis XI was able to curb the nobles and the princes of the blood, and acquired the direct sovereignty over provinces which, under the forms of feudal tenure, had before been practically independent; and his son, Charles VIII, completed this work by marrying Anne, the heiress of Brittany (1491). In Spain, the kingdoms of Aragon and Castile were united by the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella; and the conquest of Granada by the "catholic sovereigns" extirpated the last remnant of the Moorish dominion. By these changes Spain rose for the first time to a place among the chief powers of Europe.

The empire, indeed, was still under the impotent rule of Frederick III., who had even the mortification of seeing that his neighbours, George Podiebrad of Bohemia, and Matthias Corvinus of Hungary—men raised from a lower rank to the sovereignty of countries to which he supposed himself to have a better title—were more powerful than he. Yet during this time the foundation of the greatness of Austria was laid by the marriage of his son Maximilian with Mary, the only daughter and heiress of Charles "the Bold" duke of Burgundy.

After the death of Paul II the cardinals assembled on the 6th of August 1471. Again it seemed as if Bessarion were likely to be elected; but the younger members of the college dreaded the severity of his character, and the election fell on Francis della Rovere, cardinal of St. Peter ad Vincula, who took the name of Sixtus IV. The voters who had contributed to this result were liberally rewarded for their support with offices and ecclesiastical benefices.

The new pope was born near Savona, in 1414. His descent was afterwards traced to a noble Piedmontese family of the same name, and when he had risen to greatness, these were willing to admit the connexion; but it seems to be certain that his origin was really very humble. He had taught theology and philosophy in several universities, had become minister-general of the Franciscan order, and through the friendly influence of Bessarion had been promoted to the cardinalate in 1467. He had published several works by means of the new art of printing—among them, one treating of a question which had raised violent quarrels between his own order and the Dominicans—whether the Saviour's blood, which had been shed in his last sufferings, remained in union with the Godhead during the interval between his death and resurrection.

Like other popes of the age, Sixtus, at entering on his office, professed a great zeal for the war against the Turks, declaring that he was willing to spend not only his money, but his blood in the cause of Christendom. It was proposed that a general council of Christian powers should be held with a view to a crusade, but, as the pope and the emperor were unable to agree as to the place of meeting, Sixtus sent cardinal-legates into the chief European kingdoms, for the purpose of conferring with the sovereigns on the design, and of establishing peace among them. For the legation to France, Bessarion was chosen, at the desire of Lewis XI himself, who was acquainted with the Greek cardinal's fame. But Lewis took offence, either at his

having visited the court of Burgundy before that of the suzerain, or at his having desired the release of cardinal Balue, who, from having been the king's most trusted counsellor, had suddenly fallen into disgrace, and for years had been confined in an iron cage within the castle of Loches. The legate had to wait two months for an audience; and when he was at length admitted into the royal presence, Lewis turned the scene into a farce by laying hold of his long beard, and quoting a verse of the Latin Grammar :—

“Barbara Graeca genus retinent quod habere solebant.”

It is said that vexation at the failure of this mission was the cause of Bessarion's death, which took place at Ravenna, as he was on his way back to Rome. The legates who were sent into Germany and other countries met with no considerable success; and although some ships were sent into the east by the pope and the Venetian republic, the results were unimportant.

But the objects in which Sixtus felt the greatest interest lay nearer home. With his pontificate the papacy enters on a new phase, in which it appears chiefly as a great secular power, to which the spiritual character was merely attached as an accident. The system of providing for the pope's near kindred by high ecclesiastical dignities, or by the lucrative offices of the court, is no longer found sufficient, but the “nepotism” (as it was called) of the popes now aims at the establishment of their relations as sovereign princes; and even where such schemes of territorial aggrandizement are not carried out, the “nephews” become founders of great and wealthy families, which are decorated with high titles of dignity, and rank as a new power in the Roman system, counterbalancing that of the cardinals. The excessive devotion of Sixtus to the interests of his family was shown as early as the first consistory of his pontificate, when, in defiance of the capitulations which he had subscribed at his election, he bestowed the cardinalate on two of his nephews, Julian della Rovere and Peter Riario—young men of humble birth, who had been educated as Franciscans, but speedily threw off the restraints of their monastic profession. Julian, indeed, although his habits of life were by no means strict, maintained the dignity of his office, and continued to be prominent under the succeeding popes, until he himself at length attained the papacy. But Peter Riario, on whom his uncle heaped a prodigious accumulation of dignities and wealth (including the archbishopric of Florence and the titular patriarchate of Constantinople), plunged into excesses of prodigality and debauchery, which absorbed much more than the vast income of his preferments, and within two years brought his life to an end, at the age of twenty-eight. Sixtus is said to have lamented him with demonstrations of the deepest grief, and commemorated him by an epitaph in which his extravagance is exalted into a virtue.

Other relations of the pope were brought forward, and by means of some of them he endeavoured to connect himself with royal or princely families. One nephew married a daughter of the count of Urbino, and was provided with an endowment by the pope, while the count was rewarded with the title of duke. Another, who is described as “a very little man, and of intellect corresponding to his person,” married an illegitimate daughter of king Ferdinand of Naples; and in consideration of this alliance, Sixtus commuted for a white horse the tribute by which Naples was held under the apostolic see. But the most conspicuous of the lay nephews was Jerome Riario, who, like his brother cardinal Peter, was supposed to be in reality the pope's son. Jerome, who according to some writers had been a cobbler in early life, but appears rather to have been a clerk in the tax-office at Savona, was summoned to Rome on the death of his brother, and succeeded to the favour which the cardinal had enjoyed. The pope endowed him out of the possessions of the church with Imola, Forli, and other territories, and procured for him the hand of Catharine Sforza, an illegitimate daughter of Galeazzo of Milan, whose consent to the marriage was rewarded by the promotion of his son Ascanius to the cardinalate. With a view to the advancement of his relations, the pope plunged deeply into the intricacies of Italian politics; and for the same purpose he had recourse to all manner of disgraceful arts for raising money. Preferments, even to the highest ranks in the hierarchy, were openly sold, without regard to the qualifications of the purchaser; promises of pre-

ferment were often broken, and those who had paid for them were cheated out of their money. New offices of court employment—some of them bearing oriental titles, such as Janissaries, Stradiots, Mamelukes,—were instituted for the purpose of sale. The college of abbreviators was revived, and the appointments to it were sold. The administration of justice was vitiated by the sale of pardons, even for capital offences. The pope's taxation was oppressive; and the arts which he practised as to the market prices of provisions are said to have produced in some cases a famine among his subjects.

The jubilee, which Paul II had appointed to take place in 1475—twenty-five years from the last celebration—was eagerly caught at by Sixtus as a means of gathering money. But the number of pilgrims and the amount of their offerings fell greatly short of the former jubilees—partly, it is said, because a pestilence was raging at the time, and partly because the pope's evil repute had made its way even into distant countries. The personal character of Sixtus is painted by Stephen of Infessura in the darkest colours. He is charged with unnatural vices, and with abuse of his patronage in favour of those who ministered to his depravity; he is described as vainglorious, avaricious, pitiless, delighting in cruel spectacles. Under him, merit was discouraged, as it was no longer a help to preferment; he is said to have hated men of letters, and to have checked the cultivation of learning by withdrawing the salaries of professorships. But on the other hand he did much for the increase of the Vatican library, which he placed under the care of the biographer Platina.

In one instance the eagerness of Sixtus to promote the interests of his family led him to become an accomplice in a great and atrocious crime.

The government of Florence, although its constitution was still republican, had passed chiefly into the hands of Cosmo de' Medici, whose munificent employment of his wealth on public objects, and in the encouragement of literature and the arts, procured for him great influence in his own time, both at home and abroad, and a high reputation with posterity. At his death, in 1464, Cosmo was succeeded in the headship of the family by his son Peter, who died in December 1469, leaving two sons—Lorenzo and Julian. Cosmo, while he possessed the reality of power, had always studiously preserved the character of a citizen; but his descendants had come to regard themselves as princes, and to disregard the republican constitution. As they still kept up the mercantile establishment by which the greatness of their family had been founded, their agents in various countries assumed the pretensions of ministers; their commercial affairs suffered from negligence and wasteful mismanagement; and Lorenzo unscrupulously used the public funds to cover the deficiencies which naturally followed. At the same time he was careful to remove from his path, by procuring their banishment or otherwise, all who could have stood in the way of the ascendancy of his family. Among these the most prominent were the Pazzi, a family of nobles who, like the Medici, were engaged in trade, and whom Cosmo had endeavoured to conciliate by means of matrimonial connexions. Francis Pazzi, in disgust at the exclusion of his kindred from the magistracy, and at other public and private wrongs which he traced to the influence of the Medici, removed from Florence to Rome, where he undertook the management of a bank established by the family; and to him Sixtus transferred the care of the papal accounts, which from the time of Nicolas V had been in the hands of the Medici. The pope's nephew, count Jerome Riario, who had found the Medici an obstacle in the way of his ambition, was allied with the Pazzi by a common hatred; and a plot was concerted for the assassination of Lorenzo and Julian, with the design of effecting a revolution in favour of their enemies. The pope was privy to the conspiracy, and, although he professed to desire no bloodshed, he plainly signified that, if murder should be perpetrated in the execution of it, the crime would meet with his indulgence.

John Baptist of Montesecco, a condottiere in the papal service, was sent by Jerome to Florence, ostensibly on a mission to Lorenzo, but really in order that he might take part in the intended assassination. The assistance of all the pope's forces was promised; and Raphael

Riario, the pope's great-nephew, who had just been made cardinal at the age of eighteen, was transferred from the university of Pisa to Florence, with the character of legate, chiefly in order that his palace might serve to harbour such of the conspirators as were strangers to the city. The young cardinal was charged to be guided by the directions of Bartholomew Salviati, who had been consecrated by the pope as archbishop of Pisa, but had been excluded from his see through the influence of his hereditary enemies, the Medici. When, however, after some other plans had been disconcerted by various accidents, it was resolved that the assassination should be perpetrated in the cathedral, the conscience of the condottiere Montesecco took alarm; he declared that he would not add sacrilege to treachery; and it became necessary to transfer the task of despatching Lorenzo to two priests, whose reverence for sacred things had been blunted by familiarity.

On Sunday the 26th of April, at the moment of the elevation of the host at high mass in the cathedral of Florence, the assassins fell on the brothers. Julian was slain on the spot; but Lorenzo, although slightly wounded, was able to escape into the sacristy, and was saved from his pursuers. The conspirators rushed into the streets, and raised shouts of "Liberty! the people!", but instead of responding to these cries, the citizens, whom the Medici had gained by their profuse liberality and their magnificent displays, rose in their defence. Some of the Pazzi and their accomplices were torn to pieces by the multitude; the archbishop of Pisa and Francis de' Pazzi, who had endeavoured to seize the public palace and to overpower the magistrates, were hung from the palace windows by order of the gonfaloniere; the members of the Pazzi family were sought out everywhere, and many of them and of their adherents were executed. Montesecco, on being put to the torture, made disclosures which showed how deeply the pope had been concerned in the plot. Sixtus did not hesitate to show his partisanship by declaring Lorenzo de' Medici and the magistrates of Florence to be guilty of treason and sacrilege, to be excommunicate, anathematized, infamous, outlawed, and incapable of making a testament. He ordered their houses to be demolished, their property to be confiscated; and Florence was to be placed under interdict, unless they were forthwith made over to the ecclesiastical tribunals, for having laid hands on the archbishop of Pisa and other ecclesiastics. In execution of the pope's threat, the money of Florentine bankers was seized both at Rome and at Naples; and Sixtus, in concert with king Ferdinand, threw troops into the Florentine territory. The Florentines attempted to appease his wrath, and were willing to acknowledge their fault; but finding him implacable, they resolved to stand on their defence. They wrote to the pope, strongly denouncing his conduct, and plainly charging him with having employed assassins. They put forth a vindication, in which Montesecco's confession was embodied; and by the circulation of this document, with other letters, they endeavoured to bespeak the sympathy of foreign potentates and prelates. After having consulted eminent canonists, they compelled the priests within their territories to say mass, in defiance of the papal sentence; and a synod of ecclesiastics, under the presidency of Gentile, bishop of Arezzo, repelled the excommunication, declared the pope himself to be excommunicate for having unjustly uttered it, and appealed against him to a general council.

The common feeling throughout Europe was adverse to Sixtus. The emperor and other princes threatened to withdraw from his obedience if he persisted in an unjust war. Lewis of France, who had special connexions with the Medici, spoke of assembling a general council by the authority of princes, if the pope's consent were not to be obtained; he threatened to revive the pragmatic sanction in all its force, and to stop the payment of annates from his dominions, on the ground that the funds which were levied for war against the infidels were employed against Christians, or went to enrich the pope's nephew Jerome.

Meanwhile the Florentines were hard pressed by the combined forces of the pope and of king Ferdinand, under the command of the king's son Alfonso, duke of Calabria. They requested Ferdinand to state his terms of peace, but found them too humiliating; whereupon Lorenzo, in his distress, ventured on the bold expedient of going in person to Naples, where,

by the power of his discourse, and by his representations as to the true interest of the kingdom, he was able to convert Ferdinand from an enemy into an ally. On the 6th of March 1480, an alliance was concluded between Naples and the Florentine republic, to the great indignation of the Venetians and of the pope.

While Italy was thus distracted, the Turks advanced in their career of conquest. They took Otranto, where 12,000 out of 22,000 inhabitants were put to the sword, and revolting acts of cruelty, outrage and profanity were committed; and they laid siege to Rhodes, which was defended by the knights of St. John. It was evident that they aimed at Rome, and terrible stories were told of vows which Mahomet had made for the ruin of Christendom. Sixtus was so greatly alarmed that he spoke of retiring to Avignon; he issued urgent bulls for the crusade; he declared that he would even give his golden crown and the ornaments of his palace towards the expenses of the holy war, and the fear of the infidels prevailed with him to grant peace and absolution to the Florentines. This was not, however, to be done without formalities suitable to the greatness of his pretensions; and the Florentines were not in a condition to dispute about such matters. Twelve of the most eminent citizens, with the bishop of Volterra at their head, appeared at Rome as representatives of the republic. They were admitted within the gates in the dark, and without any of the marks of honour which were usually bestowed on ambassadors; and, having expressed their penitence and their desire of reconciliation, they were on Advent Sunday brought into the presence of the pope, who was seated on a lofty throne in the portico of St. Peter's. He addressed to them a rebuke "full of pride and anger" for the disobedience of which their countrymen had been guilty; and as they knelt before him, he lightly applied a rod to the shoulders of each, and chanted the verses of the Miserere alternately with the cardinals. The envoys were then admitted to kiss his feet and receive his blessing; the doors of the church were thrown open, and the pope was carried into it in state, and seated on the high altar.

The Florentines bound themselves to contribute a certain number of galleys for the Turkish war; and a force of papal and Neapolitan troops was sent to attempt the recovery of Otranto. The death of Mahomet "the Conqueror" (as his people styled him), and the contest which followed between his sons, prevented the reinforcement of the garrison; and the Turks, after having held the place for somewhat less than a year, were forced to capitulate to the duke of Calabria.

By this success the pope was extravagantly elated, and he plunged afresh into war, chiefly for the purpose of gaining Ferrara for his nephew Jerome. In conjunction with the Venetians, his troops contended with those of Naples, which, under the duke of Calabria, advanced to the very gates of Rome, until king Ferdinand contrived by large offers to gain Jerome to his side, and Sixtus, under his nephew's influence, was led to enter into a Neapolitan alliance in exchange for that of Venice. He now invited the Venetians to join the league with a view to the pacification of Italy; and on refusal he sent forth bulls denouncing the heaviest punishments against them. Venice was placed under interdict; the chiefs of the republic were excommunicated; all monks were charged to quit its territory; the offices of religion were to cease, without even the exception of communion on the bed of death; and there were the usual disabilities as to intercourse with faithful Christians, and other secular penalties by which the popes attempted to increase the spiritual terrors of their sentences. But the Venetians, whose subjection to the papacy was never very absolute, after having consulted learned jurists of Padua, took vigorous measures in opposition to the pope. The council of Ten ordered that a strict watch should be kept to prevent the introduction of missives from Rome. They required the patriarch to deliver to them any such document if it should reach him; and, through his compliance, they got possession of the bulls, and were able to prevent the publication of them within the territory of the republics. They ordered the clergy to perform their functions as usual, and banished some Franciscans who resisted the command. They assembled all the bishops within their boundaries, and in their presence appealed to a future

general council; whereupon the assembly accepted the appeal, and suspended the interdict. The titular patriarch of Constantinople, who presided, ventured to cite the pope before the future council, and means were found to post up the summons on the bridge of St Angelo, and even on the doors of the Vatican. And in addition to the ecclesiastical appeal, the Venetians entreated the princes of Christendom to give them an opportunity of stating their grievances before a general congress.

The war was continued, and in addition to it the old feuds between the anti-papal Colonna and Savelli families on the one side, and the Orsini, who were favoured by the pope, on the other side, raged with a fury which desolated the country around Rome.

A peace was at length concluded between Naples and Venice at Bagnolo. In this agreement there was no reservation for the benefit of Jerome Riario; and the pope, who was already ill when the tidings of it reached him, was so deeply mortified by its terms that his vexation is supposed to have caused his death, which took place on the fifth day after the date of the treaty.

In the city of Rome the pontificate of Sixtus was marked by much building and rebuilding, in the course of which, however, it is to be lamented that there was great destruction, not only of classical remains, but of venerable churches which had come down from the early centuries of Christianity. His name is still preserved by the Janiculan bridge, which he rebuilt, and by the chapel in the Vatican, which derives its chief fame from the grandeur of the decorations afterwards added by Michael Angelo. But perhaps more important than any individual buildings were his labours to render the city more habitable by paving and widening the streets, and by removing the porticoes and other projections which Ferdinand of Naples, at the Jubilee of 1475, pointed out to him as hindrances which prevented the popes from being fully masters of Rome. The hostile Stephen of Infessura tells us that Sixtus was followed to the tomb by the undisguised hatred and execrations of his people.

The death of Lewis XI of France preceded that of Sixtus by about a year (1483). At the instance of cardinal Julian della Rovere, he had consented to release cardinal Balue, after an imprisonment of fourteen years. In his last illness, when acute bodily sufferings awoke within him remorse for his long life of sin and crime, and rendered more intense the superstition which had always been a part of his character, he gathered around him all the most famous relics which could be obtained,—among them the holy phial, which had never before been removed from Reims since the time (as was believed) of Clovis. He entreated the pope to send him any relics which might relieve his agonies; and Sixtus complied with the request so liberally that the Romans in alarm remonstrated lest their city should suffer by being stripped of such treasures. He sent for hermits and other devotees of noted sanctity, in the hope that their intercessions might prolong his life. Of these the most renowned was one Francis, a native of Paola, in Calabria. Francis, it is said, was born with only one eye; but his mother vowed that, if the other eye might be granted to him, he should wear the habit of St. Francis for a year, at least, and her wish was fulfilled. He became a minorite friar, but, like Peter of Murrone in an earlier time, he withdrew to live in a cave, and, although utterly illiterate, was held in veneration for the austerity of his life and for his reputation of miraculous power. Lewis, having heard his fame, entreated the king of Naples and the pope that this holy man might be sent to him. The hermit, after having refused a request from his sovereign, was compelled by the pope's authority to set out; and as he passed through Rome his appearance produced a vast excitement. Sixtus granted him leave to found a society of "Hermits of St. Francis," and, with a view to the influence which he might be able through such an agent to exercise on the mind of Lewis, admitted him to long conferences. On reaching the French court, Francis was received with as much honour "as if he had been the pope himself." While others were disposed to ridicule him, Lewis could not endure to be long without his company; he knelt before him in abject superstition, hung on his words, and entreated him to spare him yet a little, as if his life were at the hermit's disposal; he bestowed rich rewards on him, and, in

order to propitiate him, founded convents at Plessis and at Amboise for the new religious society, the members of which, not content with the name of minorites, desired to signify their profession of utter insignificance by styling themselves Minims.

Although Charles VIII, the son and successor of Lewis, had attained his legal majority, the administration was for some years in the hands of his sister Anne, a young princess of clear and firm mind, and of her husband the lord of Beaujeu. The beginning of the reign was marked by a manifestation of national spirit in opposition to the papacy. At the first meeting of the estates there was much complaint as to Roman exactions, and when memoirs for the redress of grievances were presented, the first subject in that which related to ecclesiastical affairs was the restoration of the pragmatic sanction. Some of the bishops, who were indebted to Rome for their promotion, protested against the interference of the lay estates in such a matter; but, although the pragmatic sanction was not mentioned in the royal answer to the memorials, the parliaments of France continued to proceed as if it

The fury of the Roman factions burst forth with increased violence on the death of Sixtus, and the feelings of the populace towards the late pope were displayed in outrages against his favourites, his connexions, and his countrymen in general. The palace of Jerome Riario was sacked; its gardens and ornaments laid waste; and the stores of the Genoese merchants were plundered.

On the 26th of August—a fortnight after the death of Sixtus—the cardinals proceeded to the election of a successor. Intrigue was busy among them; and, according to the custom which had grown up, and which Innocent VI had in vain attempted to suppress, they endeavoured to secure advantages for themselves, and to prevent a recurrence of some late abuses, by entering into capitulations. The future pope was pledged to give one hundred gold florins monthly to every cardinal whose yearly income was under four thousand, to refrain from making more than one cardinal of his own family, and from entrusting to any of his kinsmen the fortresses of St. Angelo, Civita Vecchia, and Tivoli; and in all weighty matters he was pledged to take the advice of the sacred college. Borgia was so confident of success in the election, that he barricaded his palace in order to protect it from the spoliation which was usually committed on the dwelling of a new pope. But Julian della Rovere and Ascanius Sforza exerted themselves in opposition to him, and by special promises gained many votes for John Baptist Cibò, cardinal of St. Cecilia and bishop of Melfi, who was chosen on the fourth day of the conclave and took the name of Innocent VIII.

The family of Cibò was of Greek origin, but had been long settled at Genoa and Naples. The pope's father had been viceroy of Naples under king Rene, and senator of Rome in the pontificate of Calixtus III. Innocent was a man of handsome person and of popular manners. His earlier life had been lax, and under him Rome saw the novel scandal of seven illegitimate children, the offspring of different mothers, openly produced as the pope's family, and the objects of his paternal favour. But, although Innocent may have wished to endow his son Francis with principalities, after the manner of Sixtus IV, the only course which he found practicable was that of enriching his children out of the revenues of the church; and for this purpose, and to defray the costs of his war with Naples, he continued without abatement the corrupt and simoniacal exactions of his predecessors. Offices were created for the sake of the price which might be got by the sale of them; and the purchasers sought to repay themselves by using their opportunities of exaction. Two papal secretaries were detected in forging bulls; and as they were unable to pay the sum which was demanded for a pardon, they were put to death. With these abuses in the administration was combined an increased licence of manners in the papal court, which did not fail to affect the habits of the Romans in general.

Although Innocent, after his election, had sworn a second time to the capitulations imposed by the cardinals, and had become pledged neither to absolve himself nor to accept a release, he held himself at liberty, when firmly established in his seat, to repudiate these obligations as being contrary to the interests of the holy see. And having promised to the

Romans, with the other cardinals, and again after his election, that he would bestow the more valuable Roman preferments on none but citizens, he evaded the oath by admitting strangers to the freedom of the city, and afterwards promoting them as if they were qualified according to his promise. "But," says the chronicler Stephen of Infessura, "it is no wonder if he deceived the Roman people, since he had deceived Him to whom he had vowed and promised chastity." Throughout this pontificate Rome was distracted by the feuds of the Colonna and Orsini factions. And in 1485 the pope increased the disorders of his city by allowing all who had been banished, for whatever cause, to return. In consequence of this, Rome became a haunt of villains of every sort, who eagerly flocked to avail themselves of the papal clemency. Robbery and murder were frequent; churches were plundered of their plate and ornaments; every morning's light discovered in the streets the bodies of men who had been assassinated during the night; and the perpetrators of these crimes found an asylum in the houses of cardinals. After a time, Innocent found it necessary to proclaim that murderers and other criminals should leave the city. But the spirit of his administration was expressed by the sarcastic saying of a high officer, that "God willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he should pay and live". Immunity from all punishment was to be bought, if only a sufficient price were offered.

Although Innocent had himself in earlier life been in the service of the Neapolitan crown, he speedily found an opportunity of quarrelling with Ferdinand, by requiring that tribute should be paid for Naples as in former times, and by refusing to accept the white horse for which Sixtus had commuted the payment. In order to maintain this claim (which is supposed to have been connected with a project for the advancement of his son Franceschetto) he allied himself with the disaffected Neapolitan nobles, and put forward a grandson and namesake of king René as claimant of the throne. In the war which followed, Ferdinand's son, Alfonso, duke of Calabria, occupied the Roman Campagna with his troops, and for months distressed the city by cutting off all communications from outside; but at length a treaty was concluded which was greatly in favour of the pope. The king was to pay tribute to Rome; the barons were free to acknowledge the pope and the church as their immediate lords; and the pope was to have in his own hands the disposal of bishoprics and other dignities in the Neapolitan kingdom. But hardly had this treaty been concluded when Ferdinand set its conditions at naught. He allowed the tribute to fall into arrear; he assumed the entire patronage of sees within his dominions; and, in defiance alike of honour and of humanity, he and his son put to death many of the nobles whose safety had been solemnly promised. The pope complained loudly as to the tribute; but, after some feeble remonstrances, he did not venture to intercede for the allies who were exposed to the perfidy and cruelty of Ferdinand and Alfonso. Hostilities again began, and were prolonged for some years.

Innocent anathematized Ferdinand for withholding the payment of tribute, and declared him to be deposed and the kingdom to be forfeited to the Roman church; but in 1492 a fresh treaty was concluded, on the same terms which had before been so little regarded.

In order to strengthen himself for this contest, Innocent found it expedient to seek the alliance of Lorenzo de' Medici, to whom he had formerly been opposed. He married his son Franceschetto to a daughter of Lorenzo by his wife, Clarice Orsini; and bestowed the dignity of cardinal on the Magnifico's son John, who was then only thirteen years old. The promotion was to be kept secret until the boy should be old enough to take possession of his dignity; and when, at the age of sixteen, he repaired to Rome for this purpose, he was received with the pomp which was usually reserved for the visits of royal personages. Through his connexion with the Medici, Innocent was brought into friendly relations with the Orsini, who had formerly been so violently opposed to him that Virginius Orsini, a brother of Clarice, had threatened to throw him into the Tiber.

