

www.cristoraul.org

EL VENCEDOR EDICIONES

Horace k. Mann'

**THE
LIVES OF THE POPES
IN
THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES**

VOLUME V

**THE POPES
AT THE HEIGHT OF THEIR TEMPORAL
INFLUENCE**

**PART ONE
A.D. 1130-1216**

INNOCENT II , A. D. 1130-1143

CELESTINE II , A.D. 1143-1144

LUCIUS II , A.D. 1144-1145

BLESSED EUGENIUS III , A.D. 1145-1153

ANASTASIUS IV , A.D. 1153-1154

HADRIAN IV , A.D. 1154-1159

ALEXANDER III , 1159-1181

LUCIUS III , A.D. 1181-1185

URBAN III , A.D. 1185-1187

GREGORY VIII , A.D. 1187.

CLEMENT III , A.D. 1187-1191

CELESTINE III , A.D. 1191-1198

INNOCENT III , A.D. 1198-1216

INNOCENT II 1130-1143

EMPERORS AND KINGS OF THE ROMANS

Lothaire II, 1125-1138

Conrad III, 1138-1152

EASTERN EMPERORS

John II. (Comnenus), 1118-1143

Manuel I. (Comnenus), 1143-1180

KINGS OF ENGLAND

Henry I, 1100-1135

Stephen, 1135-1154

KINGS OF FRANCE.

Louis VI, the Fat, 1108-1137

Louis VII, the Young, 1137-1180

CHAPTER I

THE ELECTION OF INNOCENT II AND OF ANACLETUS.

On the death of Honorius II the Church was thrown into confusion, not, on this occasion, by the imperious will of a German sovereign, but by the ambition either of individual members of the Roman Church or of their families.

Whilst Honorius was still alive, it became common knowledge that “a certain Peter was scheming to obtain the Papacy”. This “certain Peter” belonged to a family of Jewish extraction which had become very powerful in Rome through the conversion of Peter’s grandfather. The convert had been baptized by St. Leo IX, took his name, and, because of his “learning”, not to say, because of his “riches”, acquired great influence in the Roman curia. He became one of the mainstays of Hildebrand in his fight for the Church’s independence. Some of his descendants, for a time at least, kept their Jewish appearance, and maintained their power in the Jewish quarter which was on both sides of the Tiber about the island, and in which Benjamin of Tudela, who visited Rome (c.

1165) in the days of Pope Alexander III, “the spiritual head of all Christendom”, found “about two hundred Jews”. One of the children of Leo, the founder of the family of the Pierleoni, was named Peter, and is known as Pierleone I. He soon acquired great power and reputation, and because, in the “investiture” quarrel, he showed himself “strenuous in arms, provident in council, and faithful to the Roman Church”, he was entrusted with the custody of the castle of St. Angelo. This naturally increased his importance, and he became “consul of the Romans”. Among the very numerous offspring of Pierleone I was another Peter, Pierleone II, the future antipope Anacletus II. The youthful Pierleone II very early showed an inclination to study, and the better to indulge his propensity betook himself to Paris. When returning home, he decided to abandon the world, and became a monk of Cluny under Peter the Venerable. But, at the request of his father, Paschal II called him to Rome, and made him cardinal-deacon of the Church of SS. Cosmas and Damian. Calixtus II, following the example of his predecessor, made him cardinal-priest of S. Maria in Trastevere, then known as “the title of Calixtus” (December 1120). Having thus become one of the principal members of the Roman clergy, he was soon selected for important work, and in 1123 we find him in France, acting as legate of the Holy See. Sometimes even he was jointly commissioned with Cardinal Gregory, whom he was afterwards to oppose so bitterly. Unfortunately, Pierleone’s ambition grew with his prosperity, and his character fell as his position rose. That he was ambitious, and in his ambition sought the Papacy by the use of unlawful means, is certain. It is not merely his rival, Innocent II, who says that he had long been aspiring to the Papacy. The assertion is made by independent witnesses. He is also charged, on what is acknowledged to be satisfactory authority, with being addicted to avarice and impurity.

Knowing, then, that there was one among their number who, though wholly unfit for the office, was prepared to use all means, whether fair or foul, to obtain the Papacy, the cardinals, or some influential ones among them, took steps to thwart him. When the demise of Honorius seemed imminent, the cardinals met together in the Church of St. Andrew, attached to the monastery wherein he lay dying. The assembled prelates agreed that no election should take place till after the Pope was buried (*insepulto Papa*), and to entrust to eight of their number the right of electing a successor to Honorius, when death should leave the See of Peter vacant. The eight who were thereupon chosen were two cardinal-bishops, three cardinal-priests, among whom was Pierleone himself, and three cardinal-deacons, among whom was Gregory, cardinal of St. Angelo, the future Innocent II. It was agreed that whoever was elected Pope by the eight or by the more worthy portion of them (*a parte sanioris consilii*) should be generally acknowledged as Supreme Pontiff. It was further decreed that whoever opposed their choice should be anathematized. Feeling that these resolutions were aimed at him, Pierleone protested that he would rather be drowned in the depth of the sea than be the cause of any scandal in the Church. To the like purport swore also, before the cardinals, certain lay representatives of the hostile families of the Pierleoni and the Frangipani.

The cardinal of S. Maria, however, showed how far he was in earnest by separating himself, along with Cardinal Jonathan, from the rest of the chosen electors before they could hold another meeting. No sooner had Pierleone dissociated himself from the other cardinals who remained with the dying Honorius, than he began openly

to make preparations with his numerous kinsfolk to possess himself of the Papacy. It was reported that Honorius was dead; and had not the dying Pontiff showed himself to the crowd of Pierleone's followers, they would have acclaimed their leader Pope forthwith.

With this additional proof of his daring ambition before them, the remnant of the chosen eight resolved to act with promptitude. Accordingly, when about sunset on Friday, February 14, Honorius breathed his last, they caused his body to be temporarily interred during the night, or more probably in the early morning, in order to fulfill the very letter of the election compact. Then the six cardinals, who out of the chosen eight still remained in the monastery of St. Andrew, met together, and, despite the protest of one of their number, Peter of Pisa, the other four elected as Pope their fifth colleague, Gregory, cardinal of St. Angelo. It was to no purpose that Gregory resisted. The choice of the four was accepted not only by the more numerous portion of the whole number of cardinals who took part in the two elections, but by the most distinguished members of the whole body. And it could the more easily have happened that, of the total number of cardinals who actually took a part in the double election, the greater number voted for Gregory, because those cardinals who adhered to him were on the spot when his election was held, whereas those who had a share in the election of Anacletus must have been hastily summoned from all parts of the city.

After this, Gregory, now Innocent II, protected by the Frangipani, was solemnly escorted to the Lateran basilica; and, according to the letter of the schimatics to Diego, entered it just as the dead body of his predecessor was being brought in from the cloisters of St. Andrew's for final interment. Placed on the pontifical throne, Innocent received the homage of his followers; and then, taken to the monastery known as the Palladium on the Palatine, was solemnly invested with the *pontificalia* of his immediate predecessors. All this, so the Emperor Lothaire was assured, was completed by about nine o'clock on the morning of February 15.

Furious at being thus forestalled, Pierleone and his brothers, by a liberal use of money, got together a number of the clergy, including many cardinals, and a very large proportion of the influential laity, and at twelve o'clock assembled in the Church of St. Mark, because, said Innocent's friends, "it was near the towers of his relatives"; because, said his enemies, "it was as it were the centre of the city". No attempt was made to inquire into the validity of Innocent's election, but, amid the applause of his party, the cardinal-bishop of Porto invested Pierleone with the red mantle, and acclaimed him Pope Anacletus II, after that ambitious prelate had gone through the comedy of suggesting another candidate.

Two cardinals had now on the same day been saluted as Pope but the claims of the candidates to that title were as different as their characters. About Cardinal Gregory (Innocent II) many speak in the highest terms, while his opponents have nothing to urge against him. But against Cardinal Pierleone many impartial men who knew him have much to say. He stands condemned on many serious counts, even by such a man as Peter the Venerable, under whom he had been a monk. Again too, if the election of Gregory was hasty, it was the work of the majority of those who had been appointed to select a successor for Honorius, and by the majority of the cardinal-bishops to whom,

by the decree of Nicholas II, the first place in papal elections had been assigned. It had been effected before that of Pierleone, and it was promptly ratified, so it would appear, by a majority of the total number of cardinals who took part in the two elections. Besides, Innocent was consecrated by two out of the three cardinals to whom the right of consecrating the Popes was reserved, viz. by the bishops of Albano and Ostia. It was this fact, we are told, which influenced “the apostolic sees of Antioch and Jerusalem” to acknowledge Innocent. The desire to save the Church from Pierleone must serve as the excuse for the indecent haste of Innocent’s electors. And why it was desirable to save the Church from Pierleone may again be emphasized—this time in the words of St. Bernard. He tells us that, while everyone says and believes “that the life and character of our Pope Innocent are above any attack even of his rival, the character of Anacletus is not safe even from his friends”. “If”, he continues, “what is commonly said of Anacletus be true, he is not fit to have the government of a single hamlet; if it is not true, it is none the less fitting that the head of the Church should be of good repute as well as of blameless life”. Finally, and it is St. Bernard again who is speaking: “even although the election of Innocent was conducted with too little solemnity, and not sufficiently according to ordinary formalities, as the enemies of unity contend, yet ought a second election to have been resolved upon before the manner of the former had been discussed, and before it had been quashed by a deliberate judgment? It is because no such investigation was attempted which obliges me to say that the factious persons are those who have hastened to lay their hands rashly upon a rash usurper, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Apostle: ‘Lay hands suddenly on no man’ (1 Tim. v. 22)”.

Hence Gerhoh, one of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of his day, who visited Rome in 1133, concludes that because Innocent’s election was more satisfactory than that of his rival, on account both of the way in which it was held and of those who held it, it was easy for anyone to decide who was the true Pope.

The new Pope Innocent; like his rival, belonged to the Trastevere. His father, John, according to Innocent’s later epitaph, was a scion of the noble family of the Papeschi, whose towers were still standing in the fifteenth century near the Church of S. Maria in Trastevere, while another church in the same region, S. Giacomo in Settignano, once displayed their tombstones. After having been a monk of the monastery at the Lateran, he became abbot of a dependent or connected house, the abbey of SS. Nicholas and Primitivus at “Gabii, near the Lacus Burranus”. In the time of Constantine, Gabii had fallen into complete decay, and is merely alluded to as a farm given by him to the Lateran baptistery. It was no doubt on this farm that the monastery over which the future Pope Innocent presided was built. It stood near the church of the martyr St. Primitivus, of which remains may still be seen on the banks of what was once the lake of Gabii near the side of the Via Praenestina.

Made cardinal deacon of St. Angelo by Urban II, Gregory was soon employed on important missions, and made a lasting reputation for himself by his tactful conduct at the Council of Worms. Fortunately for Innocent II, the qualities of Cardinal Gregory remained with him in his more exalted station.

Once proclaimed Pope, Pierleone lost no time in endeavouring to gain possession of Rome. After much bloodshed he succeeded in seizing both St. Peter’s and the

Lateran, and immediately plundered their treasuries. Many another church he treated in the same way, and thus procured money to gain more supporters. Then, by one vigorous stroke to render his position secure, he swept across the Forum with a large body of horse and foot, and tried to carry by storm the mass of fortifications which the Frangipani had erected round the arch of Titus. Here, however, he received his first check. He was driven off with loss, and had to retreat to the fortress of his family.

A momentary peace being thus secured, Innocent was ordained priest on February 22, and, on the following day, was consecrated bishop in the Church of S. Maria Nova, under the shadow of the towers of the Frangipani. On the last-named day, which was the second Sunday in Lent, Anacletus also was consecrated in St. Peter's by the bishop of Porto.

Whilst Pierleone continued his work of securing the adhesion of the city by bribery and pressure, both claimants of the Papacy endeavoured by letters and legates to gain the support of the Catholic world. Special efforts were made by both of them to win the good-will of the Emperor Lothaire; and the letters of both showed no little skill in glossing over the weak points of their position and conduct. Both alike made it plain that they would side with him against his rival Conrad; and Innocent begged him to come to Rome in the winter, that he might receive the imperial crown, and to come "with a large army", so that he might be able to make peace and defend the Church. This earnest request for help must have enlightened Lothaire as to the amount of truth there was in some of the words of Innocent's cardinals to him. He had been told that Anacletus was lurking within his ancestral fortresses, and that abbots and barons were hastening to the support of the Roman Church.

For a time the great ones in Europe, both in the Church and State, confined themselves to making inquiries regarding the circumstances of the double election. Meanwhile, in Rome the rivals excommunicated one another (March), and Innocent steadily lost ground. The Frangipani deserted him, and he had to betake himself to the towers of his family in the Trastevere (April). But his opponent, by a skillful outlay of the money he had got together by plundering the churches and by robbing the pilgrims who, as usual, were ever flocking to Rome, gradually became all-powerful in the city. The position of Innocent became untenable; and he resolved to betake himself to that home of Popes in distress, France.

Two galleys were secretly hired, and in these Innocent with all his cardinals, except Conrad of Sabina, whom he left behind as his vicar, contrived with no little difficulty to descend the Tiber and make his escape to Pisa. By this little republic, then in the first flush of its prosperity, he was received with the greatest enthusiasm. The streets of the city were bedecked with the spoils of Saracen pirates, and crowded with people. Its chief magistrates, kneeling at Innocent's feet, thanked him for choosing their city as his home, and assured him that whatever the republic possessed was at his disposal.

The Pope was deeply touched by the loyalty of the Pisans and showed it not only in words at the time and afterwards, but by his readiness to grant them favours, and by bringing about a peace between them and Genoa.

After a stay of a month or two in Pisa and Genoa, Innocent sailed for France, which Anacletus was striving hard to win over to his side, but which would seem to have declared definitely for his opponent in August or very soon in September.

An early pronouncement in Innocent's favour was made by St. Hugh of Grenoble. Though old and infirm, and though a personal friend both of Anacletus and his father, he hastened to meet a number of bishops at Puy in Velay. The sentence of excommunication which the synod passed on the antipope was a most severe blow to him on account of the great authority of the saint. This declaration was followed by a similar decision at a council at Étampes (August -September). This assembly of the bishops and nobility of France had been convened by Louis; and, very largely under the influence of St. Bernard, acknowledged the claims of Innocent, influenced thereto, we are told, more by considerations of his personal merits than by the arguments for the validity of his election. Although Louis felt himself under an obligation to Anacletus on account of the services rendered him by his family, he nevertheless accepted the decision of the council. Another fatal blow was, about the same time, given to the cause of the antipope in France by the adhesion to Innocent of Peter the Venerable, the great abbot of Cluny, under whom Anacletus had once been a monk. Without waiting, we are told, "for the voice (*consilio*) of the Gallican Church", he went to meet Innocent with the greatest pomp and solemnity, conducted him in great state to Cluny, and invited him to consecrate the new church which he had just built (October 25). "When", continues Peter's biographer, "the kings of the earth heard that he had abandoned one of his monks so highly placed (*in sede position*), and had exalted a stranger, they were filled with astonishment", and no doubt could not but be influenced by such an example.

France was now practically won for Innocent. Immediately after the council of Étampes, Louis sent Abbot Suger to Cluny to assure him of his loyalty, and with his wife and children went to visit him at the famous monastery of Fleury (January 1131). Bending before him as before "the confession of St. Peter", he threw himself at his feet and promised him his devoted service.

More important to the cause of Innocent than the submission of a king was the advocacy of St. Bernard. He devoted himself to him with all his fiery zeal and unselfish devotion. He was unquestionably Innocent's ablest and most useful ally; and if he has to share with others the credit of having gained Louis of France to his interest, he can claim to have won over Henry of England by his own unaided efforts.

Both Anacletus and Innocent had sent letters to England with a view to securing the submission of that country. Perhaps because, as cardinal-legate, Anacletus had gained accepting their good-will, the English bishops seem to have advised Henry to acknowledge him. But though "our King" did not very well know how to be driven from an opinion he had once taken up, he was to learn on this occasion from a monk. It was seemingly near Chartres that Saint Bernard and Henry of England met. For a long time the King would not allow himself to be persuaded by the holy abbot. He feared, he said, that by acknowledging Innocent he might be guilty of sin. "Do you", replied the Saint, "think how you will make answer to God for your other sins. I will take this one on my own shoulders". Henry yielded, met Innocent at Chartres, and, following the example of the king of France, prostrating himself at the feet of the Pope, promised that

both he and his kingdom would obey him (January 13, 1131). And a little later, at Rouen, he honoured him with presents, “not only from himself, but also from the nobility and even from the Jews”.

As France and England had been gained for Innocent largely by the exertions of the great monks Peter of Cluny and Bernard of Citeaux, so Germany was won over for him by the Premonstratensian, St. Norbert, archbishop of Magdeburg. From the letters which we have seen addressed to him, it is plain that he was one of the first to seek for authentic information regarding the double election. Once convinced of the justice of Innocent’s claims, he successfully used his enormous influence in his behalf. As early as October 1130, King Lothaire had been present at a council of sixteen bishops at Würzburg. Presided over by Walter, archbishop of Ravenna, a legate of Pope Innocent, it had been guided by Norbert, and had declared itself in favour of that pontiff with the full approval of the King, who had at once despatched envoys to Innocent to negotiate with him. It was arranged that an interview between them should take place at Liege, and thither accordingly Innocent betook himself after his meeting with the king of England. He entered that ancient city on the third Sunday of Lent (March 22, 1131). Lothaire, with twenty-five archbishops and bishops, fifty-three abbots, and a large number of the nobility, awaited him. As soon as the king of the Romans, who had taken up his stand in front of the cathedral, beheld the Pope, he at once went forward to meet him. With one hand taking hold of the bridle of the white horse which Innocent was riding, he walked on foot by his side for the rest of the procession, carrying in his other hand a staff as a sign of his intention of protecting him.

But, to borrow a metaphor from St. Bernard’s biographer, the sun shone too brightly to last. Lothaire could not resist the temptation of trying to take advantage of the Pope’s dependent condition. He pressed him with no little warmth to grant him the right of investiture. Fortunately for Innocent, he had in the abbot of Clairvaux an ally equal to any emergency. The eloquence of St. Bernard prevailed over the meanness of Lothaire as it had done over the obstinacy of Henry. The King, accordingly, offered his unconditional support to the Pope, and at the synod at which he was present acquiesced in the excommunication of Anacletus. But the gain was not all on the side of Innocent, for the same synod excommunicated the pretender Conrad with his brother Frederick and all their supporters. The synod also discussed the question of Lothaire’s leading an army to Rome that he might put down the usurpation of Anacletus by force, establish Innocent in the proper home of the Papacy, and receive “the plenitude of empire” which the Pope promised him. It was ultimately decided that the expedition should take place in the following year.

Before he left Liège, Innocent and all his court drove in solemn procession, “as though at Rome along the Via Triumphalis”, to the capitol of St. Lambert (March 29, *Laetare* Sunday). There he said Mass, and solemnly crowned Lothaire and his wife.

It must have been with a lighter heart that Innocent returned to France. If Rome had received Anacletus, the Church was accepting him. His progress through the country of Louis VI was a triumphal procession. He had already been solemnly crowned at Autun on Christmas Day (1130). The ceremony was with imposing pomp repeated at Easter (1131) in the great monastery of St. Denis at Paris, after the

conference with Lothaire. In the early morning of Easter Day (April 19) the Pope and his cardinals assembled at the Church of St. Denis-de-l'Estrée. "There making ready in their Roman way", says Abbot Suger, "they adorned themselves in an admirable manner. Upon the head of the Pope they placed the *frigium*, an imperial ornament like a helmet with a crown around it, and then set him on a beautifully caparisoned white horse. Gorgeously bedizened themselves, they rode horses of different colours, but all decorated with white saddlecloths, and as they advanced two by two they sang joyous canticles. The baronial feudatories of our Church (*i.e.*, the Abbey of St. Denis) and other nobles on foot acted as grooms to the Pope. A number of men marched at the head of the procession scattering a liberal supply of money among the crowd to lessen its pressure on the cortege. The highway was strewn with foliage, and was gay with rich hangings suspended from poles. Amid the crowds of soldiers and people that came forth to do honour to the Pope, came also the blind synagogue of the Jews of Paris. Offering him a roll of the Pentateuch covered with a veil, they heard from his lips this tender prayer: 'May God Almighty take away the veil from your hearts'. Arrived at length at the great church of the abbey, bright with silver and gold and precious gems, the Pope, assisted by me, offered the sacred victim, the true paschal lam". The spiritual feast was concluded by a grand banquet, at which Easter lamb (*materlalan agninu*), we are told, was one of the dishes.

After a repetition of the festivities on the following day, the Pope set out for Paris on Easter Tuesday. When he had spent a few days there, he again proceeded to move from one town or monastery of France to another, as he had done after he first landed on its shores, "supplying", adds Suger, "his own want of material resources from their abundance". But, as may readily be imagined, not all the places he visited were as wealthy or as generous as St. Denis and its abbot, and some were not slow to place on record that the visits of the papal court were a heavy burden to them.

Still further to make headway against the schism, Innocent summoned the bishops of Germany (Alamannia), Lotharingia, France, Normandy, England, and Spain, to meet at Rheims in October. At the appointed time (October 18) there assembled in the royal city of Rheims some fifty bishops (among whom was St. Norbert), and three hundred abbots from all parts of Europe.

The preacher whom Innocent commissioned to address the opening discourse to the assembly pronounced a high encomium on the papal dignity. "We have more than Moses here", he cried, "because to Moses the care of only the Jewish people was entrusted, while to him in our midst the whole Church has been committed. We have more than an angel here; for to which of the angels did God ever say: 'What you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven' (St. Matt. xvi. 18). Speaking of the dignity of the office and not of the merits of the person, it may be said that, with the exception of God, there is no one like to him on earth".

Many of the decrees of this council reaffirmed those which had been passed by the Pope at a council held by him in Clermont (November 18, 1130). Thus both councils condemned simony, and imposed celibacy on all clerics above the rank of sub-deacon; and both endeavoured to further the cause of peace by promoting the Truce of God, and by condemning violence to clerics during their lives, or the violation of their goods after

their death. Both councils, too, regulated the dress and appearance of clerics. But while the council of Clermont had simply promised obedience to Innocent, that of Rheims went further, and declared both Anacletus and Conrad, “the rebels against the Church and State”, excommunicated. We read in his *Life* how St. Norbert brought before the council the ancient documents regarding the privileges of his see. Written on papyrus, they were almost eaten away by the worms. By the authority of the Pope, they were all renewed and corrected, and, this time no doubt, were engrossed on parchment.

But the most striking incident in the council was the crowning of the second son of the king of France, called, like his father, Louis. To the intense grief of his father, Philip, the heir to his throne and a youth of great promise, had been killed by a fall from his horse. Thereupon, says Suger, “we who were his intimates, fearing that his excessive weakness might end in sudden death, advised him to have his son Louis crowned so that he might be king with him, and thus obviate any troubles in the succession”. Louis listened to the sage advice of his counsellors, appeared before the council of Rheims and unfolded to the assembly his sorrows and his plans. By a few most feeling words Innocent did much to soothe the King’s overwhelming grief. He urged submission to the will of God, who consoles us by prosperity and chastens us by sorrow, lest we should love the place of our exile and forget our heavenly country.

The King’s anguish was still further alleviated when, on the following day (Sunday, October 25, 1131), his little son Louis was solemnly crowned by the Pope.

After the coronation ceremonies were over, St. Norbert presented Innocent with letters from Lothaire in which he again promised the Pope obedience, and intimated that he was preparing to restore him to his throne with all the strength of his kingdom. Similar letters offering him their loyal obedience were presented to the Pope on behalf of the Kings Henry of England, Alfonso I of Aragon, and Alfonso VIII of Castile. Last of all there was read before the assembly an admirable letter from the Carthusians of Grenoble; “men”, says the ‘Chronicle of Morigny’ which gives us these details, “of incomparable authority from the angelic life they were leading in the fastnesses of the Alps”. With all humility they exhorted the Pope not to be discouraged at the trials which the Roman Church was now enduring. It would triumph over them as it had done over all its other great difficulties. Innocent must be an example to the whole world; for the whole world, and not a mere part of it, is his diocese. As there is one God, one Mediator, one earth and one sun, so the Vicar of Peter, the Pope, can only be one”. Now at length could it be said with truth, “Peter possesses Rome, but Gregory the whole world”.

Before the council was dissolved, the canonisation of St. Godehard, bishop of Hildesheim (*d.* 1038), was proclaimed by the assembled Fathers. An eyewitness of the affair has left on record the difficulties which the promoters of the canonization had met with on account of their distance from Rome and other such causes, and their joy when Innocent came to their country. Reminding his readers that, on account of mistakes which had often been made, it had been decreed that no one was to be canonized without the authority of the Pope, and except after a careful examination of the candidate’s life, he says that Bishop Bernward of Hildesheim had asked Innocent at Liège to declare Godehard a saint. “But”, he continues, “as it is the custom of the Roman Church to

canonize the saints of God in a general council, and as one had then been summoned to meet at Rheims on the Feast of St. Luke, the Pope deferred his decision till that date". The Bishop's request was favourably entertained by the council, and Godehard was canonized by a unanimous decree of the assembly.

After the council was over, Innocent did not forget the work that had been done for him by St. Bernard and St. Norbert. He took pleasure in granting them favours, and in the bulls which he issued in their behalf, he spoke of his indebtedness to them, sometimes in the very same words.

We may now leave Innocent for a brief space while he gradually makes his way towards the south of France to be ready to join Lothaire, who was to march into Italy with him in the coming spring, and may turn our attention to his rival Anacletus. But before doing so we will note that in February (1132) Innocent received letters from the Latin bishops of Palestine offering him their obedience, and that at some time during his journeyings through France he visited Clairvaux, the home of his great supporter St. Bernard. In all probability he visited it from Auxerre, where he stayed from July 26 to September 24, 1131. The reception he met with there was very different from those with which he had been greeted by Louis or by Lothaire, or even by Peter the Venerable and his monks at Cluny. He was received, says St. Bernard's biographer, by men not clad in purple and fine linen, nor carrying copies of the Gospels bound in gold, but by the poor of Christ clothed in garments of coarse cloth, and bearing aloft a rude cross of wood. He was welcomed not with the thunder of classical choruses, nor with loud hurrahs of joy, but with melodies soft, tender, and low. The Pope and his attendants could not restrain their tears, and they were struck with astonishment at beholding the downcast eyes of the poor of Christ who, while observed by all, saw no one themselves. Even the Church showed no signs of grandeur; there was nothing to see there but bare walls. In the refectory there was the same simplicity.

The ordinary fare served there was a poor kind of bread and vegetables; but if a fish was caught in the neighbouring Aube, it was placed before the Pope. The festivities at Clairvaux were essentially those of the soul.

Whilst Innocent was thus strengthening his authority in France, Anacletus was making vain efforts to secure the obedience of the countries beyond the Alps. He sent letters "urgent and in part undignified" to the different sovereigns. They remained unanswered. Even a letter to Lothaire from the Roman nobles and people of the anti-pope's party did not receive a reply. Highly indignant, they declared to their king that, if he did not recognize Anacletus as Pope, they would not elect him as emperor (May 18, 1130). The threat did not disturb Lothaire. He vouchsafed no reply to it. The partisans of the antipope, whether in Rome or beyond the Alps, also exerted themselves in his behalf both by word and by writing. His most distinguished supporter, the bishop of Porto, wrote to his fellow cardinal-bishops to upbraid them with electing Innocent "in a hidden place, in darkness". He pretended, quite contrary to the truth, as we know from the authentic decree of Nicholas II, that the principal voice in papal elections belonged not to the cardinal-bishops but to the cardinal-priests and deacons. He therefore called upon his brethren not to persist further in their schism. Abroad, Reimbald, a canon of Liège, took up his pen in behalf of Anacletus, and, deprecating hasty decisions, asserted

that all those who had acknowledged Innocent had done so in an irrational manner, without in the least degree knowing why they had so acted.

But the only success which Anacletus achieved across the Alps was through Gerard, bishop of Angouleme. That able but ambitious prelate had at first acknowledged Innocent; but when he found that he would not allow him to retain the legatine office which he had held under preceding pontiffs, he threw over his allegiance to Innocent, and induced the dissolute William X, count of Poitiers, duke of Aquitaine, to profess obedience to Anacletus. It required all the eloquence and faith of St. Bernard to bring the Duke to submit to Innocent (1134).

Finding that he had no hope of substantial support on the other side of the Alps, Anacletus turned to the traditional foes of the Empire, viz. to the Normans. Proceeding to Avellino, he succeeded in gaining over to his cause Roger, duke of Sicily, by giving him his sister's hand in marriage, and promising him the title of king of Sicily, Calabria, and Apulia, the principality of Capua, the lordship of Naples, and the right to the support of the men of Benevento. He was also to have the right to be crowned by the bishops of his own territories, and was, in general, to have all the rights that had been granted to his predecessors by the predecessors of Anacletus. In return, he and his heirs were to take an oath of fidelity to Anacletus and his successors, and to pay to the Roman Church six hundred "schifati" (coins of gold) a year. The terms were agreed to, and Roger was crowned with great pomp at Palermo by a legate of the antipope (December 25, 1130). Thus gained, Roger remained true to Anacletus because, among other reasons, according to the biographer of St. Bernard, he did not wish to have to restore the papal patrimonies in the neighbourhood of Monte Cassino and Benevento which Anacletus had suffered him to annex.

Now that we have reviewed not merely the beginning of the schism caused by the double election of Innocent II and Anacletus II, but also the attitude towards it at first adopted by many of the best men in Europe, and by the more important of its countries, we may trace it to its close in 1139, when peace was made between Pope Innocent and Roger of Sicily.

CHAPTER II

THE SCHISM FROM THE BEGINNING OF 1132 TO 1139.

As soon as the passes of the Alps were open, Innocent descended into north Italy, seemingly by Mont Genève in the Cottian Alps. Whilst waiting for the coming of the armed forces of Lothaire, he went about as he had done in France, from city to city, and from one great monastery to another, consecrating churches, granting or confirming privileges, and the like. At Piacenza he held in June a council of the bishops of Lombardy, Ravenna, and the March of Ancona. By this Innocent so far established his authority in the north of Italy that, despite the opposition of Milan, the Archbishop of which had declared himself in favour of the antipope Anacletus and of the anti-king

Conrad of Hohenstaufen, the latter found it desirable to leave Italy before the arrival of Lothaire.

Meanwhile, the king of the Romans had discovered that it was not so easy to organize his Italian expedition as he had supposed. The German princes were not ready with their contingents, and the opposition to him which Conrad of Hohenstaufen had organized in north Italy, was being repeated in Germany by his brother Frederick of Hohenstaufen, duke of Swabia. However, leaving the reins of government during his absence in the hands of his son-in-law, Henry the Proud, duke of Bavaria, Lothaire started on his "Rome-journey" in August. But instead of the thirty thousand men he had hoped to have with him, he had less than two thousand. Making his way into Italy by the valley of the Trent, he found that his little army inspired more ridicule than fear, and it was not till November that he joined the Pope in the plains of Roncaglia near Piacenza. There they appear to have decided that neither the season of the year nor the uncertain state of feeling in north Italy was favourable for a march on Rome. Accordingly, in the meanwhile, the Pope went to Pisa, and Lothaire eastwards, with a view to bringing to obedience some cities of doubtful loyalty.

When Innocent reached Pisa, he found that the work of peace between that city and Genoa, on which he had been engaged in 1130, had all to be done over again. He summoned St. Bernard to help him to do it. For many years their respective claims with regard to Corsica and Sardinia had furnished cause of quarrel between the rival maritime cities, and the truce which Innocent had made between them in 1130 had been so badly observed that the two states were now openly preparing for war.

In virtue of the Frankish donations, Corsica and Sardinia belonged to the Popes; but they do not appear to have themselves exercised direct control over them for any length of time. Leo III entrusted the government of Corsica to Charlemagne, as he did not feel able to protect it against the piratical attacks of the Moors. After a long series of descents upon the island, these barbarians made themselves masters of at least a large portion of it about the beginning of the eleventh century. But in the course of the same century they were driven out by the Pisans and Genoese, and the Popes resumed their control over the island, nominating the bishop of Pisa as its governor. Before the middle of the same century, through the exertions of Pope Benedict VIII, they had also been expelled from Sardinia by the same enterprising cities. Unfortunately, if but too naturally, trouble arose between the conquerors themselves about the division of the spoils. Especially were the Genoese dissatisfied with the bishop of Pisa's having been made metropolitan of the whole of Corsica by the Holy See (1092).

Various efforts had been made to no purpose by the successors of Urban II to lessen the jealousy of Genoa. By launching out into a larger scheme, Innocent met with greater success. His first step was to emancipate Genoa from the jurisdiction of Milan by making its bishop a metropolitan, thereby punishing Milan's revolt at the same time. To provide suffragans for Syrus, the new archbishop, he took away from Milan the diocese of Bobbio, and made the monastery of Brugnato into a bishopric. Besides these two dioceses, he submitted to Syrus three out of the six Corsican bishoprics which either already existed or which he brought into existence for the purpose, viz. Mariana (on the left of the mouth of the Golo, now in ruins), Nebbio (S. Fiorenzo), and Acci or

Accia in the interior, south of Golo. He also made over the northern half of the island of Corsica to Genoa, on condition that its people should take an oath of fealty to the Holy See, and pay it a pound of gold every year.

The other three Corsican bishoprics (Aleria, now in ruins, Ajaccio, and Sagona) were left in the hands of the archbishop of Pisa, who was at length (1138) compensated for his losses in Corsica by being made papal legate in Sardinia, and by being made metropolitan of two out of the four *Judicatuses* into which Sardinia was divided, viz. of the Judicatus Gallurensis, and of the Judicatus Turritanus. They comprised the northern half of Sardinia, and included the bishoprics of Nuoro-Galtelly (Galtelinensis), Ampurias and Tempio (Civitatensis), and Populonia, near Piombino, now in ruins.

By these judicious arrangements, and by the compelling influence of the eloquence of St. Bernard, who moved the whole city of Genoa as though he were its sovereign, peace was made between the rival cities on terms prescribed by the Pope. Innocent had now succeeded not only in stopping a most disastrous war, but in securing most useful allies.

Acting in conjunction with Lothaire, Pisan and Genoese galleys put to sea, whilst he himself, meeting the Pope at Calcinaja, east of Pisa, on the right bank of the Arno, advanced with him towards Rome (March 1133). The galleys sailed up the Tiber, and did not cease to harry the Romans until they had received the king and the Pope. Soon after, the Pisans began a campaign against Roger of Sicily which, the main, redounded to their advantage, and inflicted great loss on the territories of the antipope's king.