Innocent, like his predecessors since the fall of the eastern empire, projected a crusade against the Turks. In the beginning of his pontificate he invited all Christian princes to take part in such an expedition, and he afterwards entered into negotiations and agreements for

carrying it into effect; but without any considerable result. The death of Mahomet II had been followed by a contest for the throne between his sons Bajazet and Djem; the younger brother resting his claim on the fact that he had been born after his father's accession. On being defeated by his brother, Djem took refuge in Rhodes with the knights of St. John, who transferred him for safety to the care of their brethren in France. Great offers were made by Bajazet to the order, in the hope of inducing them to put Djem into his hands; while the kings of France and Hungary, of Aragon and Naples, and the sultan of Egypt, contended for him, with the view of setting him at the head of an expedition against his brother. But the pope was successful, and Djem, after a residence of more than six years in France, was escorted by cardinal Balue to Rome, where he was received as a sovereign prince, and was lodged in the Vatican palace. The master of the Hospitallers, D'Aubusson, was rewarded for the surrender of his guest by being promoted to the college of cardinals. At his first interview with the pope, Djem refused to perform the usual homage, and could only be persuaded to kiss him on the shoulder; and throughout his residence at Rome, he was careful to maintain his pretensions to dignity. Bajazet renewed his offers for the possession of his brother's person, or for his death. It is said that at one time he employed an Italian to destroy both Djem and the pope by poisoning the water of which they drank; at another time he sent an ambassador to offer a yearly payment of 40,000 ducats for the maintenance and safe keeping of the prince; and this sum was duly paid. In order further to propitiate the pope, Bajazet presented him with a relic of extraordinary sanctity—the head of the lance which had pierced the Saviour's side. This gift was not the less valued because the sacred lance was supposed to exist also at Paris, Nuremberg, and other places of the west; and to this day it is revered as one of the four chief relics of St. Peter's church.

While the project of a crusade against the Mussulmans of the east remained unexecuted, the last remnant of the Mahometan power in Spain was destroyed by the conquest of Granada, after a war of twelve years. The exultation produced at Rome by the report of this success was unbounded. The Spanish ambassador and the Spanish cardinal Borgia exhibited bull-fights and other spectacles, and for several days distributed food and wine to all who chose to apply.

Innocent VIII died, after a short illness, on the 25th of July in the same year. It is said that an attempt was made by a Jewish physician, although without the pope's consent, to prolong his life, by injecting into his veins the blood of three boys, whom their parents sold with a view to the experiment; but, although it proved fatal to the children, it was unavailing for the intended purpose.

Three months before the death of Innocent, while Rome was engrossed by the reception of the young son of Lorenzo de' Medici into the college of cardinals, the festivities were interrupted by the arrival of tidings that Lorenzo himself had died at his villa of Careggi, near Florence; and the circumstances of his deathbed lead us to trace the earlier history of a remarkable man, who, by the power of eloquence and by his earnest zeal for religion and morality, had acquired an extraordinary influence in that city.

Jerome Savonarola was born in 1452 at Ferrara, where his grandfather, a native of Padua, had settled as physician to the court. It was the wish of the family that Jerome should follow the same profession; but he preferred the study of theology, philosophy, and poetry. At the age of twenty-two, he was induced by the preaching of a friar, by some visions with which he supposed himself to be favoured, and by disgust at the wickedness and disorder of the world, to enter into the Dominican Order—to which he was especially inclined by his reverence for its great teacher, Thomas of Aquino. To the study of Aquinas he now added that of Cassian and other ascetic writers; but, above all, he devoted himself to the Holy Scriptures, of which his knowledge became very great, although he appears to have carried to an excess the caprices of the allegorical system of interpretation. After having spent seven years in the convent of Bologna, he was removed by his superiors to St. Mark's, at Florence—a monastery which but a few years before had been governed by the saintly archbishop Antoninus, while

its walls were adorned by the pencil of the “angelical” painter of Fiesole. But already its discipline had grievously decayed; and Savonarola, when after some years he was elected prior, found it necessary to correct by strict and searching reforms a state of luxury and worldliness altogether inconsistent with the institutions of St. Dominic.

After some unpromising efforts, and notwithstanding serious natural disqualifications, Savonarola had burst forth into unequalled power as a preacher; and the vast cathedral of Florence was crowded by multitudes who eagerly hung on his words. His fervid and fluent language, his passionate gestures, his eyes glowing with enthusiasm, seemed to indicate a man possessed by the convictions which he expressed, and authorized to speak in the name of God. The chief aim of his preaching was to rouse men from the chill indifference to spiritual things which marked the character of the age, and was especially conspicuous amidst the material prosperity and the literary and artistic culture of the Florentines. He denounced the sins of all classes, including the prelates and clergy—as to whom he declared that the church had once had golden priests and wooden chalices, but that now the chalices were of gold and the priests were wooden—that the outward splendour of religion had been hurtful to spirituality. He was fond of expounding the Apocalypse, and confidently foretold chastisements as being near at hand. According to words revealed to him in a vision, the sword of the Lord was to come on the earth speedily and swiftly. A new Cyrus was to descend on Italy from beyond the Alps; the church was to be scourged and was to be renewed. In part, these prophecies did not pretend to be more than the result of a firm belief in a Divine government of the world, carried on according to the principles declared in the Holy Scriptures—a conviction that, as offences had been committed, the threatened punishments would surely ensue; and as to this, Savonarola’s error consisted in assuming too certainly the time when the punishment was to come. But in part his utterances claimed a higher source; for from an early stage of his monastic life he had supposed himself to be favoured with visions and revelations, communicated to his mind by angels, and commissioned to announce the designs of God to men. As some of his predictions were fulfilled, the general belief in him increased; his followers spoke of him as “the prophet”; and by means of the press his writings and his fame were carried not only throughout Italy, but far beyond its borders. There were stories as to his being rapt from his senses while praying; that his face had been seen to shine with a celestial light; that he had contests with evil spirits.

To the family of Medici, Savonarola was inflexibly hostile. Himself a zealous republican, he regarded them as usurpers of the liberty of Florence; and he viewed with disgust and indignation the gross licentiousness and the pagan tendencies which were combined in Lorenzo with refinement of manners and high culture of tastes for literature and art. He refused to pay some marks of respect by which the priors of St. Mark’s had been accustomed to acknowledge the favours bestowed on their house by the Medicean family. The attempts of Lorenzo to alarm or to conciliate him were vain; but when at length the Magnifico felt the approach of death, and when, amidst the terrors of his aroused conscience, he found himself unable to trust the spiritual counsels of his chaplains, he eagerly requested a visit from the friar who, alone of all the clergy, had spoken to him with unflattering frankness. He professed especial remorse for three things—the cruelties committed in the sack of Volterra; his interference with the funds of a bank instituted for the benefit of young women, of whom many had in consequence of his acts been driven to a life of vice; and the bloodshed which had taken place on account of the Pazzian conspiracy. To his request for absolution Savonarola replied by assurances of the Divine mercy and goodness; but it is said that he in his turn required of the penitent three things—that he should have a living faith in God’s will and power to forgive; that he should restore all he had unjustly taken; and that he should re-establish the republican liberties of Florence. As to the first of these conditions, Lorenzo made the required profession; and to the second he consented, although with some reluctance. But when Savonarola, rising from his seat, denounced the last demand with the sternness of a

prophet, the dying man, gathering up his remaining strength, turned his back on the friar; and Savonarola left him unabsolved.

CHAPTER V.

ALEXANDER THE SIXTH.

A.D. 1492-1503.

THE death of Innocent was followed by disturbances such as had become usual during a vacancy of the popedom. The whole country around Rome was in arms; within the city itself it is said that two hundred and twenty persons were slain. The cardinals met for the election of a successor in the Sixtine chapel on the 6th of August. The practice of intrigue had been common on such occasions; but the manner in which members of the college now put themselves forward as candidates was without example. Among these the most prominent were Roderick Borgia, whose seniority, wealth, and frequent employment in the most important business of the church, gave weight to his pretensions; Ascanius Sforza, son of the great condottiere who had founded a new dynasty in the dukedom of Milan; and Julian della Rovere, the nephew of Sixtus IV. Although experience had amply proved the inefficacy of capitulations, an attempt was once more made to bind the future pope by engagements of this kind; among other things, he was required to promise that he would not make any cardinals without the consent of the existing members of the body.

The conclave was of unusual duration. Much bribery was practised. Sforza, after having ascertained that his own chance of election was little or none, transferred his interest to Borgia; and it is said that all the cardinals, except della Rovere, Piccolomini, and three others, were bought by the promise of money or preferments. At length, on the fifth night, the deliberations of the cardinals resulted in the election of Borgia, who exclaimed "I am pope, pontiff, and vicar of Christ!" and hastily put on the papal mantle, as if to assure himself of the reality of his success. The name which he took was Alexander VI.

Within a few days, Sforza, according to compact, received the office of vice-chancellor, which Borgia had held, together with his palace, and some churches and castles; while the preferments accumulated on other members of the college attested the value of their support, and the means by which it had been secured. But the consciousness of having attained his dignity by arts which might have vitiated the election—the dread of any inquiry, by a general council or any other tribunal, into the circumstances of his elevation—hung as a weight on the pope all his days, and affected his course of conduct.

Roderick Borgia (whose change of surname has been already mentioned) was born in 1431 at Valencia, of a family belonging to the lower grade of nobles. He had studied at Bologna, and in early life had been an advocate and also a soldier. To his uncle Calixtus III he was indebted for rapid ecclesiastical promotion; he became cardinal, archbishop of his native city, vice-chancellor of the Roman church; and his support of Sixtus IV at his election had procured for him the abbacy of Subiaco. By these preferments, and by inheritance from Calixtus, he had become very wealthy; and a mission as legate to Spain, for the purpose of gathering money for the crusade, had considerably increased his riches, although it had not improved his reputation. He was more esteemed for eloquence than for learning, but was especially noted for the craft, the perseverance, and the fertility of resources which marked his character as a negotiator. Fond as he was of pleasure, he never allowed the pursuit of it to interfere with business, to which he often devoted a large part of the night. And, although he hesitated at no crime for the attainment of his objects, he is praised for the placability of his disposition, and for the patience with which he overcame the enmity of opponents..

In the earlier years of his ecclesiastical life, Borgia made great professions of piety and charity, visiting churches and hospitals, and distinguishing himself by the largeness of his almsgiving. One of the first indications of the qualities for which he afterwards became infamous is found in a letter of severe reproof which Pius II, while sojourning at the baths of Petrioli after the council of Mantua, addressed to him on account of his having witnessed, if he did not even join in, some dancing which is described as indecent, in a garden at Siena. At a later time—probably about 1470—he entered into a connexion with a woman named Vanozza de' Catanei, whom he regarded as a sort of wife, while he provided her with two husbands in succession, and found places for these men in some of the government offices. By Vanozza he became the father of five children, of whom three sons and a daughter were alive at the time of his elevation to the papacy. Yet it would seem that thus far Borgia's laxity of morals had not in any remarkable degree exceeded such licence as the age allowed. His palace had not, like those of some other cardinals, been notoriously defiled by scandalous revels; nor was it until he had been raised to the most sacred office in Christendom that his infamy became conspicuous and signal.

The report of Alexander's election excited various feelings. By some of the Romans, who looked to his dignified presence, his wealth, his expensive tastes, and who expected a splendid pontificate, the tidings were received with joy, and he was extolled in verses to which his later life gives the character of the bitterest satire. But those who saw farther into his character—among them the sovereigns of his native Spain—regarded his promotion with alarm; and Ferdinand of Naples, who, notwithstanding his treachery, cruelty, and other vices, was regarded as the wisest statesman of the age, is said to have shown his knowledge of Alexander by bursting into tears.

The spirit of secular ambition, and the undisguised licentiousness, which had been more and more displayed during the late pontificates, were now carried to a monstrous excess. For the first time the bastards of a pope were brought forward as his acknowledged children; and the violence of his affection for them carried him into crimes of many sorts, tempted him to disturb the peace of the world, to make Italy, which for many years had enjoyed a tranquil prosperity such as had never before been known, a scene of violence and bloodshed, and to invite the fatal interference of foreign nations in her affairs.

For his eldest son, Peter Lewis, who died before Alexander's elevation to the papacy, he had obtained from the king of Spain the title of duke of Gandia, which passed to the next brother, John. The third son, Caesar, was designed for the ecclesiastical profession, and was a student at Pisa, when a courier announced to him his father's elevation to the papacy. On receiving the news, Caesar at once set out for Rome, where the pope received him with affection, but is said to have addressed to him a formal speech, in which, after adverting to the discredit which the first Borgia pope had incurred by his nepotism, he warned him that he must expect no promotion except such as his merits should justify. The hypocrisy of such a declaration was forthwith shown by Alexander's promoting, in his first consistory, a nephew to be archbishop of Monreale and cardinal; and three other Borgias, besides Caesar, were afterwards raised to the cardinalate, while other relations of the pope were thrust into all manner of offices and preferments. On Caesar himself his father at once bestowed the bishopric of Pampeluna (which Innocent had designed for him), and to this he added, on the day of his coronation, his own archbishopric of Valencia. In the following year, he made him a cardinal; and as illegitimacy would have been a bar to such a promotion, the pope suborned false witnesses to swear that Caesar was the lawful offspring of Vanozza by her first husband.

The pope's daughter, the beautiful Lucretia, who was in her fifteenth year, had been some time betrothed to a son of the count of Aversa; but Alexander, whose ambition had risen with his fortunes, now bribed him to sue for a dissolution of the engagement, in order that Lucretia might marry a suitor of more powerful connexions—Alexander Sforza, illegitimate son of the lord of Pesaro, and great-nephew of the first duke Sforza of Milan. The marriage

was celebrated in the Belvedere, which had been added to the Vatican by Innocent VIII; and it was followed by a banquet, at which cardinals and other high ecclesiastical dignitaries sat promiscuously with ladies, and by the performance of comedies and other amusements, which lasted far into the night. Among the party was Julia Farnese, known as “la Bella” a married woman, for whose sake Alexander made her brother a cardinal; and the chronicler who describes the scene speaks indignantly of the effect which the examples of Innocent and Alexander had produced on the morals of the clergy, and even of the monastic orders.

For his youngest son, Geoffrey, the pope planned a marriage with a daughter of Alfonso, duke of Calabria. The duke’s father, king Ferdinand, was willing to consent to this marriage, but Alfonso himself was strongly opposed to it; and by this disappointment the pope was thrown into other connexions, which were full of disaster for Italy.

Lewis Sforza, who from his swarthy complexion was styled the Moor, a man of deep ambition and perfidy, administered the government of Milan in the name of his nephew, John Galeazzo, whom it is said that, for the sake of retaining power in his own hands, he allowed to grow up without any such training as might have fitted him for the duties of his position. Lewis projected a national league of the Italian powers, for the purpose of preserving their country from foreign rule, and endeavoured to gain the pope’s co-operation but, finding that a special alliance had been concluded between Alexander, the king of Naples, and the Florentine republic, he was led by jealousy to invite Charles VIII of France into Italy, for the purpose of asserting a claim to the Neapolitan crown, which had been bequeathed by the last count of Provence to Lewis XI; and the conquest of Naples was represented as a step towards the recovery of Constantinople and Jerusalem from the infidels. The proposal was well fitted to attract the young king, who, although weak, sickly, and almost deformed in person, and yet more feeble in mind, had his imagination filled with visions of chivalrous and crusading exploits and renown. His wisest counsellors—such as his sister, the lady of Beaujeu, and Philip de Comines—endeavoured to dissuade him from undertaking an expedition into Italy, and urged him to accept the offers made by Ferdinand of Naples to hold the kingdom as tributary to the crown of France. But Charles listened to advisers of another kind—to Neapolitan exiles who were eager for vengeance on the Aragonese dynasty, and to his kinsman Lewis, duke of Orleans, who wished to use the king’s ambition for the furtherance of his own designs on Italy. He dismissed the Neapolitan ambassadors, and prepared for an expedition to Italy by making peace, on disadvantageous terms, with the kings of England and of Spain, and with Maximilian, who had lately succeeded his father Frederick as emperor.

The expectation of a French invasion brought about a connexion between the reigning dynasty of Naples and the pope. It was arranged that the youngest Borgia, Geoffrey, who was only twelve or thirteen years of age, should marry Sancha, an illegitimate daughter of the duke of Calabria; that he should receive the principality of Squillace, with other territory, and should be appointed lieutenant of the kingdom; that the duke of Gandia should be nominated to one of the chief offices, and that Caesar Borgia should receive high ecclesiastical preferment at Naples; while, on the other hand, the tribute payable by the Neapolitan crown to the papacy was to be reduced. Ferdinand died on the 25th of January, 1494, and it is believed that was hastened by the French king’s rejection of his offers. His successor, Alfonso, who was eminent as a general, but was even more treacherous and cruel than his father, was crowned by the cardinal-archbishop of Monreale, and the marriage of Geoffrey Borgia with Sancha was celebrated at the same time. In their alarm, Alfonso and the pope applied for assistance to the Turkish sultan, whom they endeavoured to move by representing that the French king avowedly looked on Naples as only a stepping-stone towards Constantinople; but they failed to obtain any effective assistance. To ambassadors who urged the claim of Charles to Naples, Alexander replied that the kingdom was a fief of the holy see, and could be disposed of only by the pope; that the Aragonese princes had been invested in it, and that he could not dispossess them unless another claim could be shown to be stronger than theirs. And

he threatened to pronounce the censures of the church if Charles should cross the Alps.

Charles had advanced as far as Lyons, where he remained a considerable time, engaged in tournaments and in voluptuous enjoyments. It was still uncertain whether the expedition to Italy were to take place, when the king's vacillating mind was determined by the arrival of cardinal Julian della Rovere, the implacable enemy of Alexander. After the election of the pope, Julian had withdrawn to the fortress of Ostia, where he was besieged and at length driven out. Alexander had attempted to conciliate him; but Julian declared that he would never again trust a Catalan; and, from having been the most zealous partisan of Naples in the college of cardinals, he transferred himself to the French interest in consequence of the pope's having entered into a connexion with Alfonso. Arriving at Lyons when the king's plans were altogether uncertain, his strong and impetuous eloquence, and the freedom with which he represented the disgrace of abandoning the enterprise, determined Charles to proceed; and in the end of August the king crossed the Alps at the head of a gallant, although undisciplined army. The money which he had raised, including a large loan from his Milanese ally, had been spent on the gaieties of Lyons, and on a fleet which was not turned to any account; and already his difficulties were such that he borrowed jewels from the duchess of Savoy and the marchioness of Montferrat, in order that he might procure money by pledging them.

After a stay of some weeks at Asti, which belonged to the duke of Orleans, Charles moved onwards. At Milan he saw the young duke, John Galeazzo; but this unfortunate prince died almost immediately afterwards, and, although he left a son five years old, Louis the Moor, who was suspected of having caused his nephew's death, assumed the ducal title. As Charles approached Florence, Peter de' Medici, who had conceived the idea of imitating his father Lorenzo's venturesome and successful visit to Naples, appeared in the French camp, and, although others had been joined with him in the mission, he took it on himself to conclude a treaty by which four of the strongest places belonging to the republic were given up to France. Peter, who had been only twenty-one years old at the time of his father's death, had already made himself obnoxious to the Florentines by his incapacity, his frivolity, his pride, his irregularities, and other faults; and the result of his negotiations with Charles exasperated them to such a degree that, on his return to the city, he and his brothers were driven into exile. The eloquence of Savonarola, who spoke of the "new Cyrus" as an instrument of Divine vengeance for the sins of the Italians, instead of rousing the citizens to resistance, tended to persuade them to submission. He reminded them that the sword which he had foretold had now actually come on them. After the expulsion of the Medici, the friar was sent at the head of an embassy which was received by Charles at Pisa. In the solemn tone of a prophet, he told the king that he must regard himself as an instrument in God's hand; that if he should forget his calling—if he should neglect to labour for the reform of the church, and to respect the liberties and the honour of the Florentines—another would be chosen in his stead. Charles answered with courtesy, although in a way which showed that he did not apprehend the peculiarity of Savonarola's character and position; but during his stay at Florence (where the citizens, who had agreed to admit him peaceably, were deeply offended by his entering with his lance on his thigh, as if assuming the character of a conqueror) the friar's admonitions were repeatedly administered to him.

In the meantime Alexander was distracted by a variety of fears. In vain he entreated Maximilian to intervene as advocate of the church. He was alarmed by hearing that the Colonnas had openly declared for the French, and entertained designs of seizing him; that the Orsini, on whose support he had relied, had submitted to the invader; that the trading classes of his city were not disposed to stand by him; that the French were devastating everywhere, and that his concubine, Julia Farnese, had fallen into their hands. Cardinal Piccolomini and others whom he sent to Charles, returned without having been able to obtain an audience. He arrested the cardinals who were in favour of France, and even the French ambassadors; and almost immediately after he released them again. He spoke of leaving Rome, but was unable

to carry out any resolution. He invited Ferdinand, duke of Calabria, to occupy the city with Neapolitan troops. But when Charles asked for leave to pass through Rome, in order to the crusade (for nothing was said of his designs on Naples), Alexander felt that he could make no effective opposition; and by his request the duke of Calabria withdrew, although with undisguised indignation, along the Appian way at the same time that the French made their entrance at the Flaminian gate. As at Florence, Charles affected to enter as a conqueror, by carrying his lance rested on his thigh. On his right and on his left rode the cardinals Julian della Rovere, Sforza, Colonna, and Savelli; and the multitude raised loud shouts in honour of France, Colonna, and the cardinal of St. Peter ad Vincula. It was night before the greater part of the troops could enter; and the gleam of torches and of lights from the windows heightened the impression made by their arms, their horses, and a train of artillery which far exceeded all that the Italians had yet beheld of its kind.

Alexander, a few days after the king's arrival, withdrew into the castle of St. Angelo, from which he uneasily watched the lights and the sounds on the other side of the Tiber. He knew that importunities were addressed to Charles by eighteen cardinals for the assembling of a general council in order to his deposition; and he felt that neither the manner of his elections nor his personal character could endure the examination of such an assembly. He was repeatedly urged by Charles to give up the fortress as a pledge; but he declared that he would rather place himself on the battlements, with the holy Eucharist and the heads of the two great apostles in his hands, and would abide the effect of an attack. The French, in their impatience at his obstinacy, twice pointed their cannon against St. Angelo; but a party among the king's advisers, which had been drawn into the pope's interest by the promise of ecclesiastical dignities, was able to prevent any practical acts of hostility. During his stay at Rome, Charles daily visited some church, to hear mass and to inspect the sacred relics; and the Romans looked on with astonishment when he touched for the king's evil in the church of St. Petronilla. But his soldiers, notwithstanding a solemn engagement to refrain from all violence, freely indulged their insolence and their love of spoil: even Vanozza's house was plundered, to Alexander's great anger and disgust.

A treaty was concluded, by which the pope was to put certain fortified towns into the hands of the French until the conquest of Naples should have been achieved. He was also to make over to them for six months the Turkish prince Djem, with a view to the proposed crusade; and he was to extend an amnesty to the cardinals and others who had offended him by taking part with France. After the conclusion of this agreement, Charles was more than once received at the Vatican, to which the pope had returned; and Briçonnet, bishop of St. Malo, one of his favourite counsellors, was promoted to the dignity of cardinal. The same honour was conferred on Peter of Luxemburg, bishop of Le Mans.

On the 28th of January the king left Rome, taking with him the Turkish prince, and accompanied by Caesar Borgia, who was decorated with the title of legate, but was really intended to serve as a hostage for the performance of his father's promises. Caesar, however, on the second night of the march absconded from Velletri in the dress of a groom, so that the security which his presence had given was lost.

At Naples the approach of the French produced an outbreak against the reigning dynasty. Alfonso, knowing that, both for his father's sake and for his own, he was execrated by his subjects, and that by his atrocious cruelties and his detestable vices he had well deserved their abhorrence, resigned the crown in favour of his son Ferdinand, and withdrew to a Sicilian monastery, where he engaged in penitential exercises, and soon after died. The new king, finding himself unable, with a disheartened and mutinous soldiery and a disaffected people, to make head against the invader, retired to the island of Ischia; and on the following day Charles entered Naples unopposed, and was received with joyful demonstrations of welcome.

But the popular feeling in favour of the French was soon changed into detestation. The

strangers abused their fortune. They treated the Neapolitans with contempt and outrage. All offices were bestowed on foreigners, and sometimes two or three were accumulated on one person; even private property was invaded to gratify the rapacity of Frenchmen; and Charles avowed an intention of reducing the barons of the kingdom from their comparative independence to a like state of subordination with the nobility of France. He neglected business; to his new subjects he was inaccessible; and those who had steadily adhered to the Angevine interest were disgusted at finding that their past fidelity and sufferings did not exempt them from being confounded with the partisans of the expelled dynasty. The young French nobles, after the king's example, gave themselves up freely to pleasure; the mass of the army, in consequence of their indulgences, were enervated by a new and loathsome disease; the project of a crusade, which had been used to sanctify the invasion of Italy, was utterly forgotten. At Naples, Djem died on the 26th of February; and his death was attributed, not only by popular opinion, but by Charles himself, to a slow poison, administered (as was supposed) by the pope, who had corresponded with Bajazet as to the means of removing the unfortunate prince, and reaped the benefit of the imputed crime by receiving 300,000 ducats for his body.

While Charles was lingering in hurtful inaction at Naples, dangers were gathering behind him. Lewis Sforza, alarmed by finding that the duke of Orleans had asserted a claim to Milan, as being the sole legitimate descendant of the Visconti, and that in this he was countenanced by the French king, concluded at Venice a league with the pope, the emperor, the sovereigns of Spain, and the Venetian republic, which, although professedly intended for defence against the Turks, had evidently a further meaning. Charles, on receiving from his envoy at Venice, Philip de Comines, a report of this formidable combination, resolved to return northwards. Before leaving Naples he wished to be formally inaugurated in his new sovereignty; but as the pope, notwithstanding an absolute promise which he had made during the king's stay at Rome, refused to grant him investiture, even with a reservation of any rival claims, he resolved to act on his own authority. He therefore, on the 12th of May, proceeded in state to the church of St. Januarius, arrayed in the ensigns of eastern imperial dignity, and there solemnly bound himself by oath to maintain the rights and liberties of the Neapolitans. He then set out homewards, leaving a part of his force to maintain his authority in the south of Italy.