Meanwhile, Anacletus began to feel his position to be very insecure. His only powerful ally, Roger, king of Sicily, had had to retreat before rebellious vassals, and the important city of Benevento had declared for Innocent. He accordingly endeavored to delay the advance of Lothaire by negotiation, and sent embassy after embassy to him to plead the justice of his cause. But, acting on the advice of his bishops, the king of the Romans replied that the whole Church had already condemned him, and continued his march. When at length he halted his army outside Rome on the Via Nomentana by the Church of St. Agnes outside-the-walls, he was met by a number of the Roman nobles whom his approach caused to turn again to Innocent. Among these were the Pope's first supporters, the Frangipani and the Corsi. These men introduced the forces of Lothaire into the city, and accompanied Innocent to the Lateran, and the King to the imperial palace on the Aventine (May 30. 1133).

After Lothaire had entered Rome, Anacletus continued his efforts to have his claims and those of Innocent submitted to a thorough examination. Moreover, as a proof of his being in earnest in the matter, he offered to give hostages to the King, and also to surrender to him his fortresses if Innocent would do the same. Anxious, writes Lothaire himself, to effect a bloodless peace, he proposed these conditions for Innocent's acceptance. But though he agreed to them, Lothaire found that Anacletus had not the slightest intention of complying with them, and in great wrath publicly proclaimed him and his supporters faithless liars, and as guilty of treason towards God and himself. More he could not effect against the antipope, for he was safely entrenched in the Leonine city, and had a very strong party in the city proper in his favour, whereas the troops at his disposal were but few.

The fact that Lothaire was unable to possess himself of St. Peter's deprived his coronation ceremonies of half their splendour. However, in no little state he and his wife Richinza proceeded from the Church of St. Boniface by their palace on the Aventine to St. John Lateran. At the entry of the basilica he took the following oath:—"I, King Lothaire, promise and swear to you, the lord Pope Innocent, and to your successors, that I will protect your life and liberty, your papal dignity, and your honour, and that I will defend the rights and belongings (regalia) of St. Peter which you possess, and, as far as in me lies, will recover those which you do not possess". After this customary oath had been taken, the royal procession entered the basilica, and Lothaire and his wife were crowned emperor and empress respectively. Then, accompanied by the Pope, they returned to the Aventine for the usual festivities.

A few days later (June 8) important documents were issued by the Pope. He had to pay the price of the emperor's assistance. By one he confirmed the Concordat of Worms, insisting that prelates must not take possession of their temporalities without application to the emperor. This bull appears to have been issued as an attempt to soothe a disappointment which the Pope had been compelled to inflict on the emperor; for, if St. Norbert's biographer has not made a mistake, Lothaire again asked Innocent to grant him the right of investiture. According to the same authority, when Innocent seemed about to grant the request, St. Norbert sprang up, and before the emperor and his court thus addressed the Pope: "What, my Father, are you about to do? To what injuries are you about to expose the flock which has been entrusted to you? Will you again reduce the Church which you have received free to the condition of a handmaid? The chair of Peter requires deeds worthy of Peter. I have promised obedience to Blessed Peter, and for the sake of Christ I have promised it equally to you; but if you grant what has been demanded of you, I declare before the Church I will oppose you and the step you take".

These bold words as effectively brought to naught this second request of Lothaire, as did those of St. Bernard his similar petition at Liège.

By a second bull "the allodial lands which the Countess Matilda formerly gave to St. Peter" were granted to Lothaire. This diploma begins by pointing out the great gain to the worship of God and to the good of mankind which results from the close union of the Papacy and the Empire. It proceeds to show how Lothaire has made the interests of the Church his, and how therefore he should be rewarded by a grateful mother. Hence it continues: "We now confer the said allodial lands upon you by the investiture of a ring, on condition that you pay one hundred pounds of silver to us and to our successors, and that after your death the lands shall revert unimpaired and without trouble to the full don in ton (ad jus et dominium) of the holy Roman Church".

The emperor had now done all he could for the Pope; but he was wholly unable to give to the enemies of Roger of Sicily that help for which they earnestly craved. The growing summer heat warned him that he must retire from Italy. This he did by forced marches, and reached Frisingen by August 23. No sooner had he left Rome than Anacletus resumed the offensive. Fortune, too, again smiled on Roger of Sicily. The foes of both had to give way before them. Innocent and Robert, prince of Capua, set sail for Pisa in the month of September. On this occasion the Frangipani remained true to

Innocent. They at once felt the weight of the antipope's wrath, and we find him boasting to Didacus of Compostela that he will soon utterly extirpate them.

Innocent reached Pisa in September or October, and had to remain there for nearly three years and a half. During that period he exercised the papal functions, issuing his decrees to all parts of the world, but was not able to visit Rome. Meanwhile, the evils of the schism continued, though they were not so serious as Ordericus Vitalis would make out. "Great troubles and dissensions", he wrote, "sprang up throughout the world. In most of the monasteries there were two abbots; and in several dioceses two bishops claimed the episcopal rights, one of whom adhered to Peter Anacletus, and the other to Gregory Innocent". This state of things could only have existed to any considerable extent where the cause of Anacletus was supported by the secular arm, as in Aquitaine and south Italy.

All this time the friends of Innocent were working in his behalf. The fleets of Genoa and Pisa were not idle; and in destroying the little state of Amalfi the Pisans deprived Roger of Sicily of his most powerful naval support (August 1135). Despite this reverse, however, Roger not merely held his own, but continued to strengthen his hold on south Italy.

But in Germany the march of events was altogether unfavourable to the cause of Anacletus. When the anti-king Conrad of Hohenstaufen abandoned Italy, he joined his forces to those of his brother Frederick, and proved a great source of annoyance to Lothaire. The emperor, however, took the field successfully against them; but it was reserved to St. Bernard to bring about peace between the rival sovereigns. Fresh from endeavours to quench the schism in Aquitaine, the holy abbot betook himself to Germany in the month of February or March 1135.

Unable to resist the saint's eloquence, first Frederick and then Conrad himself definitely submitted to Lothaire. Frederick appeared barefoot before the emperor at the diet of Bamberg, and received pardon from him, on condition that he should obtain its plenitude from the Pope (March 17, 1135). In notifying to Innocent the terms on which he had received the rebel brothers into his grace, the emperor told him that he had convoked the princes of the Empire to a diet at Spire. It was to be held at Christmas (1135), and was to deliberate on another expedition to Rome. He begged the Pope to send a legate to the assembly, and by letters to warn the clergy to be zealous in their joint service.

Meanwhile, Innocent had summoned the bishops of the Catholic world to meet at Pisa on the Feast of Pentecost (May 26, 1135). The council was not actually opened till May 30. It lasted for eight days; but, unfortunately, was not too numerously attended, though there were bishops from many different countries, including Hungary. Besides passing the usual decrees for the betterment of church discipline, the synod deposed various bishops for simony and other crimes, forbade the selling of freeborn Christians to the heathen, and, while condemning those who helped the antipope or "the tyrant Roger", granted to those who took part against them "the same indulgence which Urban granted to the crusaders at the council of Clermont". Roger and Anacletus were again excommunicated. It was also decided that every year the Pope should give a mark of

gold, his chancellor two ounces of gold, and other prelates a mark of silver to the Knights Templars.

The council also received a number of Milanese who declared that they had renounced their allegiance to the antipope and to the anti-king and to their excommunicated archbishop, Anselm of Pusterla, and that they would strive to bring their fellow-citizens to acknowledge Innocent and Lothaire. This with the aid of St. Bernard, who had been the chief figure at the council of Pisa, they succeeded in doing. The saint received a perfect ovation when he entered Milan, the people all pressing round him to kiss his feet. Later on, when they had seen the miracles which he wrought in the midst, they were wont to pluck threads from his clothes to keep as relics, and though so attached to their privileges, whilst under the spell of the saint they suffered them to pass away unheeded.

Whilst still pining in exile at Pisa, Innocent was supported and encouraged by the visits and tender words of such ardent partisans as Peter the Venerable. "With the love of a son", wrote the abbot, "I beg you to bear bravely the burdens of the Church which the will not of man but of God has laid upon you. Be not wearied at the length of time your troubles are lasting, since God, who has united His whole Church in you, and has placed nearly the whole world at your feet, will soon subject those very few who are still opposed to you, and will, as is His wont, raise the name of Catholic above that of every heresy and schism ... As far as I am concerned, and as far as the monks of Cluny are concerned, we are ready, whilst we have breath in our nostrils, to obey you, to work for you, and, if need be, to die for you. Nothing can separate us from our Pastor, from Peter, from Christ, all of whom we have in you. Wherever you are out obedience and devotion will be with you. As the poet puts it: When Camillus was at Veii Rome was there too, and Peter in prison, Clement in exile, and Marcellus in the stable ruled the Church of God no less than if they had been in the Lateran".

Meanwhile, Roger's steady advance in power in south Italy was rousing enemies of all kinds against him; for he attacked with equal impartiality any who stood in his way. With his fleets he harried the coast-line of the Greek empire with the same unconcern as he preyed upon Venetian traders. Hence envoys from the Greek emperor and from the doge of Venice concurred with St. Bernard and the Pope in urging Lothaire to take up arms against the common foe. While impressing upon the emperor that it did not become him to exhort to battle, St. Bernard assured him that it was the duty of the Church's advocate to protect the Church from the madness of the schismatics, and it was the prerogative of Cesar to uphold his own crown against the Sicilian usurper. For as a Jew by descent has seized upon the See of Peter to the injury of Christ, so without doubt everyone who makes himself a king in Sicily speaks against Cesar. Unable to resist the urgent appeals that came to him from so many quarters, Lothaire, with the advice of his nobles given in diets at Spiers and Aix-la-Chapelle, decided on war; and St. Bernard was soon able to report to the Pope that the emperor was "collecting an exceedingly great army".

This time it was with a really imposing force that Lothaire left Wurzburg for Italy (August 1136), and men in that country asked themselves in terror what they were to do or to say. When Lothaire entered north Italy some cities at once submitted to him, while

others, as usual, actively opposed him, either because they disliked imperial interference in their affairs, or because they so detested some of their neighbours that they would not be on the same side with them. However, after about six months' campaigning, he succeeded in inspiring respect for the imperial authority over the whole of north Italy. Then, marching along the east coast, he entered Apulia in April, while his son-in-law Henry, duke of Bavaria, joining the Pope at Grosseto (March 1137), entered Campania. The plan was to subdue Roger before attacking Rome. The same success attended the armies of Lothaire in south Italy as in north; or, as the chroniclers of the time express it, in Italy and in Apulia. Breaking down all opposition as he marched along, the duke of Bavaria, after putting Innocent in possession of Benevento, effected a junction with the emperor at Bari at the end of May.

After these striking successes of the imperial troops, difficulties began to beset both the emperor and the Pope. If Roger could not successfully stay Lothaire's advance by force, he contrived to hamper it by guile. His gold begot or fanned sedition in his enemy's camp. Anxious to return to their homes, a number of the German soldiers allowed themselves to be persuaded that the Pope, his cardinals, and the archbishop of Trier were the cause of the war. At Melfi these men mutinied, and, but for the personal intervention of the emperor, the Pope and his suite might have been killed.

A little severity soon quelled this disturbance, but misunderstandings between Innocent and Lothaire or the duke were not so easily terminated. The first trouble between the Pope and one of the leaders of the German armies arose at Viterbo. After the people of that city who had declared for Anacletus had been compelled by Duke Henry to submit, he exacted an indemnity from them of three thousand talents. "Thereupon", we are told, "a great dissension arose between the Pope and the duke. The former claimed the money on the ground that it came from one of his cities, while the latter held to it as spoils of war".

More serious differences arose somewhat later between Innocent and the emperor himself. Raynald of Tuscany, to secure his election as abbot of Monte Cassino, had thrown in his lot with the antipope and Roger of Sicily. Naturally, therefore, Duke Henry, when on his way to join the emperor, reached Monte Cassino, he endeavored to take possession of the abbey. But its great strength defied him, and, to the vexation of Innocent, the duke marched away content that Raynald should acknowledge the emperor, if not the Pope. Later on, too, at the close of a long dispute about the privileges of Monte Cassino between the representatives of Innocent and Raynald's adherents in presence of Lothaire himself, the emperor put pressure on the Pope to induce him to become reconciled to the scheming abbot on condition that he should take an oath of simple obedience to him (July 1137). Hence though Raynald and a number of his supporters appeared barefoot before the Pope, and abjured Anacletus, the question of their acknowledging Innocent as the overlord of Monte Casino was allowed by the emperor to remain in abeyance. He wished to have the great abbey under his own control.

But Raynald was a true child of this world, wise in his own generation. Foreseeing the ultimate triumph of Roger, he would seem to have at once made overtures to him. At any rate, acting on the information of the treason of the abbot

which had been brought to him, Lothaire promptly caused him to be seized. Again the Pope and the emperor were in disagreement as to who had the right to deal with the recalcitrant prelate. Most likely by the mediation of St. Bernard, who was with the Pope all this time, the emperor withdrew his claim to judge of the validity of an ecclesiastical election, and the abbot was deposed in due canonical form (September 1137).

But with views so fundamentally different as to their respective rights, Innocent and Lothaire could not agree. They had quarrelled over the right to depose the abbot of Monte Cassino, and they disagreed about the election of his successor. Each wished to secure an abbot after his own heart. At length, however, the emperor, finding the monks of his way of thinking, threatened the Pope that he would cut the Empire off from communion with him if he did not allow them freely to elect anyone they chose. Unwilling in his dependent position to drive matters to extremity, and seemingly imposed upon by the false or interpolated documents produced by the deacon Peter, Innocent gave way, and the monks elected Wibald, abbot of Stablo, a trusted adviser of the emperor, who with his sceptre at once invested him with the temporalities of the abbey.

Previous to this, on the fall of Salerno (August 1137), differences had arisen between the Pope and the emperor as to which of them the city belonged, and as to which of them should invest the new duke of Apulia, Rainulf of Alife. In the end he was invested by both of them with a standard, the Pope holding the upper part of the banner and the emperor the lower.

But the heroic old emperor was now feeling the weight of his years, and, full of the thought of approaching death, was anxious to return to Germany. On his return march, he took several places in the neighborhood of Rome that stood for the antipope, and at Tivoli received the submission of Ptolomey, “duke and consul of the Romans, and dictator of the people of Tusculum”. At Farfa he parted company with Innocent, who proceeded to Rome, whilst he continued his march towards Germany (October). Ardent as was his desire to see once more his native land, it could not sustain his enfeebled body, and the “great emperor breathed his last in a wretched hovel in an Alpine pass” as he was leaving Italy by the valley of the Trent (December 3, 1137)

With justice was Lothaire praised by his contemporaries for his valour and his generalship, his piety, and his love of justice. His choleric disposition, however, led him at times, as we have seen, to try to bully the Pope he was protecting. But the words of the wise, those for instance of St. Bernard, and of his wife, his own common sense, and the tact and firmness of Innocent, ever saved him from extreme measures. And yet no one who has thought over the relations of Innocent with him can have failed to contrast his independent words with the obsequious subservience of the antipope towards Roger of Sicily. With a succession of Lothaires the Church would soon have been in peace and in honor; the Empire would have become stronger and stronger; and the story we have to tell would have been more like a sweet pastoral than the terrible tragedy which the Hohenstaufen made it.

Precluded by ill-health, as we have seen, from completing his work of establishing Innocent by expelling Anacletus from Rome, Lothaire contented himself with accepting the oath of fealty of the consul of the Romans, and with leaving Innocent

to effect what he could for himself in the Eternal City. When, however, he bade farewell to the Pope towards the end of October, he left with him an ally who was of more value to him than an emperor's army he left with him Bernard of Cîteaux, who, while Innocent betook himself to Rome, at once proceeded to Apulia to meet the dreaded Roger of Sicily. When the Pope entered Rome he found that, though Anacletus still held the Leonine city, and seemingly the Lateran also, the majority of the city was in his favour, and he had no difficulty in maintaining himself therein till the death of the antipope (January 25, 1138).

Meanwhile the work of the emperor in south Italy was being undone even more quickly than it had been accomplished. No sooner had Lothaire begun to move northwards than Roger left Sicily, having in his army a number of Saracens—savages whom, as the sequel will show, the kings of Sicily were very fond of employing in their wars (October, early, 1137). The speed with which he reconquered the mainland was only equalled by the barbarity with which he defiled his conquests. Old and young, high and low were butchered, churches were profaned, and nuns were outraged. The angry monarch would not listen to the pleadings for peace either of St. Bernard or abbot Wibald. Indeed, he declared he would hang the latter if ever he fell into his hands. However, when checked for a brief space by a defeat inflicted on him by Lothaire's regent, Duke Rainulf (October 30), in order to gain time he expressed a wish to have the question of the double election of Innocent and Anacletus debated in his presence. Accordingly, about the beginning of December there appeared before him St. Bernard on behalf of Innocent, the great canonist, Cardinal Peter of Pisa, on behalf of Anacletus, and two others on each side.

“The Lord's tunic”, cried St. Bernard, “which at the time of His passion neither pagan nor Jew dare rend, Pierleone has, through the support of the king here, torn in twain. There is one Faith, one Lord, one Baptism, and there was one Ark at the time of the Deluge. And who is there who does not know that that Ark is the type of the Church. But now as there are two arks one must be a counterfeit one, and will be submerged. If the ark steered by Pierleone is of God, it will be saved; and the ark steered by Innocent, if it be not of God, will be wrecked. Then with it will be wrecked the Church of the Orient, and those of France, Germany, Ireland, and England, and of the nations of the barbarians. Then also will be wrecked the Orders of the Camalduli, Carthusians, Cluniacs, Cistercians, and the others. Roger alone of all the Princes of the world has entered the ark of Pierleone. Are all the others to be lost, and is he alone to be saved? It cannot be that the world should perish, and that the ambitious Pierleone, whose life is so well known, should win the kingdom of Heaven”.

But if the eloquence of the saint was lost upon Roger, anxious to keep his kingly title and the papal patrimonies he had seized, it gained to the cause of Innocent Cardinal Peter, the most distinguished of the adherents of Anacletus. And when Bernard returned to Rome to make known to Innocent the want of success of his mission (c. Christmas 1137), he soon gained over to him many of the partisans of the antipope.

What had been so well advanced by St. Bernard was brought to an abrupt termination by the hand of God. Anacletus died suddenly on January 25, 1138, and his party buried him so secretly that the place of his sepulture was never publicly known.

An immediate result of the antipope's demise was, as one of our English historians expressed it, that Innocent began to exercise his authority over the city as freely as he had hitherto exercised it over "the whole monarchy of the Church".

Unfortunately, however, the sudden death of Anacletus did not put an immediate end to the schism. With a view to making better terms with Innocent, a number of those most deeply pledged to the cause of Anacletus sent word to Roger that, if he were wishful, they would elect a successor to him. Only too pleased to distract his enemies, Roger gave them power to elect a pope. This they did about the middle of March saluting Gregory, cardinal-priest of the Holy Apostles, as Victor IV. But no one took this election seriously. The Romans promptly nicknamed Victor, "Carnecorius", and his supporters soon allowed themselves to be gained over by the words of St. Bernard or by the gold of Innocent. Victor secured the intercession of the saint in his behalf, and then, on the very day of the octave of Pentecost (May 29, 1138) all the supporters of Peter Leonis came to prostrate themselves together at the feet of the Pope, and to take an oath of fidelity to him, and become his liege men. The schismatic clergy also, together with the idol (Victor IV) whom they had set up, knelt at the feet of the lord Pope to promise him obedience with all formalities, and there was great joy among the people. They acclaimed St. Bernard the "Father of their country"; and if they could not retain among them "the one who for more than seven years had toiled hard for the healing of the schism, they could accompany him out of their city in profound grief".

Under Innocent's firm rule Rome revived. Visitors flocked to it from all sides. Trade and religion both sprang into active life; wastes were recultivated, churches were repaired, and the monastery of St. Anastasius at Tre Fontane, rebuilt and re-endowed, was handed over to St. Bernard and his monks at Clairvaux. In a word, to quote Boso, "the city enjoyed such peace as had not known for many years". From the days of Pope Calixtus II "the school of Roman art had been constituting itself anew", and in "the superb structure of S. Maria in Trastevere", which Innocent entirely rebuilt, "we hail once more a perfect art, as perfect as that which created S. Maria Maggiore in the fourth and fifth century. In fact, under Innocent II greater strides were made in reconstructing and adorning the city, and in forming a style of architecture, than under any other Pope since Paschal". Of the mosaics which still adorn different parts of S. Maria in Trastevere, and which display the portrait of Innocent, the only one which dates precisely from his time is the one on the hemispherical vault of the apse. In its centre are the figures of our Lord and our Lady on the same throne. The Madonna is on the right of our Lord, whose right hand is seen resting on her right shoulder, and whose left hand holds a book with the inscription, "Veni electa mea, et ponam in te thronum meum". To the left of our Lord are four saints, and on the right of the Madonna, the last of three figures, is Pope Innocent himself, holding the model of the Church. He is represented as wearing a beard, and with the pallium above a chasuble which half covers a tunic. Though his figure, like those of the other six standing figures, is "short, thickset, and lame in attitude", that of the Madonna, "splendidly dressed as a true Queen of the East", is not so. "It is one of those figures that dwell upon the memory; her pose is really beautiful, and her countenance of a sweetness quite Christian, with almost the purity of features of an antique". It is an excellent example of the revival of Roman art which, never altogether dead, was at this period making a rapid advance along all its lines.

At his own expense Innocent also replaced, with beams supplied to him by King Roger of Sicily, the roof of the Lateran basilica, which had suddenly collapsed during his reign. Besides also repairing the tower in front of the basilica, which seemed about to fall, he enriched the basilica with vestments and splendid ornaments of various kinds. He also renovated the curious old church of S. Stefano Rotondo on the Coelian; buttressed St. Paul's outside-the-walls; added two chambers to the Lateran palace, one of which contained the frescos and inscriptions which were to annoy Frederic Barbarossa; and executed many other important works in his time. Many at least of these works were not begun till after the Pope had made his peace with King Roger.

Among the other virtues, or vices, possessed by Innocent was undoubtedly a warlike disposition. No sooner had he received the submission of Victor IV, than he collected an army and marched to the support of Duke Rainulf, who was holding his own against Roger. But an illness which overtook him at Albano caused him for the time to turn his thoughts in another direction. With a view to removing the last traces of the schism, and to carrying on the work of reform, he summoned the bishops of Christendom to meet in Rome on *Laetere* Sunday (April 2, 1139).

A very large number of prelates responded to the mandate of the Pope, and the business of the synod, known as the tenth ecumenical council, began on Monday, April 3. The proceedings were opened by an address to the assembled bishops from the Pope, who, says the chronicler of Morigny, "was superior to all the others in splendour of apparel, in venerableness of appearance, and in learning". "You know", he said, "that Rome is the head of the world, and that from the Roman Pontiff all ecclesiastical honors are received, as though by feudal custom, and that without his permission they cannot be lawfully held". That being the case, he proceeded to point out the evils of a divided headship, and to remind his audience that, according to St. Augustine, whoever was cut off from the Catholic faith, no matter how well he might think he was living, was, by the one crime of being separated from the unity of Christ, devoid of life, and under the anger of God. Those then, he continued, amid the applause of the assembly, who are in this state must be dealt with severely, and so "whatever Peter Leonis decreed we annul, whomsoever he exalted we degrade, and whomsoever he consecrated we desecrate and depose". Having thus roused both himself and his hearers, Innocent violently upbraided the guilty by name, and mercilessly stripped them of their crosiers, their palliums, and their episcopal rings. Among these who had already been treated with a justice which, to say the best of it, was unseasoned with mercy, was Cardinal Peter of Pisa, whom St. Bernard had brought in penance to Innocent's feet. An indignant letter to the Pope from the saint had been the result. "If", he wrote with the independence of a prophet, "I had a judge before whom I could take you, I would quickly show you what you deserve: I speak as one in travail. There is, indeed, the tribunal of Christ (and here he spoke with the respectful love of a Catholic for the Vicar of Christ); but far be it from me to summon you there; for if it were necessary for you and possible for me, I would far rather stand there and answer for you with all my strength. And so I appeal to him to whom in this life power has been given to judge all things, *i.e.*, to you yourself". No more is known of this incident. It is quite possible that Innocent may have been put in possession of damaging facts concerning Cardinal Peter which were unknown to St. Bernard, but it is perhaps more probable that another's "advice or rather craft had

stealthily undone what his indulgence had granted, and made void the words which had proceeded from his lips”.

Before the council broke up the Fathers issued a number of decrees on the old lines against simony, clerical incontinence, usury, tournaments, the study of medicine and of civil law by clerics for gain, and against those (the followers of Peter of Bruys) “who, under the guise of religion, deny the sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, infant baptism, the sacrament of Orders, and lawful matrimony”. The ordinations of Anacletus and his followers were declared null and void, and King Roger was again declared excommunicated. Moreover, according to Otto of Frising, the Pope ordered that Arnold of Brescia, of whom we shall have more to say later, should leave Italy and preach no more.

At a council in London over which he had presided (December 1138), Alberic, cardinal-bishop of Ostia, had and invited “all the bishops and many of the abbots of England to a general council which the sovereign Pope Innocent” was to hold in the following Lent. However, to represent the bishops and abbots of England there went to the said council Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury, and four bishops, with as many abbots; “for King Stephen would not send any more on account of the troubles of his kingdom, which were then very great”. The historians of “our” country tell us of the great honour with which our bishops were received by the Apostolic See, and of the importance of the Lateran council, “an event without parallel for many past ages”. After he had received his pallium from Innocent, Theobald and his fellow bishops from England “returned joyfully to their own country, bringing with them the synodal decrees, now enrolled far and wide throughout England”.

The Lateran council was hardly over ere the death of the imperial governor of Apulia, Duke Rainulf (April 30), inclined the balance of power in south Italy wholly in favour of King Roger, and caused Innocent to commit the great mistake of his life.

On the death of Lothaire, the princes of the Empire, in the presence and largely under the influence of the papal legate Cardinal Theodwin, had elected as his successor his former rival, Conrad of Hohenstaufen, duke of Franconia, the younger brother of Frederick of Swabia and grandson of Henry IV. He was crowned by the papal legate because the archbishop of Cologne, to whom the coronation of the king belonged by right, had only just been enthroned, and was incapable of acting as archbishop because he had not up to that time received his pallium from Rome. Difficulties which immediately arose between the new king and the powerful Henry the Proud, duke of Bavaria, along with his brother Welf, kept his attention riveted on Germany.

It was during the reign of Lothaire that the Welf family was consolidated, formed a party, that of the Guelfs, and began its opposition to the Ghibelline (or Waiblingen) party of the house of Hohenstaufen. But it was whilst his successor Conrad III was fighting Duke Welf that the terrible battle-cry of Guelf and Ghibelline was heard for the first time (1140).

As a rule the Welf family, strong in their ancestral and feudal property and in their personal influence with the Saxons, were attached to the Apostolic See. But in the year 1139 Roger of Sicily contrived to use them against its interests, for he continued to

subsidize them in their struggle against Conrad, and so effectually prevented the king from listening to the appeals for help which reached him from south Italy.

In May (1139) Roger landed in the peninsula an army from Sicily, and in June Innocent, unable to obtain any assistance from Conrad, was himself marching against him to the support of Robert of Capua, the only one capable of offering any effective resistance to the invader. By the beginning of July the papal army, ravaging the country as it went along, had reached San Germano. Roger, who was then besieging Troia, at once made overtures for peace, and at the request of Innocent came to San Germano. But they could not come to any agreement, as the king would not listen to the Pope's demand that Capua should be restored to Robert. Accordingly, when Roger resumed his work of subjugating his opponents, Innocent again took the field. After some trifling successes, however, his army was surprised by Roger on the banks of the Garigliano at Mignano, near Galluccio, in the province of Caserta; and though Robert of Capua escaped, the Pope and all his court fell into the hands of the king (July 22).

Then was repeated the scene between St. Leo IX and Robert Guiscard. With one hand Roger offered respectful greetings to the Pope; with the other he held him as in a vice. At first Innocent, whose misfortune was deeply bewailed by his subjects, would not listen to the king's proposals; but at last, as he found himself more and more helpless, and was more and more impressed with the sufferings of his fellow-captives, he realized that there was nothing left for him but to assent to his wishes. On July 25 he recognized Roger as king of Sicily, the duchy of Apulia, and the principality of Capua, and with three banners invested Roger as king, one of his sons (Roger) as duke of Apulia, and Alphonsus, another son, as prince of Capua. The Garigliano was to separate the states of the Church from the kingdom of the two Sicilies. On his side Roger was to recognize Innocent as his suzerain, and to pay him six hundred schifati every year for Apulia and Capua. The Sicilian king was satisfied. His kingly title would now be recognized by all the sovereigns of Europe. He was, moreover, a vassal of the Holy See, which would at no time count for much in the way of dependence, and not of the Empire, which at any time might mean the loss of his royal title, and strict subjection.

Although, after the conclusion of the treaty, the Pope and the king journeyed amicably together to Benevento, and although no serious trouble afterwards broke out between them, Innocent had often to complain of Roger's encroachments both in the temporal and in the spiritual order. When in 1140 the troops of the Sicilian monarch crossed the Pescara, and began to subdue the old Marsian territories on the borders of the Romans, Innocent grew anxious, and, on the advice of the Romans, sent certain cardinals to bid the Normans not to attack what belonged to others. But an answer came promptly to the effect that they were merely seeking to recover lands which, belonging to the principality of Capua, were their own. So strained did the relations between Innocent and Roger thereupon become that, when the latter requested an interview, the Pope, alleging the weather and business, refused to meet him. Nor was the tension lessened when Roger attempted, though in vain, to force the papal city of Benevento to accept his debased coinage, which, as the governor of the city pointed out, spelt death for the commerce of Italy. And when, in reply to Innocent's protests against his appointing bishops, Roger replied that he was not disposed to give up customs which

his predecessors had held from the time of Guiscard, a dispute was begun which passed on to the days of Eugenius III.

When once Innocent had accepted Roger's terms he strove to promote peace. He bade the cities of south Italy submit to their king, and then, hearkening to the prayers of the Romans, returned to the city, which gave him a splendid reception. The last act of the schism had been played; but, at least to human eyes, the play does not seem to have ended well. One of the chief villains of the piece, the main supporter of the schism, emerges out of it in improved prosperity, while one of its principal heroes, Lothaire, reaps death, and his successor, Conrad, dishonor from it.

CHAPTER III

THE POPE AND THE CITIZENS OF ROME. THE NEW REPUBLIC.

DEATH OF THE POPE

We have just seen that the Roman people received Pope Innocent with great joy and honor on his return from his war with King Roger. "From Peter", writes Ordericus Vitalis, "to whom first the Lord Jesus Christ said: 'To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven', to Pope Innocent, who now governs the Apostolic See, we reckon one hundred and forty-one bishops of Rome", and during the reigns of every one of those Pontiffs much was always heard of the 'Populus Romanus'. But neither whilst the Popes were trembling fugitives in the catacombs, nor whilst they were the favoured of emperors and of kings; and neither whilst they were the sport of petty barons, nor whilst they were as a tower of strength which the mighty could not storm, were the Roman people of any real account. They were either snarling curs to whom the pagan emperors disdainfully flung bread and shows, or they were poor and helpless, subsisting on the charity of the Popes, or they were the unnumbered crowd to whom the Roman nobles were like Ajax and Achilles to the unnamed host of the Achaeans.

But from the days of Gregory the Great, when Byzantine influence in Rome began to be more and more intangible, the Roman people were thrown more and more upon themselves. Before the middle of the seventh century a Roman army again makes its appearance. This time the *exercitus Romanus* is only a local militia, organized according to the different regions of the city, but largely under the control of the new nobility which papal patronage was bringing into existence. However, as time went on, the Roman people profited by the faction fights among the nobles, and by the struggles between Pope and antipope. Growing daily less dependent, they began in the eleventh century, long after the other cities, to form themselves into guilds, and commenced to dream of imitating those cities of north Italy—Milan, Genoa, Pisa, etc.—which, setting at naught the overlordship of emperor, archbishop, or baron, had become practically independent. Irrespective of any suzerain, some at least of them had already begun to elect their own magistrates, and to manage their own affairs. They made peace or war as

they listed. The Romans would do likewise; and, inflated with idle dreamings, supposed they were really as powerful as they imagined themselves.

We have seen them grandly threaten not to elect Lothaire emperor unless he recognized their antipope Anacletus. Now, regarding the concessions of Innocent to Roger as derogatory to the dignity of the ‘Populus Romanus’, they called upon him to act on their advice, and to repudiate the terms he had made with the Sicilian king. This he stoutly refused to do, saying that his captivity had been brought about providentially for the sake of peace.

In the following spring (1140), when the troops of Roger crossed the Pescara in the north east of his dominions in order to bring to subjection certain rebellious nobles on the borders of the pontifical territories, the Romans again proffered their advice to the Pope. On this occasion Innocent followed it, and sent an embassy to warn the Normans not to interfere with the territories of the Romans.

But it was the “Tivoli incident”, which we shall now narrate, that furnished the occasion to the Romans finally to assert themselves.

All over the north and central parts of Italy at this period neighboring cities were at war with one another, incited thereto either by hatred or ambition. Angry that their power had so declined that even Tivoli could be an effective rival to their city, the Romans made an attempt to bring it to subjection on the ground of its continuance in schism. With an immense army Innocent laid siege to Tivoli (May 1142), but he was completely worsted, and very many of the Romans were captured or slain. Thirsting for vengeance, the Romans returned to the attack in the following year. This time they were successful, and were desirous of inflicting a severe and humiliating punishment on their enemies. They wanted to raze the walls of Tivoli, and drive away all its inhabitants. But “the most noble and broad-minded Pope”, says Otto of Frising, “would not give his consent to a desire so senseless and so inhuman”; and, although he was personally ill-disposed towards the people of Tivoli on account of the schism, and had excommunicated them, he concluded a treaty with them on his own account. They swore to be true to him and his successors, to leave the control of their city in his hands, and to help him to recover the papal possessions in their neighborhood.

This served as a pretext for the Romans to imitate what had been done in other cities. Desirous of renewing the ancient dignity of the city, they rushed to the Capitol and proclaimed a republic, *i.e.*, in the words of Bishop Otto, “they reinstated the senatorial order, which had for many ages been extinct”.

It was to no purpose that Innocent tried all means to suppress this outbreak against his authority. His exertions only ruined his health. He took to his bed, and died September 24, 1143. In the presence of a very numerous concourse of clergy and people, he was buried in the Lateran basilica near the end of the southern nave, his body being laid in the splendid sarcophagus which had once held the remains of the Emperor Hadrian. In the days of Clement V a fire ruined the monument, and the bones of Innocent were removed to S. Maria in Trastevere. There may still be seen in the portico of this church the inscription which was engraved on Innocent’s second tomb. It sets forth that here rest the venerable bones of Innocent II of most pious memory. A member of the family of the Papareschi, he restored this church at his own expense in 1140.