On his arrival at Rome, Charles found that Alexander had withdrawn two days before to Orvieto, and had taken with him all the cardinals, except Morton, archbishop of Canterbury, who was left to act as his vicar. At Poggibonsi the king was again visited by Savonarola, who rebuked him for having failed to perform fully the work to which he had been called, and intimated that a punishment was hanging over him, yet assured him of the Divine protection on his return. As Charles retreated northwards, the Italians, after having neglected earlier opportunities of attacking him, presented themselves in numbers far exceeding those of his army at Fornuovo on the Taro; and in this, the only battle of the whole campaign, the French gained the advantage, and the king had the satisfaction of distinguishing himself by personal valour. A peace was concluded with Sforza at Novara, and Charles, after an absence of about fourteen months, recrossed the Alps, and again found himself in France. In the meantime Ferdinand had returned to Naples; and, although he was at first driven out by Stuart of Aubigny, a skilful general of Scottish descent whom Charles had left in command of his troops, a second expedition put him into possession, of his kingdom, through the assistance of the "Great Captain" of Spain, Gonsalvo de Aguilar. Of the French who had been left at Naples, ill supplied with money and provisions, and exposed to the ravages of war and of disease, hardly any found their way home from the land of which their conquest had appeared so easy.

Gonsalvo also lent his aid to the pope for the reduction of Ostia, which had been left by Charles in the hands of Cardinal Julian, and, from its position at the mouth of the Tiber, was a

place of importance for the Romans. For this service the great captain was rewarded by a triumphal reception at Rome. In the ceremonies of the holy week, he refused to receive the palm from the pope's own hands, because the duke of Gandia had received it before him; but he condescended to accept the golden rose, which was regarded as a gift for sovereigns. But the freedom with which he expressed himself as to the disorders and scandals of the court, without sparing the pope himself, made Alexander glad to be speedily delivered from his presence.

The emperor Frederick III had been succeeded by his son Maximilian, who had already been chosen king of the Romans. In contrast to his father's inertness, Maximilian displayed an excessive love of adventure, which continually led him to undertake great things without calculation as to the possibility of carrying out his designs. The need of money, which had reduced Frederick to inaction, and had brought on him the reproach of avarice, instead of restraining Maximilian from entering on arduous enterprises, compelled him to leave them unfinished; and the world, which had at first been dazzled by his brilliant and popular personal qualities, soon learnt to understand his "unstable and necessitous courses", and to attach little value to his promises and engagements. His intervention in the affairs of Italy, in 1496, had little other effect than that of contributing greatly to the decline of his reputation.

Ferdinand II of Naples died at the age of twenty-seven, soon after the recovery of his dominions, which on his death fell to his uncle Frederick, an amiable and popular prince. The pope resolved to turn to advantage the restoration of the Aragonese dynasty; and he revived the schemes of Sixtus IV for the aggrandizement of his own family. An attempt to put down the Orsini, with a view to getting possession of their estates, was defeated by their vigorous resistance; and Alexander found it necessary to make the church bear the expense of the enrichment which he designed for his children. In a secret consistory on the 7th of June, 1597, the duke of Gandia, who had just been appointed standard-bearer of the church, was formally invested in the dukedom of Benevento, with Terracina and Pontecorvo; and it was supposed that the dukedom was intended as a step to a greater elevation in Naples. No one of the cardinals, except Piccolomini, ventured to object to this alienation of St. Peter's property; for Julian della Rovere and cardinal Perauld, bishop of Gurk, who might probably have joined in the protest, had been driven into exile.

Two days later, Caesar Borgia was appointed to proceed to Naples as legate for the coronation of the new king; *but* before his departure a mysterious crime was perpetrated. On the evening of Wednesday, the 14th of June, the duke of Gandia and Caesar, with some others, had supped at the house of Vanozza, near the church of St. Peter ad Vincula. The brothers mounted their mules, and rode together towards the Vatican quarter, when, near the palace which the pope had bestowed on Ascanius Sforza, the duke took leave of the cardinal, saying that he wished for some further amusement before returning to the Vatican. He then took up behind him one of their companions at the supper—a masked person, who for some weeks before had been accustomed to visit him at the palace,—and he rode away attended by a groom. Next day the groom was found mortally wounded in the Piazza of the Jews, but could give no information, except that he had been left there, with orders to wait an hour, and, if his master did not reappear within that time, to return to the palace. The duke's prolonged absence excited his father's alarm, and an inquiry was set on foot. A charcoal dealer gave evidence that, while watching on the Ripetta, about the fifth hour of the night, he had seen a body thrown into the Tiber by four men, acting under the orders of one on horseback, who had brought it hanging behind him as he rode; and on being asked why he had not informed the police, the witness made an answer which throws a dismal light on the state of Rome under Alexander's government—that he had in his time seen a hundred corpses cast by night into the river, without having heard of any inquiry after them. When this evidence had been received, three hundred men were employed to drag the river; and the body of the duke was found, with the throat cut, and stabbed in eight other places. The hands were bound, and some

money remained untouched in the pockets of the dress. The pope was for the time overwhelmed by his son's dark and tragical end. As the body, after having been carried up the river in a boat, was landed at the castle of St. Angelo amidst the lamentations of the countrymen of the Borgias, one voice rose so loudly above the rest that persons standing on the neighbouring bridge could distinctly hear it; and it was believed to be the voice of the miserable father. For three days he neither ate, nor drank, nor slept; he remained shut up in his apartment, from which it is said that there were heard not only his lamentations, but cries that he knew the murderer. When, however, the matter was brought before the consistory, the pope declared that he suspected no one; but the inquiry was suddenly brought to an end, and it was believed that he knew the guilty secret only too well. Although men did not venture to utter their thoughts, no one doubted the guilt of Caesar Borgia. Finding himself cut off from the natural objects of his ambition by a profession for which he had neither fitness nor liking, while the circumstances of his birth excluded him from all hope of its highest dignity, it would seem that Caesar had been struck with envy of the position to which his more fortunate brother had been raised, and of the yet higher honours which the pope was scheming for the duke; and it is said that this motive, which of itself might have been sufficient for so depraved a nature, was exasperated by jealousy at finding his brother preferred by a mistress with whom both were intimate.

To the consistory of cardinals, to ambassadors and others who were admitted to his presence, Alexander professed himself so shattered by his loss that he could take no interest in worldly objects; he professed to feel remorse for his past life—to care for nothing but the reformation of the church, for which he appointed a commission of six cardinals; he even talked of resigning the papacy. But in no long time these dispositions passed away. A scheme of reform, which was drawn up by the commission, remained a dead letter; and Alexander plunged again into intrigue and vice and crime. For a time it was believed that the ghost of the murdered man was heard wailing by night about the Vatican; but the report died away, although the people continued to see proofs of demoniacal influence in some calamities which followed quickly on each other—storm and flood, and lightning, which caused an explosion of the powder- magazine in the castle of St. Angelo.

The path of ambition now lay clear before Caesar; and it would seem that already his plans were formed. His strength of will prevailed over the pope, who appears to have resigned himself to the loss of his elder son, and to have concentrated all his affections and his hopes on the supposed fratricide. Within a few weeks after his brother's death, the cardinal proceeded on his mission to Naples, and placed the crown on the head of the king whom he was perhaps even then plotting to dethrone.

Under Alexander it has been truly said that the papacy changed from a theocracy to a tyranny. The Romans had lost all independence since the suppression of the Porcario conspiracy. The college of cardinals, although it contained a few men of higher class, was chiefly filled with nominees of Alexander, who had bought their places, who too much resembled him in character, and in action were his slaves and tools.

The death of Charles of France, which took place on the 7th of April 1498, at the age of twenty-eight, opened new prospects for Alexander. The duke of Orleans, who succeeded to the throne under the name of Lewis XII, needed the papal sanction in order that he might rid himself of his wife, who had been forced on him by her father, Lewis XI, and might marry his predecessor's widow, Anne of Brittany, who by the death of Charles had again become the sole possessor of her hereditary duchy; while the pope saw in a French alliance the means of protecting himself against the threat of a general council. The question of the king's marriage was investigated by a commission of bishops and doctors, who on false evidence and frivolous grounds pronounced it to be null, and reported this judgment to Rome.

Caesar Borgia had resolved to rid himself of the restraints of the clerical character. He appeared- before his brother cardinals, and declared that he had always been strongly inclined

to the life of a layman; that he had entered into the ecclesiastical estate out of deference to the pope's wishes alone; that he felt himself unfit for it, and desired a release from it; and that if this were granted, he would resign all his preferments. He entreated the cardinals to join with him in his petition; and they consented to do so. The pope willingly granted him the required dispensation, and the cardinal-archbishop was restored to the condition of a layman.

Caesar now prepared to go into France for the business of the king's divorce and remarriage. The magnificence of his appointments was extraordinary; even the horses of his train were shod with silver. And, although the French privately indulged their wit in ridiculing him, he was received at Avignon and at Chinon with honours such as were usually reserved for sovereigns. He carried with him bulls for the divorce and remarriage of Lewis, and also one by which the dignity of cardinal was bestowed on the king's favourite minister, George d'Amboise; but with the intention of exacting the highest possible terms from the king, he concealed the fact as to the matrimonial bull, and professed to have only that for the divorce. The secret was betrayed by the bishop of Cete to Lewis, who thereupon proceeded, without having seen the bull, to celebrate his marriage with Anne; and it is said that Caesar avenged himself for the bishop's indiscretion by poison.

The pope, in his eagerness for the advancement of his family, had asked king Frederick of Naples to bestow on Caesar the hand of one of his daughters, with a considerable territory; but both Frederick and the princess had shown the strongest repugnance to such a connexion. In return for the favour which he had bestowed on the French king in the matter of the divorce, Alexander now engaged Lewis to support him in this project; but the feelings of the Neapolitan princess were not to be overcome. Lewis, however, had so far pledged his assistance that he felt himself bound to obtain for Caesar the hand of some lady whose birth might be suitable to the aspirations of the Borgias; and thus the ex-cardinal became the husband of Charlotte d'Albret, sister of the king of Navarre, and niece of Lewis. It was a condition of the marriage that one of her brothers should be created a cardinal; and on the other hand Lewis bestowed on Caesar the duchy of Valentinois, and promised to assist him in his schemes of Italian conquest.

Lewis had from the time of his accession declared his designs on Milan by assuming the title of duke, on the ground of descent through his grandmother, Valentina, from the first duke of the Visconti family. In the summer of 1499, a campaign of twenty days made him master of the duchy, while Lewis the Moor sought a refuge in the Tyrol, with the emperor Maximilian, who had married his niece and had borrowed large sums of him. The king entered Milan in triumph, on the 6th of October but a reaction speedily followed, and Sforza, within five months from the day when he had left Milan amid the curses of his subjects, was received back with extravagant joy. In the war which ensued, however, he was betrayed at Novara by his Swiss mercenaries, who entered into an agreement with their countrymen in the French service; and the last ten years of his life were spent in a narrow iron cage at Loches. His brother, the ambitious cardinal Ascanius, was also made a prisoner, and was closely imprisoned at Bourges.

But beyond Milan Lewis carried his views to Naples. Alexander had in 1497 invested Frederick in that kingdom; but he had since been deeply offended by the persistent refusal of his son's alliance in marriage, while he had become bound to the French king by ties of mutual interests. There was, however, reason to apprehend opposition from Frederick's kinsman, Ferdinand of Spain, who asserted that he himself was the rightful heir of the Aragonese line of Naples, inasmuch as Alfonso I had not been entitled to bequeath the kingdom to his illegitimate offspring. But the crafty Ferdinand professed that, for the sake of peace, he was willing to admit the concurrent claim of Lewis, as heir of the line of Durazzo; and on this basis a flagitious scheme of joint conquest, to be followed by a partition of the Neapolitan territory between France and Spain, was agreed on at Granada on St. Martin's day, 1500. It was alleged against Frederick, not only that his title was defective, but that he had

invited the Turks to attack a Christian power—a charge which might with equal truth have been made against the pope himself, with the addition that he had profited by his correspondence with the Turks, whereas Frederick had received no benefit from them. The ambassadors of France and Spain urged these considerations on the pope, and represented that their sovereigns (whose troops had already entered the States of the Church) desired the possession of Naples only with a view to the conquest of Constantinople. The pope, in addition to his wish to punish Frederick for his offence, saw that, if he were removed, the barons of the Campagna, whose subjugation Alexander meditated, would be deprived of all support from without. He therefore agreed to invest the French and Spanish sovereigns in their expected conquests, and pronounced Frederick to be deposed for his connexion with the infidels and for having fostered rebels against the church; but this sentence was to be kept secret until the result of the expedition should be known. Ferdinand's general, the "great captain" Gonsalvo, who was already in Sicily for the purpose of assisting the Venetians against the Turks, crossed over to Naples at the invitation of the unsuspecting Frederick, and perfidiously turned against him. From the other side, Stuart of Aubigny, accompanied by Caesar Borgia as his lieutenant, advanced into the Neapolitan territory. Capua was taken by the help of treachery, and Caesar found an opportunity of signally displaying his cruelty, rapacity, and lust. It was clear that Frederick could have no hope of success against the combination of powerful enemies which had attacked him. In his extremity, he chose to surrender himself to the stranger rather than to the perfidious kinsman who had taken advantage of his unsuspecting faith to effect his ruin; and he received from Lewis the duchy of Anjou, with a pension of 30,000 ducats, on condition that he should not quit the soil of France.

With the countenance of the French king, and with some material aid from him, the duke of Valentinois entered on his campaigns in Italy in 1499. The design was to form for the Borgia family a large principality, and in the first instance to gain possession of some of the remoter territories belonging to the Roman church. These had formerly been committed to the care of papal vicars, whose descendants had gradually assumed the position of independent lords, paying their tribute to the Roman see irregularly, if at all, engaging themselves in the service of princes, without consideration of their obligations to the church, and acting in a general disregard of its superiority. Each of them had his palace and his court, at which, according to the fashion of the age, artists, poets, and men of letters were entertained. The expenses of these courts usually made it necessary to tax the subjects oppressively, even if worse means of raising money were not employed; the morals of the princes were commonly of the depraved type which in that age was characteristic of Italy; their courts and their territories were full of lawlessness and crimes; assassinations, poisonings, and other such atrocities were familiar matters of every day. By ejecting these petty tyrants, therefore, the pope intended not only to aggrandize his family, but to put into their place one who, instead of their rebellious defiance, would be guided by policy and interest to act in accordance with the papacy, and he had little reason to fear that they would be supported by any popular feeling among those who had suffered from their vices and their misgovernment. Their failure as to the payment of tribute afforded a pretext for confiscating their territories; and Caesar proceeded to carry out the papal sentence. At one place after another he was successful, the only considerable difficulty which he encountered was at Forli, where Catharine Sforza, the widow of Jerome Riario, vigorously defended herself for a time; but she was at last compelled to submit, and for a time was imprisoned in the castle of St. Angelo.

On his return to Rome, Caesar was honoured with a triumph, and with a public reception by the pope, who soon after bestowed on him the golden rose, and appointed him captain-general and standard-bearer of the church, in the room of his murdered brother. His success was celebrated with games and other festive spectacles; among which was a representation in the Piazza Navona of the victories of Julius Caesar. The alienation of the church's

patrimony to the Borgias was sanctioned by the college of cardinals; and Caesar joined to the title of Valentinois that of duke of Romagna. In order to counteract in some degree the impression which his crimes had made on the minds of men, he established throughout his dominions an energetic system of administration, which appeared in favourable contrast with the misrule of the ejected princes; but even as to this he delighted to employ that system of mysterious terror which was one of his chief instruments. Thus, when the province had been reduced to order by the stern rigour of a governor named Ramiro d'Orco, the people of Cesena were startled by discovering one morning in their market-place the body of the governor, with the head severed from it, and a block with a bloody knife between them,—a spectacle by which the duke intended to claim for himself the credit of his good government, to throw the blame of past severities on the officer who had thus been punished for them, and to strike a general awe by the manner of Ramiro's end.

Having gained the greater part of the Romagna (although he found himself obliged to leave the Bentivoglio family in possession of Bologna), Caesar turned his attention towards Tuscany. But here he found that his ally the king of France, instead of assisting him, required him to give up his attempt; and he was obliged to content himself with receiving from the republic of Florence the office of condottiere, with a large income attached to it, and with the understanding that no services were to be required of him. The countenance shown by the French king to a man so generally execrated as Caesar induced many complaints, which were laid before the king at Asti, with entreaties that he would deliver the church both from Alexander and from his son. It would seem that Lewis thought of deposing the pope, and that to this time is to be referred a medal which he struck, with the inscription, "*Perdam Babilonis nomen*". But Alexander, who had already gratified the king by appointing his minister d'Amboise legate *a latere* for France, drew the cardinal afresh into his interest by promising to create additional cardinals, with a view to promoting his election to the papacy; and Caesar, on hurrying to Lewis at Milan, was received with cordiality and confidence. The alliance with the king was confirmed, and Lewis soon after returned to France.

By the partition of the Neapolitan kingdom, the barons of the Campagna were deprived of the support on which they had relied; and Caesar proceeded to reduce them to submission. But in the course of this war, the duke's condottieri and captains, of whom many belonged to the same class with the enemies against whom they were engaged, began to perceive that they were lending themselves as instruments for their own ruin. Caesar was suddenly surprised by a mutiny, and was shut up in the town of Imola, until the besiegers were driven off by the approach of some French troops, who advanced to his assistance. Caesar, after having treated with the leaders of the mutiny singly, was able to bring them together, as if for a conference, at Sinigaglia, where he had collected as large a force as possible; and, after having by a show of kindness led them to throw off all suspicion, and to disarm their followers, he caused them to be surrounded by his soldiery, arrested them, and put some of the most important among them to death. Such was the morality of the age, that this atrocious treachery was regarded with general admiration. Lewis XII himself spoke of it (apparently without sarcasm or irony) as "a Roman deed"; and Machiavelli repeatedly eulogizes Caesar as the model of a prince and a statesman.

Among those arrested at Sinigaglia were some of the Orsini—a family which Alexander had determined to ruin. After having disregarded many warnings against intended treachery, cardinal Orsini allowed himself to be decoyed into an interview with the pope, who committed him to prison, seized his treasures, and gave up his palace to plunder. The cardinals in a body interceded for their brother, but without effect. For a time Orsini was kept without suitable food, until his mother, by a large sum of money, and his mistress, by finding and giving up a very precious pearl which had belonged to him, obtained leave to send him supplies. But before this, the pope had caused one of his favourite powders to be administered, and the cardinal died in prison. As Caesar returned to Rome, marking his path by acts of

cruelty in every town through which he passed, the Orsini made a desperate but ineffectual stand at the Ponte Lomentano. The Borgias had crushed all opposition; but the pope himself stood in awe of his son, and professed to be shocked by the atrocity of Caesar's measures.

For his daughter Lucretia, Alexander formed projects which became more and more ambitious. After a marriage of less than three years, her husband, Sforza of Pesaro, appears to have felt himself unsafe in Easter 1496—the connexion, and fled from Rome; where upon their union was dissolved under frivolous pretexts, and she was married to a youth of seventeen, Alfonso, prince of Bisceglia, an illegitimate son of Alfonso II, the late king of Naples. But this new husband appears in his turn to have suspected that mischief was intended against him, and secretly left Rome for Naples. The pope, however, persuaded him to return; and he had lived with his wife ten months longer, when, on the 15th of July, 1500, he was stabbed on the steps of St. Peter's. The assassins were carried off in safety by a troop of horsemen. The authorship of the crime was inferred from the fact that no inquiry was allowed and, as the wounded man seemed likely to recover, he was strangled in his bed on the 18th of August. It is said that Caesar Borgia not only contrived but witnessed the murder, and that he justified it by charging the victim with designs against his life. A year later, Lucretia was again married, with great pomp, to a third or fourth husband—Alfonso, eldest son of the duke of Ferrara. By condescending to such a connexion (which was forwarded by the influence of the French king) the proud house of Este, which had been alarmed by Caesar Borgia's progress, gained for itself the pope's protection, security against the territorial ambition of the Borgias, a large payment of money, and the free possession of some ecclesiastical fiefs in the Romagna; while for the Borgias, in addition to the dignity of the alliance, there was the advantage that the new duchy of Romagna was covered on its weakest side by the territory of a friendly power. Lucretia, who had not only exercised the government of Spoleto, but during her father's absence from Rome had actually been entrusted with the administration of the papacy, removed to Ferrara, where she lived until 1519. In her later years she cultivated the reputation of religion, and earned the celebration of poets—among them, of Ariosto. But although we may hesitate or refuse to believe, at least in their full extent, the foulest of the charges which have assailed her, it is impossible to disconnect her from the treasons and murders, the brutal licentiousness, the gross and scandalous festivities, amid which her earlier life was spent, and in some of which it appears that she took a conspicuous part. Nor are either poets or divines superior to the temptation of overlooking the faults of persons in high station whose patronage they regard as a benefit and an honour.

The moral degradation into which the papacy sank under Alexander has no parallel either in its earlier or in its later history, even if we make large deductions from the statements of contemporary writers on the ground of malice or exaggeration. The pope himself and his children are accused of profligacy which hesitated at nothing for its gratification, which never scrupled to remove obstacles by murder, or to violate the laws of nature. The Vatican was polluted by revels and orgies of the most shameless and loathsome obscenity, of which the pope and his daughter are represented as pleased spectators. A letter of the time, which is said to have been read in Alexander's own hearing, paints the morals of the court in the darkest colours, and speaks of him as a man stained with every vice, a second Mahomet, the predicted antichrist.

For the expenses of this disgusting and costly wickedness, for the wars and pompous displays of Caesar Borgia, for the establishment of his other children in the rank of princes, Alexander needed money continually; and he raised it by means more shameless than anything that had before been practised. An epigram of the time (for epigrams and pasquils were the only form in which the Romans then ventured to express their discontent) speaks of him as selling all that was holiest, and as entitled to sell, inasmuch as he had previously bought. The most disreputable of the expedients to which earlier popes had resorted—sale of offices and benefices, creation of new offices in order that they might be sold, traffic in indul-

gences, misappropriation of money raised under pretence of a crusade—these and such like abuses were carried to an excess before unknown. Cardinals were appointed in large numbers—at one time twelve, at another time eleven—with the avowed purpose of extorting money for their promotion. The jubilee of 1500 attracted a vast number of pilgrims to Rome: on Easter-day, 200,000 knelt in front of St. Peter's to receive the pope's benediction; and while these multitudes returned home, to scandalize all Christendom by their reports of the depravities of Rome, the papal treasury was enriched by their offerings, and by the commutations paid by those who were unable to make the pilgrimage in person. The "right of spoils" (*jus exuviarum*) received new developments for the gratification of Alexander's rapacity; he seized the property of deceased cardinals in disregard of their testamentary directions; in some cases he forbade cardinals to make wills; and it was believed that the deaths of those who had the reputation of wealth were sometimes hastened by poison. Property was largely taken from the great Roman families—often under false pretences—for the endowment of the pope's children and kindred. Thus the Gaetani were charged with treason, because Alexander had fixed his desires on the duchy of Sermoneta. The duke was committed to the castle of St. Angelo, where he died, probably of poison. Others of the family were put to death, and the duchy was made over, by a pretended sale, to Lucretia, whose son by Alfonso of Bisceglia was decorated with the title attached to it. Another boy, the son of Alexander by a Roman mother (probably Julia Farnese), was made duke of Nepi, with a suitable endowment. The interests of the church were utterly disregarded, in order that the pope's bastards might be enriched; thus Caesar, in addition to his fiefs in the Romagna, received the abbey of Subiaco with eighteen castles belonging to it; and nineteen cardinals signed the deed of alienation, while not one dared to object to it.

Rome was kept under a system of terror, so that no one dared to mutter his dissatisfaction. The dungeons of St. Angelo and of the Tor di Nona were crowded with prisoners, of whom many found an end by secret violence. Prelates whose wealth made them objects of sinister interest to the pope disappeared, and were not again heard of. Dead bodies were found in the streets, or were thrown into the Tiber. Hosts of spies and assassins lurked in secret, or audaciously swaggered about the city. The state of Rome can hardly have been made worse by an edict which allowed all persons who had been banished for murder, robbery, or other crimes, to return with impunity. The ruling spirit in this general terror was Caesar Borgia, with whom the pope remonstrated on his tyranny, while he extolled his own clemency by way of contrast.

The powers which had combined for the conquest of Naples soon quarrelled about the division of their prey. After a time, a treaty was arranged at Lyons, by which Naples was to become the endowment of a marriage between the French king's daughter Claude, and Charles, the child of the emperor's son Philip by Joanna, the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, and, until the parties should be of age to consummate the marriage, the partition of Granada was to be in force. But the Spanish general Gonsalvo, taking advantage of the weakness of the French in southern Italy, and professing that he had no official knowledge of the treaty, suddenly assumed the offensive, and made himself master of the whole Neapolitan territory, and Ferdinand, in order to gain the benefit of this treachery, disowned the treaty of Lyons, under the pretext that Philip, who had acted for him, had exceeded his instructions. The French king was preparing an expedition for the recovery of his Neapolitan territory, and for the chastisement of Caesar Borgia, who had been joined with Gonsalvo in the late campaign, when it was suddenly reported that the pope was dead.

At the age of seventy-two, Alexander still appeared full of vigour; the sonorous and musical voice with which he officiated in the mass at Easter 1503, excited the admiration of the Ferrarese ambassador. His schemes had all been thus far successful, and he was meditating yet further projects of ambition. On the 12th of August, Alexander supped at his vineyard, near the Vatican palace, with his son the duke of Valentinois and Adrian cardinal of St.

Chrysogonus and bishop of Hereford. All three were seized with sudden illness; and it was commonly believed that the pope and his son had drunk, through a servant's mistake, of poisoned wine, designed by Caesar for the cardinal, whose wealth had attracted the cupidity of the Borgias. Adrian, after a severe illness, during which it is said that the whole skin of his body was changed, recovered; Caesar, although with difficulty, was carried through by the immediate use of antidotes, aided by his youth and natural force of constitution; but the pope died within a week, after having received the last rites of the church. His illness appears to have been treated as a fever, and may perhaps have been no more than an ordinary disease of this kind. But it was reported that his body was black and swollen, as if from poison; and it was commonly believed at Rome that the devil, by whose aid he had attained the papacy, after having long attended on him in the form of an ape, had carried off his forfeit soul.

The circumstances of the time, after the expulsion of the Medici, had led the Florentines to look to Savonarola for guidance; and he found himself inevitably drawn to mingle deeply in political affairs. The parties at Florence were three : the *whites*, or popular party, who, although far from being penetrated by Savonarola's religious principles, usually acted in accordance with him; the *greys*, or adherents of the Medici, who for the time found it necessary to disguise their opinions; and the oligarchical party, mostly composed of violent young men, from whom it got the names of *arrabbiati* (infuriated) and *compagnacci*. These were generally opposed at once to Savonarola's political views and to his religious and moral strictness; and they derided his followers as *piagnoni* (weepers), *fratteschi*, and *masticapaternostri*. Agreeably to the principles of the book 'On the Government of Princes', commonly ascribed to Thomas of Aquino, Savonarola held that, while monarchy was in itself the best form of government, different polities were suitable for various states; that the intelligence, advanced culture, and courage of the Florentines rendered them fit for a purely republican government; and to his influence the establishment of a popular, yet not democratic, constitution was chiefly due. But while his political allies wished to use his religious influence for their own purposes, the Dominican's great object was to make political reform subservient to the reformation of morals and religion. He proclaimed the sovereignty of Christ, and did not hesitate to deduce from this the sacredness of the laws which he himself set forth. His visions increased, partly through the effect of his ascetic exercises. He expected supernatural guidance in determining the subjects of his preaching, and even believed in the visions of a monastic brother named Sylvester Maruffi, although these were evidently nothing more than the offspring of a nervous temperament combined with a weak and ignorant mind. He frequently expressed his expectation of a violent death, and he carried a small crucifix in his sleeve, by way of preparation for a sudden end.