When it was known that “the limitations of human nature” had taken Pope Innocent from among men, it was loudly proclaimed “that his victories had given freedom to the Church, which had been adorned and ennobled by his virtues and magnificence, and that he had rendered it affable to the lowly, but formidable to tyrants, instilling as much fear into vice as charity into religion”. Only the wicked, it was said, rejoiced in his death, as they hoped that they would be able to profit by it.

Innocent no doubt resented the rising of the Romans all the more keenly because he had brought prosperity to Rome. To the years of misery under Anacletus had succeeded years of plenty under Innocent. He had also endeavored to improve the administration of justice. He fixed the salary of judges and advocates at one hundred pounds a year, and made them swear to judge just judgment according to the laws, and not to take bribes.

The stout efforts made by Innocent against the republican movement of 1143 were continued to no purpose by his two successors for two years. At length in December 1145 Eugenius III definitely recognized the Senate, though, as we shall see, he insisted that it should receive investiture from him, and “he subordinated its authority to his own... The numerous agreements between Pope and people which were subsequently entered into were merely reiterations of that of 1145”, *i.e.*, of that year which seems to have been regarded as the year one of the renewal of the Senate. It should, however, be noted that neither the Trastevere nor the island of the Tiber was included in the new commune.

The Capitol to which the Romans betook themselves in such excitement in the memorable year 1143 was little else than a heap of ruins. It presented nothing to the eye by which an image of its past glories could be brought before the mind. But the Roman imagination of this age, which began with wild dreamings to look forward to the time when the ancient power of the city should burst forth again, and when the Capitol should be once more the centre of the world, began also to construct a mythical past for their visionary world-centre. It was about this time too that they began to commit the vagaries of their imaginations to writing, and in the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae* and afterwards in the *Graphia aurae urbi Romae* told of the time when the Capitoline hill was covered with temples and palaces all of gold and precious stones, in which magic statues representing the provinces of the Roman world showed by their movements wherever there was rebellion. But in the year 1143, amid the poor “houses, the crypts, cells, courts, gardens, trees... walls, stones, and columns”, with which the Capitol was then covered, where did the Romans assemble? Perhaps it was in the fortress into which the Corsi had converted the indestructible classical “Record Office”, *i.e.*, the ancient Tubularium; or perhaps in the little monastery of Our Lady and St. John the Baptist, attached to the Church of S. Maria *in Capitolio* or in *Ara Coeli*. Wherever they met, the place does not appear to have been particularly suitable, for the demagogue Arnold of Brescia was soon to be heard urging them to rebuild the Capitol. It would appear that his advice was so far followed that “a palace of the senators” was erected on the Capitol. Already in 1150 the Senate date their acts from a new building there, and a rude plan of the thirteenth century shows a castellated building protected by a tower as the new senatorial palace.³ Like the fortress of the Corsi, which it enlarged if it did not

altogether replace, this palace was erected on that part of the Tabularium which abutted on the Via Capitolina.

From their abode on the Capitol the new Senate issued its orders, and the temporal power of the Pope in the city of Rome was for the time in complete abeyance.

CHAPTER IV ENGLAND, IRELAND

During his troubled pontificate Innocent was often called upon to intervene both in the political and in the religious life of England. Towards King Henry, who had acknowledged him as Pope in the early days of the schism, he showed himself very well disposed. He told him of his sincere regard for him, and that he was prepared to do for him whatever the law of God would permit. Hence, although he exhorted him to root out of England and Normandy what was evil, and to plant therein what was good, he did not hesitate, “for love of him”, to insist that the archbishop of Rouen should not exact homage from certain abbots. This he did, though, as he acknowledges to the archbishop, he had himself ordered the opposite. However, while he urged the archbishop to relax for a time the strict claims of justice, he reminded the king that he must see to it that the abbots are not left without proper superintendence.

To the great abbey of Cluny Henry had in May 1131 given an annual donation of 100 marks, of which 60 were to come from the customs of London, and 40 from those of Lincoln. This donation Innocent solemnly confirmed “by the patronage of the Apostolic See”, as he did also another which he made to William of Corbeil, archbishop of Canterbury. Further, in accordance with the wishes of our aforesaid son King Henry, he authorized the establishment of canons regular in the church of St. Martin in Dover.

Passing over the privileges which Innocent granted to Christchurch (London), Lichfield, Lincoln and Canterbury, we will merely note in connection with the last named one that the Pope commissioned the abbot to have written out for his use a Bible both convenient in size and copied in such a style as to make it worthy of the Roman Pontiff.

Writing, perhaps about the same time, to the monks of Westminster Abbey, he informs them that he has instructed his legate, Henry of Blois, bishop of Winchester, to remedy their grievances; and he tells them that the Roman curia would have canonized Edward the Confessor if their envoy had brought to Rome a sufficient amount of evidence from the bishops and abbots of the country.

The request for the Confessor’s canonization had been made by his grand-nephew Stephen, whom we shall presently see recognized by Innocent as king of England. Writing to the Pope, Stephen declared that the piety of our kings had been the cause of the advance of the Church of the English in the Christian faith, so that “very specially

distinguished in is matter among all the other kingdoms, it paid an annual tribute to the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and by the mercy of God was specially cherished by the Roman Pontiffs”. He then treated of the miracles wrought by the Confessor, and of his relationship to him, and added, “Wherefore, O glorious Father and Lord, I humbly and submissively entreat your Majesty, to order by your authority that *the birthday* of the holy King be solemnly celebrated in the churches of the English”. After speaking of Westminster Abbey, which the Confessor had refounded, as “his royal seat, and as the special daughter of the Roman Church”, and after saying that he had sent the abbot and prior (Osbert) of Westminster to negotiate the affair, he begged “the Prince of God and firm pillar of the Church” to grant his petition, so that his name might be ever glorious “in the kingdom of the English”.

On the death of Henry I at Rouen (December 1, 1135), his daughter, the Empress Matilda, to whom the nobles of England had sworn fealty, was set aside by the prompt action of Stephen of Blois, his nephew, and grandson of William the Conqueror. It was given out that Henry had disinherited her, and the archbishop of Canterbury was induced to crown the usurper (December 26, 1135). Appeal was at once made to Innocent to sanction the position of Stephen. He was told by the bishops, by the king of France, and by others that he had been chosen king by the united voice of nobles and people, and had been duly consecrated by the primates of the kingdom. Influenced by these statements, and by what he was told of the anarchy that followed the demise of Henry, Innocent expressed his approval of what had been done in these guarded words addressed to King Stephen : “Knowing that in your person the divine favour accords with the choice of men so worthy, and knowing also that for the recompense of a sure hope on the day of your consecration you vowed obedience and reverence to St. Peter; and since you are known to be descended almost in a direct line from the royal lineage of the aforesaid kingdom, we, satisfied with what has been done in your case, receive you with fatherly affection as a favoured son of St. Peter and of the holy Roman Church, and heartily desire to retain you in the same privilege of regard and intimacy by which your predecessor of illustrious memory was by us distinguished”.

On receipt of this letter, Stephen assembled the bishops and nobles of England at Oxford; and in proclaiming his intention of granting liberty to the Church, of observing the laws, and of giving up the forests of Henry I, he asserted that, by the grace of God, he had been chosen king of England “by the consent of the clergy and people, had been consecrated by William, Archbishop of Canterbury, legate of the holy Roman Church, and had been confirmed by Innocent, pontiff of the holy Roman See”.

The miseries which the Norman occupation of England brought upon the people were rapidly aggravated under the reign of Stephen, helped as they were, on the one hand, by the weakness and incompetence of the king, and on the other by the efforts of Matilda and her allies to recover her inheritance. At length (1138), with a view to making peace between England and Scotland, and to effecting some reformation of manners, there landed in England Alberic, bishop of Ostia, legate of the Apostolic See. Our chroniclers all speak with the greatest respect of the learning and piety of this former monk of Cluny, and tell us that, as he brought letters from the Pope, “warranting his mission”, to the kings and prelates of England and Scotland, “he was received by all with respect”. Besides presenting a letter “to all the children of the Catholic Church as

to the condition of the holy mother Church of Rome”, he laid before the king and nobles his credentials from the Apostolic See. With the usual unwillingness of the Norman kings to allow any kind of control of their doings, and not because, as Gervase says, he was unwilling to see his brother even temporarily deprived of his legatine authority, Stephen did not receive the legate’s commission too enthusiastically. At length, however, “reverence for the apostolic authority” had its way, and Alberic at once began his work of inspection

One of the objects which the legate had at heart was to make peace between the English and Scotch, and, in making his way north, he made the circuit of nearly the whole of England, visiting the cathedral churches and the monasteries. His interview with David, king of Scotland, at Carlisle, was eminently satisfactory (September). David not only renounced the schism, and acknowledged Innocent, but consented to a truce. He had invaded England in the interests of Matilda, and, though checked by the battle of the Standard, his troops were still overrunning the north of England in the most barbarous fashion. The legate induced him to promise to slay none but actual combatants, and to release the women he had taken prisoners.

Returned to England, Alberic, in conjunction with “another legate who had just arrived from the sovereign Pope Innocent”, summoned the bishops of England to meet in London (December 6). By apostolic authority a number of canons were passed condemning investiture, simony, clerical incontinence, and the letting by schoolmasters of the teaching of their schools for hire. The council also decided that Theobald, abbot of Bec, should be the new archbishop of Canterbury. He was accordingly consecrated by Alberic (January 8, 1139). Before he left the country, the legate still further advanced the cause of peace with Scotland.

According to Ordericus, Henry, bishop of Winchester, the king’s brother, had been elected to succeed William of Corbeil (*d.* 1136) as archbishop of Canterbury. But, “as according to the canons, a bishop cannot be preferred from his own see to another without the authority Of the Roman pontiff”, Henry endeavored to prevail upon the Pope to sanction his translation. Though he failed to secure this favour, he obtained from Innocent a bull in which the Pope “enjoined the administration of his anxious charge to the lord bishop of Winchester, as legate in England” (March 1, 1139).

According to Gervase of Canterbury, the new legate exercised his legatine rights, although they were his rights, beyond discretion. Henry took his dignity very seriously, received appeals, constantly cited his archbishop and the bishops of England to attend on him, and by apostolic authority took to task those who did not pay their Peter’s pence in proper time. Naturally enough, friction soon arose between the legate who wished to seem greater than the archbishop, and the archbishop who wished to appear of more importance than the legate. Henry, therefore, betook himself to Rome at some period during the pontificate of Innocent, and endeavored to induce him to erect Winchester into an archiepiscopal see. This boon, however, he failed to obtain, though he is credited with having received the pallium from Pope Lucius II in 1142.

In the beginning of the month following the legatine appointment of Henry, was held the great council of Lateran. Before this assembly was brought an appeal by the outraged Empress Matilda against Stephen. Her claim to the throne of England was

advanced by Ulger, bishop of Angers. He was opposed on Stephen's behalf by Roger, bishop of Chester; Lovel, a cleric, representing the archbishop of Canterbury; and Arnulf, archdeacon of Sééz, afterwards bishop of Lisieux, whom we have had occasion to mention already, and of whom, seemingly without exaggeration, it may be averred that for over forty years "there was hardly a diplomatic transaction of any kind, ecclesiastical or secular, in England or in Gaul, in which he was not at some moment or in some way or other connected". He was Stephen's chief advocate. The contention of Matilda was the same as that addressed to Alexander II by William the Conqueror. She claimed the crown of England because she was the daughter of Henry, and because the succession had been secured to her by the oaths of fidelity to her which had been taken by the clergy and nobility of the country. To these arguments Arnulf replied that the Empress Matilda was unworthy to succeed to the crown because she was illegitimate, that the oaths had been extracted by force, and that she had, moreover, been disinherited by Henry on his death-bed in Stephen's favour. No match for Arnulf in diplomatic tact, Ulger lost his temper at these allegations, and spoilt a good cause by his want of self-control. He upbraided Arnulf with his low birth, and, wholly unmindful of the presence of the Pope, denounced him and all his people as unprincipled liars. He denied that Matilda was illegitimate, and declared that to call her so was to insult the Roman Church, seeing that Paschal II had crowned her empress. Annoyed at the intemperate tone of the discussion, Innocent cut it short, and by letter to Stephen reaffirmed his previous recognition of his position. Some said that Innocent had been gained by Stephen's money, and Ulger, enraged at his want of success, bitinglly muttered that St. Peter had gone from home, and left his house in charge of moneychangers.

The action of the Pope, who was no doubt influenced, as he had been before, by the difficulties and dangers which would attend any attempt to interfere with Stephen's actual possession of the crown, was strongly opposed by Guido, cardinal-priest of St. Mark's. When he became Pope Celestine II, though he would not alter Innocent's decision in Stephen's behalf, still, as he held that the affair was still *sub judice*, was still *res litigiosa*, he would not countenance any effort made to fix the throne in Stephen's line. His attitude was adopted by his successors Lucius II and Eugenius III. Hence when, 1152, Stephen made a determined effort to force the bishops of England to crown Eustace, Theobald, the archbishop of Canterbury, refused to do so on the ground that he had been forbidden by the Pope to recognize as king the son of the man who usurped the kingdom against his oath.

Among all the kings of England it may be said with the greatest truth of Stephen that he would have been accounted most worthy to rule the land if he had never been called upon to rule it. Under the shadow of his careless and incompetent weakness, the country was already being gradually flooded with misery, when he removed the last obstacle to its spread by quarrelling with the bishops. They had been his chief support, for they loyally stood by the Pope's recognition of him, declaring that it was not right for any bishop to desert one whom the Roman Church had acknowledged as king. But Stephen filled up the measure of his folly by treating them in such a manner as to bring upon himself the wrath of his brother, Henry, bishop of Winchester. This legate of Pope Innocent was a commanding personality, much more fitted to rule England than Stephen. Holding in his hands the supreme ecclesiastical authority in the country, and

no small share of its civil power, he was called by his contemporaries “the lord of England”. But a terrible sight met his gaze when in 1139 he looked over the land of which he was proclaimed the lord. “The treasury, left well filled, was empty; the kingdom was a prey to intestine war; slaughter, fire, and rapine spread ruin throughout the land; cries of distress, horror, and woe rose in every quarter ... Churches, monks, and nuns were violated, and famine consumed those whom murder had spared”. It was thought that “hell had broken loose, and that the reign of chaos had begun”. “Every powerful man”, sighs our national chronicle, “made his castles, and they filled the land full of castles, and the castles they filled with devils and evil men. Christ and His saints slept”.

Matters were brought to a head between Henry and Stephen by the latter’s arbitrary imprisonment of the bishops of Salisbury and Ely. The legate called upon the king to answer for his conduct at a council which he called together at Winchester (August 29, 1139). Though Stephen appeared at the council, he would offer no satisfaction, and when some of the bishops talked of appealing to Rome against him he let them know that if any of them left the country in opposition to him and to the dignity of his kingdom, his return might not be so easy. Moreover, as he felt himself aggrieved by the bishops, he, of his own accord, summoned them to Rome. Afraid of violence on the part of Stephen, and because, says Malmesbury, the bishops thought it would be “a rash act to excommunicate the king without the knowledge of the Pope”, they dispersed without taking any severe measures against him. But the legate and the archbishop of Canterbury begged him privately on their knees to take pity on the Church, and not to cause a schism between it and himself. Nothing, however, of any particular value was effected by their efforts.

About a month after the holding of this council, Matilda landed on the shores of England to enforce her claim to its crown with an army. The infatuated Stephen continued to anger his brother. He could not defeat his foe, and would not agree to the terms of peace which Henry endeavored to make, with her. In February 1141 Stephen was captured by the forces of Matilda, who was then joined by the legate. But her arrogance soon alienated him as it alienated so many others.

Before the end of the year Stephen was once more free (November 1). He was exchanged as a prisoner of war for Matilda’s natural brother Robert, earl of Gloucester, her chief support, who had been captured by the king’s party on September 14. After much negotiation it had been arranged that, “for the royal dignity”, Stephen should be set at liberty a little before the earl. Before Robert would agree to this risky arrangement he insisted not only that the legate and the archbishop should promise on oath to put themselves in his power if the king did not fulfill his side of the contract but that both of them should furnish him with letters to the Pope under their own seals to the following effect: “The lord Pope was to understand that they, for the liberation of the king and the peace of the kingdom, had bound themselves to the earl by this covenant, that, if the king refused to liberate him after his own release, they would give themselves into his custody. Should it, therefore, come to this calamitous issue, they earnestly implored the Pope to do that which it would become his apostolic clemency to do without being asked, *viz.*, free both the count and themselves, who were his suffragans, from unjust bonds”.

These precautions were followed by the release of Council Robert as arranged. Thereupon, in order to strengthen his brother's position, Henry of Winchester "by his legatine authority summoned a council to meet at Westminster" on December 7. The proceedings appear to have been opened by the reading of a letter from Innocent to Henry which had been received some time before. In it the Pope gently rebuked the legate for not endeavoring to release his brother; but, forgiving him his former transgression, earnestly exhorted him to attempt his liberation either by ecclesiastical or temporal means. Then, after endeavoring to excuse his own defection from the king, Henry commanded all "on the part of God and of the Pope, that they should strenuously assist the king, anointed by the will of the people, and with the approbation of the Holy See". The council closed with the excommunication of Matilda's party, but not of Matilda herself, because she was "the lady (*domina*) of the Angevins". But this assembly effected little in the way of bringing peace to the distracted country, which, long after the decease of Innocent, who had laboured so hard for its pacification, was in such a state of misery that, says Malmesbury, "not even the bishops nor monks could pass in safety from one town to another".

The difficulty experienced by bishops, or by any persons, in going in safety from one place to another in the twelfth century was so far at least increased in England in the reign of King Stephen that there was one more bishop in his time than there had been for long before. When King Henry I beheld John, bishop of Glasgow, who neither acknowledged his overlordship nor would obey his ecclesiastical superior, Thurstan of York, exercising episcopal functions in Cumberland, he was very wroth. To put an end to a state of things which limited his authority, Henry, at the instigation of Archbishop Thurstan, determined to erect Carlisle into an episcopal see subject to York. With this purpose he approached Pope Innocent. He, also, annoyed that John of Glasgow was so refractory to his repeated orders to submit to York, fell in with the king's proposals, and "by apostolic dispensation decreed that Carlisle should be honored with the episcopal dignity, and should continue to enjoy the said honor for all future time". This we know from a letter addressed by Innocent to King Stephen, in which he exhorted that monarch to complete the arrangements necessary for the proper establishment of the new see, which death had prevented King Henry from finishing¹ (April 22, 1136). Disheartened by this dismembering of his see, John of Glasgow retired to the abbey of Tyron, and it required the authority of Rome to make him return to it.

More than enough has already been said to illustrate a remark made at the beginning of this chapter to the effect that Innocent was often called upon to intervene both in the political and in the religious life of England. But because one of the men of our country with whom Innocent had relations may be said to be still exercising an influence on the land, we will record yet another incident bearing on the same subject. One of the ablest prelates of England in the unhappy days of King Stephen was Nigel, bishop of Ely (*d.* 1169), nephew of Roger, bishop of Salisbury. He is said to have been "one of the greatest financiers of the middle ages", and to have been "the founder of the system of keeping the public accounts of England. After having had the glory of creating the English exchequer under Henry I, he lived to restore it under Henry II, after the troubles and waste of the reign of Stephen had thrown it into disorder".

The violent action of Stephen in seizing Roger of Salisbury and other prelates (1139) drove Nigel into rebellion. Forced by the success of the king's arms to abandon his Isle of Ely, almost inaccessible on account of its surrounding marshes, he fled to the party of the empress, and appealed to Rome. One of the envoys whom he sent there was "a man skilled in the use of Latin, French, and English". The mission was completely successful, and the envoys "received from the excellence of the Roman dignity" letters addressed to the bishops of England and the archbishop of Rouen instructing them to aid Nigel, "who had been unjustly expelled from his see", to recover it. But it was not till he had been in exile for nearly two years that, "to the great joy of all", he returned to his see (1142).

IRELAND

During this century we have abundant evidence of that intercourse between Ireland and Rome which with the flow of time has but become closer and closer. Whenever a special Irish centre in Rome was first established, there was certainly one there in the twelfth century, and the abbey, Sanctissima Trinitas Scottorum, figures in the Roman archaeological productions of Peter Mallius and John the Deacon. According to Professor Marucchi, who unfortunately can give me no further information on the matter, this centre of Irish life in Rome stood where is now the English College, *viz.*, but a very short distance from the Campo dei Fiori. At the end of the sixteenth century the abbey church was rebuilt, and dedicated to St. Thomas of Canterbury.

To the "Most holy Trinity of the Irish" no doubt went some at least of the many Irish princes who went to Rome in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, Sitric (104c), Flaherty O'Neill (1030), Donogh of Brien, king of Munster (1060), and his nephew Turlogh O'Brien, who ruled all Ireland about the year 1080.

The invasions of the Danes, and the quarrels of the descendants of their conqueror, the great Brian Boru, reduced the moral condition of Ireland to its lowest ebb in the eleventh century. In the twelfth, however, the country began to recover a little, and the revived ecclesiastical life which then became manifest was partly a cause and partly a result of the improved state of affairs. The revival, inaugurated at home, was stimulated by Rome.

In 1106 Celsus was consecrated bishop of Armagh. He was the lineal descendant of a family which had by force kept possession of the most important see in Ireland for some two hundred years. But he was the last of this episcopal family, unique in the history of the Church, who ruled it. He was shocked at the abuse, and at the chaotic state of the Irish Church. Their lively imaginations have ever prevented the Irish people from steadily pursuing and systematically reducing to practice ideas of unity and uniformity. This trait in their character showed itself in the eleventh century in the great variety of liturgies and offices in use all over their country, and in the fact that, while there were a great many bishops in the land, there was practically no episcopal organization.

The synod of Uisneach (Usnaghnow Usney), at which Celsus presided, and that of Rath-Bresail, at which he assisted, began the work of evolving hierarchical order out of the existing episcopal chaos. The number of bishoprics was ordered to be reduced, regular dioceses were mapped out, and the metropolitan authority of Cashel was revived, on the understanding that it was to be subject to that of Armagh. But the see of Dublin was still left in subjection to Canterbury.

The man, however, to whom Ireland was most indebted at this time was Gillebert, or Gilbert, bishop of Limerick, who had been appointed legate by Pope Paschal II and who, observes St. Bernard, “was said to have been the first legate of the Apostolic See for the whole of Ireland”. Both by word of mouth and by his Writings did he labour at the work of reform. He exhorted the clergy to give up their various liturgies and to adopt the one Catholic liturgy of Rome; and he instructed them on the normal hierarchical system of the Church. He set forth the relations of priests to their bishop, of the bishop to his archbishop, and of the archbishops themselves to patriarchs in the East, or primates in the West. “But because”, he continued, “the patriarchs preside over apostolic sees, as over Jerusalem, or Antioch, or Alexandria, they ordain the archbishops, and are said in a sense to be equal to the Roman (patriarch or pontiff). However, to Peter only was it said, ‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church’. Hence the Pope alone is over the universal Church; and he ordains and judges all, and is ordained by all, because it is by the consent of the whole Church that the Romans elect him, whom we see always clad in a scarlet mantle to show he is ever ready for martyrdom”.

The Gregorian spirit of reform with which Celsus and Gilbert were inspired they handed on to one who was better and greater than either of them, *viz.*, to Malachy, bishop of Connor, one of Ireland’s greatest saints. Celsus when dying sent him his pastoral staff (1129); and when, in turn, worn out with old age and toil, Gilbert told the Pope he could be his steward no longer, Innocent in person made Malachy his successor in the legatine office; for about the year 1140 the saint, thinking that “without the authority of the Apostolic See” he could not properly perform his duties as archbishop, decided to go to Rome, he was the more moved to this that he wished to obtain for his see and for that of Cashel “the use of the pallium, which is the fullness of honor”. St. Bernard, from whom we have all these particulars, tells us how graciously he was received by Pope Innocent, who touchingly sympathized with him on the long and arduous journey he had undertaken. During the month which Malachy spent in Rome, Innocent carefully questioned him about the state of religion in Ireland, and finished by confirming its new hierarchical system. But with regard to the palliums, the Pope promised to bestow them if they were asked for by a general council of the nation. Then before the saint left Rome, the Pope placed upon his head his own mitre, and gave him the stole and maniple which he himself was wont to use at Mass, and dismissed him “encouraged with the apostolic benediction and authority”.

Before Malachy could assemble the council required by Pope Innocent, that pontiff “of happy memory”, as St. Bernard calls him, had died. But at length in 1148 Malachy summoned the synod of Holmpatrick, which not only drew up a petition for the palliums, but commissioned the saint himself to present it to the Pope. Unfortunately for Ireland, the saint died at Clairvaux on his way to Rome. But he had done much for

his country's bettermen; and, as we shall see later, Eugenius III granted the required palliums.

As materials for the *lives of the Popes* are now beginning to be very abundant, it will be no longer possible for us to narrate at length their action with regard to all the important members of the Church Catholic. In future biographies we shall have to confine our attention more and more to their general policy in connection with the Empire, and, in the matter of their more local relations, to Rome itself, and to the British Isles. If, however, it is found that an event of more than ordinary importance in any country calls for the special intervention of the Popes, it will, of course, not be left without suitable mention.

To give, however, an idea of the extent of the influence exerted by Innocent, a brief enumeration will be given here of his more important relations with persons, places, and things not noticed in the preceding chapters.

With regard to Spain, passing over grants of privilege, we will merely note Innocent's insistence on the Spanish bishops obeying the primate of Toledo, and his confirmation of the action in Spain of his legate Cardinal Guido.

To reward St. Norbert, archbishop of Magdeburg, for the support which he gave to his cause against the antipope, Innocent subjected to him (June 4, 1133) the bishops of Poland and Pomerania. No doubt, however, the Polish hierarchy objected to have their liberties sacrificed to political necessities, and the archbishop of Gnesen applied to Innocent to have the possessions of his see confirmed. The granting of this request by Innocent to Archbishop James, and subsequent independent action on the part of the Polish bishops, show that the concession to St. Norbert soon became a dead letter. In their work of reform we find Innocent's legates acting as vigorously in Poland as in England.

Conversion of Pomerania, 1122-1139

North of Poland between the Oder and the Vistula stretched Pomerania, inhabited in the twelfth century by a Slavonic people, skilled in war both on land and sea, accustomed to live on plunder, fierce and indomitable, but among themselves sociable, hospitable, and honest. However in Boleslas III, Wry-mouthed, duke of Poland, they met a master. Anxious to secure his conquests, he wished to make the Pomeranians Christian; but it was some time before anyone could be found who was willing to risk his life by preaching the faith of Christ to them. At length the task was undertaken by a Spaniard, Bernard by name. He had at Rome been consecrated bishop to replace one who had there been deposed: but, as a schism arose in his diocese in consequence, he had resigned a burden he had never wished for. He offered himself to Boleslas (*c.* 1122), desiring "either by faith to incorporate the people of Pomerania in the Catholic Church, or by the glory of martyrdom there to lay down his life for Christ". But when, in the evening of the world", he appeared among the Pomeranians, a splendour-loving people, as a poor mendicant, and told then he was a messenger of God, they laughed at the idea that the Almighty should have such a miserable envoy. They would have

nothing to do with him. They would neither listen to him, nor give him the crown of martyrdom. Not long after he had been expelled from their country, he met Otho, bishop of Bamberg. Instinctively recognizing that “the apostle of Pomerania” was before him, he bade him take up the work he had failed to do, but told him to enter the country as a prince and not as a beggar.

Otho was a man thoroughly devoted to the Papacy. Owing to schism at home, he went to Rome to be consecrated by Pope Paschal, assuring him that he had resolved to stand or fall with him, and that his one desire was to rest on his authority. Accordingly, when induced to take up Bernard’s work, “understanding”, says his biographer, “that in a household nothing is of any account which is done without the approval of the master of the house”, he realized that so serious an undertaking ought not to be commenced without the authority of the Roman Pontiff. When he had obtained the necessary permission from Pope Calixtus II, he entered Pomerania with great pomp, and showed by his distribution of gifts that he had come “rather to give of his own than to seek the goods of others”. On account of his well-known holiness, and because he came as the envoy of the Pope, he was received with great honor by the people (1124). When the good bishop returned home in the following year to attend to the affairs of his diocese, he had well laid the foundations of the faith in Pomerania. Two years later, with the blessing of Pope Honorius, he again entered the country.

This is not the place to tell all he accomplished till the hour of his death (*d.* 1139) to earn the title of “the apostle of Pomerania”. Suffice it to note here that Adalbert, the first bishop of Pomerania, was consecrated by Innocent II, who in 1140 fixed his see at Julin (Wollin), and took it under the protection of the Holy See. But, owing to the destruction of Wollin, Clement III transferred the see to Camin (February 2, 1188).

Still working among the Slavs for unity and reform, we find Innocent granting the pallium to the archbishops of Spalato, confirming the metropolitan rights of the church of Ragusa, and dispatching a legate to Moravia. Innocent commended this legate to Henry, bishop of Moravia, to whom, on condition of his faith and fitness being found satisfactory, he had previously given permission to preach Christianity to the Prussians.

SCANDINAVIA

Innocent kept in as close touch with the Scandinavians as with the Slavs, and we have a series of letters of his on the subject of obedience due from them to the archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen, to whom, in accordance with the privileges of his predecessors, he subjects all the Scandinavian bishops, including those of Iceland and Greenland. The kings of Denmark and Sweden and the bishops of the latter country are all exhorted to render canonical obedience to the archbishop of Hamburg (1133). But with the growth of national life in these various lands, it was becoming as difficult to force the bishops of one of them to obey an ecclesiastical superior in another as it was to compel the bishop of Glasgow to obey the archbishop of York. We shall soon see Nicholas Breakspear reorganizing the Scandinavian Church.

In the East we find Innocent bestowing favours on the Hospitallers and the Templars, commanding the archbishop of Tyre to recognize the patriarch of Jerusalem as his superior and to protect the Crusaders, and ordering all the Latins who had taken service with the emperor John Comnenus to leave him if he attempted to seize any places which had been captured by the soldiers of the Cross.

As guardian of the public virtue of Europe we find Innocent holding conferences with Theodoric, count of Holland, on the correction of the morals of his country, watching paternally over the more frail sex, repeating the condemnation of ordeals, working for peace, and protecting the weak or the oppressed whether in Church or State.

But Innocent had also to labour to protect his own rights and those of the Church: and so we find him impressing on the German bishops the right possessed by all of appealing to the Holy See, and nominating the archbishop of Trier to represent him throughout Germany. To guard the faith we find him condemning Abelard and Arnold of Brescia “as coiners of false doctrine”, and to encourage it, canonizing Hugh of Grenoble and Abbot Sturm. Finally, he was a faithful steward of the property of the Church. “As the Church”, he wrote, “ought not greedily to strive after what belongs to others, so she ought not by sloth or by a false complaisance to lose what is hers”.

CELESTINE II

A.D. 1143-1144

On the second day after the death of Innocent II, or, as Celestine II himself, following the Roman method of counting, says, “on the third day”, there took place the first perfectly undisturbed papal election which Rome had seen for eighty-two years. The cardinals, whether bishops, priests, deacons, or subdeacons, the clergy, and the Roman people met together in the Lateran basilica, and the cardinals, amid the acclamations of the people, and partly at their request, unanimously elected the cardinal-priest of St. Mark, Guido de Castellis, as the successor of Innocent. The new Pope took the name of Celestine, and seems to have been consecrated immediately after his election.

According to a story told over eighty years after the death of Innocent by an anonymous Cistercian monk, that Pope summoned the cardinals round his death bed. Then, reminding them of the many great evils which had resulted from the double election when he was made Pope, he urged them to avoid schism, and to choose one of the five whom he named to them. The monk does not say whether Guido was one of the five, but adds that the Pope left forty thousand marks for the defence of the Church.

It is *generally* believed that Guido was a native of Città di Castello, a little walled town pleasantly situated near the left bank of the Tiber. It stands on the site of the ancient Tifernum Tibernium, and is thought by some to have been afterwards known as the “Happy Fort, Castrum Felicitatis”. Paschal II attached to its cathedral of St. Floridus a body of canons from Lucca. At the request of one who had once belonged to the chapter of St. Floridus, *viz.*, the subject of this biography, Innocent II took the said cathedral under the apostolic protection (1141). When Guido became Pope himself, he was still mindful of the first cathedral he had served, and, according to an old and unvarying tradition of the place, presented it with a magnificent sculptured silver altar front. This splendid example of the goldsmith’s art is preserved in the Archivio of the Chapter, and displays various episodes of the life of our Lord. It is said by d’Agircourt to be the finest extant specimen of the work of the Greek school of the twelfth century.

It may have been noticed that in the preceding paragraph it was stated that Città di Castello is generally believed to have been the birthplace of Celestine II. The reason for the statement is the common, though doubtful identification of that city with Castrum Felicitatis, which is assigned by Boso as the native town of Celestine II. By the chronicler of Morigny the successor of Innocent II is called Guido *de Castellis*. Now Foglietti, the most recent writer on Celestine, has, it would appear, proved that Castrum

Felicitatis cannot be identified with Città di Castullo, but must be connected with Macerata in the March of Ancona, midway between Fermo and Osimo. He has also noted that Celestine is called de Castellis because sprung from “Castellis Maceratae”, a locality which appears in a charter (1198) in a contemporary register of the bishops of Fermo.

The chronicle of the monastery of Morigny which was visited by Guido when he was accompanying Pope Innocent II in France, assures us that he was most worthy of the Papacy, because there were combined in him three qualities which are justly regarded as of the first importance, and which had already rendered him a distinguished master in the schools (*Magister* Guido). He had nobility of birth, unflagging industry, and manifold learning. He is generally supposed to have acquired his learning at the feet of Peter Abelard, and certainly was inspired with no little love for that gifted teacher. Hence, when he was cardinal-priest of St Mark’s, St. Bernard wrote to warn him so to love Abelard as not to love his errors, reminding him that “he did not question his goodness in asking him to prefer no one to Christ in Christ’s own cause”.

Guido is said to have begun his career in Rome by being made a subdeacon and a *scriptor apostolicus* by Calixtus II. At any rate he was certainly made cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Via Lata by Honorius II (1127), and cardinal-priest of St. Mark’s by Innocent II (c. 1134), to whom he adhered from the beginning of his troubled pontificate. As cardinal of St. Mark’s he was one of those who, on behalf of Pope Innocent’s claims with regard to Monte Cassino, held a long discussion with Peter the Deacon. As a mark of his special confidence in him Innocent made him governor of Benevento, and afterwards sent him as his legate into France.