In the meantime the effects of his preaching had begun to appear in the graver dress and more decorous manners both of men and of women; in church-going, fasting, almsgiving, in the celebration of marriages with seriousness, instead of the levity which had been usual, in habits of family devotion, which were almost monastic, in the restoration of wrongful or questionable gains, in the reading of religious books, in the substitution of hymns for the licentious and half-pagan carnival-songs of former times, some of which had been composed by Lorenzo himself. The grosser vices seemed to have disappeared; the spectacles and games in which the Florentines had delighted were neglected. At the carnival of 1496, the boys of the city, whose disorderly behaviour at that season had formerly defied the authority of the magistrates, were brought by the friar's influence to enlist themselves in the service of religion; and, instead of extorting money to be spent in riotous festivity, they modestly collected alms which were employed in works of mercy under the direction of a charitable brotherhood.

Within the convent of St. Mark, Savonarola, as prior, had introduced a thorough reformation. There was a return to the earlier simplicity of food and dress. All use of gold or silver in crucifixes and other ornaments was forbidden. Schools were established, not only for

the study of Scripture in the original languages, but for painting, calligraphy, and illumination; and the practice of these arts contributed much to defray the expenses of the society. The number of brethren had increased from about fifty to two hundred and thirty-eight, of whom many were distinguished for their birth, learning, or accomplishments; and among the devoted adherents, of the prior were some of the most eminent artists of the age—such as Bartholomew or Baccio della Porta, who after Savonarola's death entered the brotherhood of St. Mark's, and is famous under the name of Fra Bartolommeo; the architect Cronaca; the painters Botticelli and Credi; the family of Della Robbia, eminent in sculpture; the sculptor Baccio of Montelupo; and, above all, Michael Angelo Buonarroti, who even to old age used to read the sermons of Savonarola, and to recall with reverence and delight his tones and gestures.

But Savonarola's course was watched with unfriendly eyes. The partisans of the Medici were hostile to him for in a sermon he had plainly recommended that anyone who should attempt to restore the tyranny of the banished family should lose his head. The *arrabbiati* were bitterly opposed to him, and they enlisted on their side the power of Lewis the Moor, and his influence with the pope. The clergy, and especially those of high position in the church, were indignant at his assaults on their manner of life; monks and friars—some of them even of his own order—were exasperated by his reproofs of their degeneracy. Frequent complaints were carried to Rome, where one Marianus of Genezzano, a Franciscan, who in Savonarola's earlier days had been his rival for fame as a preacher, was busy in representing him as a dangerous man; and as early as July 1495, prior of St. Mark's was invited by Alexander to a conference on the subject of his prophetic gifts. But July 21, although the invitation was very courteously expressed, and was accompanied by compliments as to his labours, he was warned by his friends that it was not to be trusted; he therefore excused himself on the ground that his health had suffered from over-exertion, and that, in the circumstances of the time, his presence was considered necessary at Florence. Further correspondence took place, in which the pope's blandishments were soon exchanged for a threatening tone, and Savonarola was denounced by him as a "sower of false doctrine"; while Savonarola, although he maintained the reality of his inspirations, endeavoured to explain his claims to the prophetic character in an inoffensive sense.

He was charged to refrain from preaching, and for a time obeyed, employing himself chiefly in the composition of books, while his place in the pulpit was supplied by one of his most zealous adherents, Dominic of Pescia. But the solicitations of his friends, and his own feeling as to the necessities of the time, induced him to resume his preaching, as he considered the inhibition to have been issued on false grounds, and therefore to be invalid. He now thundered against the vices of the Roman court, and denounced vengeance which was to come on them. He pointed to a general council as the remedy, and declared that it might depose unworthy prelates—even the pope himself, whose election, as it had been effected by notorious bribery, Savonarola regarded as null and void. He taught that property might lawfully be held by the church, for otherwise St. Sylvester would not have accepted it; but that the present corruptions of the church proved the expediency of resigning it. In the hope of silencing and gaining so formidable a man, Alexander employed an agent to sound him as to the acceptance of promotion to the cardinalate; but Savonarola indignantly declared from the pulpit that he would have no other red hat than one dyed with the blood of martyrdom.

Among the charges against Savonarola was that of having surreptitiously procured a papal order by which the Tuscan Dominicans were separated from the Lombard congregation. The matter was discussed until, feeling that on his independence depended the validity of his reforms, he avowed that, in case of extremity, he must resist the pope, as St. Paul withstood St. Peter to the face. Thus he was brought into direct conflict with the papacy: and he was ordered to refrain from preaching, either in public or within his convent, until he should have obeyed the papal summons to Rome.

At the approach of the carnival of 1497, Savonarola resolved to carry further the reform which he had attempted in the preceding year. For some days the boys who were under his influence went about the city, asking the inhabitants of each house to give up to them any articles which were regarded as vanities and cursed things; and these were built up into a vast pile, fifteen stories high—carnival masks and habits, rich dresses and ornaments of women, false hair, cards and dice, perfumes and cosmetics, books of sorcery, amatory poems and other works of a free character, musical instruments, paintings and sculptures—all surmounted by a monstrous figure representing the Carnival. A Venetian merchant offered the signory 20,000 crowns for the contents of the heap, but the money was refused, and he was obliged to contribute his own picture to the sacrifice. It is said that Baccio della Porta cast into the heap a number of his academic drawings from the nude figure, and that Lorenzo di Credi and other artists of Savonarola's party imitated the act. On the morning of the last day of the carnival Savonarola celebrated mass. A long procession of children and others, dressed in white, then wound through the streets, after which the pyre was kindled, and its burning was accompanied by the singing of psalms and hymns, the sounds of bells, drums, and trumpets, and the shouts of an enthusiastic multitude, while the signory looked on from a balcony. The money collected by the boys and made over to the brotherhood of St. Martin exceeded the amount which that society usually received in a year. But although Savonarola was delighted with the success of his project, the errors of judgment which he had shown in investing children with the character of censors and inquisitors, in employing them to inform against their own relations, and otherwise introducing dissension into families, in confounding harmless and indifferent things with things deeply vicious and sinful, in sanctioning the destruction of precious works of literature and art—such errors could not but tend to alienate the minds of men in general, while they furnished his enemies with weapons against him.

The opposition of these enemies was becoming more and more bitter, and showed itself in various forms— lampoons, charges of designs against the state, and attempts at personal violence. As he was preaching on Ascension-day, a violent attack was made on him; but he was saved by some of his friends, who closed around the pulpit, and were able to carry him off to his convent. In consequence of this he abstained from preaching for a time.

The pope's anger against Savonarola became also more and more exasperated. On the 12th of May was issued a sentence of excommunication, grounded chiefly on the prior's disobedience to the orders for the reunion of his convent with the Tuscan congregation; and on the 22nd of June this sentence was solemnly pronounced, with bells and lighted tapers, in the cathedral of Florence. Savonarola withdrew into his convent, while a conflict as to the merits of his case was kept up by preachers on either side. During this time he employed himself much in composition, and to it belongs his chief work, "The Triumph of the Cross".

The death of the duke of Gandia soon after furnished him with an opportunity for addressing to the pope a letter of consolation and of admonition as to the reforms which Alexander, under the pressure of that calamity, professed a wish to undertake. But although the pope appeared to receive the letter favourably, it would seem that he afterwards regarded it as an offensive intrusion.

In the beginning of August a conspiracy in the interest of the Medici was discovered, and five of the principal citizens, among whom was Bernard del Nero, a man of seventy-five, who had held the highest offices in the state, were convicted and sentenced to death. An appeal to the great council was violently refused, because it was feared that in that body they might find interest sufficient to save them; and they were beheaded in the night which followed their condemnation. This was the work of Savonarola's partisans, and both he and they suffered in general estimation by the refusal to the accused of the right of appeal, which had been allowed in the constitution established by Savonarola himself. But it would seem that, in his excommunicated and secluded state, he took no part in the affair beyond interceding—coldly, as he himself says—for one of the conspirators.

On Septuagesima Sunday, in the following year, he resumed preaching at the request of the signory. The archbishop's vicar-general, a member of the Medici family, forbade attendance at his sermons, but was induced by a threat from the signory to withdraw his prohibition. But this body of magistrates was changed every second month; and, as its elements varied from time to time, Savonarola, after having often enjoyed its support, was at length to experience its fatal hostility. His preaching was now more vehement than ever; he launched out against the pope's exaggerated claims, against the vices of the Roman court and its head, against the abuse of excommunication, as to which he even prayed in the most solemn manner that, if he should seek absolution from the unjust sentence pronounced against him, he might be made over to perdition. He urged strongly, as he had urged by letters to sovereign princes, the necessity of a general council as a remedy for the disorders of the church. It would appear from some of his expressions that he expected a miracle to be wrought in behalf of his doctrine. At the approach of Lent he repeated the "burning of vanities"; but, although the value of the things consumed was said to be greater than on the former occasion, the procession did not pass off so quietly, as the boy-censors, in the course of their movements about the city, were insulted and roughly handled by the *compagnacci*.

After the burning Savonarola's followers returned in procession to St. Mark's, where in front of the convent they planted a cross, around which they danced wildly in three circles, composed of friars, clergy, and laymen, young and old, chanting strange verses composed by one of the party. That Savonarola tolerated a repetition of these frantic scenes, by which his party had incurred just obloquy two years before, is a proof of the high state of enthusiasm to which he had been excited.

About this time one Francis of Apulia, a member of that division of the Franciscans which, from wearing wooden shoes, had the name of *zoccolanti*, challenged Savonarola to the ordeal of fire, as a test of the truth of his doctrine. For himself, he said that, being but a sinner, he must expect to be burnt, but that he would gladly give his life to expose Savonarola as a sower of scandals and errors.

The challenge was accepted by Dominic of Pescia, who had already been engaged in disputes with the Franciscan at Prato, and, in his devotion to Savonarola, believed him capable of performing miracles. Savonarola himself discouraged the ordeal, because he considered that the truth of his teaching and prophecies, and the nullity of his excommunication, were sufficiently proved by other means; he declared that he had other and better work to do; yet he evidently expected that, if such a trial should take place, it would result in the triumph of his cause. Objections were raised, but were silenced by a reference to the famous case of Peter the Fiery, of which Florence itself had been the scene four centuries earlier.

Francis of Apulia refused to encounter any other champion than Savonarola himself, to whom alone his challenge had been addressed; while, on the other side, not only all the Dominicans of St. Mark's and of Fiesole, but a multitude of men, women, and even children, entreated that they might be allowed to make the trial. At length it was settled that a Franciscan named Rondinelli should be opposed to Dominic of Pescia, and that the ordeal should take place on the 7th of April—the day before Palm Sunday. The propositions as to which the Divine judgment was thus to be invoked were these : —that the church was in need of renewal; that it would be chastised and renewed; that Florence also would pass through chastisement to renovation and prosperity; that the unbelievers would be converted to Christ; that all these things would take place during that generation; and, finally, that the excommunication of Savonarola was a nullity.

On the appointed day, the Place of the Signory, where precautions had been carefully taken for the prevention of any tumult, was filled by an immense multitude of spectators. Two heaps of combustible matter had been piled up for the purpose of the trial; they were forty yards long, two yards and a-half in height, and separated by a passage one yard wide. But the eagerness of the crowd was to be disappointed. For hours a discussion was carried on in

consequence of objections raised by the Franciscans that Savonarola's party and their champion might make use of magical charms. The wearisome dispute was still in progress, when a heavy shower fell; and at length the signory forbade the ordeal. The multitude, tired, hungry, drenched, vexed by the tedious wrangling, and at last finding themselves balked of the expected spectacle, while they did not know on whom to lay the blame, broke out against Savonarola. It was with difficulty that some of his friends were able to conduct him, carrying the holy Eucharist in his hands, through a crowd which loaded him with insulting language, to his convent.

Everything seemed now to turn against him. The secular clergy, as well as the monks, had been alienated from him. Two days later St. Mark's was besieged by a mob, and, on its surrender, the prior and Dominic of Pescia were committed to prison. Savonarola's partisans were attacked and proscribed; some of them were tumultuously murdered; a commission of men hostile to him was appointed to investigate his case; and throughout a month he was frequently subjected to torture. His nervous system, naturally delicate, and rendered more sensitive by his ascetic exercises, was unable to bear the agonies which were inflicted on him; he confessed whatever was desired, and, when the torture was over for the time, retracted the avowals which had been wrung from him. "When I am under torture," he said, "I lose myself, I am mad; that only is true which I say without torture". Many questions related to his claims to the character of a prophet; and as to these he talked wildly and inconsistently—insisting at first on the reality of his visions, but afterwards, in his despair, appearing to give up his pretensions.

While the pope repeated the request which he had before urged, that Savonarola should be sent to Rome, the magistrates of Florence, from a regard to the dignity of the republic, desired that his punishment should take place on the scene where his offences had been committed. To this the pope at length consented, and sent the general of the Dominicans and another as his commissioners, before whom the examination was resumed. It was impossible to convict the accused of unsoundness as to faith, and it appears that, in order to give a colour for charges of heterodoxy, the acts of the process were falsified.

But the judgment of the court had been predetermined. On the 22nd of May, Savonarola, with Dominic of Pescia and Sylvester Maruffi (who had been associated with them in prison), was sentenced to be hanged and burnt. Domniic, with his characteristic zeal, declared himself eager to be burnt alive; but Savonarola, on being informed of this, reproved him for wishing to exercise his choice in such a matter.

On the following day the sentence was carried out in the Place of the Signory, which was occupied by crowds as numerous as those which a few weeks before had gathered there for the expected ordeal. The duty of degrading the victims was imposed on Pagagnotti, bishop of Vaison, who had formerly been a friar of St. Mark's. In his grief and agitation the bishop mistook the form, and said to Savonarola, "I separate thee from the church triumphant". "From the militant", said Savonarola, correcting him, "not from the triumphant, for that is not thine to do".

After the execution of the sentence, such remains of the bodies as could be found were thrown into the Arno : yet relics of Savonarola were preserved with veneration among his adherents, who even believed them to work miracles, and eagerly traced in the events of the following years the fulfilment of their master's prophecies.

CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER VI TO THE END OF THE FIFTH COUNCIL
OF THE LATERAN.
A.D. 1503-1517.

CAESAR BORGIA had supposed himself (as he told Machiavelli) to have provided for all the contingencies which might occur on his father's death, with a view to controlling the election of the next pope, and of securing for himself the power which fortune and skill had combined to put into his hands. But his calculations were frustrated by the circumstance that, at the time of Alexander's death, Caesar was himself disabled for action by the illness which had seized him in the vineyard of the Vatican. He contrived, however, while on his sick-bed, to enter into an agreement with the Colonna family, for the purpose of strengthening himself against the opposition of the Orsini, who had seized the occasion to make threatening demonstrations. In the meantime the Roman populace, in vengeance for the insolence of the Spaniards under the late pontificate, attacked their houses and destroyed their property; and the city was a scene of tumult, plunder, and slaughter. As the Vatican quarter and the fortress of St. Angelo were occupied by Caesar's soldiery, the cardinals, thirty-eight in number, met in the Dominican church of St. Mary sopra Minerva, and refused to go into conclave until they were assured that these troops should be removed, and that the French army should approach no nearer than Nepi. Their wish as to the French was effected through the influence of cardinal d'Amboise, who avowedly put himself forward as a candidate for the papacy, and brought with him to the election Ascanius Sforza, whom he had gained to his interest by releasing him from his French prison, and by entertaining him honourably for the last two years. But it soon appeared that d'Amboise could barely reckon on a third part of the college as his supporters; and the cardinals, surprised and perplexed by the suddenness of the late pope's death, resolved to choose one who should not only be free from party ties, but whose age and infirmity might seem to promise another speedy vacancy. On the 22nd of September the election fell on Francis Piccolomini, who, in memory of his uncle Pius II, styled himself Pius III. The new pope was sixty-four years old; he had been promoted to the cardinalate by his uncle in 1460, and was regarded as the most respectable member of the college, which had been greatly sunk in character by Alexander's simoniacal and scandalous appointments. Rome and the ecclesiastical states were still in a condition of disturbance. Nobles of the Campagna repossessed themselves of lands which had been taken from them by the duke of Valentinois; the cities of Romagna invited their expelled lords to return, or these returned uninvited to resume their power. The Venetians invaded Romagna, and made themselves masters of Faenza and other places. By entering into an alliance with the French, Caesar Borgia provoked the Spanish general Gonsalvo to order that all the Spaniards who were in his service should leave it. The duke renewed the contest with his old enemies the Orsini, but was driven to withdraw into the Vatican and the adjoining quarter, where he endeavoured to fortify his position. By these disorders the pope was compelled to take refuge in the castle of St. Angelo, where he died after a pontificate of six-and-twenty days.

This short interval between two vacancies of the papacy had sufficed to ascertain the strength of parties in the college. D'Amboise, finding that he could not hope to be chosen, exerted himself in favour of the cardinal who was supposed to be the most devoted to the French interest, Julian della Rovere. Ascanius Sforza was gained to the same side by the hope that his family might recover the duchy of Milan; and, notwithstanding the long and open

enmity between Julian and the Borgias—although Caesar had made the eight Spanish cardinals swear that they would elect no one but a partisan of his family—even Caesar was induced, by expectations of recovering his territories, of confirmation in his office of standard-bearer, and of marrying his daughter to the future pope's nephew, to throw his influence into the scale of Julian. Capitulations were drawn up, and an oath was taken to observe them; among other things, the future pope was within two years to assemble a general council for the reformation of the church. Without having been shut up in conclave, thirty-seven out of thirty-eight cardinals voted for Julian, who, as pope, took the name of Julius—a name which had been borne by only one of his predecessors, the contemporary of Constantine and Athanasius. The pope, whose earlier career has been noticed from time to time, was now sixty years old. He was regarded as a man of sincere and open character; even Alexander VI allowed him this merit, while censuring him in other respects. But it would seem that he sometimes traded unfairly on his reputation for honesty, as when, at the election, he recommended himself to the French party by referring to his past conduct, and to the Spaniards by promising a different policy for the future. His manner of life was not immaculate; he had an illegitimate daughter, whom he married to one of the Orsini; his amours had affected his constitution, and his love of wine was notorious; but, as compared with some of his late predecessors, his character and conduct might almost be styled decorous and respectable.

Caesar Borgia had believed that, although not powerful enough to dictate the choice of a pope, he was able, through his influence with the Spanish cardinals, to prevent the election of any individual to the papacy; and he professed to regret the support which he had given to Julius as the only mistake that he had ever committed. But, as in his prosperity he had never scrupled at any treachery, he was now to be the victim of other men's deceit. Although his army was scattered by the Orsini and others, he still retained about 400 or 500 soldiers, and formed a wild scheme for the recovery of Romagna by means of this little force. But, as he was about to embark at Ostia for Spezzia, he was arrested by the pope's order, and was detained in the Vatican until he consented to sign a document by which some fortresses, which still held out for him, were made over to Julius. He then made his way by sea to Naples, and repaired to the camp of Gonsalvo, with whom he had secretly carried on negotiations. But, although he was received with a great show of honour, he was carefully guarded until the general should learn the Spanish king's pleasure respecting him; and, agreeably to Ferdinand's usual perfidy, he was arrested in defiance of the safe-conduct which he had received, was sent as a prisoner to Spain, and was imprisoned in the fortress of Medina del Campo. From this confinement, after two years, he made his escape, and he was invested with a military command by his brother-in-law the king of Navarre, who had vainly interceded for him with Ferdinand. But in March 1507, his adventurous life was ended in a skirmish near Viana, within the diocese of Pampeluna, of which he had formerly been bishop, and on the anniversary of his institution to the see. So utterly was the terror of the Borgias extinct (although Lucretia still lived as duchess of Ferrara), that a "Comedy of Duke Valentino and Pope Alexander" was acted in the ducal palace of Urbino, and that other scenes from the family story were already represented on the stage.

As Alexander's great object had been the establishment of his family in the rank of territorial princes, that of Julius was to extend the temporal power of the papacy by recovering for it all that it had ever possessed, or could pretend to claim. And to this end he employed great skill, energy, tenacity of purpose, and even the talents of a general and the endurance of a soldier. He desired to reunite under the papacy all those fiefs which had been taken by Caesar Borgia from their hereditary lords, and which since Caesar's fall had again for the most part reverted to the old dominion, while part had been seized by the Venetians. The Venetians offered to give up all their acquisitions except Faenza, and to hold that territory under the same conditions of tribute as its former lords. But the pope for a time refused even

to admit their ambassadors to his presence; and he utterly rejected their Proposals. In the end of August 1506, he set out from Rome for the purpose of reducing the fiefs of the church to obedience. Baglioni, a condottiere who had got possession of Perugia, submitted, and was allowed to continue. The Bentivogli were driven from Bologna; on St. Martin's day the pope made his triumphant entry into that city; and his return to Rome was greeted with a yet more imposing triumph.

The French had been driven out of Naples by Gonsalvo of Cordova, and the whole kingdom was now subject to Ferdinand. The death of Isabella of Castile (November 26th, 1504), and that of her son-in-law the archduke Philip (September 25th, 1506), brought into nearer prospect the vastness of the power which was likely to be concentrated in the hands of the young Charles, the heir of Spain, Naples, Austria, and the Netherlands; and Lewis of France was bent on averting the danger which seemed to threaten him from this cause.

Maximilian, at a diet which assembled at Constance, told the German estates that it was necessary for him to be crowned as emperor at Rome, if the empire were to retain any influence in Italy. The promise of men which he received from the assembly—8000 horse and 27,000 foot for half a year—was unequal to his wishes and was imperfectly performed; but he set out on his expedition. The Venetians, although they professed themselves willing to allow his passage through their territories, refused to admit his army. There were signs of opposition from other quarters, and on entering Italy from the Tyrol he found himself compelled by enemies who beset his way to engage in a warfare which did not result in his favour. The pope, in his desire to keep him at a distance, allowed him, by a special privilege, to assume the title of emperor without having gone through the ceremony of a coronation. The army, ill-fed and unpaid, broke up; and Maximilian, after having concluded a treaty with the Venetians, returned to Germany.

The republic of Venice was now at its greatest height of wealth and power, and the success of its prudent, selfish, and grasping policy had long excited a strong feeling of jealousy in other states. Thus when Pius II invited the Florentines to take part in the crusade, they had declined on the ground that whatever might be taken from the Turks would fall to the Venetians. Julius, in a letter to Maximilian, spoke of them as encroaching, as aiming at supreme domination in Italy, and even at reestablishing for themselves the old imperial power; and he had been especially offended by their rejecting one of his nephews, whom he had nominated to the see of Vicenza, and substituting a Venetian citizen, whom they required to style himself "bishop by the grace of the senate". The emperor considered that the Venetians had formed their territory at the expense of the empire. The French king was angry with them for having crossed his designs, for having craftily favoured the interest of Spain, and for having got possession of some places which had belonged to his duchy of Milan. In December 1508, a treaty was concluded at Cambray between the archduchess Margaret, regent of the Netherlands, on the part of her father the emperor, and by cardinal d'Amboise as representative of France. Spain was to take part in the treaty, and d'Amboise, as legate, took it on him to promise the pope's concurrence.

The treaty began by stating that the emperor and the French king, having resolved, at the pope's request, to make war against the Turks, held themselves bound to restrain the Venetians in their aggressions on the holy Roman empire and other Christian states; and it pledged the allied powers to hold by each other until each should have recovered whatever had been taken from it by the Venetians. For a time this treaty was kept secret from the power against which it was directed.

Although Julius had special reasons for dissatisfaction with the republic, he yet felt strongly the inexpediency of admitting foreigners to exercise dominion in Italy. And the evil was the greater in proportion to the power of the French and the Spanish sovereigns, who had respectively possessed themselves of Milan and of Naples. He dreaded the pretensions which might be advanced on the part of the empire as to Italy; he dreaded d'Amboise as one who

was intriguing to succeed him—whom Lewis, by interfering in Italian affairs, might help to attain the papacy, in order that a French pope might transfer the imperial crown from Germany to France. Hence, although in his enmity to pope Alexander he had himself been the first to bring the “barbarians” into Italy, the policy of his later years was directed chiefly to their expulsion. He therefore privately offered to make peace with the republic on condition that certain territories should be yielded up to him. But the Venetians, in reliance on their power of raising mercenary troops, and in the expectation that a league between parties widely differing in interests would soon break up of itself, declined the proposed terms; and Julius thereupon joined the league, undertaking to utter the censures of the church against the Venetians, so that Maximilian should be set free from the engagements which he had lately contracted with them.

In the spring of 1509 Lewis began hostilities, and within seventeen days his forces had made themselves masters of all that he was entitled to claim under the treaty of Cambrai. The pope about the same time sent forth a “monitory” bull, in which he reproached the Venetians for encroachments and usurpations, for interfering with the rights of the church as to jurisdiction over clerks and as to patronage of bishoprics, and for harbouring enemies of the apostolic see. He allowed them twenty-four days for submission and restitution; in case of their neglecting this opportunity he declared them to be under interdict, and that their persons and property might be seized and sold. The Venetians appealed to a general council, and found means to display their appeal on the doors of St. Peter’s at Rome; and Julius pronounced an interdict against them.

But the pope did not confine himself to the use of spiritual weapons. His troops, under the command of his nephew Francis della Rovere, duke of Urbino, marched into northern Italy, where they reduced Faenza, Rimini, Ravenna, and other places. The Venetians, pressed by this invasion, by the French king, who inflicted on them a severe defeat near Agnadello, and by the fear of preparations in which Maximilian was supposed to be actively engaged, made overtures to the pope for peace; but these were so ill received that the republic hesitated between submission to the father of Christendom and an alliance with the Grand Turk. But Julius dreaded lest the destruction of the republic should give the French king the sovereignty of all northern Italy; he was softened by the compliance of a power which had usually been so haughty; and, although the ambassadors of France and of the empire opposed a reconciliation, he listened to the intercession which Henry VIII of England addressed to him through Bainbridge, archbishop of York. The Venetians agreed to abandon their appeal, to give up all pretensions to ecclesiastical independence and to jurisdiction over the clergy. Six citizens of high dignity were sent as ambassadors to Rome, where they were required to enter by night, and were not greeted with any of the usual marks of honour. Yet they were not obliged to submit to the full humiliation which had sometimes been inflicted on penitents. On prostrating themselves before the pope in the porch of St. Peter’s, they were absolved with a simple injunction to visit the seven basilicas of Rome, and were at once received, “not as excommunicate or interdicted, but as good Christians and devoted sons of the apostolic see.” The pope himself had struck out the usual flagellation from the scheme which had been drawn up by his master of ceremonies.

Julius had quarrelled with the French king about the see of Avignon, which had become vacant by the death of a bishop while in attendance on the papal court. The pope attempted to exercise the patronage, but as Lewis declared this to be contrary to a late treaty, he was compelled to yield ungraciously. The death of cardinal d’Amboise, in May 1510, increased the ill-feeling which had arisen, as Julius claimed for the church the treasures which the minister-legate had accumulated. The pope resolved to destroy, if possible, the French king’s influence in Italy. He endeavoured to stir up troubles against him on the side of England and on that of Switzerland; and in the violence of his self-will he insisted that others, with whom he had hitherto acted, should follow him in his change of policy. Hence, when Alfonso, duke

of Ferrara, who was a feudatory of the papacy and had been one of his generals, refused to break off from the alliance against Venice, Julius declared that he had forfeited his fief, and refused to accept his tribute. He issued against him a bull of extraordinary violence, repeated its denunciations in the customary curses of the holy week, and professed that for the ruin of this enemy he would risk his tiara and his life. He declared that Lewis had forfeited his claim to the kingdom of Naples, and granted investiture in it exclusively to Ferdinand, whom he hoped by this favour to secure to his party. He negotiated through Mathias Schinner, bishop of Sion in the Valais, with the Swiss, whom Lewis had offended by resisting their demands of increased pay and by speaking of them with disparagement; and he was allowed by their diet to raise as many soldiers as he might require from the confederation.

Lewis, although unwilling to quarrel with the pope, both from his own feeling and yet more on account of his queen's influence over him, found it necessary to act in self-defence. Falling back on a suggestion of his late minister d'Amboise, he convoked at Orleans a national assembly of prelates, doctors, and other learned men, which continued its deliberations at Tours. The chancellor opened the proceedings by denouncing Julius as having attained the papacy by uncanonical intrigues, and having cruelly troubled Christendom by his love for war; and the king submitted to the council eight questions, bearing on the lawfulness of resisting an aggressive pope by force. The answers were favourable to his wishes: it was declared that a pope might not make war on a temporal prince except within the church's territory; that a prince might, in self-defence, invade the pope's territory, although not with a view of depriving him of it; that if a pope should stir up other powers against a prince, the prince might withdraw from his obedience, although only so far as might be necessary for the protection of his own rights; that in case of such withdrawal he ought to fall back on the ancient common law of the church and on the pragmatic sanction; that any censures unjustly uttered by popes were not to be regarded.

While Lewis was thus endeavouring to fortify himself by the sanction of ecclesiastical law, the pope continued to proceed by forcible means. Neither age nor sickness could check his impetuosity. At Bologna, where he had made his entry with great pomp on the 23rd of September, he ordered that all who were able and willing to fight should be assembled in the market-place; and on being informed that their numbers amounted to 15,000 foot and 5000 horse, although he was suffering from a violent attack of fever, he rushed from his bed to a balcony, and pronounced his benediction on them. Towards the end of October his life was despaired of; but he recovered, and notwithstanding the remonstrances of cardinals and ambassadors, who endeavoured to restrain him by a regard for his spiritual character, he set out in a litter for the siege of Mirandola. Arriving there on the 2nd of January 1511, he took up his abode in a peasant's hut, under the guns of the fortress. He disregarded the frost, the heavy snow, the roughness and scantiness of his fare. He reproved the officers around him for their slowness; and while his pioneers fled from the discharge of the enemy's artillery, he himself superintended the pointing of his cannon, and gave orders for the discharge. On returning to Mirandola, after a short intermission of the siege, he established himself in a little chapel, still nearer to the walls than his former quarters. A plan laid by the famous Bayard for his capture would probably have been successful, but that a sudden snowstorm drove the pope and his party back to their cover before they had reached the point at which the French ambush was posted; and, on finding himself pursued in his return, Julius with his own hand assisted in raising a drawbridge over which he had just made his escape. Undaunted by hardships or danger, he persevered in the siege; and when at length Mirandola was taken, he refused to enter by the gate, and desired that a breach might be made in the wall, so that he might make his entry in the style of a conqueror, arrayed in helmet and cuirass.

In Germany, as well as in France, there had been manifestations of discontent against the papacy. A paper of ten "Grievances" had been drawn up, setting forth, among other things, the abuses of the Roman court as to dispensations, as to the ejection of bishops who had been

duly elected, as to the reservation of the greater dignities and benefices for cardinals and papal protonotaries; as to expectancies, annates, patronage, and indulgences; as to the exaction of tenths under pretext of crusades which never took place; as to drawing of causes to Rome which ought to be decided on the spot. A list of suggested "Remedies" followed; and a paper of "Advices to the Imperial Majesty" was annexed—recommending the establishment of a pragmatic sanction, similar to that of Bourges. In consequence of these representations Maximilian took it on himself to issue an edict forbidding pluralities and simony, and desired James Wimpheling, a learned jurist, who was supposed to be the author of the *Gravamina*, to draw up a pragmatic sanction adapted to the circumstances of Germany.

Negotiations were attempted between Maximilian and the pope through Matthew Lang, bishop of Gurk, who appeared at Bologna as imperial ambassador, and was received with great marks of honour. But Julius was offended by the assumptions of the bishop, who, when three cardinals were sent to him, employed three gentlemen of his suite to meet them, as if no one but the pope himself were worthy to treat with the representative of the emperor; and Lang, on withdrawing from the court, complained of the impossibility of moving the pope's "obstinate and diabolical pertinacity."

In consequence (it is said) of the death of a cardinal at Ancona, five of his brethren, among whom Carvajal, a Spaniard, was the leader, refused to join the pope at Bologna, and obtained from the government of Florence permission to remain in that city. By this the pope was greatly incensed, as he supposed their conduct to imply a charge of poison against him, and he expressed his dissatisfaction to the Florentines. The cardinals removed from Florence to Milan, where they openly declared themselves in opposition to the pope. The French king had drawn the emperor into his wish for a general council; the two sovereigns applied to the pope, reminding him of the promise which he had made at his election, and telling him that, in case of his refusal, they would endeavour to accomplish their object by means of the cardinals; and they acted accordingly.

There was some discussion as to the place where the council should be held; for while Maximilian wished it to be at Constance, Lewis proposed Lyons, and the Italian prelates insisted that, as reform was needed not only in the members, but in the head of the church, some Italian city would be most suitable. On the 16th of May, three cardinals, in the name of themselves and of six others (by some of whom the act was afterwards disavowed), issued a document summoning the council to meet on the 1st of September at Pisa—a place which was considered of good omen, as having been the scene of the council which deposed the antipope Anacletus, and of that which, after deposing the rivals Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, elected Alexander V. They announced this step to Julius, and charged him in the meantime to refrain from creating any new cardinals. The emperor and the king of France severally issued their citations; but it was in vain that they endeavoured to gain the cooperation of Ferdinand, and Henry of England wrote in strong terms to Maximilian, expressing his horror at the possibility of a schism.

In the meantime an insurrection broke out at Bologna. The bronze statue of Julius, lately executed by Michael Angelo, and erected in front of the cathedral, was thrown down, dragged about the streets with insult, and afterwards given to the duke of Ferrara, by whom it was melted into cannon. The Bentivogli returned under French protection. The cardinal-legate, Alidosi, whose government had been greatly detested, fled in disguise by night, and made his way to Ravenna, where, on reporting his arrival, he was invited to the pope's table. But as he was on his way to the banquet, he accidentally met the pope's nephew, the duke of Urbino, who, after a vehement complaint that the legate had calumniated him to Julius as inclining to the French interest, drew out a dagger, and stabbed him mortally. The pope, although greatly distressed by the murder, was afraid to inflict any punishment on his nephew, lest he should go over to the enemy. He set out in deep grief for Rome, and on arriving at Rimini, he found the announcement of the Pisan council placarded on the door of the convent where he lodged.

On the 16th of July the pope sent forth a bull summoning a rival council to meet in the church of St. John Lateran on Monday after Easter-week in the following year. In this document he defended himself as to his performance of the engagements made at his election, professing to have been always zealously desirous of a general council, and to have endeavoured to gain the concurrence of temporal princes towards that object, although the fulfilment of his wishes had been prevented by public troubles. He compared the opposing cardinals to “acephalous locusts”, threatened them with deposition from their dignities and preferments unless they would submit within sixty-five days, and interdicted Florence, Pisa, and all places in which the schismatical council should meet. He laboured to stir up his allies against it, and at the expiration of the time of grace pronounced the refractory cardinals to be deposed, and subject to the penalties of heresy and schism.

It soon became clear that the council of Pisa would be a failure. The emperor’s promises of support proved to be delusive. In laying the subject before a meeting of German prelates at Augsburg, he found that they were present at the opening, the members of the council were almost exclusively Frenchmen, who acted under constraint of their sovereign. No confidence was placed in the cardinals, whose conduct in summoning the council was attributed to motives of personal ambition. The French king himself is said to have afterwards avowed that the assembling of it was merely a device for rendering the pope more tractable. The number of members was never considerable; it is said not to have exceeded four cardinals, who held proxies for three of their brethren; two archbishops, thirteen bishops, and five abbots; some doctors of law, among whom the most famous was Philip Decius (or Dexio), who vigorously defended the council with his pen; and a few representatives of universities. On attempting to enter the cathedral of Pisa for the performance of the opening mass, they found the doors closed, and were obliged to resort to another church, although an order from the Florentine magistrates afterwards procured them admission to the cathedral. The clergy of Pisa refused to lend them vestments, and left the city in obedience to the papal interdict. In the face of these circumstances the council, under Carvajal as president, affected to assert its authority by declaring that all that might be attempted against it by the pope or his cardinals should be null, and that it was not to be dissolved until the church should have been reformed in head and in members. But the Florentines, alarmed by the pope’s sentences and threats, became weary of allowing the rebellious assembly a place within their territory; and after three sessions the council took occasion from a street-affray between some servants of its members and some young men of Pisa, to remove to Milan.

About this time Maximilian, whose mind was singularly fertile in wild designs, conceived the strange idea of getting himself elected to the papacy. This project appears to have been suggested by an illness of Julius, which was so serious that for a time he was believed to be dead, and cries were raised at Rome for the establishment of a republic. But as the old man recovered in defiance of medical warnings and prescriptions, Maximilian wished to be appointed his coadjutor, as a step towards being chosen as his successor. In order to obtain the consent of the Spanish king, he professed himself willing to resign the empire in favour of Charles, the grandson of both; and he was ready to pledge his jewels and robes with the Fuggers, of Augsburg, the great money-dealers of the age, in order to raise funds for securing the votes of the cardinals. But the plan found no favour with Julius and appears to have come to nought through its mere extravagance.

The pope offered terms of reconciliation to Lewis; but, as he had foreseen, they were not accepted, and he entered into a new alliance with Aragon and Venice. Of this “holy league” (as it was called), the declared objects were, to preserve the unity of the church against the pretended council of Pisa, to recover Bologna and other fiefs (among which Ferrara was understood to be included) for the Roman see, and to drive out of Italy all who should oppose these designs. The concurrence of England is said to have been partly gained by a cargo of presents more novel than costly,—Greek wines, southern fruits, and other

provisions, intended for the king and the chief persons of the kingdom, and conveyed on board of the first papal vessel that had ever anchored in the Thames.

1511-12. BATTLE OF RAVENNA.

The French troops poured into Lombardy under Gaston de Foix, duke of Nemours; and it is at this time that Lewis is commonly supposed to have met the papal threats of interdict by striking the medal which bears the motto *Perdam Babilonis Nomen*. The council, which was sitting at Milan, professed to authorize Gaston, through its legate the cardinal of St. Severino, to occupy the States of the Church until St. Peter's chair should be filled by a lawfully-chosen pope. Brescia, which had risen against the French, was taken, and the capture was followed by extraordinary excesses of spoliation, cruelty, and brutality. But at the great battle of Ravenna, fought on Easter-day 1512, although the French general gained a brilliant victory over the allied Spanish and papal troops, he himself fell, at the age of twenty-four. Among the prisoners taken by the French was the cardinal-legate of Bologna, John de' Medici, whom they carried off to Milan. But there, when he offered the absolution which the pope had authorized him to bestow on all who would promise never again to bear arms against the church, his captors crowded around him, entreating his pardon and blessing; while the members of the antipapal council could not show themselves in the streets without being pursued with jeers, curses, and insulting gestures. The French army, weakened by an order which the emperor had issued for the recall of the Germans who were serving in it, and by the desertion of many soldiers who had returned to their own country after sharing in the plunder of Brescia, was needed at home for defence against the English; and as it retreated through the Milanese territory, before a force of 20,000 Swiss, which had entered Italy by the Tyrol for the service of the pope and of Venice, the inhabitants rose against the stragglers, and slaughtered many in revenge for the late outrages. The sentence of suspension which the council affected to issue against the pope, after attempts to draw him into summoning another general council, and after several delays and extensions of the time of grace allowed him, was received with general mockery; and the residue of the unfortunate assembly, after having removed to Asti and thence to Lyons, vanished so obscurely that its end was not observed.

Julius had treated all the messages of the opposition council with contempt. He had not been dismayed by the successes of the French, and had rejected, even with anger, a suggestion that he should withdraw for safety to Naples. And three weeks after the battle of Ravenna—only a fortnight later than the time originally appointed—he assembled the fifth Lateran council. The proceedings were opened by Giles of Viterbo, general of the Augustine friars, and afterwards a cardinal, who, in a discourse which was greatly admired, spoke of the evils and dangers of the time, of the benefits of synods, the providential care which had been shown in the protection of the pope, the mischiefs of schism, the necessity of ecclesiastical and moral reformation, and the duty of arming against the general enemy of Christendom.

The first and second sessions were chiefly occupied by formal business. At the third session, Matthew Lang, bishop of Gurk, appeared, and produced a commission from Maximilian, with whom the pope had lately concluded an alliance. In this document the emperor signified his adhesion to the council, and authorized his representative to do all that might be possible for the restoration of unity. The bishop then declared that in the emperor's name he revoked and annulled all that had been done in the *conciliabulum* of Pisa, for which, he said, the emperor had never given any mandate; and he and a lay envoy of Maximilian reverently kissed the pope's feet. At the same session was read and accepted a bull, reprobating and annulling all the proceedings of the refractory cardinals, and renewing an order by which Julius, in the preceding August, had interdicted all France, with the exception of Brittany, and had even condescended to gratify his enmity against the French by so petty an act of vengeance as the removal of a fair from Lyons to Geneva.

At the fourth session the question of the pragmatic sanction was brought before the council. After a reading of the instrument by which Lewis XI had abrogated it, the advocate of the council, Melchior Bardassini, requested that the pragmatic sanction should be revoked and annulled, and that a monition should be addressed to such ecclesiastical and lay persons of eminence in France as might be interested in it, requiring them to appear and to show cause why it should not be abolished. Two bulls of the proposed tenor were thereupon produced, and received the approbation of the council.

Julius had quarrelled with his Venetian allies, partly as to some territories which he claimed on the Po; and while the republic concluded a treaty with France, the pope, as we have seen, allied himself with the emperor. But whereas Maximilian set up pretensions to the duchy of Milan for himself or one of his grandsons, the pope, who could endure no foreign dominion in Italy, favoured the claims of Maximilian Sforza, son of Lewis the Moor. This claimant entered the capital on the 29th of December; and it appeared as if Julius were on the point of completing his work of expelling the “barbarians” from Italy, when he was seized with an illness which seemed likely to be fatal. In consequence of this he was unable to be present at the fifth session of the Lateran council, which was held on the 16th of February 1513; but he got from it a confirmation of a bull which he had sent forth eight years before, and had since republished, with a view to checking the practice of simony in elections to the papacy. The pope retained to the last his clearness of mind and his strength of will. With regard to the cardinals who had been concerned in the council of Pisa, he declared that as a private man he forgave them, and prayed that God would forgive the injuries which they had done to the church, but that as pope he must condemn them; and he ordered that they should be excluded from the election of his successor. On the night of the 21st of February Julius breathed his last, at the age of seventy.

On the 4th of March twenty-five cardinals met for the election of a successor to the papacy. The warlike ambition of Julius had produced so much of trouble that there was among them a general wish to fill the chair with a pope of very opposite character. The younger cardinals especially resolved to make their influence felt, and among them the most active was Alfonso Petrucci, cardinal of St. Theodore, and son of the lord of Siena. Raphael Riario, the senior and richest member of the college, whom some cardinals were disposed to choose in the hope of sharing in the great preferments which would become vacant by his election, was soon set aside—partly on account of his relationship to Sixtus IV and the late pope, and partly from doubts as to his capacity; and on the 11th of March the election fell on John de’ Medici, who had entered the conclave two days later than the other cardinals. He had been detained on his journey from Florence by an ailment which is supposed to have induced some of his brethren to vote for him on the ground that it seemed likely to shorten his life. It is said that Petrucci, in announcing the election of the new pope, as Leo the Tenth, to the people, shouted out, “Life and health to the juniors!” The result was hailed with general acclamation.

Leo at the time of his election was only thirty-seven years of age. His early promotion to the cardinalate, and his expulsion with the rest of his family from Florence, have been already mentioned. During his exile from his native city he had travelled with a party of friends in Germany, France, and the Low Countries, and had lived some years at Genoa, where his sister and her husband, Franceschetto Cibò, had established themselves. There he became intimate with Julian della Rovere, who, like himself, was under the disfavour of pope Alexander; and when his friend became pope, cardinal de’ Medici removed to Rome. Under the pontificate of Julius he lived in splendour, and showed that he had inherited the tastes of his family by his patronage of literature and art. He threw open to all a noble library, including as many of the manuscripts collected by the Medici as he had been able to recover by purchase after the troubles of Florence; his palace became a resort of painters, sculptors, musicians, and men of letters; but so far did the expense of indulging his tastes exceed his means of gratifying them, that he is said to have been sometimes reduced to pledge his silver plate in

order to procure a supply of the most necessary materials for an intended banquet.

The cardinal had been sent as legate to Bologna, at the head of a force which was intended to reduce the city after the revolt of 1511; and when the Spanish general Cardona, who commanded the besieging troops, through disregarding his advice, had allowed the French to advance to the relief of the Bolognese, the legate appeared at the battle of Ravenna, where, as we have seen, he was made prisoner. From this captivity he was able to make his escape; and within a short time he shared in the restoration of his family to Florence—for which he had contributed to pave the way by the attention which he was accustomed to bestow on Florentine visitors during his residence at Rome.

As the pope had not yet advanced beyond the order of deacon, he was ordained as priest on the 15th of March, and as bishop on the 17th; and he was hastily enthroned on the 19th, in order to avoid interference with the rites of the holy week. But Leo was not content with this imperfect ceremony, and a more splendid coronation was celebrated at the Lateran on the 11th of April. In the great procession the gods of Olympus and other heathen elements were mingled, according to the taste of the age; and the pope rode the same Turkish horse which, on the same day of the preceding year, had carried him at the battle of Ravenna. The cost of this second coronation amounted to 100,000 ducats; and such an outlay for such a purpose contrasted strongly with the practice of Julius II, who, while he incurred enormous expenses on account of his wars, had spent very little on display. Magnificence and expense were characteristic of Leo's court, and in order to find the necessary means he had recourse to the disreputable expedients of promoting cardinals for money, and of creating offices for sale. Even the luxury of his table was extraordinary. He encouraged invention in the culinary art; the flesh of monkeys and crows, and other unusual kinds of food were served up before him by way of experiment; and the discovery of peacock sausages was regarded as the highest triumph of genius in this department. His banquets were enlivened by the brilliant conversation of wits, and by the follies of bad poets, whom he condescended to entertain for the sake of the amusement which their vanity and their absurdities afforded him. The court was a scene of continual diversions, which were not always of the gravest character. The pope's favourite companions were gay, and for the most part highly-born, young cardinals. One of them, Bernard Dovizi, who from his birthplace was called Bibbiena, wrote comedies of a somewhat free character, which were acted by young performers in the Vatican; and every year a party of comedians, known as the "Academy of the Roughts", was brought from Siena for the diversion of the father of Christendom. Card-playing for heavy stakes was a common sequel of the pope's banquets; and, whether a winner or a loser, he was in the habit of throwing gold pieces among the spectators of the game. He condemned the practice of dice-playing, however, as dangerous to fortune and morals. Painters, sculptors, architects, musicians, and artists of all other kinds, found Leo a munificent patron; nor was literature neglected in the distribution of his favours, although it seems to have received but an inferior share of them. Before leaving the conclave at which he had been elected, he appointed as his private secretaries two elegant scholars, Bembo and Sadoletto, who afterwards became cardinals. He also promoted to the cardinalate some eminent divines, such as Thomas de Vio (known by the name of Cajetan), Sylvester Prierias, and Giles of Viterbo. But the learning which he chiefly favoured was not theological. His own acquirements in theology were confessedly scanty; while, as might have been expected in a pupil of Politian, he delighted in the writings of the Greek and Roman poets. His favourite amusement was hunting, in which he engaged with a zeal regardless of season, of weather, and of unwholesome air; and nothing disturbed his usually placid temper more surely than any breach of the laws of sport.

That Leo had little of piety or devotion in his character appears unquestionable. But his defects as to religion may be described as those of a man of the world too much addicted to its objects and enjoyments. The charges which have been brought against his morals appear to have been greatly exaggerated and maliciously darkened; and the tales which represent him as

an unbeliever in the Christian revelation may be regarded as utterly groundless. Good-natured as Leo usually was, he sometimes showed himself stern. He beheaded Baglioni, who (as we have seen) had made himself tyrant of Perugia, for acts of tyranny, robbery, and murder, notwithstanding the intercessions of the Orsini; he hanged a doctor of laws for producing forged documents in a suit; and he punished with unsparing severity the conspiracy of cardinal Petrucci.

Leo was desirous, like his predecessor, to exclude the rule of foreigners from Italy; but his ambition was of a lower kind than that which had thrown a sort of grandeur over the schemes of Julius, and had in some degree covered the unscrupulous nature of the means which he employed. It was not for the church, for the papacy, or for Italy that the Medicean pope laboured, but for his own family. His eagerness to forward the interests of his relations was shown immediately after his election by his appointing his cousin Julius, a knight of Rhodes, and son of the victim of the Pazzian conspiracy, to the archbishopric of Florence; and to this were soon added the dignity of cardinal and the legation of Bologna. At a later time great troubles arose out of his endeavours to provide a principality for a nephew by uniting Parma and Piacenza with Reggio, and, on the failure of that plan, by bestowing on him the duchy of Ferrara, which was for that purpose to be taken from Alfonso d'Este; and in a lower degree the pope was noted for his partiality for his countrymen in general,—so that Rome, to the disgust of its native citizens, swarmed with Florentines who were employed in all sorts of offices and occupations.

1514-15. BATTLE OF MARIGNANO.

Leo had followed Julius in his hostility to France; and he was a party to a new league which was concluded against that power at Mechlin, in April 1513, between the emperor, the king of England, and the king of Spain, although neither the pope nor Ferdinand formally signed it. But the course of events speedily induced him to change his policy. The French, after some successes in northern Italy, were defeated at Novara by Swiss troops in the interest of Maximilian Sforza, and were driven back across the Alps, while the fortresses which had been held for them in Italy surrendered, and by the disasters of France the power of Spain became more alarming, as the vast dominions of that country (including its acquisitions in the new world), of Austria, Naples, and the Netherlands, with the dignity of emperor, were likely to be soon united under the young Charles, the grandson of Ferdinand and of Maximilian. The pope, therefore, was disposed to conciliate the French king, who, partly from his own regard for the papacy, and yet more in consequence of his consort's importunities, was ready to abandon the unsuccessful council which he had assembled in opposition to Leo's predecessor. An agreement was easily concluded; and at the eighth session of the Lateran council it was declared that Lewis adhered to that council, and undertook to expel the rival assembly from Lyons or any other place in his dominions, while the pope recalled all the censures which had been uttered against France. The schismatical cardinals Carvajal and San Severino, who had been arrested in Tuscany on their way to the conclave, had at the seventh session petitioned the council for pardon, and, on making their humble submission to the pope, and abjuring the council of Pisa, had a few days later been reinstated in their dignity.

Within three weeks after the reconciliation of France with the papacy, queen Anne of Brittany died; and on the first day of the year 1415, her death was followed by that of Lewis XII, who in the meantime had married a third wife—the young princess Mary of England. The crown of France descended to Francis, duke of Angouleme, the first prince of the blood, and son-in-law of the late king. At the time of his accession, Francis was only twenty years old. He was possessed of showy qualities, personal and mental, which won for him admiration and popularity; but he was thoroughly selfish and hard-hearted, voluptuous, unsteady, and faithless; and these grave faults were more and more developed with advancing years.

The new king at once signified his intention of prosecuting his predecessor's designs on Italy by assuming the title of duke of Milan; and in August he crossed the Alps into Lombardy—a country devastated, exhausted, and reduced to misery by the sufferings of years, during which it had been the battleground of French and Spanish, German and Venetian, armies. The glory acquired by Gaston de Foix during his brief career stimulated the emulation of the young Francis. At the battle of Marignano, the greatest action of the age, which the veteran general Trivulzio declared to be a battle of giants, in comparison of which all his former engagements were but as children's play, the king's desire of glory was gratified by a signal victory over the Swiss, who until then had been regarded as invincible; and when the fight was over, he distinguished the “fearless and blameless knight”, Bayard, by asking and receiving knighthood at his hands. In consequence of this battle, Maximilian Sforza, who had never been able to gain a firm hold on the Milanese, gave up all pretensions to the duchy of Milan, and withdrew to a life of privacy in France.

After some negotiation Leo sought a conference with Francis, and the two potentates met at Bologna. Francis showed the pope all ceremonious marks of reverence by kissing his feet, his hand, and his mouth, holding his train, and serving him at mass. And the result of the conference was greatly in favour of Leo. He obtained the king's consent to his designs on the duchy of Urbino; he put off his request for investiture in Naples by holding out hopes of the changes which might follow on the expected death of Ferdinand of Spain. But the most important business of the conference related to the pragmatic sanction, which for three-quarters of a century had been a subject of contention between France and the papacy. The late pope, at the fourth session of the Lateran council, had cited the king, the princes, the bishops, and the parliaments of France, to show cause why the law should not be abrogated. At the ninth session (May 5, 1514) the procurator of the council reported that the French had not obeyed this summons; but the bishop of Marseilles explained that the prelates of France had been unable to procure a safe-conduct from the duke of Milan. On this, the Milanese ambassador said that his master had not refused a safe-conduct, but had required time for consideration; and the subject was further discussed at the following session.