Soon after his election to the Papacy Celestine wrote to Peter the Venerable and the monks of Cluny to implore their prayers; and the insight which his letter gives us into the state of his mind on that occasion reveals at once his clear understanding and his genuine humility, and abundantly justifies the picture drawn of him by the chronicler of Morigny. While freely acknowledging his unworthiness and complete unfitness for the great dignity to which, “by some inscrutable decree of Heaven”, he had been raised, he would, he says, have been glad to decline the burden. “But, because it is not right to oppose the will of God, I accepted what the merciful hand of my King wished to do with me. However, in submitting my neck to the divine yoke, I find myself weighted with such a load that I can truly say: ‘I am bent low and humbled exceedingly’. The great number of my occupations so depresses me that my soul can scarcely ever rise to thoughts of heavenly things. I am borne down by the waves of multitudinous cases; and after the peaceful leisure which I enjoyed before I assumed this burden, I have been so buffeted by the billows of a stormy life that I can aver with truth : ‘I am come into the depth of the sea, and a tempest hath overwhelmed me’ (Ps. LXVIII). Pray therefore”, he continues, “that the God of mercy may stretch out His hand to me so that with the barque of His Church, which He has entrusted to me, I may reach the harbour of eternal rest.

To judge from a letter of Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux, to Celestine, from which we have already quoted, it would seem that his election was generally popular. According to Arnulf there was, after the death of the heroic Innocent, a widespread fear that the

powers of evil would everywhere gain victories over the Church. But, he wrote, on the news of the election of Guido de Castellis, the hopes of wicked men waned, and the good experienced a feeling of security. The previous career of the Pope and the unanimity of his election, continued Arnulf, had caused a conviction “that Rome could not have given the world a more worthy successor of so illustrious a predecessor”. Nevertheless, while professing himself but “dust and ashes”, the bishop did not bring his letter to a close without exhorting the new Pope to show himself worthy of the high hopes that had been entertained concerning him, and of the satisfaction with which the news of his election had been received.

Despite his advanced age, Celestine would appear to have given manifestations of an intention to pursue a bold policy differing in many respects from that of his predecessor. He was opposed to Innocent’s concessions to Roger of Sicily, and to his recognition of the claims of Stephen to the throne of England. This attitude of Celestine is revealed to us by John of Hexham, who regarded him as a man of a somewhat austere cast of mind. “Being a man of great age”, says the prior, “he conceived designs beyond his strength against King Roger of Sicily on account of that very country which belonged to the jurisdiction of the Pope”. Probably it was just as well for Celestine that an early death prevented him from attempting anything against the powerful Sicilian monarch. Of the embassy he sent him mention will be made in the biography of his successor.

Convinced of the justice of the claims of the house of Anjou to the English crown, Celestine was determined to support it, and made known his views by refusing to renew the legatine authority which Innocent had bestowed on Henry of Winchester, a refusal continued by Lucius II, who in other respects showed himself well disposed towards the bishop.

The most important event in the brief reign of Celestine was his reconciling Louis VII with the Church. Alberic, archbishop of Bourges, died in 1141. Seemingly with a view to securing the election of one of his courtiers, Louis VII, known as the Young, declared that, with the exception of Pierre de la Châtre, the canons might elect whomsoever they chose. The chapter, however, elected Pierre; and, as the king swore he should never be archbishop whilst he lived, the newly elected prelate went to Rome to lay his case before Pope Innocent. The king is a boy, said the Pope, and must be educated, lest he fall into bad habits. Thereupon he consecrated Pierre himself, and sent him back to France to take possession of his see (1142); for, as he truly said, that was not a free election where one of the candidates was excluded by a temporal prince. When Pierre returned to France, although all the churches obeyed him, the king would not allow him to enter his episcopal city. Thereupon Innocent struck with an interdict every place which the king of France might enter. Theobald, count of Champagne, received the fugitive archbishop into his dominions, and for some time all efforts made by St. Bernard and others to bring about an understanding completely failed. Matters were still further complicated by the fact that Ralph, seneschal of France, divorced a niece of Theobald to marry a sister of the queen. Theobald turned to Rome, and Ralph to the king. War broke out between Louis and the count with terrible results to the people of Champagne, over one thousand of them being burnt to death in a church during the siege of Vitry (January 1143). St. Bernard was greatly distressed at the

miseries produced by the war, and never ceased negotiating with all the parties concerned till his efforts were at last crowned with success. But in the meantime he sanctioned, and induced Innocent to sanction, an equivocal diplomatic ruse, which effected but a momentary peace, and brought remorse to the devoted abbot, as well as the ill-will of the Pope. But Innocent could not be moved, either by the letters of St. Bernard or by the entreaties of such of his cardinals as had been gained over by Macharius, abbot of Morigny, the special envoy of the king, to remove the interdict until Louis should recall his oath.

At length Innocent died, and various causes contributed to make Louis as well as St. Bernard and Theobald anxious for peace. All appealed to the new Pope. "That which Count Theobald asks of you", wrote the saint to Celestine, "I ask also; he is a son of peace, and we entreat you that it may be brought about by your assistance. Give us then this peace; send peace to us". Again, too, the ambassadors of Louis appeared in Rome. This time all were in earnest to win the blessings of peace, and rising up with joy in the midst of the envoys and of a crowd of nobles, at whose numbers Rome is wont to groan, Celestine raised his hand and made the sign of the cross in the direction of France, and thus absolved it from the sentence of interdict". Pierre de la Châtre received from the king the temporalities of his see, and afterwards became his close friend; while Louis is said by our chronicler, Ralph de Diceto, to have vowed to take the cross reparation for his rash vow.

"But death, who spares no one", says the oft-quoted chronicler of Morigny, "suddenly snatched from this world even this great Pope". He died on March 8, 1144, in the monastery of St. Sebastian on the Palatine and was buried in the south transept of the Lateran basilica near Honorius II.

It is with Pope Celestine that the so-called prophecies of St. Malachy begin. They first saw the light in a book, *Lignum Vitae, Ornamentum et Decus Ecclesiae*, published in 1595 by the Benedictine Arnold Wion, and are thought to have been fabricated for the election of Gregory XIV in 1590, or "about 1585, shortly after the accession of Sixtus V", when the forger set down a number of mottoes which would well apply to a number of men then living in Rome who might one day be Popes. They have continued to deceive the unwary from that day to this.

LUCIUS II

A.D. 1144-1145

Gerard Caccianemici, a native of Bologna and the son of Ursus, was for a long time a canon of St. John Lateran. He was taken thence by Honorius II, and made librarian of the Roman Church, and cardinal-priest of S. Croce in Gerusalemme. "Like a good pastor", says Boso, he not only completely renovated his basilica, and attached thereto a body of regular canons, but he also materially improved its revenue. Unfortunately, the present S. Croce does not contain any memorial of Lucius, though it appears that on the ancient ciborium there were to be seen the names of three Roman marble-workers who are known to have lived in Gerard's time. When he became Pope he did not forget his former titular church, but "on the octave of his consecration offered on its altar a copy of the Gospels, bound with plates of gold, and most beautifully adorned with precious stones and enamels". Not long after, he presented it with a superb altar-cover and with two splendidly chased silver-gilt ampullae for use at Mass. He further endowed it with the Church of St. John before the Latin Gate, and the church and hospital of St. Nicholas near the Porta Asinaria or Laterannensis.

"On account of his learning and virtue" he was still further advanced by Innocent II, who made him chancellor of the Apostolic See, and sent him on important embassies as his predecessors had done. Finally, when dying, Innocent entrusted him, "as the most important member of the Church", with the charge of its goods.

Of the details of the election which made Cardinal Gerard Pope Lucius II nothing is known. He was consecrated on Sunday, March 12, 1144, and had a pontificate, short indeed, but much troubled by the new republican faction and by illness.

One who was greatly rejoiced at the election of Lucius was King Roger of Sicily. Gerard had been his friend, and the godfather of one of his children. The king had received early notice of his accession to the Apostolic See, and astounded the legates, Cardinal Octavian and the consul Cencius Frangipane, whom Celestine had sent to him to arrange a *modus vivendi* with Rome, by informing them that their master was no more, and that his friend, the late chancellor, was reigning in his stead. As their powers expired with the death of Celestine, the two envoys returned to Rome; but they were bearers of a request to the new Pope from Roger that he would arrange an interview with him. The two met at Ceprano, on the right bank of the Liris (June).

The king and his two sons, after kissing the Pope's feet and then his lips, professed themselves his servants, and offered him some splendid presents in the shape

of golden vessels and silk altar coverings “marvellously embroidered with gold”. Then, after Mass, terms of peace were discussed. The Pope demanded back the principality of Capua, whilst Roger wished the surrender to him even of those parts of it still in the hands of the Pope.

Day after day passed and no agreement could be arrived at. Although Lucius was as well disposed towards Roger as his predecessor had been ill disposed to him the Romans remained as hostile to him as ever. Hence, through the opposition of his cardinals, Lucius could not come to any satisfactory understanding with the Sicilian king. Roger in a rage returned to Sicily, and commissioned his son Roger, duke of Apulia, to invade Campania. He did so, and ravaged the country as far as Ferentino. This no doubt had its effect on the Romans, and the Pope was enabled to make a truce at least with the Normans. They surrendered what they had captured, and withdrew (about September 1144).

When Lucius first became Pope he seems to have been successful in dealing with the Senate. By his prudence and firmness, and by the exercise of the same eloquence as had brought about the election of Lothaire, he succeeded in inducing or compelling the new senators to leave the Capitol and lay down their usurped power (*magisterium*). But, making use of his peace with Roger, as they had used the Tivoli incident under Pope Innocent, “Jordan (the son of Pierleone I, and brother of the anti-pope Anacletus), with the senators and all the lesser people, rebelled against the Pope”. The leader of the rising, Jordan, was proclaimed Patricius, and the republic was again constituted, or rather a tyranny under Jordan was established.

In his difficulties Lucius turned to the natural protector of the Church, Conrad, king of the Romans. He wrote and told him of the appointment of a Patricius “whom all obey as a prince”, and of the senators coming to him and demanding that he should yield up all his regal rights (*regalia*), both within and without the city, into the hands of their Patricius, and, like the ancient bishops, support himself on tithes and offerings (December? 1144).

When news of this second outbreak of the Romans reached St. Bernard, he was much distressed, and himself wrote a strong letter to Conrad urging him to take up the sword in the Pope’s behalf. He reminded him that God had instituted kings and priests for their mutual support. “May my soul never come into the counsel of those who say that either the peace and liberty of the churches is injurious to the Empire, or that the prosperity and exaltation of the Empire are harmful to the churches. For God, the Founder of both, has not joined them for destruction, but for edification. Is not (then) Rome at once the Apostolic See and the capital of the Empire? It is well known that to guard his own crown and to defend the Church are in the charge of Cesar ... The haughtiness and arrogance of the Romans are greater than their courage ... This accursed and turbulent people, which knows not how to measure its strength, has in its folly had the audacity to attempt this great sacrilege”.

Whilst awaiting Conrad’s reply, Lucius seems to have formed a party among the aristocracy, and to have trusted especially to the Frangipani, to whom he handed over as a fortress the Circus Maximus (January 31, 1145). With its Turrus Cartularia and castellated arch of Titus on the one side, and its fortified Circus on the other, this

powerful family had complete control of the southern portion of the Palatine. The whole neighborhood of the Forum soon resounded with the clang of arms, and Lucius had to write to say that the great disturbances in the city prevented him from going to St. Saba's on the Aventine to ordain its abbot (January 20, 1145).

The Pope himself would appear to have been in the very midst of these disturbances. He led an attack on the Capitol, but was beaten off by Jordan, and, according to Godfrey of Viterbo, was grievously wounded by some great stones which caused or accelerated his death. However, of this wounding, which Godfrey mentions as a report, the local writers say nothing; and it seems more likely that the improvement in his health, to which on September 22, 1144. Lucius looked forward, did not take place. He died at St. Gregory's on the Clivus Scauri, where he would be under the protection of the neighboring fortresses of the Frangipani, before he had been Pope for twelve months (February 15, 1145). He was buried with due solemnity in the Lateran basilica in the circular portico behind the apse. For this Pope the illustrious abbot, Peter the Venerable, declared that he had more affection than for any of his predecessors, and that this affection was engendered not merely by the Pope's kindness towards himself, but still more by the great piety which he perceived in his heart.

ENGLAND

During his short reign Lucius had much intercourse with England. Not only did he give a number of privileges to bishops, to monasteries, and to churches, and exempt the monastery of St. Edmund from all subjection even to the secular authority, but, "on the business of the Church", sent a legate into England. The papal legate was Igmarius (Hicmar), and he was commissioned among other things to investigate the claims of Bernard, bishop of St. David's, to metropolitanical authority, and to take the pallium to William, archbishop of York.

Bernard, who is praised by the Welsh chronicles for his "extreme exertions upon sea and land towards procuring for the church of Menevia its ancient liberty", addressed a letter to Innocent, the supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church asking that "gracious judge" to grant his church the pallium. He renewed his petition to Pope Lucius, who replied that he had carefully examined the letters he had sent to the Apostolic See, but had decided that the case should be examined on the spot by his legate. There is no record that Igmarius made any inquiry into the claims of Bernard, and although the Church of St. David's continued to appeal to Rome for the pallium, the opposition of Canterbury was always strong enough to defeat its attempts.

From John of Hexham it would appear that Igmarius did not reach England till 1146, and that, as Archbishop William, "through carelessness, being engaged in other affairs of less moment, as was customary with him, delayed to meet him", Igmarius returned to Rome without giving him the pallium. He had found that there was a suspicion that William had been elected by undue influence of the court, and that consequently all those who were anxious for a reform were opposed to him. Among these the chief was Henry Murdac, abbot of Fountains, who, according to the

historian of Hexham, relied on his favour with the Pope. When in 1147 Eugenius III deposed William, he consecrated Henry in his stead.

Whilst the Roman people were striving to lower the dignity of the Pope by depriving him of authority in his own city, he was being made the suzerain of cities and of kingdoms, and property belonging to the Church was being freely restored to him.

PORTUGAL

Guido, a cardinal deacon, and his brother Ubaldino, anxious to withdraw their portion of the town of Montalto on the Arno, in the diocese of Lucca, from the devastating war then going on between that city and Pisa, made it over to the Pope (March 18, 1144), and, under a penalty of ten pounds of gold, agreed to defend it for him against all comers. Their territories were then returned to them as a fief. The same also was done with the kingdom of Portugal.

Count Henry of Besançon, one of the Burgundian nobles who had come to aid Alfonso VII of Castile and Leon, el Emperador, in his wars against the Moors, had been made by him governor of Portugal. On the death of Alfonso (1109), Henry styled himself “by God’s grace, Count and Lord of all Portugal”, and his son Alfonso Henriquez, after his great victory over the Moors at Ourique (1139), was saluted as king by his people. To strengthen his independence of the crown of Castile and Leon, Henriquez had turned to the Holy See, and had already done homage to Innocent II. Addressing Lucius, “Adefonsus, by the grace of God king of Portugal”, tells him that he had already done homage to his Lord and Father Innocent II, and had offered him his territory on condition that, whilst he and his successors were to pay yearly four ounces of gold to Blessed Peter, he, “as the special soldier or vassal (*miles*) of Blessed Peter and the Roman Pontiff”, and his successors were to have “the defence and support (*solatium*) of the Apostolic See”, so that he should never be compelled to acknowledge any ecclesiastical or secular superior save only the Apostolic See or its legate *a latere* (December 13, 1142).

“The Papacy”, says an historian of Portugal, “in the words of an eloquent writer, was a kind of tribunal of dictatorship, since its action, falling immediately over the ferocious and brutal rulers of Europe, exercised its power to protect the weak and helpless. The religious influence of the Pontificate at an epoch principally characterized by the association of a lively faith and laxity of customs, became a powerful balance to render vacillating the firmest throne, but at the same time it was a firm column against which the weakest might lean. ... At times (sovereigns) repelled the idea that the Pope should be the dispenser of crowns, but the very ones who in some juncture refused the supreme jurisdiction of the Church, were the most forward to acknowledge and invoke its aid when urged by necessity or ambitious motives”.

In acknowledging the feudal homage of Alfonso Henriquez (May 1, 1144), Lucius did not go quite as far as the new ruler had hoped. The Pope praises his act, excuses him, owing to his struggles with the infidel, from the obligation of coming to Rome and in person offering his homage to the Pope, and receives him among the heirs of the

Prince of the Apostles, so that he may remain under his protection. But he did not acknowledge his kingly title; he saluted him merely as “Dux Portugallensis”.

Nevertheless, the homage of the Portuguese Crown having been accepted by the Apostolic See, the last vestiges of its dependence in relation to Leon altogether disappeared. But, as vassal to the Prince of the Church, it was due to the Pope to confirm the royal dignity. After much negotiation this was done by Alexander III.

While Lucius was receiving fresh rights of overlordship which had never before been held by the Papacy, he also received back some which had been taken from them. From the days when the prefect Peter, the son of John Michinus, “first held Corneto”, the rights and property of the Holy See in that city were usurped. Accordingly, on November 20, 1144, the consuls and people of Corneto, by formal deed, voluntarily restored all that had been taken from the Roman Church.

Almost at the very time too when in Rome Lucius himself stood much in need of help, his protection was sought in that very city. Humbert of Pringins (a castle situated above Lake Geneva, near Nyon), came to Rome, did homage to the Pope for his estates, paying in sign thereof the ordinary annual tax of a golden byzant, and received them back as a fief of the Holy See.

Another who had recourse to Rome, which Peter the Venerable called “the well-known refuge of all”, was the church of Liège (*Ecclesia Leodiensis*). Its letter to Lucius begins thus: “As we believe, and as facts show, divine wisdom has set the see of Rome in the citadel of the Catholic Church, that, by its foresight, protection may be found for all, and that those whom the battle of life threatens with destruction may have a haven of refuge”. The writers proceed to say that they wish to bring before Lucius, who has the care of all the churches, the doctrines of certain men who have newly appeared among them, and who are leading the minds of simple people into error, in order that he may suppress them. They tell the Pope that the errors of which they complain arose in France in a place which they call Monte Guimari, viz., Montwimer, near Chalons, in Champagne. The people, they continue, would have burnt the heretics, but they have saved most of them, and are sending him one of them who has abjured the heresy, and given them information about the sect which he has renounced.

It proved to be one of those infamous sects which were not content with denying the efficacy of the sacraments, or the lawfulness of ever taking an oath, or with asserting that the Catholic Church was to be found only among themselves, but went to the outrageous length of condemning matrimony, and of hypocritically receiving the sacraments of the Church in order to hide their doings.

The aforesaid letter finished by informing the Pope that the heretics who had been rescued from the angry populace had been placed in various religious houses, and he was asked what should be done in their regard. It also added that “all the cities of the Gallic kingdom and of ours are to a great extent infected with the poison of this error”.

This communication from the church of Liège is only one of many documents of this period which show that in various parts of France, and in the northern provinces of the Empire, there were sectaries who were trying in secret to spread doctrines which were closely akin to Manichaeism, and which were in practice very adverse to

morality. Proceedings had been instituted against similar heresies in the eleventh century, but they had either not been rooted out, or they had been reintroduced into Europe from the East or from Africa. On this occasion certainly, though the eloquence of St. Bernard was enlisted against them, these unholy doctrines were not stamped out, and we shall soon see what evil fruit they brought forth in Languedoc, and what bloodshed was caused by the attempt, perhaps necessary, to crush them out by force.

Whether the important letter which we have just analyzed ever reached Lucius is not known. If it did, his short and disturbed pontificate prevented him from attending to it; for, as we have seen, though “by his affability and humility he was worthy of his office”, he did not occupy it twelve months.

BLESSED EUGENIUS III

A.D. 1145-1153

EMPERORS AND KINGS OF THE ROMANS

Conrad III, 1138-1152

Frederick I Barbarossa, 1152-1190

EASTERN EMPERORS

Manuel I (Comnenus)

KINGS OF ENGLAND

Stephen, 1135-1154

KINGS OF FRANCE

Louis VII, the Young, 1137-1180

CHAPTER I

EUGENIUS III HIS EARLY YEARS, AND HIS RELATIONS AS POPE WITH ROME DOWN TO HIS DEATH IN 1153. ARNOLD OF BRESCIA. 'DE CONSIDERATIONE'

The heir of the spiritual authority of Lucius II, as well as of his local difficulties and troubles, was Bernard Paganelli, whose father was lord of Montemagno, not far from Camajore, in the territory of Lucca. The noble birth of Eugenius has been called in question on account of the way in which St. Bernard speaks of his lowliness. But the saint seems only to refer to his having been, as a monk, "of low estate in the house of the Lord" when he was called to the supreme pontificate, and himself appears to hint that he was, as far as the world is concerned, of good family. A gloss on the chronicle of Otto of Frising points in the same direction, and Bertini, from later but no doubt reliable sources, has satisfactorily proved what has just been stated regarding the family of Eugenius.

Of whatever rank in life were the parents of the future Pope Eugenius III, it is certain that he occupied the important ecclesiastical position of *vicedominus* of the church of Pisa, and that, “despising for the sake of Christ all that the world had to offer”, he became a monk of Clairvaux. When Innocent II began his work for the moral and material improvement of Rome, he begged St. Bernard to send him some monks to take possession of the restored monastery of St. Anastasius “apud Aquas-Salvias”. In charge of the brethren thereupon sent by St. Bernard came Bernard, the future Pope. Under his careful guidance the monastery flourished exceedingly, and, as the native Italians flocked to it, Bernard was soon in command of a large community. The good he was doing reached the ears of St. Bernard, who wrote to tell the monks how much he longed to see them, and what joy it gave him “to receive the good report concerning you which has come to me from my very dear brother and co-abbot, the venerable Bernard, your abbot. I congratulate you much on the satisfaction which is given to him by your love for the discipline and rule of the Order”. And how severe the spirit of that discipline may be estimated from what the saint goes on to say. The neighborhood in which this monastery stands is most malarious, and it is only comparatively recently that, by planting the eucalyptus tree all round their buildings, the monks have been able to live in them. Evidently, even in the days of St. Bernard, it was fever-stricken, and his poor monks, a prey to malaria, seem to have been not unnaturally wishful to have frequent recourse to medical advice and treatment. “But”, continues St. Bernard in his letter to them, “there is one thing, indeed, which your venerable father asks me about, which I can in nowise approve. ... I know, indeed, that the district in which you live is unhealthy, and that many of you labour under infirmities. I sympathise, therefore, really and truly with your infirmities of body; but what is much more to be feared and avoided is infirmity of soul. And it is not only not agreement with your vow as religious to have recourse to medicines for the body, but it is really not conducive to health. It is certainly permitted to poor religious to make use sometimes of simples of little value, and this is frequently done. But to purchase drugs, to call in mediciners, and to take their potions and remedies, this is neither becoming to the rigour of our vow, nor befits the honor and purity of our Order”.

St. Bernard had originally decided to send his namesake into Italy at the request not of Pope Innocent, but of Atenulf, abbot of Farfa. Innocent, however, as we have seen, prevailed upon the saint to put his monks under his control. But the Pope had seemingly no place ready to receive them, and, as we can judge from a letter which the new abbot, though he was “but dust and ashes”, addressed to him “in the bitterness of his soul”, they had at first much to suffer from want of resources. Bernard felt very keenly his separation from his saintly spiritual father, whose sweet company imparted such joy to his monks. “As often as I recall that day of misery and calamity on which I was torn from your consoling bosom”, he wrote to St. Bernard, “I am more inclined to weep than to write anything. ... Woe is me! I have lost sight of the pattern on which I tried to fashion myself, the mirror of what I ought to be, the light of my eyes! No longer does that sweet voice sound in my ears, nor that kindly and pleasant face which used to blush at my faults appear before my eyes. Why did you set me as a leader and teacher of others, and a chief over your people? Was it my career in the world? But that was foul. Was it my life in the cloister? But that was lukewarm and backward”. Such was the lowly monk who was to be elected to rule the Church of God.

On the death of Pope Lucius, the cardinal-bishops and priests betook themselves to the monastery of St. Caesarus *in Palatio*, in order that they might be under the protection of the Frangipani. “Fearing the senators and the Roman people”, they would appear to have proceeded expeditiously with the work of electing a new Pope; and, to the surprise of all, unanimously elected Bernard, abbot of St. Anastasius. When Abbot Bernard, who took the name of Eugenius, wrote that he was elected against his will, there was as little reason to doubt his assertion as when he wrote that his election came to him as a complete surprise.

Quite as much surprised was his former spiritual father St. Bernard, and, full of that rather incredulous astonishment which men always feel when one whom they have instructed and guided is suddenly placed over them, he manifested his feelings very plainly to all the cardinals and bishops of the curia. “May God forgive you what you have done”, he wrote. ...”You have again involved in cares and thrown amongst crowds a man who had fled from both ... Did he leave Pisa only that he should be taken to Rome? Did he who shrank from being the second in command in one church, require the supreme command over the whole Church? ... Was there no wise and experienced man amongst you more fitted for such things? It certainly seems absurd that a man humble and ragged should be taken to preside over kings, to rule bishops, to dispose of kingdoms and empires. Is it ridiculous or miraculous?” He knew, indeed, that God sometimes calls the lowly to rule, as he called David. “But I fear for my son”, he continued, “who is of a delicate nature... It is to be feared that he will not execute the offices of his apostleship with the dignity that is fitting”. The saint concluded by exhorting the cardinals to help Eugenius to bear the crushing load they had placed upon him.

Soon after he wrote to Eugenius himself, “to my lord. For I dare not call you any longer my son ... If you will let me say so, I begot you in one sense through the Gospel. What, then, is my hope and joy, and crown of rejoicing? Is it not you before God? A wise son is the glory of his father (Prov. X. 1). But henceforward you will not be called a son; ... my son Bernard has been promoted to my Father Eugenius ... If Christ has sent you”, continued the saint with holy liberty, “you will feel that you have come not to be ministered unto, but to minister; and to minister not only of your substance, but of your life itself... Therefore, having such confidence in you as she seems to have had for a long time in none of your predecessors, the whole assembly of the saints everywhere rejoices ... I rejoiced (too), but in the very moment of my rejoicing fear and trembling came upon me ... I look at the height of your dignity, and I see the mouth of the abyss that lies beneath you.... The place where you are standing is the place of the Prince of the Apostles ... It is the place of him whom the Lord made lord of his house ... And if you should turn aside from the way of the Lord, recollect that he was buried in the same place that he may be for a testimony against you ... Who will grant me to see, before I die, the Church of God as in the days of old when the Apostles let down their nets for a draught, not of silver and gold, but of souls”. In conclusion, Bernard would have the Pope think of death in all that he does, and, from the short reigns of his predecessors, realize the short space in which he has to rule.

Eugenius did not wait to receive letters of congratulation from his former spiritual father before he sent him expressions of his goodwill and his apostolic benediction.

“When I heard this”, replied the saint, “my spirit lived again, and, giving thanks to God, I fell prone upon my face, and I and your brethren rendered homage to you upon the earth”.

In the midst of the general satisfaction caused by the elevation of the saintly abbot to the headship of the Church, many seemed to have shared the misgivings entertained by St. Bernard. They wondered whether a ragged rustic straight from the plough, as St. Bernard described his disciple, was, after all, a suitable person to place on the throne of Peter. But we are assured by the same writer who tells us of these doubtings that God bestowed upon him such wisdom, eloquence, generosity, love of justice, and elegance of manners, that his deeds and reputation surpassed those of many of his predecessors.

Meanwhile, over the coarse garment which Eugenius continued to wear to the end of his life, were placed the robes of flowered silk, and of cloth of gold adorned with gems, and the red cope which were at this time the insignia of the Pope. Then mounting on a white horse, and with the *flabelli* or great fans of peacocks’ feathers waving over his head, surrounded by soldiers and attendants who made a way for him through the crowd, the new Pontiff went to take possession of the Lateran. With his enthronization there the peaceful portion of his election came to an abrupt termination. His prompt election had somewhat disconcerted the new senators, but they now hastened to make it known that they would dispute his election unless he confirmed their usurped authority. Seeing that opposition to them was hopeless, Eugenius left the city, by night (February 17), and with a few followers betook himself to Monticelli in the Sabina.

Thence, with the cardinals who had fled from Rome to join him, he went to the monastery at Farfa, where he was duly consecrated (February 18). Then by way of Narni, Orte, and Civita Castellana, he went to Viterbo, where he celebrated the feast of Easter, and remained for some eight months.

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH AND ROME

Whilst staying at Viterbo, and whilst the historian bishop, Otto of Frising, who tells us of the incident, was at his court, Eugenius received a remarkable deputation of Armenians. In this century, as indeed in most others, the Armenians were in a woeful condition. Whilst a fragment of them were forming a new kingdom in Cilicia, their ancient country was for the most part in the hands of the Seljukian Turks. What political misery was spared them by these barbarians was inflicted upon them by the Byzantines and by their own internal dissensions. To add to their troubles, they were torn by religious differences and by schisms. Since the council of Chalcedon (451) they had separated themselves from the Greek Church; and, rightly or wrongly, had become suspected of being monophysites. At any rate, unceasing efforts were made by the Byzantines to subject them to their rule, both in the political and in the spiritual order. But the Armenians began at length again to turn to Rome.

“In the beginning of the patriarchate of Gregory II (Vecaiaser or Martyrophilus) ... a new age dawned on the Armenian Church”. He strove by every means in his power to draw closer the bonds of union with Rome, and entered into communication with St.

Gregory VII. Though that great Pontiff wrote to him in order to learn whether when saying Mass the Armenians mixed a little water with the wine, whether they made the chrism from butter and not from balsam, and whether they honored Dioscorus, who had been condemned by the council of Chalcedon, he would appear to have been convinced of his orthodoxy, and to have sent him the pallium. The union with Rome thus commenced by Gregory II was strengthened by his immediate successors, and lasted for several centuries.

If Gregory VII could write with truth in 1074 that almost all the Armenians have fallen away from the faith, he could also write with truth that almost all the Easterns are waiting for the faith of Peter to decide between their various opinions. As we have just seen, he found by his own experience that such was actually the fact in the case of the Armenians themselves; and Eugenius III also was to find it out in the case of the same long-suffering people. An embassy was sent to him by the second successor of the patriarch, or Catholicus, Gregory II, *viz.*, by Gregory III, Pahlavuni (1113-1167), who had himself been present at the council of Jerusalem (April 21, 1142) presided over by Alberic, cardinal-bishop of Ostia, and had promised that certain matters in which the Armenians differed from the Latins should be amended. After a toilsome journey of a year and six months, the deputies reached Viterbo, and were received by the Pope in the presence of Otto and many others in the *Old Hall*. After they had in the name of their church offered full submission to the Pope, they told him that they differed from the Greeks in certain particulars with regard to the sacrifice of the Mass and other points. They neither used fermented bread¹ nor did they mix water with the wine like the Greeks, and they kept the feast of Christmas on the same day as the feast of the Epiphany. They were anxious for the decision of the Roman Church on these matters, and wanted to be instructed in the Roman ritual of the Mass.

For this purpose the Pope bade the Armenians assist at his Mass, and carefully to observe all that was done. This they did; and one of them, who was a bishop, afterwards declared before the whole papal court (*in plena curia*) that during one of the Pope's Masses he had seen two doves hovering over his head in the midst of a halo of light (November 18, 1145). Recognizing this as miraculous, the bishop felt himself more than ever drawn towards the Roman Church.

As we learn from the acts of the important council of Sis (1307), in lesser Armenia, Eugenius gave a letter for the Catholicus Gregory to the Armenian deputies in which he explained the points of Catholic doctrine on which their people needed enlightenment. Though this letter appears to be now lost, it was evidently carefully preserved as a guide in doctrine by the Armenian Church from the twelfth century to the fourteenth.

This official recognition of the supremacy of the See of Peter on the part of the Armenian Church, witnessed by Otto of Frising, has been renewed at regular intervals ever since. And, despite the fact that, since the council of Chalcedon, a very large number of the Armenians has always remained bitterly opposed to their brethren united with Rome, many of the greatest lights of the Armenian Church have followed the example of the Catholicus, St. Nerses, Clajensis (1167-1172), the brother and successor

of Gregory III, and proclaimed “the Roman Pontiff the first of all the archbishops and the successor of the Apostle Peter”.

Another interesting person whom Otto met on this same occasion was the Syrian bishop of the sea-coast town of Gabala. He had come to Europe on public and private business. He had come to seek help for the Holy Land from the kings of France and of the Romans, and to appeal to the Pope against his metropolitan, the patriarch of Antioch, and against the mother of the prince of Antioch. They had denied him that share of the booty taken from the Saracens which, in accordance with ancient custom, he maintained was his due. As he had been the chief means of securing the dependence of Antioch on the see of Rome, he fully expected that the Pope would see that he received his tithes. Whether his expectations were realized or not, Otto does not inform us. This bishop was also the first who brought to Europe an authentic notice of Prester John (Presbyter Johannes), about whom something will be said under the pontificate of Alexander III.

To keep together the notices about envoys from the East who were accredited to Eugenius, we may here mention an embassy which the Greek emperor Manuel sent to him in 1148. The chief of the embassy was a learned and eloquent bishop whose name is not given. What was the direct object of his mission is not stated; but it may have been concerned with the question of reunion between the two churches, or with the misconduct of the Greeks in connection with the second crusade, or with the promise made by Conrad to give Italy as a dower to the Empress Irene. Whatever may have been the immediate purpose of the bishop’s mission, he at any rate spent a great deal of time in discussing those points of doctrine and practice regarding which the Greeks differed from the Latins, especially the subjects of the procession of the Holy Ghost and the azymus.

The writer on whom we are dependent for this item of information was Anselm, bishop of Havelberg, in Prussia. He visited Eugenius at Tusculum in the March of 1149, and was told by him of the recent visit of the Greek bishop. No doubt the conversation between them turned on the Greek question, because Anselm had himself been an ambassador at Constantinople. He had been sent thither by the Emperor Lothaire to the Emperor Kalojoannes, as he calls him, *i.e.*, to John II, Comnenus (1118-1143). Whatever was the precise object of his embassy, it caused him to make some little stay in the imperial city (1135-1136), and he also spent no little time in holding conferences both in public and private, and before both Greeks and Latins, on the religious questions which divided the two peoples.

Of his public disputations the most important were two which he held with Nicetas, or Nechites as he calls him, whom he describes as the most learned archbishop of Nicomedia, and as the chief of the twelve professors (*didascalus*) who regulate the studies of the liberal arts and the Holy Scriptures, and take precedence over the other learned men, and whose decision on the questions referred to them is final.

Nicetas was evidently the president of a body somewhat akin to the French Academy. The first discussion between them took place in the Pisan quarter near the famous Justinian Church of St. Irene. This church, which has never been converted into a mosque, is still the nearest to the Seraglio Point, and was separated by the old city

wall from the still more famous Church of St. Sophia, in the apse of which the second disputation between the two bishops was held. The discussion caused a great sensation in the city. The emperor, who was a keen inquirer into matters religious, and the patriarch Nicholas were interested in it, and it was very numerously attended, among others by three learned Westerns, who were thoroughly skilled in both Greek and Latin. One of the three, an Italian, Moses by name, who was most highly esteemed by both parties, was elected as interpreter. The presence of Silentarii was a guarantee of order during the disputation, and that of notaries secured that the arguments used should not be lost to posterity.