Leo now succeeded in arranging with Francis that that sanction should be abolished, and a new concordat should be substituted for it. The blame of this concession was laid by the French on the king's chancellor, Duprat, whom the pope had gained to his interest by the hope of the cardinalate and of other rewards. In return for his concessions the king obtained the dignity of cardinal for Adrian de Boissy, bishop of Coutances and brother of the grand-master of France, with a discharge as to certain moneys which had been collected as if for a crusade, and had been detained by Lewis XII; and in addition to these favours, the pope professed to bestow on him new privileges with regard to ecclesiastical elections.

The terms of the concordat were settled at Bologna in August 1516, and were ratified by the Lateran council at its eleventh session, on the 19th of December—one bishop only expressing any difference of opinion. Elections in cathedrals and monasteries were abolished, on account of the alleged evil consequences. In case of the vacancy of a see, the king was within six months to present to the pope a person not under twenty-seven years of age, and having certain other qualifications. If he should present one not so qualified, he might within a further time of three months present another; and in case of delay, the pope might appoint a bishop, as he was also authorized to do when a vacancy was caused by the death of a prelate at the Roman court. Exceptions were, however, made as to some of the qualifications in the case of persons of royal or high birth, and of friars who by the statutes of their order were unable to take the prescribed degrees. A like rule was established as to monasteries, where the heads were to be chosen from persons of the same order to which the monks belonged, and not under twenty-three years of age. The bull of Boniface VIII known as *Unam Sanctam*, with the slight modification of it introduced by Clement V, was reenacted, and the pragmatic sanction—which was spoken of as “the Bourges corruption of the kingdom of France”—was

abolished. Thus the pope, in order to conciliate the king, had made over to the crown a large part of the privileges which were taken from the French church. The Roman practices of reservation and expectative graces were given up, but the pope found his compensation in the recovery of the annates.

The report of the concordat was received in France with general indignation and disgust. The students of the university of Paris broke out into tumult, and dragged about the streets a figure of the chancellor Duprat, whom they regarded as the betrayer of the national church. Preachers loudly denounced from the pulpit the sacrifice of ecclesiastical liberty. When Francis convened at the Palace of Justice a great assembly of the parliament, the bishops, the chapter of the cathedral, and the chief doctors of the university, the concordat and the chancellor's explanations of it, with his statement that it must be regarded as a remedy for worse evils, were received with loud cries of disapprobation. When the king sent forth letters patent, by which the courts were ordered to take the concordat for the basis of their future judgments, the advocate-general, instead of requiring that the concordat and the letters should be registered by the parliament, desired that the pragmatic sanction might be maintained, and appealed "against the congregation which claimed the title of Lateran council."

The parliament of Paris blamed the re-imposition of annates as a measure which would beggar the kingdom, and also as simoniacal. It appealed "to the pope better advised, and to the first lawfully assembled council"; and in this it was followed by provincial parliaments. The university of Paris appealed in like manner, and forbade all printers and booksellers to circulate the obnoxious document under pain of being rejected from the academic body.

Francis, in no less indignation, met these demonstrations by threats, and by high-handed measures. He imprisoned some members of the university who had made themselves conspicuous in opposition to the concordat. But the parliament still carried on a long war of formalities, in the hope of delaying, if not of preventing, the enforcement of the new system. Chapters and monastic bodies continued to elect their heads, and the parliaments maintained the men so chosen, to the exclusion of the king's nominees. The courts affected to act and to decide as if the pragmatic sanction were still in force, until Francis, in 1527, by transferring the cognizance of ecclesiastical causes from them to the great council of state, procured a reluctant submission to the concordats. The chief remaining trace of the Gallican liberties was to be found in that freer tone of thought by which the French church was until very recent times distinguished from other portions of the Roman communion.

The Lateran council, although more considerable as to numbers than that of Pisa, had never been largely attended, and the greater part of its members (who at the utmost did not exceed sixteen cardinals and about a hundred bishops and abbots) were Italians or bishops *in partibus*, although there were also representatives of England, Spain, and Hungary. Under Leo it had become merely an instrument of the papal policy. A few decrees for reform of the curia and other such objects were passed in later sessions; but they were so limited by exceptions and reservations that little effect was to be expected from them. There was also a project of an alliance between Christian sovereigns against the Turks. There was a condemnation of some sceptical opinions which had been vented as to the eternity of the world and the mortality of the soul; and, in order to check the indulgence in such speculations, it was decreed that no student in any university should spend more than five years in philosophical and poetical studies without also studying theology or canon law, either instead of such subjects or together with them.

The council broke up at its twelfth session, on the 16th of March 1517, having enabled the pope to triumph over the threatened schism, and to gain a victory over the church of France which placed his authority higher than it had ever stood in that country. On the 31st of October in the same year, Martin Luther began the great movement against the authority of Rome by publishing his ninety-five propositions at Wittenberg.

CHAPTER VII.
PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL—MEASURES AGAINST JEWS AND
MAHOMETANS IN SPAIN—WITCHCRAFT—SECTARIES—FORERUNNERS OF THE
REFORMATION.

CHRISTIANITY was now professed throughout the European countries, although in the Byzantine empire it had been forced to stoop under the ascendancy of the victorious Turks. We also meet with occasional notices of missions to some of the regions which had been the chief scenes of such enterprise in the ages immediately preceding—as when Eugenius IV, in 1433, sent a bishop and twenty Franciscans into the countries bordering on the Caspian Sea. But the progress of geographical discovery opened new fields for missionary labour.

Thus the Portuguese, carrying their explorations along the coast of Africa, made settlements in Congo, where many of the natives were brought to receive baptism. In 1497, the passage to India round the Cape of Good Hope was discovered by the same nation; and in their intercourse with the east they were brought into acquaintance with the church of Abyssinia, which they supposed to be the country of Prester John, and with that of Malabar, which traced its origin to St. Thomas.

But the discoveries of the Spaniards, which revealed a new world to Europe, were yet more important. Christopher Columbus, himself a Genoese, after fruitless endeavours to recommend to various potentates the project which he had conceived of reaching the Indies by a western course, gained with difficulty the patronage of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. He set sail on his first voyage in August 1492, and returned in March 1493, having discovered the West Indian islands; and by him and his successors in adventure, a large portion of the great western continent was explored within the following years. The newly-found territories, according to a principle which the popes had succeeded in establishing, were supposed to belong to the apostolic see; and Alexander VI was requested to decide between the claims of the two neighbouring nations which had been foremost in the work of discovery. In May 1493, Alexander VI issued a bull, by which the boundary line was fixed at 100 leagues west of the Cape de Verde islands and of the Azores, all new discoveries within this line being assigned to Portugal, while all beyond it were to belong to Spain. But the Portuguese were dissatisfied with the award; and in the following year the Spaniards and the pope consented that the boundary should be drawn 370 leagues westward of the Azores.

In dealing with such questions, the pope inculcated on the discoverers the duty of spreading the gospel in the countries which had come under their dominion; and some missions to the natives were very early set on foot. But it would be of little use to enter on any account of these missions, when all but the very beginning of their work belongs to a later period of history.

While it was desired and intended that the knowledge of the Christian faith should be propagated by peaceful and gentle means among the heathens of the newly-discovered countries, measures of a very different kind were employed in order to force it on the Jews and the Mahometans of Spain. For this purpose the inquisition, which during the schism of the papacy seemed to have been dormant, was now revived in that country, with new circumstances of iniquity and cruelty, which have made the Spanish inquisition an object of especially profound and deserved abhorrence.

The union of Aragon and Castile under Ferdinand and Isabella suggested the idea of establishing entire unity of religion among their subjects; and, while with Ferdinand religion was commonly little better than a pretext for a selfish and treacherous secular policy, the mind of his more estimable consort was much under the influence of the clergy. Thomas de Torquemada, who had acquired a power over her by having been her confessor in early life, is said to have exacted a promise that, if she should inherit the crown, she would devote herself to the extirpation of heresy, for the glory of God. The earnestness with which Torquemada and others now urged the fulfilment of this promise overpowered the queen's natural tenderness, and she was reluctantly persuaded to request of Sixtus IV that an inquisition might be established in Castile. On All Saints' day, 1478, the pope issued a bull for this purpose. The new inquisition was distinguished by its peculiar connexion with the state; the members of the tribunal were to be appointed by the sovereigns, and might be dismissed by them; and the property of the victims was to be confiscated to the crown. The bishops had no share in the management of the inquisition, but were themselves subject to the action of this new and irresponsible power. Even the papacy, after a time, found itself unable to cope with the inquisitors on their own ground.

In 1483, the organization of the tribunal was completed by the nomination of Torquemada as chief inquisitor for Castile, and he was confirmed in his office by Innocent VIII, in 1486. Four years after his original appointment, his power was extended to Aragon, where an inquisition had been established by Gregory IX for the suppression of the Albigensian doctrines, but had latterly differed little from an ordinary ecclesiastical court. The new institution speedily gave signs of activity. It surrounded itself with a host of "familiar"—spies, and ministers of its tyranny; indeed the machinery was so extensive that the cost of it almost absorbed all the funds which were obtained by confiscations and fines. Every year, in the beginning of Lent, the clergy were required to declare from the pulpit the duty of informing against any who might be suspected of religious error— even the nearest relations; and the information thus obtained by secret, and often anonymous, accusations, was used against the persons denounced, with more than all the injustice which had marked the proceedings of the inquisition in other countries and in its earlier stages. No fair opportunity of defence was allowed; and torture was employed to wring out confessions. The severities of the inquisition began on the Epiphany of 1481, when six victims were committed to the flames at Seville; and within the following ten months, 298 were burnt in that city alone. During the first few years of its operations, 2000 were burnt alive in Spain, and a still greater number were burnt in effigy, having been driven to seek their safety in exile. Torquemada, by proclaiming an offer of pardon to all who should voluntarily surrender themselves, induced about 17,000—"men and women of all ages and conditions"—to seek reconciliation with the church, although this commonly involved such penalties as heavy fines, or total confiscation of property, civil disabilities, or imprisonment, which in many cases was for life.

In Aragon—a country which had enjoyed much of liberty, and where many of the chief families, from intermarriage with persons of Jewish descent, were likely to fall under the suspicion of the new tribunal—a spirit of indignation was aroused. The cortes remonstrated against the inquisition, both at the Spanish court and at Rome; they protested that the practice of confiscation, and the denial of a fair and open trial, were violations of their hereditary privileges. The chief inquisitor of the province, Peter Arbues, was mortally wounded while attending a midnight office in the cathedral of Saragossa; and it was found that the assassins had been hired by the contributions of many nobles, and of many converts from Judaism. The crime was immediately punished; but there were serious tumults throughout the kingdom. The cortes renewed their remonstrances from time to time against the horrible tyranny which had been imposed on their country.

Torquemada himself lived in constant fear of a violent end. It is said that he endeavoured to fortify himself against poison by having always on his table a horn, which was

supposed to be that of an unicorn, and to be an infallible test of its presence; and he never stirred abroad without a strong body-guard. He was thrice obliged to send his colleague Badaja to defend him at Rome, where charges had been preferred against him; and in 1494 Alexander VI appointed four bishops to be his coadjutors, under the pretext that his age required assistance, but in reality to mitigate his severity. The Roman court, in its eagerness to get money by all means, attempted to sell exemptions from the authority of the inquisition and pardons for offences condemned by it; but the tribunal was too strong, and Alexander was obliged to give up this source of gain.

The first objects of the inquisition's zeal were the Jews, who in Spain had advanced more than in any other country as to wealth, culture, and general prosperity. Many of them from time to time had professed Christianity; many noble houses had sought to improve their fortunes by alliances with these "new Christians"; and not a few of them had attained high dignities, as well in the hierarchy as in the state. The inquisition now set itself to search out any symptoms of Judaism among the descendants of converts, and to punish it with unsparing severity, as a relapse. The old stories of outrages against the holy Eucharist, of administering poison in the character of physicians, of stealing and crucifying Christian children, were revived against the Jews, and a more general measure for the suppression of Judaism in Spain was designed. The unfortunate people endeavoured to avert this by offering largely towards the expenses of the Moorish war; but while the matter was under consideration, Torquemada burst into the royal council, holding the crucifix in his hands; he told the sovereigns that to accept such an offer would be like the bargain of Judas, who sold his master; and dashing the crucifix on the floor, he indignantly departed. After the capture of Granada, Ferdinand and Isabella issued from that city an order that all Jews should before the end of July either submit to baptism or go into exile. They were allowed to sell their property, and to carry away the value of it in bills of exchange, but were forbidden to take with them gold, silver, or precious stones.

The Jews disposed of their possessions at a grievous loss, and at the appointed time they left the land which for many generations had sheltered their forefathers. The greater part sought a refuge in Portugal, where king John II was willing to admit them on payment of a tax for each person; but his successor, Emanuel, pledged himself, as a condition of marrying a Spanish princess, to imitate the policy of Ferdinand and Isabella by requiring the fugitives to choose between baptism and exile. Such of them as refused to be baptized were shipped off to Africa, where they suffered extreme miseries. Many died of hardship or of ill-usage; some struggled to a Spanish settlement, where they made profession of Christianity, in the hope of being allowed to return to Spain. Of those who sought a refuge elsewhere, some repaired to Rome, to appeal to Alexander VI against an intolerance of which the popes themselves had given no example; and Ferdinand remonstrated with Alexander for having (for the sake of money, as it appears) allowed them to pitch their tents on the Appian way, near the tomb of Caecilia Metella.

At the conquest of Granada, the catholic sovereigns had promised to the Moors by treaty the free exercise of their religion, with other privileges which might mitigate the loss of their independence. But in this case too it was regarded as a duty to establish unity of religion. Francis de Talavera, the first archbishop of Granada, wished to pave the way for the acceptance of the Christian faith by means of conviction and with this view he himself, although no longer young, undertook to learn the language of the Moors; he encouraged his clergy to do the like, and promoted the compilation of vocabularies, and the translation of some parts of Scripture into Arabic.

But a different course was taken by the most prominent ecclesiastic of the Spanish church in that age, Francis Ximenes de Cisneros. Ximenes, who was born in 1436, of a family belonging to the poorer class of nobility, had in earlier life given many proofs of a resolute character and of a burning ecclesiastical zeal. After having spent six years in study at Rome,

he had obtained from the pope a presentation to an “expected” archpriestship in the diocese of Toledo. The archbishop, Carillo, to whom the patronage ordinarily belonged, regarding this as an invasion of his rights, endeavoured to make him relinquish it, and on his refusal committed him to prison; but, as Ximenes at the end of six years showed no disposition to yield, the archbishop set him at liberty, and allowed him to take possession of his benefice. Ximenes, however, exchanged it for one in the diocese of Sigüenza, where, under the bishop, Mendoza, he was speedily promoted, and appeared to have a prosperous career before him, when he suddenly resigned his preferments and entered the Franciscan order, exchanging his baptismal name, Gonsalvo, for that of the founder. He plunged into a course of the severest austerities, and after a time withdrew to a remote and lonely chestnut forest, where he built himself a little hut with his own hands. From this retreat he was drawn forth by his monastic superiors; and in 1492, through the recommendation of his old patron Mendoza, then archbishop of Toledo, he was appointed confessor to the queen. The reluctance with which he undertook this office appears to have been sincere, and he was yet more unwilling to accept the archbishopric of Toledo after the death of Mendoza, in 1495. The large revenues of his see were spent on ecclesiastical and charitable objects; he even undertook at his own expense a crusade in Africa; while his own habits were of the most rigidly simple kind. As provincial of his order in Castile, he had carried out a reform of the Franciscan convents, where discipline was greatly decayed; and under the authority of papal privileges he had extended his reforms, with characteristic resolution, to other monastic orders and to the secular clergy.

Arriving at Granada in 1499, while the king and queen were visiting that city, Ximenes vehemently urged on them the duty of extirpating the Mahometan religion from their dominions. The capitulations he set aside with scorn, as a compromise with evil which could have no validity. While Talavera was for awaiting the results of instruction, Ximenes held that baptism should be administered at once, on the ground that, if the profession of Christianity were insincere on the part of the recipient, it would become real in the next generation. He was willing that there should be catechisms and popular elementary books in the vernacular tongue, but held that, until converts should have been brought by these to a love of the gospel, they were not fit to receive the Scriptures, but were likely rather to dishonour them; nor would he allow the sacred books to be in any other tongue than those of the originals and of the Vulgate. He entered into conferences with Moorish doctors, and discoursed with fiery vehemence on the doctrines of the faith. He even burdened his see in order to find the means of bribing the Moors to embrace the gospel, and his zeal is said to have been rewarded by vast numbers of conversions, so that in a single day he baptized more than 3000 proselytes by aspersion. Where the milder methods of persuasion were ineffectual, he did not scruple to make use of chains and other forcible means. Although he was noted for his munificent patronage of learning, his religious intolerance led him to order the destruction of all Arabic books except such as related to medical science; and it is said that 80,000 volumes—among them 5000 copies of the Koran, of which many were enriched with splendid illuminations and with precious ornaments—were committed to the flames. The exasperated people of Granada broke out into insurrection and besieged the primate in the archiepiscopal palace; and after having been rescued, chiefly through the mediation of Talavera, he repaired to the court at Seville, where he pressed on Ferdinand and Isabella the necessity of dealing with the Mahometans as they had dealt with the Jews.

On the 12th of February 1502, a decree was published by which all male Moors above fourteen years of age, and all females above twelve, were required either to receive baptism or to leave the kingdom before the end of April. Like the Jews, they were forbidden to carry with them gold, silver, or jewels, and they were charged not to betake themselves to the dominions of the Grand Turk, or of any enemy of Spain.

In consequence of this edict multitudes left the country. Some were imprisoned, and children under the ages named were forcibly torn from their parents. But many submitted to

baptism and remained; and these new Christians, whose profession was justly suspected, were watched by all men with jealousy, and continually furnished victims for the tyranny of the inquisition.

As in former times, the inquisition concerned itself not only with heresy, but with witchcraft—a thing which Gratian, in his ‘Decretum,’ had spoken of as a pagan delusion, but which had come to be more and more a matter of popular belief. Witchcraft was regarded as more detestable than heresy, because, in addition to impiety, it included malignity and hurt to mankind; and for the same reason, as being a civil offence, it was liable to prosecution by the secular magistrates, as well as by the clergy. Many cases of such prosecution are found during this time in Italy, Germany, France, and other countries; but the most remarkable was that which occurred at Arras, in 1459. The first person who was brought to trial was a woman of disreputable life; but gradually the victims were taken from higher and higher stations, and were chosen with an evident regard to their wealth. The offence imputed to them was styled *Vauderie*; yet, although this word appeared to connect them with the Waldensian sectaries, the charges and the evidence seem to relate wholly to the practice of sorcery; indeed, their story is a proof how readily the imputation of heresy might run into the yet more odious suspicion of witchcraft. Some of the accused, on being put to the torture, confessed monstrous things—that they had been conveyed by the devil to the meetings of the party, riding through the air on an anointed stick, and that at those meetings they had practised obscene, revolting, and absurd rites and abominations. On these avowals they were condemned, and were made over to the secular arm; whereupon they burst out into loud complaints against their counsel for having led them to suppose that, by confessing whatever might be laid to their charge, they might save their lives; and they steadfastly declared their confessions to be entirely false. It was in vain that Giles Carlier, dean of Cambrai, endeavoured to bring them off with a slight penance; the bishop of Berytus, who was suffragan of Arras and had been a papal penitentiary, urged on the trial with rigour. Many were put to death by fire; some were sentenced to imprisonment for life, or to the payment of heavy fines.

The excitement produced by these trials was immense, and for a time general uneasiness and suspicion reigned throughout the north of France. But some of those whom the inquisitors had ventured to accuse appealed to the parliament of Paris, which in 1461 put a stop to the processes as groundless. It was not, however, until thirty years later, when Artois had reverted to the French crown, that the parliament of Paris gave its final decision, by which the processes were declared to be abusive and null, and the heirs of the duke of Burgundy, and of the chief persons concerned in them, were condemned to make reparation to the representatives of the sufferers. The use of torture in such cases was forbidden, and in consequence of the indignation excited by the Arras trials, the inquisition disappeared in France.

In 1484 Innocent VIII addressed a letter to the Germans, in which he set forth the rife of magical practices, and the manifold dangers with which society was threatened by them. In order to check these evils, he appointed two Dominicans, James Sprenger and Henry Kramer (in Latin called *Institor*), inquisitors for Germany, and invested them with powers which trespassed on the province of the secular magistracy. These learned personages, by way of warning, published at Cologne in 1489 a book entitled ‘The Hammer of Witches’, which is a strange compendium of the superstitions of the age. From this time prosecutions for witchcraft became more frequent than before; and, after the pope’s formal acknowledgment of the reality of the crime, any doubt as to its existence was regarded as impious. The fifth Lateran council forbade all magical practices, whether by clergy or by laity, under severe penalties.

REGINALD PECOCK

During this period we often meet with notices which show that opinions, which had

been the cause of serious commotions in earlier ages, continued to exist, although more obscurely than before. Thus, about the middle of the fifteenth century, we find mention of Manicheans or cathari in Bosnia, where the king's father-in-law and many other persons of high station were among the followers of the heresy. The eloquence of John of Capistrano is said to have converted multitudes from this form of error in Transylvania and the Danubian countries,—among them the chief of the sect, whom he baptized. We read of fraticelli “of the opinion”, as they are sometimes styled, who lurked about Italy, and even of attempts to spread the doctrines of the party in Ireland. We find turlupins put to death at Lille in 1465, and, while the charges against them are mostly of the usual kind, one article relates to a denial of the Holy Ghost. The Waldenses in the valleys of Dauphiny and northern Italy attract from time to time the notice of the ecclesiastical authorities; and the same party appears in Bohemia as connected with the Hussites. Prophecies continued to be circulated and to affect the minds of men. Strange preachers appeared, with apocalyptic oracles and predictions of Antichrist, whom some of them declared to be already born; and not uncommonly such preachers, after a short career of success, ended their lives at the stake. Some taught that all things were common, that the married state was unlawful and inconsistent with salvation, or other such fantastical and mischievous notions. And sometimes a great excitement was produced by the appearance of a brilliant and mysterious adventurer, whose variety of learning and accomplishments seemed inconsistent with his years, and suggested the suspicion that he might be no other than the very Antichrist himself.

In England, during the earlier part of the fifteenth century, charges of lollardism frequently occur, and the persons accused of this offence are usually treated without mercy. This severity may have arisen in part from the fact that the dangerous political elements of lollardism became more and more conspicuous; that members of the party advocated community of goods, that they were busy in agitating against taxation, and vented doctrines hostile to all civil government.

A general decay of discipline at this time pervaded the English church. The bishops were commonly unpopular, and there was much outcry against them for their neglect of the duties of preaching and residence. Against such complaints their cause was strenuously maintained by Reginald Pecock, bishop of St. Asaph, in a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, and afterwards in a long and elaborate treatise, entitled ‘The Repressor of over-much Wyting [*i.e.* Blaming] of the Clergy’.

Pecock was probably a native of the diocese of St. David's, and is supposed to have been born about the end of the fourteenth century. He studied at Oxford, where he became a fellow of Oriel College, and in 1444 he was promoted to the bishopric of St. Asaph. The merit of his honesty of intention was somewhat marred by vanity and self-confidence, and by a tendency to a style of argument rather subtle than solid; and these defects appeared in his sermon at St. Paul's Cross and in the ‘Repressor’. He maintained that bishops, as such, are not bound to preach, and that for reasonable causes they may be non-resident. He asserted that the pope, as successor of St. Peter, was head of the church. He held that the pope was the universal pastor, and was entitled to the whole revenues of the church, so that the sums paid by bishops, by way of first-fruits and the like, were merely a partial restoration of that which was his own—like the payments made by a steward to his lord. He not only maintained the episcopal order and vindicated the right of church-property against the attacks of the Wyclifites, but defended images and relics (in behalf of which he alleged stories of miracles performed by them), pilgrimages, the monastic system, the splendour of conventual buildings, the adoration of the cross, and many questionable ceremonies of the church. The excitement produced by his sermon was very great; instead of quelling the popular odium of bishops, it further exasperated it. And in addition to this, he was charged by adversaries of a different kind with setting reason above Holy Scripture, with treating in the vernacular language subjects too deep for the understanding of the multitude, and with disrespect to fathers,

councils, and the authority of the church.

Notwithstanding these circumstances, Pecock was translated in 1450 to the see of Chichester, which had become vacant through the murder of the late bishop. For this promotion he was indebted to the duke of Suffolk and to queen Margaret's confessor, the bishop of Norwich; but, when Suffolk had been overthrown, Pecock was left without powerful protectors. When he appeared at the king's council, in October 1457, with many spiritual and temporal lords, there was an outburst of indignation against him, as having vented novel doctrines and even as having incited the people to insurrection; and he was compelled to leave the assembly. His books—of which he declared that he would be answerable for such only as he had set forth within the last three years—were, by order of the archbishop, Bourchier, committed for examination to twenty-four doctors. Their report was that his writings contained many errors and heresies, and, after several examinations, the archbishop desired him to choose between retractation and delivery to the secular arm, "as the food of fire, and fuel for the burning". Utterly unmanned by terror, Pecock submitted to make an abjuration, which he publicly performed at St. Paul's Cross—the same place in which his obnoxious sermon had been preached—on the second Sunday in Advent, in the presence of the primate, three bishops, and 20,000 people; with his own hands he delivered his censured books to be thrown into the flames; and it was believed that, if the multitude could have reached him, he would have shared the fate of his writings. "He retracted errors which he had never uttered, and he retracted utterances which he knew to be truths". By a representation of his case to the pope he obtained three bulls, ordering the archbishop to restore him; but Bourchier refused to receive the bulls, as being contrary to the statute of provisors. Whether Pecock resigned his see, or was deprived of it, is uncertain; his last days were spent in rigorous seclusion at Thorney Abbey, and the time of his death is unknown.