If no great good came from the discussion, it was at any rate conducted with the greatest courtesy, and with no little skill. Certainly the views of Nicetas on the religious positions of Rome and Constantinople were neither so crude nor so brusquely expressed as were those of his contemporary the princess-historian, Anna Comnena (*d.* 1148), whose ideas no doubt represent those of the average well-informed person of the imperial city. "The Latins", wrote this strong-minded lady, "both say and believe that (the Pope) is the first of the patriarchs, and that he is set over the whole world. This is part of their insolence; for when the imperium was transferred to our royal city, there was transferred also, along with the Senate and the whole civil administration, the whole ecclesiastical regime. And the divine emperors gave the primacy to the throne of Constantinople, and the council of Chalcedon especially raised that throne to the highest elevation, and subjected to it all the dioceses of the world".

The chief matters on which the two churches were at variance were closely debated, but Anselm laid most stress on the effective primacy of the Roman Pontiff, to which, he said, we must submit "not only with true humility but also from necessity of salvation". He pointed out that the Roman Church was so specially founded on a firm rock that it might never be shaken by any wind of heretical doctrine; that the Roman pontiffs are the head of the Church on earth; and that the primacy of the Roman Church is that of a monarchy, and not that of the first of a triumvirate (Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria), as his adversary was prepared to admit.

Nicetas, on the other hand, contended that, while the Greeks did not "differ in faith from the Roman Church", they could not be expected to accept the decisions of councils over which the Pope presided, but at which they had not been present. Moreover, the Roman Church, "to which we do not deny the primacy of honour", going out of its province, split up the empire (*monarchiam*), and by so doing divided the churches of the East and West. "With you", concluded the Greek, "do I venerate the Roman Church, but with you I do not follow it in everything". The debate, however, came to a most amicable conclusion by both desiring the summoning of a general council by the Pope, so that "both Greeks and Latins might be made one people under one Lord Jesus Christ, having one faith, one baptism, and one ritual".

When Eugenius heard of this important discussion which the bishop had held, he commanded him to put it down in Writing, and Anselm's *Dialogues*, addressed to the Pope, is the combined result of this order, "which", he says, "he dared not disobey", and of what he could recollect of the whole affair. No doubt it was in connection with these

Greek disputations that Eugenius caused to be made that translation of St. John Damascene's work (*De fide orthodoxa*), to which attention has already been called.

Meanwhile in Rome the new regime, which was much more of a *tyranny* than a republic, was demonstrating by its deeds of what stuff it was made. Under the *Patricius* Jordan Pierleone the wildest excesses were indulged in. The prefectship was abolished, and all the nobility were called upon to submit to the *Patricius*. The fortified dwellings of such of them as refused submission were sacked and levelled to the ground, as were the splendid palaces of the cardinals and the houses of the clergy. Not content with this, "the Roman people" fortified St. Peter's, maltreated and plundered the pilgrims, and in some cases even put to death those who would not surrender their property to them. The licentious conduct in which they indulged in the city they repeated in its neighborhood.

Finding that his own mild words and paternal admonition were as little able to influence the rioters as those of St. Bernard, and as the excommunication of Jordan, Eugenius drew the sword. With the aid of the people of Tivoli and of his friends within the city, he put such pressure on the senators that they were glad to receive him into their midst. Accordingly, in the last month of the year (December 19 or 20, 1145) he was received by the people on his entry into Rome with every demonstration of joy. They kissed his feet and his face, they strewed branches of trees in his way, and they sang: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord". The Roman militia with their banners marched before him, while the notaries and the civil authorities walked behind him. The Jews too took part in the general rejoicing, "carrying a copy of the Pentateuch on their shoulders".

The conditions on which Eugenius had returned to the city were these: the office of *Patricius* was to be abolished, and that of prefect restored, and the senators were to hold their power of the Pope. But the troubles of Eugenius were only beginning. The Romans' jealousy of the Tivolese revived when they reflected that it was largely through their action that they had had to come to terms with the Pope. They accordingly ceaselessly urged the Pope to lead them against Tivoli. This, of course, he refused to do; but, to escape their importunities, he had to abandon the Lateran, and weary, as he said, of his life, to retire to the Trastevere (1146), which was not included in the commune of Rome.

THE ROMAN SENATE

From this date (1145) till the middle of the thirteenth century, at least, the principal feature of the new commune was the Senate, which had its seat on the Capitol, and in which were vested the different functions of a state, the legislative, executive, and judicial powers, the right of declaring war or peace, and the power of coining money. At any rate such were the powers gradually claimed and often exercised by the senators. Its decisions and decrees, however, had to be ratified by the consent of the people, summoned to the Capitol by the sound of bell and trumpet. If the senators were in need of special enlightenment on any subject, they sought for advice from

the *consilium urbis*. This deliberative assembly sat in the Church of S. Maria in Ara Coeli, and was composed of the more important men in the city, who were convoked in such numbers as the gravity of the case to be submitted to them required.

During the first half century of their existence the number of the senators varied. As a rule there were rather over fifty; and they were elected annually by the people, seemingly in the month of November. But in the last decade of the twelfth century their number was occasionally reduced to one or two, and after the year 1204 the number of two was never exceeded. Whilst the Senate was composed of a comparatively large number of members, a fourth or fifth of their number formed a kind of executive council. They were the *senatores consilarii* or *senatores consiliatores*. The Senate naturally had its permanent officials, such as clerks and secretaries, of whom the chief was the chancellor or scribe of the Senate (*scriba senatus*), and, certainly in the thirteenth century, *vestararii*, *assectatores*, *justitiiarii*, *executores*, *mandatarii*, a *judex palatinus*, etc. The exact nature of the duties performed by some of these officials is not certain. But while such functionaries as the *assectatores* and *justitiiarii* were doubtless employed in putting the decrees of the Senate into execution, the *mandatarii* and the *preco* (herald) were engaged in making them known.

By the terms of the treaty which, as we have seen, Eugenius made with the Senate (1145), the senators were to receive their investiture from the Pope. On the other hand, the Pope had to give as well as to take. He had to pay the salaries of the senators and of their officials, as well as to contribute to the general expenses of the city.

From the time when the Senate first came to power they found that much of the authority which they wished to arrogate to themselves was already in the hands of the prefect. This papal official not only had control of the police, *i.e.*, was responsible for the maintenance of law and order in the city and neighborhood, but also, as the chief criminal judge, had the power of life and death. Hence, as we have seen, the first republican outbreak resulted in the abolition of the office of prefect; and the first care of Eugenius when he came to terms with the Senate was to insist on its restoration. By degrees, however, the Senate possessed itself of the rights of the prefect as of all other powers in the city. This fresh acquisition of authority seems to have been helped forward under Innocent III, when the office of prefect is said to have become hereditary in the family of the lords of Vico. Ceasing in this way to be dependent upon the Popes, they are alleged to have gone over to the party of the emperor. In any case, in their gradual acquirement of all administrative authority in the city, the Senate got possession in the thirteenth century of the powers of the prefect.

Another of the rights of the sovereign, *viz.*, that of coining money, seems to have been very promptly claimed by the senators; but when they first began to exercise that right is not clear. Certainly no coins of the Popes are known between those of Paschal II and Benedict XI, though Gregorovius is of opinion that the Popes continued to mint money after the establishment of the Senate. To judge from the treaty between Pope Clement III and the senators (1188), it appears that the Senate had really coined money before that year, as the treaty restores that right to the Pope. The various cartularies connected with the city of Rome which have been already printed, begin to mention the senatorial money in the course of the last twenty years of the twelfth century. There is

constant reference in them, both before and after that period, to the money of Pavia, and of Provins Champagne, and more occasional allusion to that of Lucca. The first time, however, that the cartularies make mention “solidorum provisinorum senatus” is in the year 1188.

ARNOLD OF BRESCIA

During this period, then, of papal history of which we are now writing, we shall see the curious phenomenon of the Popes steadily becoming more and more widely recognized not only as the religious but as the political suzerains of Europe, and at the very same time less and less influential in Rome. While abroad reverence for their position will be seen making them the arbitrators between princes and the protectors of kingdoms, at home they will be found, while struggling for their old rights over Rome, often exiles from the capital, or making concessions to their turbulent and fickle people by means of petty treaties with senators of the city.

Among the men who visited Pope Eugenius at Viterbo, and who, from one cause or another, may be called interesting, was Arnold of Brescia, a man in whose favour those spoke most loudly who came into the least contact with him. Such a man, for instance, as our countryman Walter Map, who, it would seem, was born about the time when Arnold was being condemned for heresy, and when his words were inflaming some of the worst passions of men, maintains that by birth Arnold was among the great, by his learning among the greatest, and by his religion among the very first; that he only allowed himself such food and raiment as strict necessity required; that in his teaching he sought not himself but God; and that he made himself admired and beloved by all. Another of our countrymen, however, John of Salisbury, knowing more about the revolutionary doctrines of Arnold, has limned a more exact portrait of the disturber. While agreeing with Map that Arnold was clever, learned, and eloquent, and both practised and preached contempt of the world, he assures us that it was common talk that he was seditious, and that wherever he went he always turned the people against the clergy. John might even have added further that wherever he went he also stirred up the lower clergy against the higher.

It is quite likely that in the early stages of his career Arnold may have aimed at promoting reform in a legitimate manner through the ordinary channels, and that either the difficulty or slowness of motion along those lines, or unjust persecution or both, may have gradually driven him into that reckless fanaticism which he certainly displayed in the later period of his life.

At any rate, whilst he was acting as superior of a number of canons regular at Brescia, he so excited the people against their bishop during his temporary absence in Rome, that they would scarcely receive him back again. For this and for certain heretical teachings he was condemned by Innocent II, and ordered to be banished from Italy. He then betook himself to France, became a disciple of Peter Abelard, and, after the latter had retired to Cluny, assumed the role of professor himself. Into the ears of the riff-raff of the people, who alone formed his classes, he poured abuse of the episcopacy.

He did not even spare St. Bernard, but said he was full of vainglory, and envied all those who had any reputation for learning or piety if they were not of his school. Such a man, like yon “lean and hungry Cassius”, was dangerous, and St. Bernard very wisely induced the king to expel him from France. As Innocent II, who had condemned him, was dead, Arnold returned to Italy, and with humble promises of obedience presented himself before Eugenius at Viterbo (September 1145). Unfortunately the Pope believed his promises, accepted his oaths, and imposed a penance upon him which he undertook to perform by fasting and by praying in the holy places in Rome.

No sooner, however, did he reach the city than he began, secretly at first, to spread about his anti-clerical doctrines, and soon gained a following among a people ever as ready to strike as to fawn upon their clergy. It was the manifestation of the discontent caused by Arnold’s teachings that drove Eugenius to take refuge in the Trastevere (January 1146).

As the year 1146 advanced, the position of the Pope in Rome did not improve. It was in vain that he looked for help from Conrad. To no purpose had St. Bernard urged Conrad to defend the papal authority against the rebellious Romans; to no purpose had he reminded him that Rome was at once the Apostolic See and the capital of the Empire, and that, if it was not for the good of the Church, it was certainly net to the king’s honor that he should hold in his hands a broken sceptre. He assured Conrad that victory would be his. “The haughtiness and arrogance of the Romans are greater than their courage ... Would any emperor or king, no matter how great and powerful, presume, to offer such an insult at once to the Empire and to the priesthood? But this accursed and turbulent people, which knows not how to measure its strength, or to think of its object, or to consider the issue, has in its folly had the audacity to attempt this great sacrilege”. But Conrad had Hungary and Welf, duke of Bavaria, to deal with, and could not leave Germany.

Throughout the whole of the year 1146 the subversive teachings of Arnold continued to spread. And when, in response to a request from Louis VII, Eugenius left the Trastevere to go to France in order to arrange for another crusade (January 1147), the fanatical preacher, ignoring prudence and despising his oaths, openly incited the people against the Pope and the higher clergy. He formed a sect of Puritans, who by a show of virtue and austerity of life pleased the people, and drew their chief support from pious women. Moreover, he never lost an opportunity of appealing to the people in the true spirit of a demagogue, either on the Capitoline hill or some other public place. Not only did he urge the rebuilding of the Capitol, and the restoration of the senatorial and equestrian orders on the model of antiquity, but he proclaimed that the Pope ought not to have any voice in the management of the city, and that neither clerics nor monks ought to possess any property, nor bishops hold regalia. The college of cardinals, he said, was a den of thieves, and the Pope a man of blood who was always filling his own coffers at the expense of those of others. Hence as he was not a real follower of the apostles, no obedience was to be rendered to him.

While such doctrines were being openly and freely poured into the ears of an unstable people during the time (about a year and a half) that Eugenius was absent in France, they continued to draw their practical conclusions from them. Whenever

opportunity offered, they plundered the houses of the higher clergy and of the nobility, and did not even hesitate to wound certain of the cardinals.

Not wishing to stay in France, where rumours were arriving of the failure of the second Crusade which he had so keenly advocated, Eugenius returned to Italy. Before long he made his way to Brescia, which city, glad to have got rid of its firebrand Arnold, received the Pope willingly. Thence he wrote to the Roman clergy bidding them avoid Arnold as a schismatic, and warning any of them who should, in future, venture to follow his teaching that they would be deprived of their offices and benefices. Soon after, when he reached Viterbo (December 1148), where he again took up his abode for some time, he entered into negotiations with the Romans. But they came to nothing, as the people would not give up Arnold.

As words had failed, Eugenius at length sadly resolved to try arms. Proceeding to Tusculum (April 1149), he procured help from its counts and from the Normans, and, placing these auxiliaries under the command of Cardinal Guido, surnamed Puella, harassed the Romans, at greater expense to himself than with injury to them. The Romans, however, began to be afraid of the consequences of their repeated acts of violence. The counts of Tusculum were still powerful, and the then head of the family, Ptolemy II, had married one of the Pierleoni, who were still in possession of the castle of St. Angelo, which the people had not been able to take. Eugenius, in union with these nobles and with the Normans, might soon be in a position to punish them severely for their rebellion. They accordingly formed the extraordinary resolution of appealing to Conrad, who had ingloriously returned from the second Crusade in this year (1149). They sent him letter after letter in which they asked his assistance, pretending that all they had done had been in his interests. One of these letters, which has not inaptly been described as a masterpiece of inconsequence, vanity, and ignorance, was addressed : “To the most excellent and renowned Conrad, lord of the city and the whole world, by the grace of God king of the Romans, ever Augustus, the Senate and people of Rome wish health and a happy and glorious rule over the Roman Empire”. The writers point out that in several letters they have made him acquainted with their loyalty and what they have done for the exaltation of his imperial crown, and they express their astonishment that their letters have not been answered. They tell him of the restoration of the Senate and of the crushing of most of the enemies of the Roman Empire, which they are striving to bring back under him to the condition in which it was when Constantine and Justinian, through the vigour of the Senate and the Roman people, held the whole world in their hands. However, the Pope and the sons of Pierleone, with the exception of Jordan, who is our standard-bearer, and other allies of the king of Sicily, are hindering their work for the king. Hence they would have him come without delay, and, removing all clerical obstacles, reside in the city which is the capital of the world, and rule all Italy and Germany more powerfully than any of his predecessors”. They have repaired and fortified the Milvian Bridge, so that his army could enter Rome without being in danger from the castle of St. Angelo. In fine, they inform Conrad that in return for the money which the Pope had received from the king of Sicily, he had granted that prince the use of the crozier, ring, dalmatic, mitre, and sandals, and the right of receiving only such legates in his country as he may choose to request.

According to Otto, Conrad paid no attention to these puerilities, but, on the contrary, gave a favourable hearing to the legates of the Pope.

Whilst the headquarters of Eugenius were still at Tusculum, he was visited by Louis VII on his return from the unfortunate second Crusade. On account of the great honor which Louis had shown him whilst he was in France, Eugenius gave him a most glorious reception and bestowed many splendid presents upon him (October). This visit no doubt helped the prestige of the Pope. On the other hand, the Romans were weary of the war, saw no hope of help from Conrad, and were, as usual, in want of money. They came to terms with the Pope. They agreed to take the usual oath of fidelity to him on condition of receiving a *beneficium* of five hundred pounds. The oath was to be taken by four of the people from each region who were to swear to respect the persons and property of the Church. The *regalia*, with the exception of the right to build citadels in Reiano (Riano?) and Maliano (Magliano on the Flammian Way), were to be restored, as was also the money which had been taken from the churches or the regalia, except that which had been expended on the war (1149). All the fortresses outside the walls were also to be surrendered, though special arrangements were made regarding the *munitiones S. Gregorii* (thought to be the fortress *Statuario*) and the *turris de Sclaceis* (supposed to be the Torre di Selce). Finally, the Pope, “as father and lord”, was to do all he could to promote peace between the city and the surrounding districts.

On these conditions Eugenius made another triumphant entry into his city (November 1149).

Although at this moment Arnold of Brescia does appear to have been engaged in openly opposing the papal authority in Rome, Eugenius was not altogether at ease. He realized what it meant for him that the dangerous demagogue should still be at large, and he was anxious about the attitude of Conrad. Since that prince had returned from the Holy Land, he had not sent any direct communication to Rome regarding the papal letters and envoys which he had received. It was, moreover, rumoured that, to the detriment of the Roman Church, he had formed an alliance with the Greek Emperor Manuel against Roger of Sicily, and Eugenius could not but feel that what was done against his ally would be done against himself. Though, therefore, the Pope affected not to believe the report, he was glad when he heard that no such alliance had been contracted, and that Abbot Wibald had removed from Conrad’s mind the ill-feeling against the Roman Church with which Greek bombast and insubordination had temporarily inspired him. Nor was Eugenius less glad when he received sympathetic letters from Conrad in one of which the king assured him that he was distressed at whatever was done against his venerable person, or against what belonged to the Holy Roman Church, “of which we are the defenders appointed by God”. In another letter Conrad explained that a long and serious illness, which had ensued on his return from the Crusade, had completely prevented him from attending to serious business, and till then from sending to the Pope such envoys and letters as he had wished

ABBOT WIBALD

The great ally of Eugenius at this time in the court of the German king was Wibald of Corbey, one of those remarkable Benedictine abbots who exercised during this age such enormous influence in the affairs of Europe. Wibald was to Conrad exactly what Suger was to Louis VI, and Louis VII. He was also sincerely devoted to the Papacy, and though Roger of Sicily was personally distasteful to him, he would not sanction any action against him which would be directly injurious to the Pope.

In the midst of his difficulties, therefore, Eugenius was greatly encouraged by receiving from Wibald a letter full of expressions of devotion to himself, and informing him that the capture of Welf had removed the last obstacle in the way of Conrad's coming into Italy.

But "the Rome-journey" could not be arranged in a month or two, and meanwhile the Romans—that race unaccustomed to peace, familiar with tumult; a race to this very day (it is St Bernard who is speaking) fierce and intractable, who will never submit except when they have no power to resist—these Romans again made life in the city unbearable for Eugenius. He accordingly once more left Rome (June 1150) and betook himself to the south of Italy to come to some understanding with King Roger of Sicily on ecclesiastical matters. "For the king", says John of Salisbury, "after the manner of other tyrants, had reduced the Church in his territories to slavery, not suffering freedom of election to take place anywhere, but designating those beforehand who were to be chosen, thus disposing of ecclesiastical dignities as he did of the offices of the palace". Furthermore, he would not allow papal legates to enter his kingdom unless they had been asked for by him or had previously received his permission. Still, though, like William the Conqueror, he wished to have the Church completely under his own control, he was, also like William, free from the stain of simony, and appointed only good men. Eugenius had, however, brought about a deadlock by refusing to allow the king's nominees to be consecrated. Accordingly, when Roger met the Pope near Ceprano, he undertook to allow freedom of election in the future, and not to interfere with the Pope's freedom of arranging the churches in his kingdom. He also promised to be at the service of the Apostolic See in its difficulties. But with all these concessions he could not obtain from Eugenius the confirmation of his position as king of the two Sicilies under the suzerainty of the Pope. Eugenius was too conscious of the enmity of Conrad towards Roger to commit himself to a close alliance with the Sicilian king.

Although, whilst he stayed in Campania (June 1150-December 1152), Eugenius recovered several places which had been lost to the Roman Church during some of the outbreaks of the Romans, and although his cause was publicly defended in learned disputations at Rome by Gerhoh of Reichersberg, many things went against him. Without consulting him as his suzerain as he ought to have done, Roger of Sicily associated his son William with him in the kingdom (April 5, 1151). Not unnaturally Eugenius was much annoyed at this, but the wickedness of the times, says John of Salisbury, prevented him from taking any action in the matter.

More serious was the state of affairs at Rome, in which his authority was reduced to a minimum, and in which all was confusion. Many of the people left the city, and the

reports which were spread about everywhere of the disorders within its walls prevented travellers from visiting it. This we know from a quaint description of Rome written in Arabic by Abu Hamid of Granada. When in the year 1150, as he tells us, he was within a few days' journey of Rome, to which the stories of its greatness were attracting him, he was warned by those to whom he made known his intention of visiting the city, on no account to go near it, as its nobles were waging fierce war against one another, and the great king (*i.e.*, the Pope) was unable to subdue them. This king, notes our traveller, "is called the Rahim (the Clement), which corresponds with the Moslem Caliph, and to his decisions all the Christians submit, obeying his commands". The fighting in the city, where siege was being laid to the king's palaces, was so severe that Abu was assured that the people of the different regions had made various openings in the walls in order to effect their escape. It is more than likely that the tales which were poured into the ears of the inquiring Abu were not all strictly true, but there is no doubt that they were substantially accurate.

Such being the condition of Rome, the satisfaction of Eugenius can be imagined when he received a letter from Conrad (after September 15, 1151), in which the king reaffirmed his readiness to promote the honor of the Church and of the Pope, and informed him that he had made his final arrangements for "the Italian expedition". At the same time he sent his sole communication to the Roman people. His letter was addressed to the prefect of the city (the papal official), to the consuls and the captains, and to the whole Roman people, and must have proved anything but reassuring to many of the said people. He notes that after his return from Jerusalem he had received various communications from them, and that, though their letters contained much that was impractical, he thanked their writers for the expressions of goodwill towards himself which they contained. At their invitation he was about to come to Italy in order to reward the loyal and punish the rebellious. But the rebellious were able to draw their breath in peace for a while longer. Conrad died February 15, 1152, at Bamberg, where he was collecting his forces to enter Italy in the spring.

FREDERICK BARBAROSSA

On his death-bed Conrad recommended as his successor not his very youthful son but his nephew Frederick, the young duke of Swabia. His recommendation was followed; and on March 5 there was elected as their king, and as king of the Romans, by all the German princes and by certain barons from Italy, one who has ever since retained the greatest hold on the imagination of the Germans, *viz.*, the immortal Frederick Barbarossa,—immortal, if only because popular legend supposes him to be still sitting in the midst of "the gigantic mass of the Untersberg", ready to come forth and to deliver the Fatherland in the hour of its greatest need. He was the man for the moment, the man whose person and deeds were calculated to make a lasting impression on the minds of his people.

He was the man for the moment, because he was the link between the two parties which divided Germany, between the North and the South; between the Welf and the Waiblingen. "There were", writes the uncle of Barbarossa, the episcopal historian Otto,

“in the Roman Empire two renowned families, one that of the Henries of Waiblingen (de Gueibalinga), the other that of the Welfs of Altorf. The one was wont to produce emperors, the other powerful dukes. These families, as is wont to happen among mighty men greedy of glory, were often jealous of each other, and often disturbed the peace of the state. But, as it is believed, by the will of God providing for the future peace of His people, it happened in the days of Henry V that Duke Frederick, a member of the family which begets kings, took to wife the daughter of Henry, duke of Bavaria, a scion of the other family. The offspring of this union was Frederick (Barbarossa), and, the princes regarding not only the energy and valour of the said youth, but also the fact that, as sprung from both houses, he could, like a corner-stone, bind the two families together, chose him as their king, in the hope that, by the blessing of God, an end might be put to the serious and lasting strife which the two families waged against each other for their private advantage”. By his long and close friendship with his cousin Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony, the head of the Welfs, Frederick was able, for many years at least, to keep that peace in Germany which had been expected of him.

But what impressed Barbarossa so deeply on the German mind was not so much his noble birth, which closely connected him with the great princes of Germany and with the Royal house of England, as his personal qualities and the glamour of his warlike deeds. His appearance was very prepossessing, with his elegant and well-proportioned frame, fair skin, yellow curly hair, clear and keen eyes, well-shaped nose, bright and open face, and reddish beard which caused the Italians to give him his best-known name. Nor was his character, if we are to trust his panegyrists, conspicuously inferior to the outer man. He never forgot a name nor a face. He was religious, charitable, brave, simple, chaste, attentive to business, generally honorable, and, considering the methods of waging war universally practised in his day, perhaps not to be called wantonly cruel. Fond of reading history, he found no difficulty in understanding Latin, though he did not talk it readily.

Of this their fair hero, who oft made Italy tremble from end to end, who fought against the unbelieving Moslems in his youth, and who died marching against them in his old age, the Germans have never been weary of talking. He has been to them, and to their popular history, what Richard of the Lion’s heart or Harry of Agincourt has been to the English, and to the stories they love to hear.

Unfortunately, however, his views of the imperial prerogatives, fostered by many of the new race of Italian lawyers who were imbued with ideas of Byzantine absolutism drawn from their studies of the Justinian Code, were to prove fatal to the peace of Italy and of the Church, to that peace for the sake of which alone, we are told, he waged war. So generally known was his desire to restore the ancient sway of the Roman Empire, that the kings of Spain, England, France, Denmark, Bohemia, and Hungary ever viewed his power with suspicion. So tactfully, however, did he attach them to himself, that wherever they sent envoys or letters to him they assured him that it was for him to command, and for them to obey. To show how substantial was his power, Rahewin says that he forced Manuel, the basileus of Constantinople, to sign himself not “emperor of Rome”, but “emperor of New Rome”.

Fired with the ambition of putting a curb on the world itself, it will be readily conceived how little he would be disposed to brook opposition from an Italian city that aspired to almost complete independence of the Empire, or from a Church that would not be his obsequious handmaid. Yet, though he beat fiercely, not to say savagely, against these two rocks, he was destined in the end to have to recoil hopelessly broken from before them. Those who from a distance watched all this violence against the Church and against the Milanese and their allies, and who were not under the spell of his personality, took a very different view of Frederick from his panegyrists. They simply tell us of the “many evil deeds which he wrought”, call him the head and front of the wicked, and attribute to him the evils of the schism which for eighteen years harassed the Church in the days of Alexander III.

Frederick, destined, as our chroniclers note, to be the great disturber of ecclesiastical peace, began his reign by informing Eugenius, to whom he offered filial love and the due reverence in the Lord, that he had been elected king, and intended to defend the Roman Church by carrying out what his predecessor had planned for the liberation of the Apostolic See (March 1152). Wibald, however, informed Eugenius at the same time that, against the advice of the clergy, the lay nobles, perchance from want of statesmanship, had advised the king not to undertake “the Rome-journey” at once, lest a rebellion might take place against his new authority. Besides, they had urged, it would more become his dignity if he waited till he was formally requested to come to his help by the Pope.

Eugenius lest no time in replying to Frederick’s letter, he congratulated him on his accession, and exhorted him to defend the Church, and to have a care for the widow and the orphan, and for all the people committed to his care.

Meanwhile, Arnold and his friends were not idle. One of them, Wetzel by name, wrote to congratulate Frederick on his accession to the throne, but regretted “that, owing to the advice of clerics and monks by whose teachings the sacred and the profane are confounded”, he had not sought the confirmation of Rome, the mistress of the world, the mother of emperors, by whom alone all emperors have ever reigned. He then proceeded to decry the clerical possession of temporal power; to denounce the clergy themselves, by whom Frederick’s predecessors, and till then Frederick himself, had been called to the Empire; and to stigmatize the Donation of Constantine as a fable which old women in Rome were capable of exposing. Finally, this republican exhorts Frederick to come with his lawyers and with his Justinian Code, and to proclaim that “the will of the Prince has the force of law”.

Whilst Wetzel, presumably one of Arnold’s followers, was writing in this infatuated strain, his master was distracting the city with proposals for a new constitution. Writing to Wibald (September 20, 1152), Eugenius informed him that Arnold, unknown to the great ones of the city, had banded together about two thousand men of the lower orders with whose aid it was his intention to create a hundred life senators, two consuls, and an emperor.

Frederick, however, whom the new Republic had endeavored to attract to its cause, taking no heed either of its words or of its deeds, concluded a concordat and convention with the Pope. By this document Frederick agreed not to make peace either

with the Romans or with Sicily without the consent of the Pope, but to bring the former back to the old subjection. On his side Eugenius undertook to crown Frederick as emperor and to support his authority to the best of his ability (February 1152). Both parties were, moreover, to oppose any aggressive action of the Greeks.

Meanwhile the Romans seeing that, despite all their efforts, they were making no progress with Frederick, entered into another agreement with the Pope, who made yet another triumphant entry into his capital (December 9, 1152).

No doubt the agreement into which Eugenius entered with the Romans involved a renewal of his recognition of the commune. But he found it so galling that he at once took steps to secure its undoing; and, knowing the ingrained venality of the Romans, he employed a means that has always succeeded with them. He spent money freely, and won the people over to his side. This, at least, is the statement of Romuald of Salerno, who adds that, but for his sudden death, the Pope would, with their aid, have stripped the senators of their new authority. What success Eugenius might have achieved in this direction it is impossible to say, for he died on July 8, 1153, at Tivoli, to which he had retired about the beginning of the month. With every mark of respect, and amid great demonstrations of grief, “especially on the part of the widow and of the orphan”, his body was brought back to Rome.

There, quite contrary to the usual custom, the funeral obsequies were celebrated during two days with such veneration “that one would have believed that he who in death was so honoured on earth was already reigning in heaven”. The body of the deceased Pope was buried in St. Peter’s in the oratory of Our Lady, beneath the tomb of Gregory III, and was laid to rest in a sarcophagus “made up from different stones”, taken, no doubt, from ancient classical sepulchres. It is not known whether the epitaph preserved by Alberic *Trium fontium* was really engraved on his tomb or not. The inscription¹ which praises Eugenius as the world’s glory, simply gives a brief sketch of his career and the date of his death.

VATICAN PALACE

Before his last return to Rome, Eugenius had resided for over a year at Segni. It was no doubt during that palace, period that he built the palace of which Boso speaks, but of which no trace seems now to remain. Fortunately, it is not necessary to say the same of another of his palaces; for the other one which he built has developed into the actual residence of the Popes, viz., the Vatican palace. From time to time the Popes had taken up their abode on the Vatican hill, at least from the days of the great builder, Pope Symmachus, who erected an episcopal palace there. But though the work of Eugenius was continued by Innocent III and other Pontiffs, the Vatican palace did not become the regular home of the Popes till after the return from Avignon.

The Pope whose death has just been recorded is highly praised by ancient and modern writers alike. Cardinal Hugo, who notified his death to the Cistercians, spoke of him as the glory of the Church, which he had restored to its high position, and as the father of justice. In this latter connection the most severe censors of his time, John of

Salisbury and Gerhoh of Reichersberg, are at one in asserting that he was completely free from the essentially Roman vice of avarice and most careful never to accept any present from a litigant. The former writer tells a story of a prior who had a case to bring before the Pope offering him some money, and begging him most respectfully to accept it. "What!" cried Eugenius, "you have scarcely entered the house than you try to corrupt its master". The holy Pontiff, continues John, called every gift offered whilst a suit was pending corruption.

If the verdicts of Eugenius were never influenced by gold, they were nevertheless fated to be very frequently reversed by his successors. According to our observant countryman, this was a kind of judgment on him, because he himself had not been at all slow to alter the decisions of his predecessors. John assigns as the reason of his faulty judgments his habit of following his own opinion in preference to the legal advice given him by his canonists. This he did because he was so suspicious that he hardly trusted anybody. Besides the usual cause of this habit of suspicion, viz., a certain weakness of character, there was another in the case of Eugenius. He was conscious, he used to say with a play upon words, of the weakness of his sides (*laterum suorum*), i.e., of his counsellors, of those who were *de latere suo*.

In reading John of Salisbury's all too short *Historia Pontificalis*, one cannot fail to be impressed with Eugenius's knowledge of human nature, and with the great personal influence with which his holiness endowed him. John gives two instances in which he reconciled husband and wife, bent upon divorce. Heedless of ideas of dignity, and of the fact that his mitre was rolling in the dust, he threw himself on one occasion at the feet of a count who had resolved to divorce his wife, and eloquently implored him, by the respect which he owed the Pope as his spiritual father, to lay aside all rancour against her, and with love to take her back, not so much because he was bound by the law so to do, as to show his faith, and his affection for his spouse. John, who tells us that he was a witness of this moving scene, which he recounts to the glory of God and to the great credit of the Pope, says that all present were deeply touched, and that the count, dissolved in tears, promised faithfully to obey the Pope's behests. On some of these occasions our historian assures us that Eugenius himself, though naturally of an unemotional disposition, could not refrain from tears.

Wherever there was human misery, thither turned the heart of Eugenius. When the disorders of the tenth century had begun to abate, and people had opportunities of thinking of other matters besides war, the charitable ones among them, especially holy women, began towards the close of the eleventh century to pay particular attention to the then very numerous class affected by the horrible disease of leprosy. Shunned by his associates, the leper took refuge with outlaws, who herded together, and lived in a state of filth, misery, and moral degradation terrible to recall. But at the period just named the unfortunate lepers began to be gathered together in hospitals. By this means their isolation was effected, and by the thirteenth century the ravages of leprosy, which is certainly if but slowly contagious, were much diminished. One of the first of the Popes to take an interest in the lepers was Eugenius III. Three bulls of his are known which speak of them. In one of them he decrees that a certain chapel, monastery, and cemetery shall be appropriated to their exclusive use; and in another, while taking a leper-house under his protection, he forbids tithes to be exacted from its afflicted inmates. Though

Gerhoh of Reichersberg would not have any man bold enough to pass judgment on the successors of Peter, whether they are to be seen with him flashing the sword and walking on the waters, or trembling before servants of the High Priest and in danger of shipwreck, still he himself ventures to call Eugenius another Elias, and to grieve that he does not see an Eliseus following him.

What doubtless greatly helped Eugenius to keep up a high idea of the duties and obligations of his state was his reading of a book (*De considerationi*) which St. Bernard wrote for him in 1149. One of the greatest of the Popes, St. Gregory I, had long ago written his ever-famous *Regula Pastoralis* (On the Pastoral Care) for the guidance of bishops and clergy. Now one of the holiest of the clergy ventures to write a book for the instruction of Popes, “which may edify, delight, or console”.

The gist of the little work is to impress upon the Pope that he must not allow his “accursed occupations” so to drag him at their heels that he has not time for reflection, for *consideration* of the needs of his own soul. He would have more time were it not for the number of litigants who come to him, “men full of ambition and avarice, simoniacal, sacrilegious, keepers of concubines, incestuous, all sorts of human monsters”, who come in the hope of obtaining or retaining by his apostolical authority ecclesiastical distinctions. Many of the cases brought before him ought to be left to the kings and princes of the earth, or to other persons, and the rest ought to be decided summarily without the intervention of canon-lawyers. Every effort should be made to reform the ecclesiastical bar, especially in the matter of bribery.

The Pope is reminded that he is set on high because he has been “appointed watchman over all”, but that he is placed there not so much to command as to do what the times require, to use the hoe rather than the sceptre. Beyond dispute he is “the chief of ministers”, but he should be supreme in other respects; supreme, for instance, in humility, than which “no gem in all his gorgeous attire shines with a clearer and purer light”.

Again, while acknowledging that, as Pope, he has charge of the Universal Church throughout the world, the sum of all the other churches put together, the writer reminds him that by nature he is but a man, “poor, wretched, pitiable”, and that he must examine himself to see how he does his duty. He is warned against the relaxing results of prosperity, against idleness, and against being a respecter of persons. On the other hand, he is not to aim at lording it over other men. Hence if, on account of “the singular primacy” of the Apostolic See, it is right that appeal should be made to the Pope from all over the world, he should see that the right is not abused, and should punish unjust appeals. “How long will you pretend not to notice, or will really not heed, the murmurs of the whole earth? ... How long will it be before your consideration awakes to this gigantic confusing and abusing of appeals?”

In connection with the lording it over men, the Pope is told that ecclesiastical rank is to be respected, and is then asked if he does uphold “the gradations of honor and dignity”. “Abbots are exempted from their bishops, bishops from archbishops, archbishops from patriarchs or primates. Does this look well?” The constant doing of these things may show that the Pope has the authority to do them, but not that he has a keen sense of justice.

Above all things, the Pope ought to enforce the apostolic decrees, and ought to begin by compelling those immediately around him to observe them. It ought not to be that the churches are robbed in order that largess may be scattered broadcast to satisfy the avarice of the greedy Romans. If the Pope, by spiritual means, can do no good to the Romans, he should not himself employ the material sword against them, but should leave that to the emperor, and go forth from the city. Then, concluded the saintly writer, “I think you will not regret your exile if you exchange Rome for the world”.

Next, passing from the Romans in general to those in the immediate entourage of the Pope, St. Bernard pointed out that those around the Pontiff should be chosen with the greatest care, as their acts reflected on their master. Some of them were not what they ought to be; and so the Pope is urged to look once more at the doings of those who were about his person. He should see to it that his household was a model one.

The fifth and last book of this famous work treated of “the things which are above the Pope” but which imperatively called for his deep consideration, viz., God and His angels. After thoughts have been presented by which some knowledge of God may be obtained, the treatise finished with these words: “But perhaps He is more worthily sought through prayer than through dialectics, and more easily found. With this let us end the book—but not our search for Him”.

CHAPTER II

EUGENIUS IN FRANCE. THE SECOND CRUSADE. HILDEGARD. GILBERT DE LA PORRÉE

Evil times were falling on the Latin kingdoms of Holy Land. Fulk, king of Jerusalem, died a year or two before Eugenius became Pope, viz, in November 1143 or 1144, leaving his crown to a mere youth, Baldwin III; while on the other hand a powerful Moslem ruler, Imad ed din Zanki, had arisen in the kingdom of Mosul and Aleppo. This redoubtable warrior, by his capture of Edessa (December 25, 1144), had endangered the safety of all the Latin kingdoms of Syria; for it was their bulwark, commanding, as it did, the roads from Mosul to Aleppo, and penetrating like a wedge between Moslem Syria and the emirates of Mesopotamia. Thoroughly alarmed at the fall of their rampart, which at all costs they ought to have prevented, the Syrian Latins at once sent to Europe for help. As we have seen, the bishop of Gabala came to implore the assistance of the Pope (November 1145) and other ambassadors from the East appeared in France and Germany.

Eugenius, “a man full of God”, realizing at once the gravity of the situation, wrote to Louis VII of France, and, pointing out to him that by the fall of Edessa, “called in our language Rohais (Roas)”, the Church of God and all Christendom were in peril, exhorted him and his nobles to take up arms against the infidel. He would have the king show himself another Mathathias, and, in assuming the cross, not to devote himself to

the idle and vain pomp of war, but to its solid needs. Louis himself did not require to be urged to fight the infidels. He had already made up his mind to take the cross to atone for the massacre of Vitry, and to fulfill the vow of going to Jerusalem which had been taken by his brother Philip, but which death had prevented his accomplishing. Finding, however, that his first appeal to his barons for support met with little sympathy, Louis called upon St. Bernard to proclaim the Crusade. But for a time the saint resisted both his exhortations and those of the Pope, and only yielded after the latter had issued another encyclical inviting all to take the cross in order either to free their brethren or to die for them. The initial success at any rate of the Crusade was now assured. When St. Bernard addressed the multitudes on the woody height of Vezelay (1146), he awoke an echo that did not die away till it had reverberated throughout all France, and resounded across the Rhine and the English Channel. His words were intensified by the letters which he sent in all directions, and by the miracles which he wrought as he journeyed on. And all that he did was supported by the Pope, who, prevented as he said “by the tyranny of the Romans” from preaching the Crusade, sent his letters in all directions, and special crosses to Louis and his nobles. The Crusade was everywhere taken up with the greatest enthusiasm. In France cities and castles are made empty, writes St. Bernard, and now they find with difficulty one man that seven women can lay hold of, so many widows are there everywhere, and their husbands still living. From England we are told that the flower of the English youth, all manly hearts, and the most distinguished for valour and resolution, flew with eagerness to wipe out the disgrace (of Edessa), so that it might have been supposed that England was depopulated by the emigration of pilgrims in such numbers and classes. Nor were the Germans able to resist the earnestness and eloquence of Bernard, and the letters of the Pope. King Conrad declared his intention of taking the cross, and the note of preparation for war was heard throughout all Germany.

Before leaving his country, Louis felt there was much to be done, and he accordingly pressed the Pope to come to France, in order to help him to make his final arrangements. Not unwilling to be away from the untractable Romans, Eugenius accepted the invitation, and reached Lyons in March 1147. A few days afterwards he met the king at Dijon. As soon as Louis saw the Apostolic Majesty he dismounted from his horse, and kissed the Pope’s feet as though he had met Peter the Apostle or Jesus Christ Himself. For a brief space the Pope appeared to take no notice of him, whereupon the people cried aloud: “It is the king! May your Apostolic Majesty deign to receive him, and to bid him mount his horse”. Still he rode on, though the sight of the king’s humility was moving him to tears. At length he stopped, and after greeting him in a manner “becoming both the apostolical and the royal dignity”, he thus addressed him: “My son, consider how wondrously God works in this world. Your brother Henry, the heir of a race of kings, now a monk at Clairvaux, is washing dishes, and I, who, by one of the secret dispensations of God, have been made the father of all Christians, have myself oft washed dishes also while a Cistercian monk. It was then for the greater glory of God that I delayed to greet you for a little while, so that by showing yourself, great king as you are, humble towards God’s vicar, you might receive from Him a crown of endless glory”.

After this interview with Louis, Eugenius went to Paris where he met with a splendid reception. He then celebrated Easter with great pomp in the abbey of St Denis (April 20), in the presence of a vast crowd of people. As soon as the Easter festivities were over, Eugenius devoted himself, in conjunction with Louis, to forwarding the preparations for the Crusade. In his bulls he did not confine himself to offering a plenary indulgence to the contrite who took part in the Crusade, and to taking under the protection of the Church the wives, children, and property of the Crusaders, but he issued various practical regulations for their benefit. No suit was to be instituted against a Crusader in his absence regarding any property which he was holding in peaceful possession when he took the cross; he was also exempted from the payment of usurious interest, and, to raise money for the holy war, could pledge his fief to anyone if his suzerain was unable or unwilling to advance him the required sums. Finally, he instructed the Crusaders not to consult luxury but utility in preparing for the war; not to go with dogs and hawks, fine clothes and gorgeous armour, but with horses and such arms as would make for victory. Had the spirit of the Pope's instructions in this last respect been carried out, the second Crusade might have had a very different result.

To preserve harmony among the different princes and peoples who were taking part in the Crusade, he attached two cardinals to the crusading host, and, that lasting spiritual good might follow from the expedition, he begged Conrad to strive for the reunion of the Church of Constantinople with 'the holy Roman Church. He had already written to the Byzantine emperor (Manuel Comnenus) to bespeak his goodwill towards the Crusaders. Though Manuel, in his reply, had stipulated that the soldiers of the cross should do homage to him, and had begged Eugenius to urge the offering of it in return for his help, he had shown himself very gracious to the Pope. He had expressed his astonishment that Eugenius had hitherto not sent an apocrisiarius to him to inform him of his health; had assured him that his great virtue had attracted his love and confidence; and had begged him to pray for the Empire. It was no doubt these expressions of Manuel's goodwill towards him that led Eugenius to hope that he would be favourable to an attempt at reunion. But he and his successors were to learn by bitter experience that when the Byzantine emperors wanted anything from them, they were ever ready to dangle the bait of the reunion of East and West before their eager eyes, and that they were seldom animated by any but political motives.

Though Abbot Suger, Louis's chief counsellor, was opposed to his sovereign's undertaking the Crusade, he was the one who was chosen to be the regent of the kingdom in the absence of its ruler; but it required the authority of Eugenius, into whose special custody the country was committed, to compel the reluctant abbot to accept the weighty charge. Owing to the complete confidence which existed between the great abbot and the Pope, the arrangement which made Eugenius guardian of France, and Suger its regent, worked well; for, writes the latter's biographer, "whatever Suger decreed in France was ratified at Rome, and whatever the one initiated was corroborated by the other". As a last measure of precaution, the Pope, before he left France to return to Italy, declared all such excommunicated as should dare to disturb the kingdom during the absence of its king. Under these two monks, under the Cistercian Pope and the Benedictine abbot, France flourished; and, when Louis returned from the inglorious

second Crusade, he received back from the little, feeble monk the talent of his kingdom with interest.

Meanwhile, however, the time for the departure of the French host had arrived, and Louis betook himself, according to custom, to the abbey of St. Denis to obtain the protection of the patron saint of France. The excitement of the people was intense. By turns they wept, and by turns blessed their king. After Mass the Pope presented to Louis the relics of St. Denis to be kissed, and then gave him the staff and wallet of the pilgrim, and the oriflamme or standard of St. Denis (June 10).

About the same time that, in their hundreds of thousands Crusaders left France and the Empire to fight the infidels in the Holy Land, others marched thence against the Moors in Spain, and against the heathen Slavs. Some indeed, believe it to have been the design of St. Bernard and the Pope to send forth the might of Christendom against the hordes of heathens and infidels which encircled it. However, as a matter of fact, although Eugenius did bless these efforts¹ still he would appear to have made it plain that he was more pleased that the soldiers of the Empire should fight against the Saracen than against the Slav.

Unfortunately, the failure on the part of Conrad and Louis to obtain the advice of the king of Jerusalem as to their conduct of the expedition, the jealousies of the Christian princes, and, to put the case very temperately, the unsatisfactory conduct of the Byzantines, caused the second Crusade to end in nothing. It was a lamentable failure. Conrad and Louis returned to Europe without having effected anything (1149). "Woe to our princes!" wrote St. Bernard. "In the Lord's land they did no good, and in their own, to which they returned with all speed (1149), they practise incredible mischief".

Although St. Bernard had to bear the brunt of the odium which the collapse of the Crusade brought upon its authors, he was not so disheartened as was the Pope. Eugenius was able, indeed, to console Conrad for its disasters, but not himself. The blood that had been shed was ever before his mind, and he was filled with inconsolable grief. When, therefore, word reached Europe that the principality of Antioch was in danger, although St. Bernard and Suger wished to promote another crusade, not only were the bishops of France lukewarm, but the Pope was timid. Even a strong letter from St. Bernard exhorting him "not to fall below the zeal of him (St Peter) whose place he held", failed to do more than win from him a cold assent to his designs and those of Suger (June 19, 1150). The second Crusade was dead and buried, and could not be resuscitated.

When Conrad and Louis and the hosts of Germany and France marched off to fight in the East, Eugenius did not at once return to Italy. He did not, in fact, recross the Alps till news of the failure of the Crusade began to be noised abroad. In the meantime he journeyed from place to place in France and Germany, acting not merely as Pope, but as guardian of those countries, especially of France. In his cooperation with Suger in the government of France, we find him giving instructions to the regent as to how to deal with refractory bishops. "With regard to those bishops who will not act along with you in the defence of the kingdom, send me the names of some of them, that we may not appear to be blaming the whole episcopal body. I will then take them to task, and admonish them to lend themselves to preserve the good order of the kingdom".

While in this way helping Suger to make his regency a success, the Pope did not lose sight of Germany. He not only promised his assistance to Conrad's son Henry, the young king of the Romans, and urged the bishops of the Empire to serve him loyally, but himself went to Trier (November 1147) that he might be more in touch with the course of events in Germany. He had been invited thither by its archbishop, Alberon or Adalberon, who, as we are told by his admiring biographer, Balderic, in preparation for the coming of Eugenius, built the Pope's house" of three storeys in six weeks. On Sunday, November 30, Eugenius was conducted to the cathedral in great state by the clergy and people. With Alberon on his right, and the archbishop of Cologne on his left, he was preceded by "many bishops of Germany, Belgium, France, England, Burgundy, and of every nation under the sun". The enthusiastic historian then names the cardinals "who in face, manner, gait, learning, character, and high repute were worthy of immortal fame". On Christmas day, he notes, the Pope and the cardinals rode to the cathedral on horses with white trappings, and, he adds, there was not an inch of room to spare in the great building. For twelve weeks did the archbishop entertain Eugenius and his court with the utmost liberality, and give hospitality to the crowds who came to see the Pope.

ST. HILDEGARD

Whilst thus generously entertained by the archbishop of the ancient Roman city on the Moselle, there were brought to the special notice of Eugenius the life and writings of St. Hildegard of Bingen, "fair Bingen on the Rhine". Hildegard, one of the greatest souls who ever lived in a nunnery, was another Cathetrine of Siena. She was the fearless counsellor of popes and emperors, was as learned as she was holy, and was already believed to have written works that "had come through God, and through that power of prophecy by which the prophets had anciently written". Her instructions in virtue were cast in the form of revelations, and St. Bernard, one of her correspondents, "with the consent of others, urged the Pope not to suffer so great a light to be obscured, but to confirm it by authority".

Eugenius was deeply impressed by what he heard of the holy maiden, and conceived a special affection for her. Nevertheless, in writing to her on the subject of her visions he did not fail to warn her against the dangers of pride: "We congratulate ourselves in this grace of God, and we congratulate thee, but we would have thee reminded that God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the lowly. Take good care of this grace which is within thee, in order that what thou art spiritually (in spiritu) urged to proclaim, thou mayest proclaim with caution". An extract from the lengthy reply of the abbess, "written in an admonitory tone", will serve to show the mystical nature of her writings. "The light", she says, "stays within me, and glows in my soul as it has done since my childhood.... A jewel lies on the road, a bear comes, and deeming it beautiful puts out his paw and would treasure it in his bosom (the bear is the German emperor). But suddenly an eagle snatches the jewel, wraps it in the covering of his wings, and bears it upward to the royal palace (the eagle represents the Pope, the palace the kingdom of Christ). The jewel gives out much light before the king, so that he

rejoices, and out of love of the jewel gives to the eagle golden shoes (the insignia of papal authority), and praises him for his goodness. Now do thou, who art sitting in the place of Christ, in care of the Church, choose the better part, be as the eagle overcoming the bear, that with the souls entrusted to thee thou mayest decorate the palace of the Church ... Make all things pure, and have thine eyes everywhere”.

In the course of the month of February, Eugenius began slowly to return to France, for he had summoned a council to meet at Rheims in March. On the appointed day it was duly opened by the Pope, and was attended by over four hundred bishops and abbots. Three English bishops were present with the consent of King Stephen, and without it, as we shall see later, Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury. Among the disciplinary decrees issued by the council may be noted, besides the condemnation of clerical marriage and of tournaments, the prohibition to give any manner of assistance to the heretics in Gascony or Provence, and the declaration of the nullity of the orders conferred by Pierleone and other schismatics.

The assembled bishops were also called upon to consider certain doctrines which had for their fathers a lunatic on the one hand, and a bishop of profound learning and sanctity on the other. The deranged teacher was an illiterate Breton, by name Kum (Eon, Eunus, Eudo) of the Star (de Stella). In our own country history tells how a certain Ward was able to found a sect, because the Scripture promised “Peace on earth towards men (to Ward’s men)” so Eon or Eum was able to gather a number of followers, and to disturb the peace of France, because he was sure that God had entrusted the Last Judgment to him, inasmuch as the Church prayed “per *Eum* qui venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos”. The Fathers decided that the insane creature should be entrusted to the care of the Regent, Abbot Suger.

THE DOCTRINE OF GILBERT DE LA PORRÉE

The other doctrines examined by the council were of a very different sort. They had for their author the learned teacher Gilbert de la Porrée, at this time bishop of Poitiers. An eminent philosopher, devoted to the realistic theory of universals, he enunciated certain novel teachings with regard to the Blessed Trinity. These propositions he had deduced by applying to the truths which have been revealed concerning the nature of God, theories which were highly speculative even with regard to created things. Hence he was led to maintain the separation of the Divinity from God, and to uphold various corollaries connected with that doctrine. St. Bernard, to whom the slightest breath of heresy was nauseous, was induced to take the field against him; and at the same time his theories were brought before the notice of the Pope just before he left Italy for France. Eugenius ordered both parties to present themselves before him at Easter time in Paris.

For several days the abstruse questions in debate were duly discussed before the Pope, who, says our episcopal historian, “inasmuch as he was a cautious and religious man, perceiving the difficulties of the matter, adjourned it to the general council he had summoned to meet at Rheims in the Lent of the following year (1148)”.

The points in dispute were accordingly once more thoroughly sifted at the council of Rheims, seemingly after it had been officially closed. The Pope had in the meanwhile caused the works of Bishop Gilbert to be examined and criticized by a learned Premonstratensian monk. The aid of the monk's notes enabled the Pope at last to bring the discussion to a definite issue. But in the meantime the questions in dispute were debated very hotly, and much feeling was aroused. St. Bernard, who had won over to his side the great majority of the French episcopate, carried away by his zeal, practically assumed the whole direction of the affair. This roused the indignation of the cardinals. Declaring that the saint had acted in a similar manner in dealing with Master Peter (Abelard), they showed considerable sympathy with Gilbert, and carried their complaints before the Pope. They did not hesitate to accuse him of preferring his private affection for Citeaux to the general utility of the Church. Your abbot, they said, and these Gauls have in our presence been assuming the prerogatives of the Roman Church, to whom alone it pertains to decide on questions regarding the faith. St. Bernard, on his side, approached the Pope, freely urged him to play the man in the case, and persuaded him to accept the propositions which his party had prepared. At the same time, to pacify the cardinals, he disclaimed any intention of wishing to define any article of faith, and declared that, as Gilbert had wished to see his doctrine written down, he had simply procured the help of the bishops to enable him to comply. The mild answer turned away wrath, and the indignation of the cardinals was soothed. But the saint's articles of belief were not accepted as a symbol of faith. "Blessed be God", bursts in Otto, "who so provided for His spouse the Church that even her greatest members might not be at variance with their head, and that so large a number of religious and discreet persons of the Gallican Church in taking some judicial authority away from the Roman Church might not be an occasion of schism"

The propositions of St Bernard, of which mention has just been made, had been drawn up to oppose the contention of Gilbert in his negative reply to the Pope's crucial question as to whether the Divinity and God were one and the same. "You have said many things, my brother", said Eugenius to Gilbert, "and you have caused things to be read which perchance have not been understood, but I wish to hear from you simply whether you believe that that supreme essence by which you profess the Three Persons exist, is the One God". To this categorical question, wearied by the discussion, Gilbert had given an equally categorical reply in the negative. But he afterwards qualified his denial, and furthermore frankly proclaimed that he wished to believe, teach, and write in the same sense as the Pope.

Eugenius at last brought the matter to a close by bidding the incriminated works of Gilbert to be read until they had been corrected. And when the bishop himself offered to correct them under the direction of the Pope, Eugenius informed him that the necessary correction would be made by others.

There were some, John of Salisbury says, who were of opinion that the bishop was not so humble and sincere as he pretended. In this criticism there was perchance but little truth : however, Gilbert used to say himself that, lest the more simple might be scandalized, he would change his words, but not the doctrine with which the Holy Spirit had inspired him. And he was in the habit of proclaiming that the propositions which

had been drawn up by St. Bernard and his coadjutors were not opposed to his teaching, if only they were understood in the right sense.

At any rate, Gilbert's reputation for orthodoxy did not suffer by his examination at Paris and at Rheims. Along with the works of Peter Lombard, his *De Sex principiis* was held in great esteem as a text-book on logic until the close of the Middle Ages.

For a few months after the close of the important council at Rheims, Eugenius went about France from one place to another. In the month of April we find him sending the Golden Rose to Alfonso VII, el Emperador, as a mark of his goodwill. It was carried, he told the king, by the popes in memory of the Passion and Resurrection of Christ, and he therefore exhorted him to let the sight of it make him more Christ-like. As we have already seen, the spreading of the news of the failure of the second Crusade made residence in France unpleasant for the Pope, and he left it in May (1148). Its collapse was attributed to him. "The Roman Church itself", wrote Pope Hadrian to King Louis a few years later, "was not a little compromised because it had given you its counsel and favour for the expedition. All cried out against it in great indignation, saying that it was the cause of the misfortune".

Unable to bear up against this storm of unjust reproach which beat upon him, Eugenius, as we have said, left France for Italy in the month of May (1148).

CHAPTER III

ENGLAND, IRELAND, AND SCOTLAND, ETC.

On the petition of Theobald, Celestine II had taken away from the bishop of Winchester, and had bestowed on the archbishop, the legatine authority in England which had been given to Henry by Pope Innocent II. Mortified at this humiliation, Henry persuaded his brother King Stephen to forbid the archbishop to obey the summons which Eugenius had issued to the bishops of England to attend the council of Rheims. He argued that Theobald would be proscribed if he disobeyed the king, and would be suspended or deposed by the Pope if he did not obey his mandate. But Theobald, "fearing God rather than man", contrived to evade the vigilance of the king's guards, and at the risk of his life to cross the Channel in a crazy old craft. "It were difficult", says the historian of the Church of Canterbury, "to describe the exceeding joy and honour with which he was welcomed by the Pope, who, in the presence of the whole assemblage, declared that he had arrived there rather by swimming than by sailing, and this he had done out of regard for Blessed Peter".

At this council not only was William of York, whose history will be told presently, excommunicated, but King Stephen very nearly snared the same fate. The

Pope was annoyed with the English monarch because he had interfered with the movements of Cardinal John Paparo, who was going on a papal mission to Ireland; had prevented Henry Murdach from taking possession of the see of York, and had forbidden most of the English bishops to go to the council. Taking no heed of the request of many who were present and promised amendment in the king's name, Eugenius was about to pronounce sentence of excommunication against him, when Theobald stepped forward and earnestly implored him to spare his sovereign. Filled with astonishment, the Pope cried out: "Behold, my brethren, a man who fulfills the Gospel precept, loves his enemies, and ceases not to pray for his persecutors. ... In response to his prayers we will grant the king three months' grace". Similarly, at the request of Theobald, count of Blois, Henry's brother, the suspension of the bishop of Winchester was put off for six months, to give him an opportunity of presenting himself before the Pope.

As a further mark of his appreciation of the archbishop's magnanimity, Eugenius left it to his discretion to confirm or annul the sentence of suspension decreed against the prelates of England for their disobedience in not attending the synod.

When the council was dissolved, Theobald returned to Canterbury; but he was warned to leave the country at once, as Stephen was furious because he had attended the council against his orders. He accordingly returned to France. His property was confiscated, and for the second time was he proscribed for his obedience to the Roman Church. To that Church he at once appealed. His envoys found the Pope at Brescia (July-September 1148), and had no difficulty in persuading him to espouse their master's cause. Eugenius accordingly wrote to the bishops of England individually and collectively, and bade them admonish the king to make all due satisfaction to the archbishop, and, in case of his refusal, to lay the country under an interdict, and inform the king that the Pope himself would excommunicate him by name on the forthcoming feast of St. Michael. He also urged the French bishops and nobles to help the archbishop as far as they could.

The bishops of England, however, did not move; some were unwilling to act, and others were afraid. Accordingly, when the interdict was proclaimed, it was only obeyed by the see of Canterbury; and even there the monks of St. Augustine's at Canterbury dared to disregard it. For this flagrant act of disobedience their ringleaders were promptly excommunicated by the archbishop, whose sentence was confirmed by the Pope.

Whilst Theobald was still in exile, he consecrated bishop of Hereford the famous Gilbert Foliot. Gilbert, then abbot of Gloucester, had been elected by the influence of the archbishop, to the great satisfaction of Henry, duke of Normandy, soon to be Henry II, king of England. As the latter's party had still control over the west of England, Henry would not confirm the election unless Gilbert in person promised fealty to him, and not to King Stephen, who, in accordance with the directions of the Holy See, was recognized by the whole English Church. The bishop-elect accordingly went over to France along with three English bishops whom the Pope had ordered to assist at his consecration. The three bishops, however, under the pretence that they had sworn fealty to Stephen, and that it was against ancient custom that a bishop should be consecrated outside the country, especially without the consent of the king, and without having

sworn allegiance to the king, were unwilling to obey. In accordance, therefore, with the command of the Pope, French bishops assisted Theobald in the consecration (September 1148). But no sooner had Gilbert received the episcopal character, and returned to England, than he swore fealty to Stephen. Henry's indignation may be imagined; but he was at length pacified by the archbishop's pointing out to him that a bishop ought not to cause a schism in a church by refusing allegiance to one whom the Roman Church had recognized as king.

Time passed, and the archbishop, finding that the proceedings of the Roman court had been clogged by the king's gold, returned to England to support the action of those who were working to bring about peace between him and the king. Safe in Hugh Bigod's castle of Framlingham in Suffolk, he renewed the interdict, and summoned the bishops before him. At length, through the mediation of a number of bishops and nobles, a settlement was effected. A fresh charter of liberty was granted the church, the archbishop's property was restored, and he himself was conducted with great pomp to Canterbury.

Making use of the powers which Eugenius had granted him, Theobald had absolved from suspension all the bishops of England except Henry of Winchester, who had failed to present himself before the Pope during the six months' grace which had been granted him. Henry, therefore, betook himself to Rome, and no sooner had his suspension been removed by the aid of some of his friends among the cardinals, than he began to move every lever in order that the pallium might be granted him, and that he might be made archbishop of the west of England, or that he might again be made papal legate in England. Failing to secure either of these privileges, he strove to obtain that his church, or at least that he himself personally, might be exempted from the jurisdiction of Canterbury. But the Pope would not hearken to any of his requests, "both because he was suspicious of him and regarded him as the cause of all the trouble in England, and because he knew what was due to the church of Canterbury". Eugenius believed that it was Henry who urged his brother to harass the Church. "But", adds John of Salisbury, "the king's conduct showed that he was guided neither by him nor by any other wise man". It chanced, however, that once whilst Henry was in the Pope's company, word was brought that Stephen was again troubling the Church. "I am glad I was not at home", broke in the bishop, "or this new disturbance would have been put down to me". Upon this the Pope smiled and said: "Once when the devil's mother was upbraiding him for his evil deeds, a tempest arose, and several vessels were shipwrecked under their eyes. 'If I had been there', interposed the devil, 'you would have credited me with that evil'. 'Well', replied his mother, 'even if you were not there, you have already dragged your tail there'. Turning then to the bishop, Eugenius queried: Have you not dragged your tail through the English sea?"

Though for the sake of the peace of the realm Innocent II had confirmed Stephen's claim to the English throne, the Holy See persistently refused to sanction the succession of his son Eustace. With a view, however, to securing the crown to him, Stephen held in London a general council of the prelates and nobles of the land, and requested his coronation. But Theobald, acting, we are told, under the able advice of Thomas Becket, pleaded that Pope Eugenius had forbidden him to crown Eustace. At first the bishops upheld the decision of Theobald; but, terrified by the anger of the

furious king, they began to desert him. Thereupon the archbishop once again fled the country; but on this occasion a short time only elapsed before he was recalled. The policy of the Popes saved the situation; and if the anarchy of Stephen's reign was succeeded by more than the semblance of peace and order under Henry II, it is acknowledged that the restoration of the form at least of law was due to Rome.

ST. WILLIAM OF YORK

In the beginning of this chapter it was stated that William, archbishop of York, was excommunicated at the council of Rheims (1148). The events which led up to the excommunication may be conveniently related here. On the death of Thurstan (1140), a number of intrigues were set on foot by different parties to secure the election of a candidate after their own heart. Waltheof, the famous prior of Kirkham, was prevented by King Stephen from being elected because he was a great favourite of David of Scotland, and Stephen's nephew, Henry de Sully, abbot of Fecamp, was disallowed by the Pope because he would not agree to give up his monastery if he became archbishop. At length, in January 1141, the clergy of York met again, and the majority of them agreed in choosing their treasurer William. But he was another of the king's nephews; and the natural suspicion of undue court influence was much strengthened when William de Albemarle, earl of York, who had been present at the election, seized and imprisoned the archdeacons of York who were on their way to the king to protest against it.

After the king had presented William with the temporalities of his see, Henry, bishop of Winchester, then papal legate in England, sent him to Rome, and remitted his case to the judgment of the apostolic sovereign, because a formal charge of simony had been preferred against him by certain of the York clergy (1142). Their accusations were supported by the Cistercian party of reform, chief of whom, after 1143, was Henry Murdach, a disciple of St. Bernard, and then (1143) abbot of Fountains, a man as severe and uncompromising towards others as towards himself. When Innocent had heard the charges, he ordered all the parties concerned to present themselves before him on the third Sunday in the Lent of the following year. Accordingly, both William and his accusers presented themselves before Innocent in the Lateran palace (1143). "The sum of the complaint" against the archbishop-elect, says John of Hexham, "appeared to be in this, that William, earl of York, as the representative of the king in the chapter of York, commanded that this William should be elected". The Pope, therefore, decreed that if William, dean of York, would swear that this order of the king was never brought by the earl before the chapter, William (Fitz-Herbert) might be duly consecrated, provided also that he would give a pledge in his own person that he had not sought this preferment by bribery.

On his return to England, the archbishop-elect, in accordance with the apostolic decree, presented himself before the papal legate and the bishops of the country at

Winchester (September 1143). Unfortunately for the archbishop, William, formerly dean of York, but at the moment bishop of Durham, was prevented, or pretended that he was prevented, by local disturbances from attending the synod. The oath, therefore, which the Pope had ordered to be taken was never proffered. However, as the affection of the multitude was urgent in his favour, and as no one appeared to say anything against him, he was consecrated by Henry, the papal legate; for Archbishop Theobald, not satisfied with William's election, would not perform the function (September 26). Everything seemed now well for William; and, to crown all, Pope Lucius sent a legate, Igmarius (Hincmar) to England with the pallium for him. "But", says our Tyneside historian, "William, through carelessness, delayed to meet him, being engaged in other affairs of less moment, as was customary with him. He had been brought up in luxury and wealth, and was little accustomed to exertion". Meanwhile Pope Lucius died, and was succeeded by Eugenius, while a fellow-disciple of the latter, Henry Murdach, had become abbot of Fountains. Those, therefore, who were opposed to the archbishop, regaining confidence, again came together along with this Henry (Murdach), who greatly relied on his favour with the Pope, and again pressed their appeal against William. Thereupon Igmarius was recalled, and returned to Rome carrying back the pallium".

When it was too late, William aroused himself, and went to Rome for his pallium, only to find Eugenius prejudiced against him owing to St. Bernard's opposition to him. The saint, reminding Eugenius that it was the prerogative of the Roman pontiff alone peremptorily to order the deposition of a bishop, called upon him to dethrone that "idol at York". Despite the support which William received from certain cardinals, Eugenius accordingly declared him suspended from his episcopal office until the former dean of York should take the oath that had been ordered by Innocent. But no oath was forthcoming, and St. Bernard gives us the reason. "Letters", said he to the Pope, "written by the dean of York to the legate of the Apostolic See are in existence in which he openly asserts that there was an open intrusion, and denies the validity of the election. So therefore (the archbishop) finds that the witness that he had himself brought forward is his accuser"."

Whilst with all his wonted force St. Bernard was urging William's deposition, news reached Rome that some of his kindred, "enraged at his troubles", made an effort to seize Murdach, whom they considered as the chief author of them. Though they failed to find the abbot of Fountains, they sacked his monastery. This indiscreet zeal on the part of William's friends was fatal to him. He was declared deposed "from the functions and benefice of the archbishopric of York" by the Pope at the council of Paris (April-June, 1147). At the same time Eugenius addressed a letter to William, bishop of Durham, and the Chapter of York, requiring them, "within forty days after the receipt of his epistle, to elect in his stead a man of learning, judgment, and piety".

These misfortunes proved the salvation of William. They made him a saint. In losing all, he gained all. He withdrew under the protection of Henry of Winchester; and, "during the whole period of his humiliation, he uttered no murmur or complaint.... He never reproached his opponents, and closed his heart and ears against those who did ... He became altogether a changed character".

In the meanwhile, in obedience to the Pope's decree, the superior clergy of the church and diocese of York assembled at St. Martin's Church in the suburb of Richmond (July 24). The electors were divided in their choice; one party, that of the deposed Archbishop William, chose Master Hilary, the Pope's clerk; the other party gave the preference to Henry Murdach, abbot of Fountains. The Pope determined this question by consecrating Henry archbishop at the city of Trier (December 7, 1147).