Although Pecock was so far from agreeing with the Lollards that his main object was to confute them, and that his ingenuity was exercised in defending points of the existing system which were the objects of their attacks, he was popularly confounded with them, so that the contemporary statutes of King's College, Cambridge, require the members to swear that they will not favour the opinions of Wyclif or of Pecock. The books of the two became together the objects of a search and of a burning at Oxford in 1476, and many writers, both on the Roman and on the Protestant side, have repeated the mistake of supposing their doctrines to have been nearly akin. In some respects Pecock may be regarded as standing midway between the doctrines of Rome and those of the English reformation. He was an advocate of toleration in an age when intolerance was regarded as a duty to the truths. In the endeavour to distinguish between the provinces of reason and of Scripture—in maintaining that the warrant of Scripture need not be sought where reason is sufficient—he has been characterized as a forerunner of Hooker. Although ignorant of Greek, and although he was deceived by forgeries such as the pseudo-Dionysian books, he has the merit of having exposed the donation of Constantine by a clear historical argument, independent of his contemporary Valla's more famous treatise. That he was led into error by an excess of confidence in his judgment, is not to be denied; but of some of the opinions imputed to him he was wholly or partly guiltless. As to the fallibility of the church, he said nothing beyond what had before been said by Marsilius of Padua, by Nicolas of Clemanges, and others of the Paris academics; indeed it would seem that the opinions for which he was accused under this head were merely put forward by way of suppositions on which he was willing to argue. The charge that he denied the Holy Ghost was false; and his omission of the Descent into Hell from the creed was probably not a denial of the article as it is now generally understood, but of the gross construction which was put on it by the popular mind in the middle ages.

BOHEMIA

The religious ferment in Bohemia gave rise to some extreme manifestations in addition to those already mentioned. John of Trittenheim tells us of a party who were styled *fossarii*, from their custom of meeting by night in ditches and caves. He describes them as practising promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, as despising the church and its ministers, as mocking at the sacraments, and “full of errors without end”. Their numbers had increased rapidly, so that in the year 1501 they were more than 19,000, and among those who had joined them were many men of rank and influence. But perhaps we may question the accuracy of a statement which in its worst features so closely resembles the charges imputed to many denominations of heretics in one generation after another.

On the death of George Podiebrad, the Bohemian estates chose for their king a Polish prince, Ladislaus, who, as the see of Prague was still vacant, was crowned by two Polish bishops. Although the pope, Sixtus IV, refused to acknowledge any other king of Bohemia than Matthias Corvinus, of Hungary, Ladislaus, by the aid of his father, king Casimir, was able to make good his claims; and eventually he succeeded Matthias in the kingdom of Hungary also. In 1478 the Roman party endeavoured to compel the utraquists to relinquish their peculiar usages; but in the following year a peace was concluded, by which the utraquists obtained a confirmation of the *compactata*, and an acknowledgment that it was not heretical to receive the holy Eucharist under both kinds. Further troubles ensued; the utraquists, not content with their late gains, spoke of requiring the king to attend their churches, and to receive in both kinds; and in other respects their violence was such that Ladislaus found it necessary to banish some of their leaders, and even to put some of them to death. In 1485 a fresh treaty was concluded, by which each of the great parties was to enjoy perfect freedom of religion. It was provided that, on a vacancy in any parish, a new incumbent should be chosen from the same party to which his predecessor had belonged; and the king consented that the utraquists should on their side elect an administrator for the archbishopric of Prague. The peace thus established continued in force, although not without occasional disturbances, throughout the reign of Ladislaus, who died in 1516.

JOHN OF GOCH

About the middle of the fifteenth century, some divines appeared in Germany who may be said, in their views of nature and grace, of justification and kindred subjects, to have anticipated the Saxon reformation. Of these the most noted were John of Goch, John of Wesel, and John Wessel.

John Pupper, who was commonly named after his birthplace, Goch, near Cleves, was born in the beginning of the century, and is supposed to have been educated at the university of Paris; but nothing is known with certainty as to the history of his early life. In 1451, when he was about fifty years old, he founded a convent for canonesses at Mechlin, and entered into holy orders. The remainder of his days was spent in the office of prior of this institution, and he died in 1475. During his lifetime he was never molested on account of his opinions, which seem to have been then known only to a narrow circle of persons who agreed with him; nor can any distinct influence of them be traced in the reformers of the following century.

The second of the teachers above named, John Richrath or Ruchrath, of Wesel, was born at Oberwesel, on the Rhine, at some time between the years 1400 and 1420. He studied, and afterwards taught, at Erfurt; and the continuance of his influence in that university appears from Luther's speaking of himself as having prepared himself for the degree of master of arts by the study of John of Wesel's books. While at Erfurt, John was roused to indignation by the preaching of indulgences in connexion with the jubilee of 1450. He wrote not only against the grosser abuses of the system, but against the principle on which it was founded; yet he was allowed to proceed to the degree of doctor of divinity in 1456, and was appointed preacher at Worms in 1461-2. In this office he gained great popularity; but he excited enmity by attacking

the faults of the clergy, and by inconsiderate language—as when he declared that if St. Peter instituted fasting, it was probably with a view to getting a better market for his fish; so that his friend Wessel, while admiring his learning and ability, was compelled to lament his extravagance and indiscretion.

In 1479 John was brought by the bishop of Worms before a court at Mayence on a charge of heresy. He was accused of intimacy with Jews and Hussites, and even of being secretly a Hussite bishop; of denying the authority of the church as to the exposition of Scripture; of denying the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son; of denying original sin; of denying the powers of the Christian ministry, and the distinction of presbyters from bishops and popes; of opposing many rites of the church, the celibacy of the clergy, the use of ecclesiastical vestments, the practice of fasting, and the sacrament of extreme unction. Archbishop Diether, who felt himself obliged to take the matter up lest he should again lose his see, requested the assistance of doctors from Cologne and Heidelberg for the inquiry. The accused was old, was weak from illness, and was hard pressed by the members of the court. He declared that he had said nothing against the authority of the church, and disavowed some other things which were imputed to him ; but he expressed a wish to retract all errors, and, on the sixth day of the examination, he submitted to make a general retraction. His writings were burnt, and he was committed to the convent of Augustinian friars at Mayence, where he soon after died. The reporter of the case expresses an opinion that, except as to the procession of the Holy Spirit, John, if time had been allowed him, might have defended himself with success; that as a secular and a nominalist he suffered disadvantage from a tribunal of monastic and realistic judges : and he mentions some divines of note as having been disgusted by the unfairness of the process.

John Wessel, who was styled by his admirers “The light of the world”, while his opponents styled him “The master of contradictions”, was born at Groningen about 1429, and was educated for a time under the Brethren of the Common Life at Zwolle, where it has been supposed that he was known to Thomas of Kempten. From Zwolle he went to the university of Cologne, where he studied theology, the oriental languages, and ancient philosophy. He complained that the ordinary course of reading was confined to the works of Thomas of Aquino and Albert the Great; and he preferred Plato to Aristotle. For sixteen years he taught at Paris, where, from having been a realist, he became a nominalist; and he afterwards visited Italy, where he renewed an acquaintance formed in France with pope Sixtus IV. It is said that, on being desired by Sixtus to choose a gift, he made choice of a Bible in the original tongues, from the Vatican Library; and when the pope laughingly asked why he had not rather desired a bishopric, he answered that he did not need such things. In 1477, Wessel was invited by Philip, elector-palatine, to Heidelberg; but the theological faculty of the university refused to admit him as a member, because he had not taken the degree of doctor, and declined to qualify himself for it by receiving the tonsure. He therefore taught as a philosophical lecturer, and was much engaged in disputes with the party whose opinions he had abandoned. The prosecution of John of Wesel led him to expect a like attack on himself; but this fear was needless, and his last years, during which most of his extant works were written, were spent in quiet at his native town, where he was sheltered from the malice of enemies by the favour of the archbishop of Utrecht and the bishop of Munster. Wessel died in 1489. Luther said of him, “If I had read his works earlier, my enemies might have thought that I derived everything from him, so much does the spirit of the two agree”. Yet as to the doctrine of the Eucharist, Wessel seems to have been a forerunner rather of the Zwinglian than of the Lutheran reformation.

CHAPTER VIII.
SUPPLEMENTARY.

The Hierarchy.

(THE councils of Constance and Basel, by asserting the supremacy of general councils, and by endeavouring to reestablish the independence of the episcopate, appeared to overthrow the power which the popes had gradually built up ; and by the rules which they laid down for the regular meeting of general councils at short intervals, it seemed as if the right of control which they had asserted over the papacy were secured. But in the event, these apparent victories proved nugatory. The popes were always ready to act, and able to take advantage of all circumstances, while councils must in any case have been rare and unwieldy. The pope chosen at Constance, Martin V, from the very time of his election asserted the claims of his office in a manner which reduced much of the council's acts to a nullity. The council of Basel, by its imprudent assumptions and its mismanagement, allowed its adversary Eugenius to triumph over it. The decrees for periodical councils were never carried into execution; the appeals which were frequently made to future general councils were fruitless; for the popes always found some pretext for eluding not only the decree of Constance, but the solemn promises which they themselves had made on this subject at their election. And against the councils of Constance and Basel they were able to set those of Florence and the Lateran, by the last of which the pragmatic sanction of Bourges, the only result of the council of Basel which had remained until then, was abolished. The fathers of Basel, indeed, in their attempts to reduce the papacy to its proper limits, felt themselves hampered by the system in which they had been trained, and were unable to rid themselves of its restraints, as a larger acquaintance with Christian antiquity would have enabled them to do.

The critical spirit of Valla and others had opened men's eyes to the spuriousness of such documents as the donation of Constantine and the false decretals. Yet these exposures seem to have as yet had less effect than might have been expected, and to have been little urged to their consequences as affecting the authority of the church in whose interest the forgeries had been executed. At Basel the pope had been spoken of as the "ministerial head of the church"—a term by which it was meant that he was not entitled to give laws to the church, but that these ought to proceed from councils. But in opposition to such doctrines, some writers in the papal interest now vented extravagances even greater than those which we have had occasion to notice in earlier ages. It was maintained that the pope was infallible and absolute. All power, temporal as well as spiritual, was ascribed to him; it was said that he might not only depose emperors and kings, but might extinguish empires and kingdoms, even without cause; that, as being the source of all spiritual power, he was entitled to do, by his immediate authority, whatever the local bishop might do in any diocese; that appeals ought to be carried, not from a pope to a council, but from a general council, to the pope. It was asserted that Constantine's supposed donation was not a gift, but a partial restitution, inasmuch as the pope is rightly lord of all and while in France such opinions were condemned by parliaments, and universities, the sovereigns of other countries sometimes found their account in admitting them—as the Spaniards and Portuguese were glad to avail themselves of the papal sanction for their conquests in the countries which they had discovered.

Popes now began to bestow complimentary titles on kings as tokens of their favour. Thus, after the repeal of the pragmatic sanction, Lewis XI of France was styled by Pius II (or, according to some authorities, by Paul II) "Most Christian". Alexander VI was disposed to

transfer this title to Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, but at the request of his cardinals he bestowed on them instead of it the epithet of “Most Catholic”. Julius II conferred on James IV of Scotland the title of “Protector of the Christian Faith ; and as is well known, Henry VIII of England was rewarded for his book against Luther by being styled “Defender of the Faith”.

The secular power of the popes entered during this time on a new stage of its development. This advance began, as we have seen, with Sixtus IV, and it was carried further by his successors. The dominion which Caesar Borgia had gained for himself by the acquisition of the Romagna, and by the subjugation of the unruly barons, fell, on the collapse of his power, to the Roman church; and Julius II further extended the temporal sovereignty of the papacy. Thus, in addition to his spiritual pretensions, the pope became a great Italian prince; and, as Italy was now the chief subject of contention between the greatest sovereigns of the continent, his alliance in that character was very important, and he acquired much political influence.

While the papacy was thus for a time triumphing over all hindrances, the empire continued to sink. Sigismund, indeed, had been enabled by circumstances to assert his office as advocate and protector of the church at Constance and at Basel; but he was unable to maintain throughout the elevation which he had thus attained. The long and inglorious reign of Frederick III reduced the imperial dignity to the lowest point; and Maximilian’s attempts to restore it were foiled by his want of means for carrying them out, and by his own rash and inconstant character. The emperors were without any adequate provision for the expenses of their position. The crown lands, the tolls of the Rhine, and other sources of revenue had been alienated by capitulations with the electoral princes, or by other improvident grants. The taxes on Jews and on the cities of the empire had been redeemed. For the means of supporting his dignity, and for the expenses of war, the emperor was obliged to rely on the diet of the empire; and thus he found himself in an unseemly condition of dependence. At the same time the other chief sovereigns of Europe—the kings of France, England, and Spain—by the union of territories, by the subjection of great feudatories and nobles, or otherwise, had become much stronger than before; so that the emperor, although bearing a far loftier title, although it was for him to bestow royal and ducal dignities, was really inferior in power to them, and even to his vassal duke Charles of Burgundy, or to the trading republic of Venice. Yet while his real authority and importance were thus waning, the theory of his grandeur was elaborated more than ever by jurists, whose invention was stimulated by the doctrines of canonists as to the papacy. The empire, according to the jurists, was “holy” and independent of the ecclesiastical power; the emperor was lord paramount and “monarch” of all the world, so that from him all secular dominion was supposed to be derived.

The popes continued to interfere with ecclesiastical patronage of all sorts, and their interference was often resented. In England, by appointing resident legates *a latere*, and by inducing the archbishops of Canterbury to accept the office, they acquired a new power over the church, as the government of it appeared thenceforth to be exercised by delegation from the Roman see. In Scotland there were some demonstrations of independence; but the popes at their own will erected the sees of St. Andrew’s and Glasgow into archbishoprics, and granted such exemptions from the archiepiscopal authority as they thought fit. James IV is found expressing great thankfulness to Julius II for having appointed his illegitimate son, Alexander Stuart, while yet a boy, to the primacy of Scotland, and requesting that a bishopric may be bestowed on a Dominican who was employed in the administration of the province during the archbishop’s minority. There were continual endeavours on the part of sovereigns to prevent the occupation of benefices in their dominions by alien and non-resident incumbents, whom the pope took it upon himself to nominate. But the same argument from practical results by which Frederick Barbarossa had endeavoured to show that the disposal of bishoprics was better placed in the hands of sovereigns than of chapters, was used by Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini in behalf of the papal patronage. And when raised to the papacy he introduced the

new abuse of charging preferments with the payment of pensions to cardinals, or to officials of the Roman court.

As the crown became stronger in various countries, the sovereigns showed a disposition to limit the power of the church in various ways. Thus they forbade appeals to Rome, and the introduction of Roman documents into their dominions, except with their previous knowledge and licence. Old grievances are found continually recurring; as when the popes and the English clergy complain of the statutes of praemunire, and the popes complain that their collectors are arrested and imprisoned. The immunities claimed by the clergy, and the boundaries of secular and spiritual jurisdiction, are also frequent subjects of contest. Thus we find that spiritual courts are forbidden to meddle with the suits of laymen, that the secular affairs of the clergy are brought before secular tribunals, and that such courts exercise criminal jurisdiction over ecclesiastics. The parliament of Paris took it on itself to commit bishops to prison. The control exercised by the Venetian republic over its clergy has appeared in the course of our story. Henry VII of England enacted that clerks convicted of crimes should be burnt in the hand; and for this he was afterwards denounced by Perkin Warbeck as an invader of the rights of holy church.

But where the popes were masters, the clerical immunities were jealously preserved. Thus, on Ascension day 1487, the gonfaloniere and another magistrate of Bologna did penance in St. Peter's at Rome, for having exceeded their jurisdiction by hanging a Franciscan and a secular priest. The gonfaloniere was deprived of all office and dignity. He and his companion were flogged by the penitentiaries of the church while the psalm Miserere was chanted, and after this they were solemnly rebuked by the pope. The deposed chief magistrate was required to build and endow a chapel at Bologna, and on every Sunday and holy-day to attend mass in it, kneeling from the beginning to the end of the service with a burning taper in his hand, and to pray for the souls of the ecclesiastics on whom he had presumed to execute justice.

Complaints as to the defects of the clergy are as loud and as frequent as before. We read of the greed and corruption of the Roman court, of simony in all quarters, of neglect of spiritual duties, of the ignorance and rudeness of the lower clergy, of their seeking to eke out their income by farming, keeping shops or taverns, and other unsuitable occupations; and the effects of enforced celibacy were scandalously evident. As the church would not relax its rules on this point, notwithstanding the opinion of some of its most enlightened members, the great mass of the clergy lived in a state of concubinage. It was in vain that the councils of Constance and of Basel forbade this, and that their decrees were echoed by provincial councils. The example of the popes, in openly bringing forward their illegitimate children, in heaping church-preferment or lands on them, and in labouring to connect them by marriage with reigning families, could not but produce an effect. The contagion of evil spread to the lower clergy, and from the clergy to the laity, so that a general demoralization ensued. Yet after all the overwhelming evidence which experience had afforded as to the mischievous effects of compulsory celibacy, it is remarkable that, when the authorities of the Roman church were driven by the success of the protestant movement to attempt an internal reformation, this point of discipline was one as to which no reform or modification was introduced.

Monasticism.

Of the orders which arose in the fifteenth century, the most remarkable was that of Eremites of St. Francis, or Minims, founded, as we have already seen, by St. Francis of Paola, and approved by Sixtus IV in 1474. It was a branch of the Franciscan community, and was distinguished by extraordinary strictness—as that the members were to observe the severity of Lenten diet throughout the whole year. There were sisters and tertiaries attached to the

order—the last under a milder rule in respect of food. From the founder's native Italy, and from France, where his last years were spent, this order spread into Spain, and it is said to have numbered about 450 houses in the beginning of the eighteenth century.

The mendicant orders continued to enjoy much popularity, and endeavoured, as before, to supplant the secular clergy utterly in the respect and affection of the laity. They were thoroughly devoted to the papacy, except, indeed, when it failed to favour them; and this it seldom ventured on with such resolute and valuable allies. Alexander VI is reported to have said that it was safer to offend any powerful king than a Franciscan or a Dominican. The mendicants did not scruple to use pretended visions, miracles, and other such tricks for the furtherance of their purposes. For a time the Franciscans were ordered to refrain from setting forth their founder's stigmata, and the Dominicans were forbidden to represent St. Catharine of Siena with similar marks. But the flights of the Franciscans in honour of their great saint became, if possible, more extravagant than before; and, if more active than other orders, they directed most of their labours to the advancement of popular superstitions and of papal assumptions, or to the exclusive glorification of their own brotherhood. It was believed that Paul II was about to publish letters, drawn up by Calixtus III, depriving the mendicants of all their special privileges; but nothing came of this, and Sixtus, by bulls of 1474 and 1479, granted the Dominicans and the Franciscans a confirmation of all former favours.

The Carmelites even outdid the Franciscans in their pretensions, asserting that the blessed Virgin every Saturday released from purgatory all those who had died in the scapulary of the order during the preceding week. For this they professed to have the authority of bulls of John XXII and of Alexander V; and, although both these bulls were forgeries, the persistent audacity of the Carmelites extorted confirmations of the privilege from later popes.

The chief check to the pretensions of the mendicants was opposed by the university of Paris, which condemned their invasion of the rights of the secular clergy, compelled them to conform to its terms, and would not allow any of them to teach until he had gone through a course of study prescribed by its own authority. And when the friars procured bulls in their favour from Eugenius IV and Nicolas V, they were required to swear that they would make no use of these documents.

Complaints of a decay in monastic discipline, and attempts at a reformation, are found throughout the period. The council of Constance projected a large scheme of reform; but it remained without effect. The council of Basel was more successful in this respect.

In northern Germany a reformation was begun by the regular canons of Windesheim, and was so satisfactory that these were employed, under a commission from the legate Nicolas of Cusa, to carry out a similar work elsewhere. But in this they met with much difficulty. Monks were not more seriously in need of reform than determined to resist any attempt to reform them. In some places they had recourse to violence. One monk threatened to stab the visitor, John Busch, with a knife; another, to cut his throat with a pair of scissors; and it was sometimes necessary to put down opposition by the help of the secular power. Some communities appealed to Rome against the visitors, but met with no success. The nuns (as to whose morals and discipline the report is usually very unfavourable) were yet more intractable than the men. In one place, although the visitors were supported by the authority of the duke of Brunswick, the nuns repeatedly declared that they had sworn not to reform, and that they would not become perjured. They threw themselves down on the pavement of the choir, with their limbs stretched out in the form of a cross, and shrieked out the anthem, "In the midst of life we are in death!". They arranged the images of the saints in order, and placed lights between them, as if by way of defence against the supposed profanation. At another convent the sisters not only sang the same ominous strain, but hurled their burning tapers at the commissioners and pelted them with earth and stones. Even miracles were alleged in opposition to reform, while on the other side there are stories of judgments which befell the refractory.

The English Benedictines underwent a reform under Henry V about the year 1421. A reform of those of Germany was begun at the monastery of Bursfeld, and was carried out elsewhere in imitation of the model which had been there established. But these reforms were only partial; and sometimes, when monasteries which had accepted a reform found that their order in general held out against it, they formed themselves into separate congregations.

Reforms were sometimes forced on reluctant communities by princes or bishops, and sometimes by distress consequent on the extravagance of some gay young abbot, who had wasted the revenues of his church, and thus indirectly became the means of bringing his brethren to a better mind.

Among the greatest obstacles to reform was the practice of dividing the monastic income—a practice utterly contrary to the principle of monachism, but recommended by the independence and freedom from discipline which it encouraged. At the council of Constance a Cistercian failed in an endeavour to get this system acknowledged as lawful but it was too firmly rooted to be easily extirpated.

Rites and Usages.

The increase of festivals and ceremonies, of pilgrimages, relics, and fabulous legends, was not to be checked by the protests of those who had succeeded to the opinions of Gerson and his associates. The alleged miracles of bleeding hosts, in particular, became more frequent, because they now served not only to prove the doctrine of transubstantiation in its coarsest form, but to justify the withdrawal of the eucharistic cup from the laity. In some cases, however, these miracles seem to have been produced merely for the sake of gain; and hence cardinal Nicolas of Cusa, when legate in Germany, forbade the display of such hosts, and ordered that they should rather be consumed by the priests at mass. But this superstition was not to be so readily put down. Occasion was not uncommonly taken from stories of outrages done by Jews to the consecrated host to set on foot a persecution against that people.

Indulgences became more frequent than before, although the council of Constance had endeavoured to mitigate the abuse of them. They were now offered for a great variety of objects : for the crusade against the Turks, which the popes continually dangled before the eyes of western Christendom, although without ever carrying it out; for any other expeditions, whether against heathens or against Christians, to which the popes, might give the character of a crusade; for the jubilee, for visiting certain places, for performing certain devotions, for celebrating festivals, and for the rebuilding of churches, especially for that of St. Peter's at Rome, which was undertaken by Julius II in 1506. The indignation which these indulgences naturally provoked in the more discerning, was swelled by the impudent pretensions of the preachers who set them forth; and this, on the occasion of the indulgence for St. Peter's, when renewed by Leo X became the immediate occasion of Luther's defiance of Rome.

That indulgences were applicable to souls departed, had been maintained by some of the schoolmen,—as Alexander of Hales, and Aquinas. The doctrine received a practical application from Sixtus IV in 1477, and from Innocent VIII in 1490. But the most remarkable exemplification of it was in the bull issued by Alexander VI for the jubilee of 1500, when the faithful were invited to pay money towards the repair of St. Peter's, in order that indulgences might be bestowed on the souls of their friends in purgatory, by the way of suffrage. And this was imitated by Julius II in his bull of 1510, for the rebuilding of the great church.

The reverence for the blessed Virgin, which had already been excessive, was in this time carried yet further. It was now that the fable of the "holy house" took form, and attracted multitudes of pilgrims to Loreto. The festival of the "Compassion of the Blessed Virgin", in remembrance of her sufferings at the cross, was instituted on account of the outrages of the Hussites. The festival of her Visitation was sanctioned by the council of Basel, which also decreed in favour of the immaculate conception. But this decree, as it was passed after the

breach between the council and the pope, was not regarded as authoritative. Sixtus IV, after having in earlier life written in defence of the immaculate conception, sent forth as pope two bulls in favour of the doctrine. Yet the Franciscan pope was so far influenced by a regard for the power of the Dominicans that he did not venture to proscribe their contrary doctrine, but contented himself with forbidding the partisans of either opinion to denounce their opponents as guilty of heresy or of mortal sin, forasmuch as the matter had not yet been determined by the Roman church and by the apostolic see.

Some universities, however, took a more decided line as to this matter. At Paris, a doctor named John le Ver (or Véry), in consequence of having preached at Dieppe against the immaculate conception, was required to retract; and it was resolved that in future no theological student should be admitted, and no degree should be given, except on condition of swearing to maintain the immaculate conception. This example of Paris was followed by similar decrees of the universities of Cologne and Mayence.

The Dominicans, while they opposed the doctrine of the immaculate conception, were yet unwilling to lose the credit of devotion to the blessed Virgin. They therefore instituted the brotherhood of the Rosary, the members of which were bound to perform certain devotions in her honour while telling their beads. But towards the end of the period the Dominicans attempted to support their doctrine by the help of an audacious imposture. The occasion grew out of a quarrel which took place at Frankfort between a member of the order, named Wigand Wirth, and the chief secular priest of the town; but the Dominicans resolved that Berne should be the scene of their intended operations, as at Frankfort they had reason to fear the opposition of the archbishop of Mayence, whereas they reckoned on finding at Berne a people simple enough to be deceived and strong enough to maintain any opinion which they might embrace. A young man of weak and credulous character, who had lately forsaken the trade of a tailor to enter into the order, was deluded by pretended visions, in which figures personating the blessed Virgin and other saints appeared to him, and professed to entrust him with revelations. Among other things, the representative of St. Mary charged him to inform pope Julius that she had been conceived in sin; and by way of a token, she impressed the stigma on one of his hands with a nail. At length the dupe's eyes were opened; and on his threatening to publish the deceits which had been practised on him, the Dominicans attempted to poison him. The bishop of Lausanne and the magistrates of Berne interfered in the matter. A commission, composed of two bishops and the provincial of the Dominicans, was sent by the pope to investigate it; and the prior and three other monks of the convent at Berne, who had been most active in the imposture, were convicted, degraded, made over to the secular arm, and burnt. The detection of this abominable trick gave a triumph to the opposite party, and redounded to the advantage of the doctrine against which the Dominicans had employed such discreditable means.

Arts and Learning.

Although the highest perfection of pointed architecture had passed away before the time with which we are now concerned, a development of the style continued to prevail in the countries north of the Alps, and was displayed in many splendid and celebrated works,—among them a great part of the church of St. Ouen, at Rouen, and the chapel of King's College at Cambridge. To this time are due many of the loftiest and most majestic towers—such as the spires of Chartres and Antwerp, and, in the very end of the period, the central tower of Canterbury. In our own country the fifteenth century produced a multitude of buildings of all classes, from the abbey or cathedral (although in these the work of this age was mostly limited to alterations and additions) down to humble parochial churches and chapels. Where architects were at liberty to indulge their fancy, they became more and more disposed to overload their work with ornament, as in Henry VII's chapel at Westminster, and in the church of Brou in

Bresse, erected by Margaret of Austria in memory of her husband, Philibert of Savoy. A comparison of these typical examples is said to show that the faults of the late Gothic style were exaggerated far more in France than in England.