Unfortunately, however, the difficulties of the church of York were not terminated by the Pope's decisive action. When Murdach returned to England, Stephen refused to receive him, unless he took an oath of fealty to him. From this we may no doubt conclude that Murdach would not do homage to the king, on the ground that he had already been consecrated; for, by the concordat concluded with Henry I, homage could only be exacted before consecration. Moreover, as the Popes had always refused to recognize Stephen's son as the heir to the throne, Murdach may possibly have also declined to countenance the succession of Eustace—a course of action which throws light on Eustace's personal opposition to him. Owing to the action of the king, William's party, who were in the ascendant at York, would not admit Murdach within their walls, and even put to death, or at least very badly mutilated, one of the archdeacons who had favoured him throughout. The archbishop retorted by laying the city under an interdict, which Eustace forced the clergy to disregard. But in this, Murdach eagerly wrote a complaint to the Pope. But Eustace, reflecting that the archbishop enjoyed the Pope's favour, came at length to the conclusion that it would be more for his own interests to make a friend of him, than to continue to oppose him. He accordingly had a private interview with the archbishop, in which he appears to have persuaded him that it would be for the good of the kingdom if he succeeded his father. He next reconciled Stephen with Henry, who was installed in his see with great pomp (January 25, 1151). Then, after the archbishop had offered upon the altar the grants of dignities, liberties, and immunities bestowed in former times by the Popes on the church of York, and had settled to his satisfaction the affairs of his see, he set out for Rome and kept Easter with Eugenius (March 30, 1151). He had been despatched as ambassador to him on the business of the king and realm, of which the chief matter was that the king's son, Eustace, might be established by papal authority as heir to the throne. We have, however, already seen that not even for love of his friend and fellow-disciple would Eugenius reverse in this respect the policy of his predecessors. Murdach's journey was to no purpose.

It is impossible here to deal with all the relations between Eugenius and England. From all parts of the country petitions for favours were forwarded to him, and cases of all kinds were laid before him. He approved of the rule for religious men and women drawn up by St. Gilbert of Sempringham, the only founder of an important religious order which has had its origin in this country; and he had to intervene between bishop and archbishop, and between bishop and king. He decided, for instance, in favour of Archbishop Theobald, that Bernard, bishop of St. David's, was to be subject to Canterbury, and was not to be metropolitan of Wales; and he begged Stephen to be content with the solemn assurance of Robert, bishop of London, that he would not injure him in his person or on his property, because he would not take the required oath of fealty. Eugenius could the more readily appeal to Stephen for consideration,

inasmuch as though he refused to consent that his son Eustace should succeed him on the throne, he always, as we have seen, supported his own claims to the crown.

IRELAND AND SCOTLAND

The care and authority which Eugenius exercised over the different countries that now compose the United Kingdom were not confined to England and Wales, but extended also to Scotland and Ireland,

In the seventh century the anchorites or hermits of Ireland came to be known as Ceile De, or worshippers of God. From Ireland these hermits found their way into Scotland in the following century, and were there known as Keledei or Culdees. In both countries "the worshippers of God" were brought under a canonical rule such as that which had been instituted by St. Chrodegang. The result of this was that in course of time the name of Culdee became almost synonymous with that of secular canons; and in course of time also the various bodies of Culdees lost the spirit of their institution. Special asceticism was the original character of the Keledean rule. Special laxity, after the natural course of monastic orders, became their character by the twelfth century. But the particular Keledean laxity appears to have been that, precisely like their Irish and Welsh congeners, they generally lapsed into something like impropiators (to use the modern term), married, and transmitted their church endowments as if they had been their own to their children. Full of the Cistercian zeal for reform Eugenius did not fail to notice these abuses, but, cooperating with the rulers spiritual and temporal of Scotland, he contributed to that gradual suppression of their authors which was almost completed in this century. Hence we find him granting to the canons regular of St. Andrews, who had been established by Pope Lucius II, the right of electing the bishop of that see, which had formerly been possessed by the Culdees. By one piece of adverse legislation after another, the Culdees were completely extinguished by the middle of the fourteenth century.

In the biography of Innocent II attention was called to the efforts which St. Malachy and others were making legatine to effect a reformation of manners in Ireland, and to the petition which the Irish Church addressed to the Holy See that four palliums might be granted to it. Eugenius at length decided to accede to the request, and commissioned Cardinal John Paparo to take the palliums to Ireland (1150). But when the legate landed in England on his way thither, Stephen refused to grant him a convoy unless he would give his promise that in this expedition he would compass nothing to the injury of the kingdom of England. Resenting this language, the cardinal returned to the Pope, and the Roman court was on this account ill-affected towards the king.

The Irish, however, were not to be put off thus. They sent another embassy to push their views. Their perseverance met with its reward. John was again despatched with the palliums, but on this occasion landed in a part of England where at that time Stephen had no power. The cardinal disembarked at Tynemouth in Northumberland, and found himself in territory under the control of King David of Scotland. William, bishop of Durham, received him with great reverence, and he was nobly entertained,

and with him one of the Irish bishops, *viz.*, Christian, bishop of Lismore. As soon as King David heard of his arrival, and that he wanted from him a convoy to Ireland, he sent his chancellor to escort him from Hexham to Carlisle, where he was awaiting him. On his arrival at that ancient and attractive city, about the feast of St. Michael (September 29, 1151), the king and his son, Earl Henry, dutifully received him, and sought his favour by costly and devoted attentions. By these adroit means they prevailed upon the legate to engage to obtain from the Pope a pallium for St. Andrews, and that it should become the metropolitan Church of Scotland, the Orkneys, and the adjacent isles. For, continues John of Salisbury, who gives us this insight into Scotch diplomacy, the Scots had declined to submit to the archbishop of York, to whom the Popes had subjected them, though they had often promised obedience to the see of Canterbury, if the Popes would have agreed to this arrangement.

After John and Christian, who was the ordinary “papal legate of all Ireland”, had landed in that country a national synod was held at Kells, in the county of Meath, on March 9, 1152. At this council were present most of the bishops of Ireland, a great many abbots and inferior clergy, and a number of princes and nobles. With the consent of the whole assembly, over which John Paparo presided, it was decided by pontifical authority that the bishops of Ireland should be subjected to the four metropolitans of Armagh, Cashel, Dublin, and Tuam, for whom the cardinal had brought the palliums from Rome. Various disciplinary canons against simony, etc., were also passed at the synod; and it was enacted that for the future the abbess of St. Brigit’s should not take precedence over the bishops, as hitherto they had been wont to sit at her feet. According to John of Hexham, the legate also “administered much correction to the Irish people, as they did not conform to the law of marriage”.

At the conclusion of the synod, the cardinal, we are told, gave his blessing to the assembled clergy, and having accomplished the object of his mission (*viz.*, especially the shaping of the Irish hierarchy into that form which it has practically retained ever since), returned after Easter (April 19) to King David. King Stephen also, continues the historian of Hexham Abbey, repenting of his former want of courtesy, invited the cardinal to come to him, promising that he would atone for his previous offence. But our northern historian does not say whether John gave Stephen an opportunity of making amends for his want of statecraft.

SCANDINAVIA AND POLAND

The question of the hierarchies in different countries was one to which Eugenius devoted special attention. We find him engaged in the delimitation of dioceses in Poland, and, as we shall relate more at length in the Life of Hadrian IV, in the rearranging of metropolitical authority throughout the whole of Scandinavia. Furthermore, the fact of his having consecrated an archbishop for Africa, *Africanum archiepiscopum*, may be accepted as proof that he made one of the final efforts to save the expiring hierarchy of that once glorious member of the Church Catholic.

The simple monk who, as Eugenius III, wrought all these works, died, as already said, in the year 1153; and will ever claim from posterity the praise bestowed upon him by his contemporaries, whether our countrymen or his own. He was a man, says Roger of Hoveden, “worthy of the highest dignity of the Papacy. His mind was always kindly disposed, his discretion always to be relied on, his countenance always not only cheerful, but even joyous”. A contemporary canon of St. John Lateran, Nicholas Maniacutius, shows his good opinion of the Pope by expressing the hope that he may live as long as he wishes, and then ascend to heaven. Writing to St. Bernard, and incidentally observing that he had often seen the Pope not only in Rome but in various places in France, and both in public with prelates and even with the Roman Senate, and in private, Peter the Venerable declared that in the mobile face of Eugenius “there shone forth a truly apostolic vigour”. In no one, he continued, had he ever found a truer friend, a more trustworthy brother, or a more tender father. “His ears are ever ready to listen, and his tongue is ever quick and capable in retort. But he speaks not as a superior to an inferior, but rather as an equal to an equal, or even as an inferior to a superior. In him there was no arrogance, no haughtiness, nor assumption of majesty; but justice, humility, and reason claimed the whole man for themselves”. What was asked of him he granted, or so refused that no ill-feeling was possible.

“Immediately after his death”, writes another contemporary, “there appeared miracles at his tomb, which was erected with splendour in the Church of Blessed Peter”. This, together with his saintly and amiable life, will explain why his name appears in the Cistercian calendar of the saints of the order, and why Pius IX numbered him among the Blessed, December 28, 1872.

ANASTASIUS IV

A.D. 1153-1154

THE successor of Eugenius III was Conrad, cardinal-bishop of Sabina, the Pope's vicar in Rome, a man distinguished by his fearless loyalty to Innocent II, and "of great weight with the Romans", but old and infirm. He was the son of one Benedict, and was a native of Rome, having been born in the populous district of the Subura, which occupied the valley between the Esquiline, Quirinal, and Viminal hills. When he became a cardinal-priest is not known, but he seems to have been consecrated cardinal bishop of Sabina by Honorius II in 1126, and is said to have been the nephew of that pontiff. At any rate, he was certainly bishop of Sabina in 1130, and in that capacity was one of the principal promoters of the election of Innocent II, who, when he betook himself to France, left Conrad in the then dangerous position of his vicar in Rome. As papal vicar in the city he performed those functions which were exercised by the Pope as the diocesan *ordinary* of Rome.

Elected Pope by common consent, on the day of his predecessor's death, he was consecrated on Sunday July 12, 1153. The reign of Anastasius IV, for such is the name by which the new Pontiff was known, was too short to enable him to do much to make his name great among the Popes, even if he had not been too old to turn his experience to good account. But he reigned long enough to incur the blame of the holy nun Hildegard for "neglecting justice"; and of the historian Otto of Frising for showing himself too complacent to Frederick, and thus furnishing fuel to the arbitrary will of that potentate.

Eugenius III had resisted the translation, without his consent, of Wichmann (Guicmann), bishop of Naumburg, to Magdeburg by Frederick's influence; and when Anastasius succeeded him he sent Cardinal Gerard to adjudicate on the affair. The cardinal, it appears, was not a diplomatist. He seems to have been wanting in tact or in manners; or perhaps it was simply that he failed where anyone else in similar circumstances would have failed. At any rate the king roughly bade him begone, and the unfortunate envoy's want of success was completed by his death on his return journey.

Frederick now in turn sent an embassy to Rome, adding Wichmann himself to their number. Perhaps because the death of his legate left Anastasius imperfectly informed, he approved of the bishop's translation to the archiepiscopal see of Magdeburg, and gave him the pallium. This action of the Pope, says the episcopal chronicler, caused much scandal to many, inasmuch as they had heard from many of those in authority at Rome that these concessions would never be made. Frederick

himself evidently felt that he had gained a victory over the Papacy, for in his letter to Otto, which that historian has prefixed to his story of his king, he says: “We transferred Bishop Wichmann to the archiepiscopal see of Magdeburg, and although this caused considerable controversy between us and the Roman Church, at length what we had well done (*laudabiliter*) was confirmed by apostolic authority”. But while the king rejoiced at his success others grieved at it, as they observed that, after it, “the authority of the sovereign greatly increased not merely in matters secular, but also in ecclesiastical affairs”.

It is not necessary to conclude from this incident that the character of Anastasius was as weak as his body. The brief records of his short reign put him before us on several occasions as a man of firm purpose. In a letter to the archbishop of Bourges he informs him of a complaint which has been lodged against him, and gives him a peremptory order to make satisfaction if the facts are as stated. If he has to write again he will take such steps that the archbishop will in future be anxious enough “to carry out the commands given him by the Roman Pontiff”. We know also that he opposed the revolutionary schemes of Arnold of Brescia; and he endeavored to thwart the ambition of Octavian Maledictus, the cardinal of St. Cecily, whom we have seen denounced by John of Salisbury for his rapacity, and who, by his opposition to Alexander III, was to cause so much trouble in the Church. Alluding to the cardinal's surname (*Maledictus*, accursed), Anastasius is said to have once addressed him thus indignantly and prophetically: “Never, son of the excommunicated and accursed one (*Maledicti*), never will you wear that papal mantle, which you so ardently desire and so shamelessly seek, except to thine own confusion, and to the ruin of many”.

It fell to the lot of Anastasius to restore peace to the Church in the north of England, which had been much distracted by the difficulties attending the elections of Henry Murdach to the see of York, and of Hugh to the see of Durham. There died about the same time the three principal opponents of William, the deposed archbishop of York, *viz.*, Eugenius III, St. Bernard (August 20, 1153), and Murdach (October 14, 1153), and the predominant Cistercian influence in the whole Church, and in the north of England, came to an end. As soon as the death of the Pope and that of the abbot were known, William, “conceiving a hope of his restoration, went hastily to Rome, not arraigning the decision against him, but humbly craving pity... And behold”, continues William of Newburgh, whom we are here citing, “an authentic account arriving from England of the demise of the archbishop of York, greatly assisted his very humble petition ... At length he experienced the clemency of the apostolic kindness, for the Pope and cardinals pitied his grey hairs; and Gregory, a cardinal in high esteem, took a very active part in his behalf. Wherefore, being completely reinstated, and honoured with the pallium”, he returned to England only to die within a few weeks after having taken possession of his archdiocese (June, 1154).

Pope Anastasius also did honour to another of those to whom Henry Murdach of York was opposed. In January 1153 there had been duly elected to the see of Durham Hugh de Pinset, nephew of King Stephen, a man whose splendid appearance was a harbinger of the magnificent manner in which he was destined to rule his see (1153-1197). His election was, however, opposed by the severe archbishop of York, to whom belonged the right of consecrating the bishop of Durham, He alleged the candidate's

“uncanonical age and the lightness of his character”. The dispute soon became acute, though Hugh himself took no part in it, and the clergy of Durham, “seeing that the archbishop enjoyed the Pope’s favour, did not venture to call to their support either the king or anyone else”. At length, however, the question was referred to Rome. Hugh went thither himself, “furnished with recommendations from Archbishop Theobald and other persons of high estimation in England”, while Henry Murdach “sent his proxy to oppose the election and prevent the consecration”. When the disputants reached Rome, they found that Eugenius had been succeeded by Anastasius. The death of Hugh’s opponents smoothed the way for him as it presently did for Archbishop William, and he was consecrated by the Pope himself (December 20, 1153).

We shall here pass over this Pope’s other relations with England, as they are not of sufficient importance to detain us, *e.g.*, his grants of privileges to monasteries, his intervention in a dispute between an archdeacon and the prior of Ely, and his letter to Archbishop Theobald concerning the punishment of those who had seized certain clerics on their way to Rome.

Notwithstanding his short reign of under two years, Anastasius found time, in the midst of his care for Christendom and for the poor, to be a builder. The official palace of the Lateran was not the only papal residence in Rome at this period. From time to time the Popes had built other palaces in the city, and Anastasius added to their number. The spot he chose for his “new palace” was hard by the Pantheon, S. Maria Rotunda, as it was then called. It is hard to imagine why he selected this low-lying site, constantly liable even in these days to be flooded by any rise of the Tiber. Whatever may have caused him to build his new residence in that unfavourable position, the palace cannot have been a very imposing building, as he seems to have been occupying it as early as October 1153.

It was during the pontificate of Anastasius that the famous Arabian geographer, Edrisi (1099-1180) dedicated to Roger II of Sicily (1154) his geographical work known as *The Book of Roger* (Al Rojari). What he had heard or seen in his travels of the position and virtues of the Popes, and perhaps what he may have heard in particular of the palace-building of Eugenius III and his successor, evidently made a great impression on the Oriental imagination of Mohammed Edrisi. Amongst many extraordinary stories which he tells of Rome, as, for instance, that its streets were paved with white and blue marble, and that the bottom of that portion of the Tiber which flowed through the city was paved with copper, he says: “Rome is one of the columns of Christianity and the seat of a patriarch. ... In the city ... there is a palace of the Sovereign, who is called the Pope. No one is superior to him in power, the Kings are subject to him, and consider him equal to the Creator. He governs with equity, redresses injustices, aids the weak and the poor, and protects the oppressed against the oppressors. His decrees have force over all the Kings of the Romans (of Europe), and none of them can oppose him”.

The historian of the Lateran basilica, John the Deacon, who often stood by the side of Pope Anastasius, tells us that this Pope, even whilst he was only bishop of Sabina, had a very special love for the great church about which he was writing. Not only did Anastasius love the basilica itself, but those who served it; and we find him issuing privileges in favour of its canons, and granting them, amongst other property,

the chapel of St. Gregory in Marcio with the palace in which it was situated and the buildings appertaining to it. Both before and after he became Pope, he also bestowed upon it valuable plate and vestments.

The original entry into the baptistery of the Lateran was through the apse or portico which projects from one of its octagonal sides. In this apsidal *atrium* or portico, which he converted into a chapel, the cardinal-bishop of Sabina erected an altar over the bodies of SS. Rufina and Secunda, which he had himself discovered. He must have had some skill in the work of the archaeologist; for, as John the Deacon narrates, he made systematic excavations to find their sacred remains, and in the course of them also discovered the bodies of the famous martyrs SS. Cyprian and Justina. He placed the relics of these saints, on the history of whose lives rest the various stories of Faust, in a marble sarcophagus, and placed it beneath another altar which he himself had consecrated in the same portico. After he became Pope apparently he also consecrated the altar he had built over the bodies of SS. Rufina and Secunda “in the presence of us all, of the canons of the Lateran basilica, and of a great many people from the city and from elsewhere”. This altar is on the right of the chapel as you enter it, being directly opposite to the altar over the remains of SS. Cyprian and Justina.

The archaeological tastes of Anastasius led him to select for himself a very special tomb. According to various ancient authorities, St. Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, was buried in a tomb on the Via Labicana, once called *ad duas Lauros*, but now *Torre Pignattara* from the earthen vases (*pignatte*) built into the vaulted roof to lessen its weight. The body of the empress rested in a huge sarcophagus of porphyry, which was covered with large bas-reliefs of Roman horse-soldiers prancing in the air, and trampling on a number of prisoners, and was more remarkable, like the times in which it was made, for show than for real artistic beauty. The remains of the body of St. Helena seem to have been placed in the porphyry urn which is now beneath the altar of the chapel dedicated to her in the east transept of the Church of S. Maria in Ara Coeli; at any rate, Anastasius took possession of the sarcophagus, and had it transferred to the Lateran basilica to serve as a tomb for himself. He placed it near the altar of Our Lady *de Reposo*, at the end of the northern aisle, *i.e.*, close to the entrance of the present Orsini chapel.

When Anastasius died (December 3, 1154), his body was placed in this immense tomb. “It appears to have been much injured by the hands of indiscreet pilgrims, and when Pius VI added it to the wonders of the Vatican Museum, it was subjected to a thorough process of restoration which employed twenty-five stone-cutters for a period of nine years”

HADRIAN IV

A.D. 1154-1159

EMPERORS OF THE ROMANS

Frederick I Barbarossa, 1152-1190.

KING OF ENGLAND

Henry II, 1154-1189

EASTERN EMPEROR

Manuel I Comnenus, 1143-1180.

KING OF FRANCE

Louis VII, the Young, 1137-1180.

CHAPTER I

NICHOLAS BREAKSPEAR OR BREKESPERE

About the beginning of the twelfth century there was born into the world near the old Roman municipium of Verulamium (close to St. Albans in Hertfordshire) one who was destined to become one of the most distinguished of Rome's rulers. At that time, among the many dependencies of the famous Benedictine Abbey of St. Albans, was a village called, because it belonged to the monastery, Abbot's Langley, to distinguish it from the adjoining King's Langley. Now, in the parish of Abbot's Langley, "on the outskirts of the hamlet of Bedmond", is a small building known as Breakspear's farm, which is believed to be built on the site of the house where Nicholas first saw the light. The building, which stands at the foot of a gentle declivity of a hill, is now divided into two or three cottage dwellings, is of brick, and is comparatively modern, "though portions of the interior seem to be older than the outside walls".

It seems equally probable that the family seat of the Breakspears, whence they derived their name, was at *Break-spears*, in the parish of Harefield, in Middlesex. The fine residence of Commander Tarleton, Hadrian's modern biographer, which now bears that name, and which occupies the site of the original house, is situated on the edge of

the plateau on which stands the parish of Harefield, and is sheltered by the brow of the hill which slopes down to the fertile valley of the sedgy Colne. It stands in the midst of a gently undulating country, even now so well wooded, especially with the tall elm, as to appear a forest. Being on the border of Hertfordshire, at the point where the Colne enters Middlesex, it is within comparatively easy distance of the place where Nicholas was born. Records show that a family named Brekespere or Breakspear lived here in 1317, and the records of a neighbouring house (Moor Hall) "mention the name at an earlier date still.... The house remained in possession of this family till 1430", and the recorded Christian names of its members include Adrian, Nicholas, and Robert.

If it be the fact that Robert Breakspear, the father of the future Pope, was a younger brother of the Breakspear family, then his leaving the paternal mansion at Breakspears for Abbot's Langley, and his comparative poverty, are easily accounted for. He had at least one more son besides Nicholas, and if he did not survive his illustrious child, it is certain that his brother and mother did, and that after Nicholas' death the old age of his mother was spent in pain and want.

Unfortunately, the historians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries have said very little about the youth of Nicholas, and what they do say is not always quite consistent. In what follows so much will be given from other early writers as can be reconciled with the statements of William of Newburgh, an author strictly contemporary with Hadrian. William proposes to tell how Nicholas "was lifted, as it were, from the dust, to sit in the midst of princes, and to occupy the throne of apostolical glory". Tired at length of the world, Nicholas' father, Robert Breakspear, "a clerk of slender means", with his wife's consent, became a monk of St. Albans. It was his thought that Nicholas should in due course join him in the monastery, and it is more than likely that when he entered it, he arranged that the youth should in the meantime be brought up at its expense. However, when the time came for Nicholas to be accepted by the abbot, or when the youth, thinking that it had come, asked to be received as a monk, he was met with a refusal. Whether he had been lazy, or his mind was slow in developing, the worthy abbot bade him have patience, and stay at school till he was better fitted for the calling to which he aspired. At the same time the young postulant had to endure the bitter taunts of his father, who upbraided him with his indolence, and drove him from the abbey.

Thus "left to himself and urged by hard necessity to attempt something, he went to France, ingenuously ashamed", says the Yorkshire canon, "either to dig or to beg in England".

For some time the youthful scholar appears to have studied at Paris with great success (c. 1125); to have had as a master one Marianus, of whom in after life as Pope he spoke with great affection; and to have made the acquaintance of John of Salisbury.

"Succeeding but indifferently in France ... he wandered beyond the Rhone into Provence, and from one place to another in that interesting district. He is credited by Ciacconius, who professes to be quoting Pope Gregory IX (1227-1241), with having stayed some time as a poor clerk at the Church of St. James at Melgorium in the diocese of Maguelonne, afterwards Montpellier. He also studied for a while at Arles, and finally settled down at the monastery of St. Rufus near Avignon, which, when Pope, he himself transferred to Valence, and which belonged to a local order of canons regular. In that

monastery he assumed their habit, and "as he was elegant in person, pleasant in countenance, prudent in speech, and of ready obedience, he gained the favour of all, and for many years was the most exact observer of regular discipline".

The English historian who thus describes Nicholas as he was in the cloisters of St. Rutilus, then proceeds to narrate the events which terminated in his being made a cardinal. "As he was of excellent abilities, and fluent in speech, he attained by frequent and unremitting study, to great science and eloquence; hence it came to pass that, on the death of the abbot (William II, 1137), the brethren unanimously and formally elected him their superior. After he had presided over them for some time, repentant and indignant at having elected a foreigner to rule over them, they became faithless and hostile to him. Their hatred, by degrees, became so excessive that they now looked angrily at him in whom they had before been well pleased; and at length they instituted charges against him, and summoned him before the apostolical see. Eugenius, of pious memory, ... when he heard the complaints of these rebellious children against their father, and perceived the prudence and modesty of his defence, interposed his effectual labours for the restoration of peace ... and dismissed them in amity. Malice, however, which knows no repose, could not be long at rest, and the tempest revived with redoubled fury. The same venerable pontiff was again disturbed (1146?) ... Piously and prudently regarding each party, he said: "I know, my brethren, where the seat of Satan is; I know what excites this storm among you. Depart! choose a superior with whom you may, or rather with whom you will, be at peace, for this one shall burthen you no longer".

"Wherefore, dismissing the fraternity, and retaining the abbot in the service of St. Peter, he ordained him bishop of Albano". This must have been before January 30, 1150, as his signature (*Ego Nicolaus Albanensis episcopus subscri.*) appears in papal documents on and after that date till he went to Norway. In all probability he was the second English cardinal, as the first known one, Robert Pulleyn, sometime chancellor of the Apostolic See, did not die till the year 1150. And so it came to pass, as old Fuller quaintly notes, "that he, who was refused to be *Monachus Albanensis* in England, became *Episcopus Albanensis* in Italy". He had exchanged the white robes and sash of a canon of St. Rufus for the purple and fine linen of a cardinal.

The mission to Scardinavia, 1152-4

When in the course of the tenth and eleventh centuries the Scandinavian kingdoms of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden began to take shape politically and ecclesiastically, they were not content till they had freed themselves from spiritual dependence on an archbishop of the Empire, viz., the archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen. And when, in the beginning of the twelfth century, Pope Paschal placed them under the archbishopric of Lund, then Norway and Sweden began to besiege Rome with petitions that they might have archbishops of their own. To put an end to this state of unrest, Eugenius commissioned Cardinal Nicholas, precisely because he was an Englishman, to proceed to the North to rearrange the whole Scandinavian hierarchy. As the conversion of Norway and Sweden had been largely effected by missionaries from England,

Eugenius felt that Nicholas would be welcomed by them. The cardinal accordingly left Rome about March 1152, and once more returned to his native land. There is reason to believe that both his father and mother were still living when he became Pope, so that it may be presumed that he saw them both on this occasion. From England he sailed to Norway, where he found the whole country in confusion.

After the murder of Harald Gille-Krist (1136), who was the servant (*gille*) of Christ in nothing but name, Norway was kept in a ferment by the adverse claims of his three sons, Sigurd of the Mouth (Mund), Inge the Humpback, and Eystein. Throwing the weight of his influence in favour of Inge, "whom he called his son", Nicholas brought about a reconciliation between the brothers, and then moved them to let John Birgisson be consecrated archbishop of Nidaros (Drontheim), and gave him a vestment which is called a pallium, and settled moreover that the archbishop's seat should be in Nidaros, in Christ's Church, where King Olaf the saint reposes. "Before that time", continues the famous Icelandic historian Snorri Sturleson, "there had only been common bishops in Norway. The cardinal introduced also the law that no man should go unpunished who appeared with arms in the merchant town, excepting the twelve men in attendance on the king. He improved many of the customs of the Northmen while he was in the country. There never came a foreigner to Norway whom all men respected so highly or who could govern the people so well as he did. After some time he returned to the South with many presents, and declared ever after that he was the greatest friend of the people of Norway ... And according to the report of the men who went to Rome (when he was Pope), he had never any business, however important, to settle with other people, but he would break it off to speak with the Northmen who desired to see him. He was not long Pope, and is now considered a saint".

To the new metropolitan see of Nidaros, Nicholas subjected not merely the four bishoprics of Norway and the two of Iceland, but also the four bishops of Greenland, the Faroe Islands, the Orkneys, and Sodor and Man.

After he had accomplished these useful reforms as well in the Church as in the State of Norway, Nicholas went to Sweden, and summoned a council at Lynkoping. Though Sweden at this time acknowledged the authority of King Swerker, it comprised two kindred but distinct peoples, the *Sviar* or Swedes proper and the more southerly *Gautar* or Goths. Bitterly jealous of each other, neither people would suffer the metropolitan see to be situated in the territory of its rival; and so the legate decided to leave them subject to Lund. In other respects the two peoples showed themselves very docile to the legate. They not only received him with the greatest honor, and accepted the laws he laid down about the carrying of arms and the like, but, to show their love of the Apostolic See, decreed that they would every year send Peter's Pence to Rome.

But the hardest task the legate had to perform was still before him. It was to soothe Eskill, the primate of Lund, for the loss of Norway. This he succeeded in doing by confirming to him the primacy over Sweden, and, in sign thereof, he left him the pallium for the archbishop whom the Goths and Swedes might at length agree to elect, and decreed that the Swedish archbishop should be subject to the primate of Lund. This decision of Nicholas, which he himself confirmed as Pope, was still in force in the days

of Saxo Grammaticus, the historian we were quoting. Accordingly, when, some years after the departure of Nicholas (*viz.* in 1163), the Swedes and Goths agreed that their archbishop should have his see at Upsala, he was for about the end of the thirteenth century, the archbishops of Upsala began to obtain their palliums direct from Rome; and Bishop Nicholas Ragvald obtained a decree from the council of Basle which finally freed the Swedish archbishop from any dependence on the Danish see of Lund.

Before leaving the territory of Denmark, the legate made a strenuous effort to prevent its King Sweyn from making war on Sweden. "With Roman diligence", he pointed out to him that the risks he would run were great, whereas the profit he might reap would be small. He told the king that, if he went to war, he would be like the spider which, from its very entrails, weaves a web with which it catches but miserable flies. But, adds Saxo, though Sweyn paid great honour to the cardinal's dignity whilst he was in his country, he hearkened not to his advice when he left it. He entered the territories of Swerker, who retired before him, enticed him into the wilds of Finland, and then surprised and defeated him.

When, at length, Nicholas returned to Rome he left behind him not only a name which the Norsemen will never forget, but also, as his biographer Boso succinctly, and without much exaggeration, states, "peace for kingdoms, laws for barbarians, quiet for monasteries, order for churches, discipline for the clergy, and a people acceptable to God, doers of good works".

CHAPTER II.

TROUBLES IN ROME. DEATH OF ARNOLD OF BRESCIA. BARBAROSSA AND THE ROMAN SENATE. CORONATION OF BARBAROSSA IN ROME. THE EMPEROR RETURNS TO GERMANY.

WHEN Nicholas returned to Rome, probably in the autumn of the year 1154, he devoted himself, successfully as we have seen, to obtaining the Pope's ratification of the changes he had effected in the hierarchy of Scandinavia. Within a few months after the cardinal's return, Pope Anastasius died, and the great reputation for learning, virtue, and energy which Nicholas had now obtained caused him to be unanimously elected his successor. Assembled in St. Peter's, and crying out: "Pope Hadrian has been by God elected", both the clergy and the laity combined in forcing him against his will into the chair of St. Peter.

Consecrated on the following day (Sunday, December 5), he was soon to learn, whether he accepted the Papacy willingly or unwillingly, that he had assumed a hard yoke; and he was to live to assure his friend, John of Salisbury, with many a weary sigh, that no one was more unhappy than the Pope of Rome; that, apart from anything else, the work alone which he had to do would soon kill him, and that, in comparison with his

present misery, all the bitterness he had ever experienced before he became Pope was sweetness itself. Thorny, he declared, was the throne of Peter, and so full of the sharpest spikes was his mantle that it would lacerate the stoutest shoulders. The crown and mitre (*corona et phrygium*) that are worn by the Popes seem gloriously bright, and so they are, for they are all of fire. He often told his English confidant that, from the time he had left the cloister, and had mounted the ladder which had brought him to the Papacy, he had never found that a higher position had added the smallest degree of peace and happiness to that which he had had in the lower station. “The Lord”, he said, “has long since placed me between the hammer and the anvil, and now He must Himself support the burden He has placed upon me, for I cannot carry it”.

The unhappy Hadrian was soon to find that one of the greatest difficulties he had to face was the avarice of some of the Romans of his curia. He seemed, as honest John tells us, to be faced with one of these alternatives; he must either himself become a slave of avarice, and lose his soul, or be at the mercy of the hands and tongues of the Romans. For if he had not wherewith to close their mouths and restrain their hands, he would have to harden himself to endure crime and sacrilege. Hence, in his distress, Hadrian used to say that he would rather never have left his native England, or have remained for ever hidden in the cloister of St. Rufus, than have accepted his present position. To this wish, however, he appended the proviso, except that he was afraid of opposing the will of God, which shows that he was not a man to let vain regrets interfere with present action. In every position in which Providence placed him, he worked with all the energy of which his vigorous nature was capable.

Hadrian’s much beloved mentor, John of Salisbury, however, hinted to him one day that he was beginning to look keenly for his children’s gifts in order that he might have the money necessary to keep Rome under his authority. Full of an Englishman’s ideas of law and order, John would indeed have had the Pope forcibly curb the turbulent Romans and their agitator Arnold; “If you are the ruler, why do you not strike terror into your Roman subjects”, he indignantly asked Hadrian, “and bring them back to their fealty by repressing their rashness?”. But he impressed upon him the necessity of giving justice to all gratuitously. Without wishing to maintain that avarice was not a prevailing weakness even among the Romans of the curia, we must note that “the cupidity of the Roman court” was an obsession with our worthy countryman. He had had apparently to suffer from it, or, at least, he thought he had, and that fact seems to have rendered him somewhat preternaturally acute in discovering traces of this vice. This Hadrian would seem to have realised; for he laughed at John’s diatribe, and, bidding him always report to him what evil men said of him, proceeded to relate the fable of the belly and the members.

Although Hadrian did not pretend to have always acted rightly, his sensible answer convinced his would-be monitor that, if there was to be life and activity in the members of the Church, the Roman Church, the source of their life, must be well nourished by them. John declared himself satisfied, and professed his readiness to put his shoulder to the wheel.

Whatever other human weakness may have been possessed by Hadrian, there was in him no trace of malice or ingratitude. In the beginning of his reign he was visited by

Robert of Gorham, the eighteenth abbot (1151-6) of that monastery of St. Albans where he had received his first serious rebuff. The abbot had come both on the king's business and on his own. Henry II, "who had recently been anointed", had despatched to Rome (October 9, 1155), on very important state affairs, an embassy of which he had made Robert the chief. Besides entrusting him with letters to the Pope on his own affairs, the king had, no doubt at Robert's request, furnished him with a letter in which he begged the Pope to interest himself not only in his affairs, but also in those of the monastery of St. Albans, seeing that it was under his royal patronage. Not content with a king's letter, the wise abbot provided himself with a large sum of money (140 marks), and a number of beautiful presents.