But south of the Alps an entire change came over the prevailing taste in architecture. In the great cathedral of Milan, indeed, an attempt was made to borrow Gothic art from Germany; but the result, however wonderful in itself, is something greatly vitiated from the purity of the pointed manner. The revolution which took place in literature had its parallel in art. Brunelleschi, a Florentine, is regarded as the great connecting link between the earlier and the later architecture. In company with his countryman Donatello, who holds a similar place in the history of sculpture, he lived among the ruins of Rome, both supporting themselves by working as goldsmiths, while each, with a view to his own art, was deeply studying the remains of classical antiquity. Brunelleschi applied mathematical science to architecture in a degree unknown to his predecessors; and, discarding the use of buttresses, which had been necessary and characteristic features in the buildings of the middle ages, he completed the work of Arnulf by raising into the air the vast cupola of the cathedral at Florence. In this there is still much of the Gothic element; but from the date of it Italian architecture bears the character of the “renaissance”—an eclectic style, in which the details are taken from Greek and Roman models, while the general design is not closely imitative, but, disregarding the bondage of ancient rules, is accommodated to the actual purpose of the building.

At Rome, where the pointed architecture had never taken root, the victory of the new manner was easy. All the popes, from Martin V to Leo X, were more or less engaged in building and restoration, while many cardinals and others followed their example by erecting churches and palaces. Baccio Pontelli, of Florence, the architect employed by Sixtus IV, was the chief agent in the transition between the medieval style of Rome and the fully-developed modern architecture of which Bramante was the most famous master. Although a rebuilding of the venerable basilica of St. Peter had been projected, and even begun, by Nicolas V, the greatness of the enterprise seems to have deterred his successors from prosecuting it; and the decaying walls underwent a continual process of repair, until at length Julius II, partly with a view to provide a fitting shrine for the monument which he had commissioned Michael Angelo to prepare for him, began the erection of the new St. Peter’s under the superintendence of Bramante.

While the architecture of the middle ages had a perfection and completeness of its own, the art of painting was still in a far less mature stage; but in this time it reached the greatest excellence which it has ever attained. The study of the antique was introduced, and was encouraged by the discovery of such masterpieces of ancient art as the Apollo, the torso of the Belvedere, and the Laocoon. The study of the anatomical structure of the body, and various technical discoveries, contributed to the advancement of art; and the object proposed was to employ these elements of improved culture on Christian themes.

The first impulse to a new manner was given by Masaccio, of Florence, who was born in 1402 and died in 1443. Florence was, in art as in literature, the head-quarters of the movement of the age; but schools of painting grew up in all parts of Italy. Rome itself did not produce any great master in any branch of art, but sought to draw to itself the most eminent talents from other quarters—from Lombardy, Tuscany, Umbria, or wherever genius and skill might be found. Sixtus IV, having resolved to decorate his chapel in the Vatican with paintings, employed the Tuscans Signorelli, Botticelli, and Ghirlandaio, with the Umbrians Perugino and Pinturicchio, and others; but their works in that place were afterwards eclipsed by the grander creations of Michael Angelo Buonarroti. Fresh from the religious lessons of Savonarola, the great Florentine appeared at Rome in 1496, at the age of twenty-one, and four years later he executed the group of the Virgin-mother with the dead Saviour, which now adorns one of the chapels in St. Peter’s. Julius, struck with his ability, invited him to return to Rome about 1505, and entrusted him with the preparation of a monument for himself, which

was designed on a vast and magnificent plan, but, after having for many years been the cause of infinite vexation to the artist, was so dwarfed and marred in the execution (which is chiefly by other hands), that it may be said to have resulted in little beyond the awful figure of Moses.

At the age of thirty-three Michael Angelo began his labours on the roof of the Sixtine Chapel. It is said by Vasari that he undertook the task unwillingly, as one alien from what he regarded as his true profession of sculptor, and even that it was imposed on him by the pope through the unfriendly influence of Bramante, who expected the result to be a failure. The same writer tells us that, although Michael Angelo had to overcome the difficulties of fresco-painting, which was new to him, and dismissed all assistants on finding that they were unequal to his requirements, this gigantic work was executed by him between the 10th of May 1508 and the 1st of November in the following year. But the story is incredible, and the truth appears to be that, although on All Saints' day 1509 the artist allowed the scaffolding to be removed so that his impatient patron might see the amount of his progress, the labour which gave being to "the most majestic forms that painting has yet embodied", continued to occupy him during the following three years.

In the meantime Raphael Sanzio, of Urbino, eight years younger than Michael Angelo, was introduced by his kinsman Bramante to the papal court, and at twenty-five began his series of pictures in the chambers of the Vatican, where, while the doctrine of the church is represented by the Miracle of Bolsena and the Dispute on the Sacrament, the revived classicism of the age appears in the School of Athens and the Parnassus. At the time of Julius's death Raphael was engaged on his Heliodorus, a work intended to symbolize the expulsion of the "barbarians" from the sacred soil of Italy, and under Leo he continued to paint subjects which have a like reference to the history of his new patron. Thus the Attila, which again signified the repulse of the barbarian invaders, the Fire of the Borgo, the Defeat of the Saracens at Ostia, the Coronation of Charlemagne, were all commemorative of older popes who had borne the same name with their reigning successor.

Admirable as were the advances of this time in art, they were too commonly accompanied by a decay of that religious feeling which had animated the older Christian painters, and which the statutes of the artistic guilds in some places had enjoined their members to cultivate. Of Angelico of Fiesole, who, although he lived in the days of the classical revival, remained unaffected by it, it is said that he never took up his brush without prayer; but in many of those who came after him the influence of the paganizing opinions and of the corrupted society which surrounded them is only too evident. The spiritual qualities which are expressed in their works came in too many instances from the power of the artist's mind and hand, rather than from any kindred elements in himself.

In German and Flemish art the influence of the classical revival was as yet hardly felt. Albert Durer, although his works excited the admiration of Raphael, remained to the last intensely German, and his Christianity has little in common with the new spirit which had transformed the art of Italy.

The invention of printing coincided, in a manner which cannot fail to suggest a variety of reflections and speculations to every mind, with that revival of ancient literature to which the new art lent itself as a powerful agent. The first complete book produced by the press is supposed to be the Bible published by Gutenberg and Schoffer at Mayence, in 1455—a vast effort for an art which was as yet only in its birth. From Mayence the great discovery was carried, chiefly by Germans, into other countries, and within a few years it was widely diffused. The Jews took advantage of it to produce a complete edition of the Old Testament at Soncino (a little town of Lombardy), in 1488, some portions of their Scriptures having already appeared in a detached form; but it was not until nearly thirty years later that the New Testament was published in the original language. Cardinal Ximenes, whose zeal for the promotion of religion and learning contrasts brightly with the intolerance which led him to persecute the Jews and the Moors of Spain, conceived the idea of publishing, as an antidote to heresy, a

Bible which should contain the original Scriptures with the chief ancient versions. With a view to this he collected manuscripts, including some which were supplied from the papal library; he employed a band of scholars in editing the book, and imported type-cutters and founders from Germany; and, after fifteen years of labour, he had, shortly before his death, the satisfaction of witnessing the completion of the great work, on which he had expended enormous sums, and which he had watched in its progress with unremitting interest and care. The printing was executed at Alcalá de Henares, where the cardinal's munificence had founded an university; and from the Latin name of the city, Complutum, the book is known as the Complutensian Polyglott. Its six volumes, dedicated to pope Leo contain the Old Testament in Hebrew, with the Chaldee paraphrase of the Pentateuch; the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, the New Testament in Greek, and the Latin Vulgate translation of the whole, with literal Latin versions of the Septuagint and of the Chaldee, a Hebrew dictionary, and other supplementary matter.

The Complutensian New Testament was finished in 1514; but as the publication of the Polyglott was delayed by the death of Ximenes, in November 1517, and the copies were not sent forth until 1522, the Greek New Testament of Erasmus, published at Basel in 1516, was the first edition in which the original text of the Christian Scriptures was given to the world.

The press was largely employed in producing vernacular translations of the Scriptures. It is remarkable that in England the labours of Wyclif, instead of promoting such works, deterred men from undertaking them on account of the obloquy which was attached to his name, so that no printed English Bible existed until the time of the Reformation. But in Germany there were many complete editions in various dialects before the end of the fifteenth century, besides separate publications of particular books. There was also a complete Italian translation; and portions of the Scriptures had been printed in French, Bohemian, and other languages. All these were rendered from the Latin Vulgate.

It is supposed that such translations found their circulation in great part among persons of a mystical tendency or of suspected orthodoxy. The ecclesiastical authorities, in alarm at the operations of the press, endeavoured to control them by establishing a censorship. The first attempt of this sort was made in 1486, by Berthold of Henneberg, archbishop of Mayence, who forbade the printing and sale of books without a licence, and complained of the translation of works on "Divine offices and the high points of our religion" in German,—a language which he considered inadequate to express the higher religious matters, and likely to expose them to disgrace. In 1501, Alexander VI sent forth a bull with special reference to the provinces of Cologne, Mayence, Treves, and Magdeburg, denouncing the printing of books "containing various errors and pernicious doctrines, even hostile to the Catholic faith", and ordering that for the future nothing should be printed except with archiepiscopal licence, and that the obnoxious books already in existence should be destroyed. In 1502, a censorship was established in Spain, at first under royal authority, from which it was afterwards transferred to the inquisition; and the Lateran council, at its tenth session, approved a bull by which a censorship was instituted for the prevention of publications dangerous to faith or morals.

In addition to Alcalá, several universities were founded during this time,—among them, Wittenberg, in Saxony, which was soon to become famous in connexion with the Reformation; Buda, Copenhagen, St. Andrew's, Glasgow, and Aberdeen. By thus bringing home the opportunities of academical education to various countries, the great mass of students were spared the cost, the labour, and perhaps something of the moral temptations connected with a resort to Paris, Bologna, or Oxford; but on the other hand there was a disadvantage in the decrease of intercommunication between the nations of Europe.

The university of Rome, after having been dormant during the great schism, was refounded in 1431 by Eugenius IV. Alexander VI erected new buildings for it, and was a benefactor to it in other ways; and it was more fully organized under the patronage and by the bounty of Leo X.

In England, this period was marked by many foundations for the purpose of education. Among them were the royal school of Eton, the colleges founded at Cambridge by Henry VI and his queen, by the mother of Henry VII, and by Alcock, bishop of Ely, with those of archbishop Chichele, and bishops Fleming, Waynefleet, Smith, and Fox at Oxford. Yet learning, at least during the earlier part of the time, made little progress. Poggio, who visited this country about 1420, finds fault with the barbarous and obsolete nature of our university studies. There are great complaints as to the decay of Oxford, which was such that at one time Paris suspended correspondence with the English university. This decay was in part traced to the uncertainty of ecclesiastical promotion, in consequence of which the universities are found petitioning archbishop Chichele and others, that in the disposal of patronage a regard may be had to the claims of graduates in such matters. Erasmus, in 1513, speaks of a great revival and extension of studies as having taken place at Cambridge within the last thirty years, so that the university might then “compete with the first schools of the age” ; and there can be no doubt that Oxford had shared in the improvement.

At Paris the university was for a time distracted by a continuation of the old feuds between mendicants and seculars, between nominalists and realists; but these were now superseded by a change which furnished new subjects and causes of dispute.

From Italy, where the revival of Greek learning began, it spread into the countries north of the Alps. The first German who distinguished himself in the new study was Rudolf Haussmann (or Agricola), who, under the patronage of a bishop of Worms, lectured there and at Heidelberg. In France the cultivation of Greek was encouraged by Lewis XI, who was favourable to all progress which did not conflict with his despotism; and in the beginning of the sixteenth century, Budé taught with great fame at Paris. In England, where the Greek language was introduced by Sellyng, prior of Christchurch, Canterbury, after a visit to Italy in 1480, there soon grew up a band of zealous scholars, among whom Grocyn, Linacre, William Latimer, Colet, and Thomas More were conspicuous.

In Italy, the merits of Aristotle and Plato were discussed by their respective partisans, both Greek refugees and Italians, with the same eagerness which had marked the contests between the nominalists and the realists. Platonism—or rather the later Alexandrian philosophy which was mistaken for it—was taught at Florence by Marsiglio Ficino, who, although a canon of the cathedral and an admired preacher, is said to have been so devoted to the Greek sage that the only image admitted into his study was one of Plato, before which a lamp was continually burning. This eclectic system associated Orpheus with Moses, Plato with the Saviour, classicism with Christian faith, while it contained much admixture of superstition and mysticism; and by such doctrines it was that Ficino proposed to overcome the repugnance which the men of letters of his day too commonly felt for Christianity—that as they had been led away by philosophy from the Christian faith, they might by a truer philosophy be brought back to it. The Florentine Academy founded by Cosmo de’ Medici, and patronized by Lorenzo, celebrated the festival of Plato’s birth and death on the 29th of November; and we have already met with the similar association at Rome, over which Pomponio Leti presided, and which perhaps deserved the suspicions of pope Paul II in a greater degree than Platina would allow. Leti and others of the Italians, provoked by the exclusiveness of the votaries of Greek literature, and regarding themselves as representatives of the ancient conquerors of the world, betook themselves in opposition to asserting the claims of Latin; and some of them, discarding the free and expressive, although inelegant, Latinity of the middle ages, made it their study to imitate the purity and graces of Cicero. The absurdities which resulted from this pedantic affectation were exposed at a somewhat later date by the keen satire of Erasmus, who defined the true Ciceronianism to be that the modems should speak as Cicero would have spoken in their circumstances. Erasmus does not spare the pagan tendencies which found a shelter under the profession of Ciceronianism, and which in many places showed themselves in a strange mixture of heathen with Christian ideas. The classical

revival had, indeed, produced much unbelief, and many of the worst corruptions of heathen morality. Even in the papal court, a light and sceptical tone prevailed; nay, as we have seen, even some popes were not above the suspicion of disbelieving the very elements of Christian faith.

In Germany the “humanist” movement took a different course; for, as the cultivation of the new learning had begun in such institutions as the schools of the Brethren of the Common Life, it was brought into the service of religion, and issued, not in a contempt for the Christian faith, but in a desire of reform. In Germany, however, as elsewhere, the old academics, far from originating or welcoming the classical movement, looked down with the contempt of superior knowledge on those whom they styled grammarians or poets, while these in turn regarded the doctors of the earlier school as antiquated and barbarous.

The most eminent humanists of Germany were Reuchlin and Erasmus. Reuchlin, who was born in 1465, at Pforzheim, studied at the new university of Freiburg, and through the patronage of Eberhard, count of Wurtemberg, was enabled to continue his studies at Paris, and to travel in Italy, where, according to the fashion of the age, he grecised his name into Capnio. He became an advocate, was much employed by count Eberhard in political missions, and enjoyed the favour of the emperor Frederick; and after Eberhard’s death, in 1496, he settled at Heidelberg, where he found a new patron in Philip Count Palatine. By Reuchlin the study of classical literature was greatly promoted in Germany; but he is more especially noted as the first of his countrymen who cultivated Hebrew learning. Unfortunately he took up from his Jewish teachers much of the mysticism which was prevalent among them; he dabbled in astrology, and endeavoured to reconcile Judaism and Christianity by means of the Cabbala. Reuchlin, although he had been appointed advocate of the Dominican order, had already offended the monastic party by a satirical comedy, when he was involved in a quarrel with John Pfefferkorn, a Jew of Cologne, who, at the age of fifty, had professed Christianity. Pfefferkorn had published sundry writings for the purpose of converting his brethren, without success; when, finding argument useless, he petitioned the emperor Maximilian that all Jewish books except the Bible might be destroyed, in order to deprive the Jews of support for their unbelief.

By this petition he obtained an imperial order, authorizing the destruction of Jewish books which attacked the Christian religion; but Pfefferkorn proceeded to confiscate all Hebrew writings without distinction, and the archbishop of Mayence, Uriel of Gemmingen, suggested to the emperor that Reuchlin and other competent authorities should be consulted on the subject. With the emperor’s sanction, Reuchlin was requested to state his opinion; and he replied by an argumentative treatise.

He distinguished the books of the Jews into seven classes; among the lighter sort, he said, might be a few in mockery of the Christian religion, but these were condemned by the Jewish doctors themselves as false and calumnious. The rest ought not to be destroyed, but might be studied by Christians, as Moses, Solomon, and Daniel had studied the wisdom of the heathen. He insisted on the utility of Hebrew for Christian theologians, and recommended that during the next ten years it should be taught in universities, as a means of furnishing them with better weapons against the Jews than those which Pfefferkorn wished to employ.

Pfefferkorn furiously assailed Reuchlin in a book to which he gave the name of ‘Handspiegel’ (‘Hand-glass’); to which Reuchlin rejoined with vehemence in one entitled ‘Augenspiegel’ (‘Eyeglass’), professing to convict his adversary of thirty-four untruths. The matter was taken up by the Dominicans of Cologne, who frightened Reuchlin into an apology; but when they went on to require that he should retract, he refused, and stood on his defence. The inquisitor of the province of Cologne, James Hoogstraten, or Hochstraten (who had already written against Reuchlin), went to Mayence, and there, although beyond his jurisdiction, set up a court, by which Reuchlin, notwithstanding his protestations on the ground of irregularity, was condemned for the publication of the ‘Eye-glass.’ But the proceedings were

stayed by the archbishop of Mayence, and Reuchlin appealed to the pope. The matter was referred by Leo to the bishop of Spire, who appointed a commission of doctors to investigate it; and these condemned Hoogstraten to pay Reuchlin damages for the irregularity and injustice of his proceedings towards him. Meanwhile, the Dominicans at Cologne had publicly burnt the 'Eye-glass' and had obtained opinions in their favour from Paris and other universities. Again the case was carried before Leo, and Reuchlin's cause was supported by the recommendations of a multitude of princes and prelates. Leo, at once unwilling to condemn the humanists and to provoke Dominicans, committed the investigation to cardinal Grimani and, although the Dominicans were greatly annoyed, Reuchlin was but imperfectly satisfied by the issue of a mandate which, instead of pronouncing for either party, superseded the suit.

In 1519, however, the quarrel was decided after the manner of the age and country. Francis von Sickingen, a gallant but somewhat lawless noble, threatened that unless the judgment of Spire were carried out within a month, he would lay waste the territory of Cologne. In consequence of this threat, Hoogstraten and his party paid the damages, and although they made underhand attempts to excite the Roman court against Reuchlin, and even procured a fresh condemnation of his book, it appears that he suffered no actual molestation until his death in June, 1522.

In this controversy Reuchlin was supported by the friends of intellectual progress throughout Europe, who, indeed, learnt from it to acknowledge a common interest, so that some of them even spoke of themselves as Reuchlinists. There were writings on both sides, both serious and satirical; and of these by far the most effective was the collection of letters entitled 'Epistole Obscurorum Virorum', of which the first part appeared in 1515 and the second in 1517. The chief authors of these letters are supposed to have been John Jager, a professor of Erfurt, who styled himself Crotus Rubianus, and Ulric von Hutten, a young literary adventurer of noble family and brilliant talents, of loose morality and strong reforming zeal.

The title of this famous satire was suggested by the 'Letters of Illustrious Men' to Reuchlin, which some of his friends had published in 1514, with the intention of supporting him in his contest with the Dominicans. To these is opposed a set of 'Letters of Obscure Men', addressed to Ortuinus Gratius (Ortwin von Graes), of Cologne, who was supposed to have helped Pfefferkorn in his Latin, and was obnoxious to the Reuchlinists from having taken the side opposite to that on which, as a pupil of the school of Deventer and as a professor of "humane" literature, he might have been expected to range himself. The 'Obscure Men' display, with an air of entire unconsciousness, the characteristics of the vulgar monkish party—their stupidity, narrowness, and ignorance, their hatred of improvement and enlightenment, their intolerance, their obtuse self-satisfaction, their absurd pedantry, their coarse and shameless sensuality. They dispute in scholastic form about nonsensical questions; they look down with the contempt of professed theologians on Reuchlin, as a lawyer who had irregularly intruded into their province; they would prohibit Greek and the "new Latinity"; and their barbarous Latin has an air of verisimilitude which is irresistibly comical. The audacity of the book is astounding; the writers are not restrained by any considerations of decency or reverence, and the liberties taken with Ortwin, with Pfefferkorn and his wife, with Hoogstraten and others, must appear to a modern reader outrageous. Among the letters of imaginary persons, whose vulgar German names are rendered more ridiculous by Latin terminations, are some which are impudently ascribed to Ortwin, to Arnold of Tongres, who had been concerned in the affair of Reuchlin, and to the formidable Hoogstraten himself, whose adventures in pursuing the suit against Reuchlin at Rome are represented as having ended in the exhaustion of his purse, so that he had to plod his way homewards on foot, exposed to all the inclemency of the seasons.

The effect of these letters was immense, and was not to be counteracted by any

publications on the other side. It is indeed said with apparent seriousness (although we may find it difficult to believe the statement) that the imitation of the monkish style was so successful as to deceive some of the satirized party, who lauded and circulated the book as a precious contribution to the cause of orthodoxy. But those against whom it was more immediately directed applied at Rome for a condemnation of it; and in March 1517 Leo issued a prohibition, which, however, had no other result than to increase the celebrity and the effect of the work.

The fame of Erasmus was more popular and more widely extended than that of Reuchlin. He was born at Rotterdam in 1465, the offspring of a connexion which had become unlawful because the paternal grandfather had determined that one of his many sons should become a monk, and on this account refused to allow his son Gerard to marry the object of his affections. Gerard, who had gone to Italy, was persuaded to enter into the priesthood by information sent by his parents that the mother of his son was dead; and when the irrevocable step had been taken, he discovered that the story was false. Erasmus received the greater part of his early education under the Brethren of the Common Life at Deventer. At the age of thirteen he lost both his parents, and was left to the care of guardians, who made away with his property and endeavoured to cover their dishonesty by persuading him to enter a cloister. The influence of his teachers at Deventer was used for the same purpose; but he withstood all solicitations until at length he was overcome by the importunity of a pretended friend, who represented in delusive colours the advantages of the monastic life, and whose treachery and worthlessness he afterwards discovered. At the age of seventeen or eighteen he became a novice; after a year of probation he made his profession among the Augustinian canons of Stein, and in 1492 he was ordained a priest. The circumstances of his history were not likely to impress him with a favourable opinion of the monastic system, and his experiences of the conventual life were repulsive. We cannot wonder that his tainted birth, his solitary position, the frauds of which he had been the victim, the hardships and uncertainty of a scholar's profession, the pretensions of patrons and the slackness of their performance, with his nervous temperament and the delicate health which was partly the effect of the monastic diet, tended to produce in him a spirit of distrust and caution, which even resulted in something of selfishness.

After having been drawn from his monastery by the bishop of Cambrai, he pursued his studies at Paris; and there he met with a pupil, Lord Mountjoy, by whom he was invited to England. His first visit to this country, in 1498, was followed by others in 1505, 1511-14, and 1515, during which, (although he disdained to learn the language, and on that account resigned a benefice bestowed on him by archbishop Warham), he became acquainted with many eminent men—among them Warham, Wolsey, Fisher bishop of Rochester, Tonstal, afterwards bishop of London and of Durham, Linacre, and the young king Henry VIII, of whose early promise he speaks in extravagant terms. But his chosen associates were John Colet, dean of St. Paul's and founder of St. Paul's School, by whom his opinions were not a little affected, and Thomas More. With these two he lived on terms of familiar intimacy and in a close sympathy of thought. He resided at both the universities, and during his third and longest visit was professor of Greek at Cambridge.

In 1508 he was able to fulfil a long-cherished desire to see Italy, where he was received by scholars and by high ecclesiastical personages with flattering respect. His 'Adagia', first published in 1500, and afterwards much enlarged, had laid the foundation of a great reputation for ability and learning. His 'Praise of Folly', meditated during his return from Italy to England, and completed in the house of Sir Thomas More, acquired a vast popularity,—twenty-seven editions, at least, having been published during his lifetime. In this, after a long exordium, in which pedantry is perhaps more conspicuous than wit, he keenly attacks the prevailing follies of all classes, but especially the faults of the clergy and the superstitions which they fostered. His 'Colloquies', of later date (1527), were so eagerly received that in one year

24,000 copies were sold; and in these he again assailed with especial force the mistaken devotions which the monks inculcated, with the intrusiveness and rapacity of the mendicants in connexion with death-beds, wills, and funerals.

In addition to his original writings, Erasmus, who about the year 1515 established himself at Basel, where his works were printed by Froben, was diligently employed on labours of other kinds—editions of classical works, of St. Jerome, and other fathers; and in 1516 he produced his Greek New Testament, with a corrected Latin version—the earliest edition, as we have seen, in which the original of the Christian Scriptures was offered to the world.

His old associates at Stein had chosen one of his friends as abbot, and were induced by the renown which Erasmus had acquired to attempt to regain him for their society; but he had been released by the pope from his monastic obligations, and expressed in his answer an inflexible resolution to be no more ensnared in a way of life which his reason, his feelings, and his experience condemned.

A career so brilliant, and at the same time so contrary to the common ecclesiastical manner of thinking, could not be without opposition. His New Testament was attacked: why should the language of the schismatic Greeks interfere with the sacred and traditional Latin? How could any improvement be made on the Vulgate translation? There was a college at Cambridge, especially proud of its theological character, which would not admit a copy within its gates; and from many other quarters there was an outcry against the dangerous novelty. But the editor was able to shelter himself under the name of pope Leo, who had accepted the dedication of the volume.

At the time which we have reached, Erasmus was acknowledged as the chief among scholars and men of letters. He had been patronized, invited, pensioned, tempted with offers of promotion, by all the chief princes of Europe, and by prelates innumerable. And thus far he was regarded by the opponents of innovation as a dangerous reformer. A different state of things was to follow, when, finding himself unable to advance with the movement of popular opinion—unable, from his critical and somewhat indecisive temper, to take part thoroughly either with the reformers or with their adversaries, because he saw, as he believed, the errors of both parties—reproached by those who had left him behind, and distrusted by those whom he had once opposed, but to whose interest he had fallen back,—he spent his last years in disquiet and in the turmoil of bitter controversy, a mark for obloquy from both sides, and at last left as his epitaph the melancholy words, “The Lutheran tragedy loaded him with intolerable ill-will; he was torn in pieces by both parties, while he endeavoured to consult the good of both.”

Powerful as scholarship had been in preparing the way for a reformation, the great change which was actually at hand—a change which not only rent from the papacy a large portion of its dominion, but compelled it to undertake new and vigorous measures of internal reform—was not to be accomplished by the efforts of scholars or men of elegant learning, but by ruder and perhaps more earnest labourers.

www.cristoraul.org

THE END



EL VENCEDOR EDICIONES