After a journey of about seven or eight weeks, Henry's ambassadors found Hadrian at Benevento, where it is known that he had been residing from at least November 21. When the king's business had been duly transacted, the abbot made as though he would return at once to England. To this, however, Hadrian would not agree, but bade the three bishops, who had accompanied the abbot, return, and give the king an account of their mission. Left now alone with the Pope, Robert offered him the gold and presents which he had brought with him. Hadrian accepted them with a pleasant smile. He would not, however, retain anything except certain mitres and, for the sake of their beautiful workmanship, some sandals which Christina, prioress of Markyate, or Mergate, had wrought for him; but, while praising the abbot for his courtesy, he said banteringly: "I refuse your presents, because when I once asked the abbot of St. Albans to give me the habit of a monk, he refused to accept me". "But", promptly retorted the abbot, "he could not have received you; for God in His all-seeing wisdom willed it otherwise, since He had set apart your life for a higher position". After so graceful a reply, what wonder that the abbot heard from the Pope the welcome words: "Ask boldly for what you want. The bishop of Albano can refuse nothing to St. Albans". Before he preferred his petition, the worthy abbot distributed to the members of the papal court the presents he had brought for the Pope: "knowing full well that the Romans are insatiable as leeches, and ever thirsty for money". By this judicious action the abbot's "name was extolled to the skies, and he found favour with all the Romans". Accordingly, when he preferred his complaints against the *ordinary* of his diocese, *viz.*, the bishop of Lincoln, and asked for favours for St. Albans, Hadrian "granted the Church of St. Albans the well-known privilege by which we, both monks of the cloister, and those living outside the monastery, in its smaller dependencies, are made free of all episcopal authority, save only that of Rome, to all time. And further, his Holiness granted us other such special privileges, that there is no monastery in all England which can compare with St. Albans for liberty". With letters for the king, and these valuable privileges for his monastery, Robert returned home rejoicing.

This story of the abbot of St. Albans has shown us one side of Hadrian's character, and the conversation of the blunt English scholar from Salisbury with an English Pope whom he loved and revered but to whom he fearlessly spoke his mind, a conversation hitherto unique in the annals of the Papacy, has shown us another side of his character. Provisionally then, at least, we may accept the description of Hadrian's character by another Englishman, even though it be couched in language used by papal biographers who wrote some four hundred years before his time. Hadrian, says Boso,

was a man who was affability itself, a man who was mild and patient. Skilled in Latin and in his English tongue, he was fluent and polished in his speech; an excellent singer, and a most distinguished preacher. He was slow to yield to anger, but quick to forgive. His alms were given cheerfully and abundantly, and along the road of all the virtues both natural and supernatural he had advanced far.

But the life of Hadrian was not to be passed in listening to the suave speeches of diplomatic abbots, or even to the straightforward criticisms of sympathetic friends, nor in receiving pretty presents from the skilled hands of English needlewomen. Serious difficulties were springing up all round him both near and far. A king, the haughty Barbarossa, had already appeared in northern Italy who was determined to be the first man in Europe, and who was resolved to make his will the sole law; William I of Sicily was in arms against the Church in south Italy, and at Hadrian's very door in Rome his rule was being disputed by Arnold of Brescia and the Senate. That demagogue realised that in the English Pope he had an antagonist of very different stamp to that of either Eugenius or Anastasius, and redoubled his efforts to keep his hold on the people and to stir them up against papal authority. Hadrian ordered him to quit the city, but the agitator paid no heed to his command, and his followers attacked the venerable Cardinal Guido of S. Pudenziana as he was going along the Via Sacra to visit the Pope in the Leonine city, and left him for dead.

To the profound astonishment of the Romans, Hadrian at once laid the city under an interdict. They had often heard of the order for the cessation of religious worship in other places in punishment of far less crimes than they had often committed; but till this moment no Pope had ever inflicted this terrible punishment on them. The bare necessities of the spiritual life were all that were permitted. Children could be baptized and the confessions of the dying could be heard; but the churches were closed, and there could be no Mass, no communion, no confirmation, no solemnisation of marriage, no Extreme Unction. For some time the Romans held out; but when Holy Week came, and there was the dismal prospect of an Easter without the joys of religion, and without the substantial profits which, but for the interdict, pilgrims would have brought to the city, both clergy and people brought pressure to bear on the senators. Arnold and his followers were expelled from Rome and its district, the interdict was removed, and on Maunday Thursday (March 23), amidst a great crowd of rejoicing people, Hadrian, surrounded by his cardinals, went in solemn procession from the Leonine city to the Lateran. There he celebrated the festival of Easter in the usual joyous fashion

During all the time this struggle was going on in Rome, Hadrian was in the midst of political movements that involved the empires of the East and of the West, and the kingdom of the two Sicilies, not to mention smaller powers. It was around the double kingdom that the currents of policy ebbed and flowed. Its growing strength was feared not merely by the Pope, but by the Autocrator at Constantinople, and by the king of the Romans on the Rhine. Manuel I (Comnenus) was anxious to weaken a power that had defied the Eastern Roman Empire, and Frederick I (Barbarossa) was resolved to reduce it, as well as every other part of Italy, to complete subjection to himself. In the midst of these complications the famous Roger II of Sicily gave up his soul to God, and his kingdom to his son William I, perhaps too easily called "the Bad" (February 1154). In his difficulties the new king turned to the Pope, and in the very beginning of Hadrian's

pontificate sent him an embassy to arrange a treaty of peace. But, perhaps because he was annoyed that William, though a feudatory of the Holy See, had assumed the crown without any reference to his suzerain, or perhaps because he was resolved to stand by the treaty of Constance, which Eugenius had made with Barbarossa, at any rate, the Pope would not listen to William's offers. On the contrary, he entered into communication with Barbarossa in the very first month of his pontificate.

Thereupon William, seeing that no profit was likely to arise from further negotiation, crossed over to Salerno from Sicily during Lent (1155), refused to see a legate of the Pope because the latter would not acknowledge his title of king, and instructed his lieutenant to invade the papal territories. Benevento was besieged, and Ceprano, Bauco, and other unfortified places in the Campagna were burnt. The excommunication of William for these hostile acts did not result in the cessation of hostilities on the part of his troops; but the near approach to Rome of the soldiers of Barbarossa from the North checked for the time the advance of the Normans from the South.

Meanwhile, the king of the Romans had entered Italy in October 1154, to receive the imperial crown and the homage of the whole peninsula. Rich in peace, as his name (Friedrich) we are told implied, he had pacified Germany that he might subdue warlike Italy. Many of the cities of the North submitted to him at once. Others, however, the chief of which was Milan, refused to acknowledge him; but, although grievous complaints against that powerful city were laid before him at a diet which he held on the plain of Roncaglia, he did not feel strong enough to attack it. When he found that it required sixty days to reduce Tortona, he realized the magnitude of the task that awaited him if he attempted to subdue all the cities which were hostile to him, and determined to get the imperial crown without further delay. Receiving the crown of Lombardy at Pavia (April 17), he marched into Tuscany. There, at the hill-town of San Quirico, midway between Sienna and Acquapendente, he was met by three cardinals.

Hadrian had been much disturbed by the stories which reached him of Frederick's rather ruthless conduct in north Italy, and on his way to meet the king, held a consultation at Sutri with his cardinals and with Peter, the prefect of Rome, and the consul, Odo Frangipane (June). As a result of their deliberations the cardinals were sent forward with precise instructions as to the line of conduct they were to pursue in their dealings with the German monarch. To test his intentions, he was to be asked to cause Arnold of Brescia to be restored to the hands of the papal officials. Soon after his expulsion from Rome that irrepressible agitator had been captured by Odo, the cardinal-deacon of St. Nicholas, at Bricola, better known as Lo Spedaletto di S. Pellegrino, on the right bank of the Orcia, some six miles south-east of San Quirico. But he had been rescued by the viscounts of Campagnatico, whose sway extended over the vale of the Orcia near San Quirico.

Frederick agreed to this requirement of the Pope, and, by promptly seizing one of the viscounts, caused the agitator to be delivered into the hands of the cardinals. He had had no difficulty in satisfying himself that, if Arnold was animated with a sincere wish to effect reforms, he was nevertheless a dangerous agitator; that his teachings had resulted in rapine and murder, and that, despite these consequences, which no

government could tolerate, he would not refrain from continuing to proclaim his doctrines. Accordingly, the prefect of Rome, whose business it was to deal with cases involving life and death, was instructed by Frederick to treat Arnold as an acknowledged criminal.

If, only a few generations ago, our ancestors thought it right to hang a man for stealing a sheep, it is small matter for wonder if Frederick and the Prefect of Rome decided to hang Arnold of Brescia, not merely because he may have taught heresy, but because, by his doctrines, which he refused to keep to himself, he had brought about acts of violence which had ended in the destruction of life and property. Precise details, however, of the time and place of Arnold's death are wanting, but it is certain that the misguided enthusiast was hanged, that his body was burnt, and that his ashes were cast into the Tiber lest they might be honoured by ignorant people as relics.

Seeing that the prefect of the city was a papal official, it may be taken for granted that the Pope concurred with Frederick in sanctioning the execution of Arnold; but it must be noted that he was condemned not for desiring to reform the Church, nor for denouncing its corruptions, for he could not have done that more vigorously than Gerhoh of Reichersberg and Bernard of Clairvaux, but for sedition. There is one way of preaching a reformation of manners, which is that of men who are at once good and sensible, and which effects its purpose; there is another which leads to violence and bloodshed, and which is the way of the fool or of the rogue. "And it is only just to point out", writes Tarleton, "that, like all dreamers, Arnold was one sided in his judgment; his enthusiasm only enabled him to see the abuse of riches in the Church, and failed to show him that she must, if she was to live, have the means necessary to carry out her mission, to keep up her dignity, to relieve her poorer members, and to maintain the worship of God; not to mention the training of her sons and the mission work of bringing fresh sheep to the fold".

But, after Frederick had ordered Arnold to be given into the hands of the Pope's legates, he would not enter into further negotiations with them. He had despatched envoys to Hadrian about the same time that Hadrian had sent his cardinals to him; and he would not deal further with the papal legates until his own envoys had returned with the Pope's answers to his proposals. The two embassies had crossed, and Hadrian had equally refused to deal with the king's envoys until his own had brought back answers to his queries from their master. Frederick's ambassadors had experienced some difficulty in finding the Pope, who, rendered somewhat suspicious by the king's rapid advance, had left Viterbo for the still stronger position of Civita Castellana. Fortunately, when returning to their respective masters the two embassies encountered each other, and, after a brief consultation, both proceeded to the camp of Frederick near Viterbo.

To their chagrin the cardinals found that their arrival had been anticipated by Octavian, the cardinal of St. Cecily's, who, advancing still further along the path of ambition, had betaken himself to Frederick when he found he was not acceptable to the Pope. Fortunately, however, his efforts to make mischief were frustrated by his brethren, and he had to retire covered with confusion. Then, before a full diet, an elected representative of the king swore in his name that he would not make any attempt against the person of the Pope, or his court, and that he would not allow any aggression against

the Pope's honour possessions. When this had been done, arrangements were soon made for an interview between Hadrian and the king, and for the latter's receiving the imperial crown.

The Pope accordingly made his way to Nepi, and the king advanced his camp to Campo Grasso near Sutri. On the day following his arrival at Nepi, *viz.*, on June 9, Hadrian, surrounded by his cardinals, rode towards the German camp. He was accorded a warm reception by the Teutonic host, and was conducted in triumph to Frederick's tent. But here the harmony of the proceedings was rudely broken. The king did not come forward to offer that mark of respect which his predecessors had shown to the successors of the Apostles by holding the stirrup whilst the Pope dismounted. The cardinals, interpreting this to denote ill-will on the part of Frederick, and mindful of the seizure of Paschal II by Henry VI, at once turned their horses round and fled at full speed towards Civita Castellana, leaving the Pope alone. Though perturbed at this unexpected incident, Hadrian quietly dismounted from his horse, and took the seat which had been prepared for him. Frederick thereupon advanced, kissed the Pope's feet, and would have given him the prescribed kiss of peace. But Hadrian drew back, saying that, until he had shown to him that mark of respect which his predecessors had been wont to show to the Roman pontiffs, he would not give him the customary kiss of peace. Frederick, however, would not give way. It was no part of his duty, he haughtily declared, to act as the Pope's groom. But next day, after Hadrian had returned to Nepi, it was proved by the testimony of the older princes, and by the records of history, that precedent was against the king, and it was decided that, "out of reverence for the blessed Apostles", he should perform the office of groom to the Pope. The German camp was, accordingly, pushed forward to Lake Janula near the town of Monterosi (June 11), and when Hadrian rode towards it, Frederick advanced to meet him, and, in sight of the whole army, stepped boldly forward, cheerfully led the Pope's horse for a brief space, and assisted him to dismount. The kiss of peace then given him by the Pope sealed the reconciliation between these two iron characters.

When, now full of respect for one another, the Pope and the king were on their way to Rome, they were met by a deputation from the city. The envoys addressed Frederick in the same bombastic style which the new Roman republic had previously used to the German monarch. They exhorted him to listen to what the Mistress of the world had to say to him. They had, they said, long awaited the coming of one who would throw off the yoke of the clergy, and under whom the insolence of the world would be subjected to the monarchy of the city. It was the city which had made emperors of the German kings, and so he must observe all its laws and customs which his ancestors had confirmed to it, must give five thousand pounds of gold to its officials who would acclaim him in the Capitol, and protect the republic even to the shedding of his blood.

These cool demands were too much for the blunt German, and he broke in with the curt phrase that what he had heard of the wisdom of the Romans did not accord with the foolish words he had been listening to, and he reminded the envoys that the glory of the city had departed long ago, and was now to be found among the Germans. He had come, he told them, to claim his own, and not to receive anything from them. As for

defending the city and its laws, he would know how to look after what belonged to himself.

Dumbfounded at this angry outburst of their future over-lord, the Roman envoys left the German camp, saying that they must consult with those who had sent them before they could say more. Not overpleased with the attitude which the Romans had taken up, Frederick consulted the Pope on the situation. “My son”, replied Hadrian, “you will realise the guile of the Romans more and more as time goes on. ... Meantime, send forward with all speed a body of picked troops who will assist my soldiers in holding St. Peter’s and the Leonine city, and (to facilitate negotiations) I will attach to them Cardinal Octavian, a man of the noblest Roman descent and most true to you”. The Pope’s advice was promptly acted upon, and a thousand men, the flower of the German army, were soon standing shoulder to shoulder with the papal troops by the bridge and castle of St. Angelo and on the old walls of Leo IV.

Just after sunrise on June 18, the Pope and his cardinals betook themselves to Rome to await the arrival of Frederick. At length, to those on the watch, the bright flashings of the rays of the morning sun from helmet and cuirass, and from sword and spear, revealed the German host descending the slopes of the Mons Gaudii. Leaving, as usual, the main mass of his troops outside the walls, Frederick entered the Leonine city by the Golden Gate near St. Peter’s. Then, exchanging his military accoutrements for the state robes of an emperor, he was received by Hadrian in front of the altar of S. Maria in Turri. There, kneeling before the Sovereign Pontiff with his hands in those of the Pope, he swore to be the defender of the Holy Roman Church in the terms set forth in the *Ordo* which was followed on this occasion.

Hadrian then went to St. Peter’s, whither he was followed in solemn procession by Frederick. At the Silver Gate the new emperor was met by the cardinal-bishop of Albano, who pronounced the first prayer over him: “O God in whose hands are the hearts of kings ... grant to Thy servant Frederick, our emperor, the shield of Thy wisdom, and that, drawing his counsels from Thee, he may please Thee, and may preside over all the kings of the earth”.

Advancing up the nave of the great basilica, Frederick reached the great disc of red porphyry set into its floor. Here the second prayer was offered up by the bishop of Porto: “O God ... the ruler of empires, who from the seed of ... Abraham did take the Everlasting King ... firmly establish this sovereign ... in the throne of empire. Visit him as You did Moses in the burning bush, ... and pour on him the dew of Your wisdom ... Be You to him a shield in all his difficulties, and grant that the nations may be true to him, that his nobles may keep the peace, and that his people may ever enjoy the blessings of happiness and peace”.

From the disc Frederick moved forward to the Confession of St. Peter, and prostrated himself on the ground whilst the archdeacon intoned the Litany. When it was finished, the bishop of Ostia anointed the emperor on his right arm and between the shoulders, at the same time calling on God, in whom all power resides, to grant him a happy period of imperial rule (*prosperum imperatorie dignitatis effectual*), that nothing may hinder his care for the Church, and that he may rule his people with justice. After another prayer Mass began, and, according to one codex, when the epistle had been

read, the emperor was presented to the Pope, who, standing in front of the altar of St. Peter, and taking from it a sword in its sheath, girt it on him saying : “Receive this sword, taken from the body of St. Peter”. Then, after Frederick had drawn the sword and had right manfully (*viriliter*) thrice brandished it in the air and had received the sceptre, came the supreme moment. The Pope took the imperial crown from the altar, and placed it on the monarch's head with the words: “Receive this emblem of glory in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and so wear it in justice and mercy that you may receive from our Lord the crown of eternal life”.

No sooner were these momentous words uttered than the Germans raised so tremendous a cheer that it seemed, writes Boso, as though a thunderbolt had suddenly fallen from heaven.

During the rest of the Mass the emperor sat on a faldstool by the Pope's right hand, and when it was over returned on horseback to his tent just outside the walls with the imperial crown on his head, whilst the Pope withdrew to the Vatican palace.

All this had been accomplished before nine o'clock in the morning. Meanwhile, word of what was being done began to spread like wildfire through the city. The alarm was sounded, and senators and people rushed to the Capitol. Furious that Frederick had not deigned to seek the imperial crown from them, they flew to arms, and, as the Germans had followed their ruler to the camp outside the walls, they forced their way into the Leonine city from the Trastevere and across the bridge of St. Angelo. Killing or plundering all they met, the Romans pressed on to St. Peter's. Meanwhile, the tumult and the cries of fugitives roused the emperor, who, fearing for the Pope and the cardinals, called his troops to arms. Although oppressed by the heat, the Germans obeyed the call with alacrity and rushed into the city. A desperate hand-to-hand fight ensued which lasted till nightfall. By that time the imperial forces had driven the Romans out of the Leonine city with great slaughter, and the patriotic episcopal historian grimly tells us that they smote as though they were saying: “Take, you Romans, German steel instead of Arabic gold. This is the money your Prince gives you for his crown. 'Tis thus empire is bought by the Franks”.

According to the same authority, a thousand Romans were killed or drowned, six hundred of them were taken prisoners, while a countless number were wounded. The losses were, however, not confined to the Romans, and when the Germans retired to their camp at night they had to mourn the loss of many a gallant comrade.

This terrible slaughter of his people greatly distressed Hadrian; and, as soon as morning broke, he went to the tent of Frederick, and did not leave it until he had procured the release of all the captives. Despite the defeat of the Romans, the emperor did not care to remain in the neighborhood of their city. His forces, not large even when he had entered Italy, were now much reduced, and they were suffering from the heat, and from want of provisions, as he was not strong enough to compel the Romans to supply them. However, still further to impress the people of the peninsula with a sense of his power, he resolved to destroy some of the castles of the Campagna. Accompanied by Hadrian, he marched along the right bank of the Tiber, passing between it and the heights of Soracte. A few miles further north he crossed the river at the ford “de Malliano”, viz., Magliano della Sabina, near the Ponte Felice, not far from which there

is still a ford. From the left bank of the Tiber he advanced to the imperial monastery of Farfa, and thence to Poli, some six or seven miles from Tivoli. In the course of his march the emperor destroyed many of the castles of the Roman nobles. Poli, perched on a rock in a valley which cuts deeply into the mount of Guadagnolo, was no doubt one of the strongest of the castles attacked by Frederick. Whether he levelled it also with the ground or not, he marched from it to Ponte Lucano, about a mile south-west of Tivoli, where the Via Tiburtina (or Valeria) crosses the Anio. In a green and pleasant vale by the ancient and picturesque bridge the emperor rested his wearied troops, and, on the feast of St. Peter and Paul, assisted at the Pope's Mass in state, wearing his crown. It is said, writes Bishop Otto, that, on this occasion, Pope Hadrian absolved those who in the conflict with the Romans had shed human blood, on the ground that a soldier who fights in obedience to his commander, against the enemies of the Empire and of the Church, is accounted, by the laws both of God and of man, not a murderer but an avenger (*vindex*).

With a view no doubt to making another attempt to subdue the Romans themselves, Frederick took up a position between Frascati and Rome. But the unhealthy state of the Campagna in July soon compelled him to retire to the mountains. Accordingly, taking leave of the Pope at Tivoli, he pitched his camp in the Apennines, near the sources of the white waters of the sulphureous Nar. Thence, ravaging Spoleto on his way, he marched to Ancona, where he had an interview with ambassadors from the emperor Manuel, in connection with an alliance against the Normans. Consequently, he made a last effort to induce the princes to march with him into Apulia in order to cooperate with the Greeks, and to lend active support to Robert of Capua, and the other nobles who were in rebellion against William of Sicily. But fever had got the host in its grip, and the princes decided that they must return to Germany, a decision to which, with bitterness of heart, Frederick had to bow. His year's fighting in Italy had brought him the imperial crown, but it had left Milan, Rome, and William of Sicily all unsubdued.

Whilst Frederick was still in the neighborhood of Tivoli, that town, always ready to act against the Pope, threw off its allegiance to Hadrian and offered its keys to the emperor. But, appealing to him "as the advocate of the Roman Church", the Pope demanded that the place should be restored to him. Thereupon, "out of reverence for the Prince of the Apostles and for the Pope", the emperor commanded the people to return to their allegiance, "saving in all things the imperial rights".

Of these "imperial rights" Frederick was extremely jealous, as he showed on another occasion shortly before this. Whilst still near Rome, he was informed that there was a picture in the Lateran palace depicting Lothaire kneeling at the feet of Innocent II and receiving the imperial crown, and that there was an inscription beneath it setting forth that he had become "the Pope's man", and had received the imperial crown from him. Frederick was mightily displeased, and at once had a friendly altercation with Hadrian, who, seemingly astonished that the emperor should make so much out of a trifle, undertook to efface both the picture and the inscription, in order that so childish a thing might not furnish a cause of quarrel to the greatest men in the world.

CHAPTER III
THE NORMANS. HADRIAN AS THE GUARDIAN OF THE PATRIMONY
OF ST. PETER

The departure of the emperor had left the Pope in a very precarious position. His coming had done more harm than good to Hadrian's relations with the Romans, and his leaving the peninsula exposed him to the tender mercies of William of Sicily. Frederick's Italian expedition had disappointed many—the Greeks, who had looked for his support against the Normans; the Pope, who had hoped that he would have rendered both the Romans and the Normans submissive; and a number of Norman nobles, both those who, trusting to him, had revolted against William on account of his favouritism; and those who, exiled by his predecessor Roger II, had relied on the emperor's undertaking to restore them.

Finding the hopes which they had placed in Frederick thus come to naught, the different parties began to act for themselves. The Greeks landed troops in south Italy, and took possession of various strongholds; while the revolted barons of Apulia, whose numbers had been augmented by the excommunication of their sovereign, turned to the Pope. After the departure of the emperor, Hadrian had not been able to return to Rome, but had remained either near Tivoli, or Tusculum, or at Civita Castellana. At one of these places he received the envoys of the revolted barons, who begged him as their suzerain to come into Apulia, and to take themselves and their property under his protection. Hadrian, accordingly, gathering together what forces he could from the nobility of the city and of the Campagna, and from the adjoining towns, marched to San Germano "about the feast of St. Michael" (c. September 29). Here and at Sora and at Benevento he received the oaths of allegiance of Robert, Prince of Capua, and other nobles, and about the same time was greeted with an offer of men and money from the Greek emperor on condition that he would hand over to him three maritime cities of Apulia. It would seem likely too that negotiations were at the same time entered into between them for the reunion of the Greek and Latin Churches.

Alarmed at the combination against him, William endeavored to make peace with the Pope. If he were freed from excommunication and restored to Hadrian's good graces, he undertook to do homage to him, to give liberty to the churches of his dominions, to make a donation to the Pope of certain places near Benevento, and to induce the Romans to submit to him. Unfortunately, against his own inclinations, but in deference to the views of his cardinals, who regarded the discomfiture of William as certain, Hadrian rejected the king's proffered terms.

Inspired now with the courage of despair William marched rapidly into Apulia. The Greeks were utterly defeated, and the forces of the rebels seemed to melt away before the victorious king (April and May 1156).

The Pope was now in a very helpless position. However, he resolved to face it by himself, and, sending the majority of the cardinals into a more safe place in Campania, awaited with a trusty few in Benevento the arrival of William. He treated the cardinals in this way, either because he had compassion on their weakness, mindful of the way they had abandoned him on his first encounter with Frederick, or because he feared that they might again adopt the uncompromising attitude towards William which had proved so unfortunate. As soon as the victorious troops of the Sicilian king were descried from the walls of the city, Hadrian sent forward his chancellor, Roland, the cardinal-priest of St. Mark's, and two other cardinals to meet them. They had been instructed to take a high stand, and in the name of Blessed Peter to bid the king to cease from further hostilities, to make atonement for the injuries he had committed, and to leave the rights of the Roman Church undisturbed. William received the legates well, and, after much discussion, the terms of a settlement between the Pope and himself were arranged (June 18).

In the first place, Hadrian was compelled to recognise certain territorial claims on the part of the Normans which his predecessors had refused to allow. To William and his heirs were conceded "the kingdom of Sicily, the duchy of Apulia, and the principedom of Capua, with all that belonged thereto, Naples, Salerno, and Amalfi, with all that appertained to them, Marsia and other places beyond it, and the other belongings which were legally held by our predecessors, vassals of the holy Roman Church".

While the Pope on his side engaged to help William to hold these territories against all comers, the king on his side did homage to the Pope for them, and undertook to pay a yearly tax of 600 schifati for Apulia and Calabria, and 500 for Marsia.

With regard to the ecclesiastical clauses of the treaty, a distinction was drawn between Apulia and Calabria on the one hand, and Sicily on the other. In the former localities permission was to be given for clerics to appeal to the Pope in ecclesiastical disputes; for translations from see to see to be made with the consent of the Pope, and for the Roman Church to consecrate the bishops and hold visitations of their dioceses, to send legates there, who, however, must not ruin the possessions of the churches, and, finally, to have the right to hold councils in any city, except where the king may chance to be at the time.

In Sicily itself, however, the rights of the Papacy were more restricted. The Roman Church was to have the right of consecration and visitation, and of summoning ecclesiastics to Rome. But with regard to the last-named right, the king was empowered to retain such as he really needed for ecclesiastical purposes or to crown him. Apart from the rights of appeal and of sending legates, which were only to be exercised at the request of the king, the Church was to have in Sicily all the remaining privileges which it had in the other parts of the king's realms. In the matter of elections the clergy were to choose suitable persons, and submit their names to the king, who was to approve of them unless they were "from some cause or other" distasteful to him.

In these negotiations Hadrian did not forget the Norman nobles who had acted with him, and who had fled to Benevento for protection. At his intercession William agreed to allow them to leave his kingdom in possession of their freedom and of all their property.

When the terms of peace had been arranged, Hadrian left Benevento with the few cardinals he had still with him and went to the Church of St. Marcian, near the river Calore. Here, in the presence of all his nobles, William took the oath of fealty to the Pope, which Oddo Frangipane read out for him, and with three banners was duly invested with Sicily, the duchy of Apulia, and the principality of Capua. Before the Pope and the king parted, the former showed his goodwill to his new liegeman by subjecting the churches of Agrigentum and Mazarium, which were immediately dependent on the Holy See, to the archiepiscopal see of Palermo (Panormus), while the king on his side gave great presents of gold, silver, and silk to the Pope and his court.

After solemnly confirming the treaty, which was in the main more favourable than he might have hoped for, Hadrian, keeping to the mountains, moved north, and reached Narni at the beginning of August. Henceforth, free from enemies near home, he steadily devoted himself to strengthening his temporal authority over the Patrimony of St Peter and to its material development and that too despite his further difficulties with Barbarossa, which will be recounted in the next chapter.

From Narni he went to Orvieto, which, after a long period of independence, he had only recently won back to the allegiance of the Holy See. As it was generally believed that the city had never yet been visited by a Pope, it was felt that the best means of securing its loyalty would be for Hadrian to take up his abode there for a time. This expectation was not disappointed. The people of Orvieto, headed by one of the Farnese family, gave the Pope a most hearty welcome, and were in turn treated by him with the most affectionate kindness.

On the approach of winter, Hadrian left Orvieto, and returning to Rome, where he was received with becoming honour, took up his permanent residence at the Lateran palace. Here he stayed for the rest of his life, only leaving it in the summer heats for some hill-town, Segi or Anagni, Narni or Sutri, or, as it is said, picturesque Ravello, where the remains of the castle in which he resided are still shown.

Hadrian's summer visits to different parts of the Patrimony of St. Peter enabled him to see what was needed for its improvement, and he accordingly devoted what leisure he could find to bettering both it and the city.

At the south end of the transept of old St. Peter's was the chapel of St. Processus, and at the north end were the baptismal fonts of the basilica. As the roof of the saint's chapel was out of repair, it would seem that, when reconstructing it, Hadrian made it equal in height to the main roof of the transept, and that to keep right the proportions of the transept, he raised in like manner the roof of the baptistery at its other extremity. In the Lateran palace also he effected many improvements, adding to it, for instance, what Boso calls "a very necessary and very large tank": and in the Church of SS. Cosmas and Damian he consecrated a new altar-stone which had been placed on top of the one which St. Gregory I had consecrated there over five hundred years before.

But he did not confine himself to repairing or erecting churches in Rome or its immediate neighbourhood. He sent sculptors as far as Pisa, "which had shown itself so devoted to its predecessors", that they might there erect a monastery. By these and other similar attentions to churches, Hadrian has furnished us with additional proof of the continued vitality of the Roman school of art, and that he at least did not merit the

reproach which John of Salisbury tells us was levelled at some of the Popes, viz., that they built, palaces whilst the churches were falling to ruin.

On May 29, 1153, the abbot of Monte Amiata had made over, on certain conditions, “the quaint volcanic mountain-knoll” of Radicofani to Eugenius III. With walls which seem still to defy time, with towers and a deep ditch, Hadrian rendered this a strong fortress. He took similar steps with regard to Orcle (Orchia), now Casteila d'Orchia, midway between Bieda and Toscanella. This place had been abandoned by its inhabitants, and had become a den of thieves. At great expense Hadrian re-peopled and fortified it.

Besides erecting a chapel at Ponte Lucano, and supplying it with all the necessaries for the celebration of Mass, we are assured by Boso that “Hadrian greatly increased the Patrimony of Blessed Peter” by the purchase of land and buildings. His biographer proceeds to give several examples of the Pope’s acquisitions, and it is interesting to find that his accuracy is attested by many of the original deeds of purchase that have survived to our time in the *Liber Censuum* of Cencius. Finally, he augmented the papal property by the lands which he inherited from certain nobles who, either in admiration or fear of his character, or to secure his protection, made over all their possessions to him by formal legal documents.

After they had thus been put into his hands, they were generally again made over to their late owners as fiefs; and, even when they had originally been taken by force, they were often given back in the same way. A certain Adenulf of Aquapuzza, near Sezza, the Setia of the Volscians, thought himself strong enough to defy the Pope. But a force of horse and foot was at once sent out from Rome against him, under the treasurer Boso, cardinal-deacon of SS. Cosmas and Damian. The baron held out for a long time, but was at length compelled to surrender unconditionally. The papal banner was planted on his tower, and he himself with bare feet and a rope round his neck, handed over his castle to Hadrian by presenting him with a myrtle bough. “Then, with the customary clemency of the Apostolic See, the Pope invested the aforesaid Adenulf with his castle as a fief”.

Besides imparting the blessings of law and order to the Patrimony generally, Hadrian endeavoured to impress them on those with whom he came into daily contact. Documents, for instance, are extant which show that he reorganised the schola of the *ostiarii*, doorkeepers or guardians, of the Lateran palace, and of the basilicas of St. Lawrence and St. Silvester. He placed them under the control of the camerarius (*treasurer*), and made them take a solemn oath to be true to the Pope, to guard the places committed to their charge during his life or at his death, and not to steal any of his property or that of the places entrusted to them.

If only Hadrian’s organising power had been spared to the Roman See for a long period of years, there can be no doubt that the power and resources of the Roman pontiffs at home would have been very greatly enhanced!

CHAPTER IV
THE DIET OF BESANÇON. THE POPE AND THE LOMBARDS AGAINST
BARBAROSSA. DEATH OF HADRIAN

ALTHOUGH Frederick had left Italy as the friend of the Pope, the good understanding between them did not last long. One perhaps all-sufficient cause of this was the character of the two men. The emperor had the highest opinion of his dignity, and was resolved that all and everything should bend before it. This opinion was not lessened by his imperial coronation, but, on the contrary, as one chronicler expresses it, "the lord of the earth felt raised to the very heavens". Hadrian on his side regarded himself as the Father of all Christians, and as the Shepherd of the entire flock of Christ, and believed that it was for him to reprimand any of his erring children, whether they were kings or peasants.

Hence when in June 1156 Frederick, possibly illegally, married the beautiful Beatrice, daughter of Reinhold, count of Burgundy, he fell under the displeasure of the Pope. His first wife was Adelheid or Adelaide of Vohburg, and her, with the consent of his bishops, and, according to Otto of Frising, of certain papal legates, he had, in the opinion of many, *unjustly* divorced. Up to the time of his marriage with Beatrice, it might have been supposed that he was content with a mere separation from Adelaide, but after that it was obvious that he had repudiated his marriage with her altogether. At this point Hadrian took the matter up; but it would seem that a little inquiry must have proved that the marriage was in order; for no mention of it occurs in any of the incriminating letters which, as we shall soon see, Hadrian addressed to the emperor, or in any official document of the period which has come down to us.

But while we cannot do more than suppose that Frederick was irritated at the legality of his marriage with Beatrice being called in question, it is certain that he was very angry at Hadrian's treaty with the Normans. He maintained that the Pope had, by this concordat, proved himself false to the agreement of Constance, though, as it has been pertinently pointed out, it is difficult to conjecture what he expected Hadrian to do; for the Pope had asked for the emperor's help, and, that refused, he was by all the rules of war entitled to make the best terms for himself. Finally—for we are told that when men are determined to quarrel a straw will furnish the occasion—Frederick proclaimed his profound annoyance at Innocent's picture of Lothaire's coronation.

That ill-will towards Rome was gaining ground with Frederick could not long remain unknown to Hadrian. He accordingly wrote to Abbot Wibald in the beginning of the year 1157 exhorting him with all prudence to admonish the emperor to continue to display due respect to the Apostolic See. This, however, was beyond Wibald's power, and an event occurred some eight months after the despatch of this letter which furnished Frederick with an excuse for a violent display of temper. The spark which caused the fiery monarch's smouldering discontent to burst into vigorous flame was a letter from the Pope.

One of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of the north of Europe at this time was Eskill, archbishop of Lund. When this aged prelate was returning home after a visit to Hadrian, he was seized in Burgundy by one of those robber nobles who were the plague of travellers and of all honest men. The bishop was not only stripped of all he had, but maltreated, and, for the sake of a ransom, thrown into a dungeon. The emperor was appealed to, but took no steps to punish the culprits. With his English love of justice, Hadrian was very indignant at this treatment of Eskill, and sent to Frederick a letter of remonstrance by two cardinals, the famous Roland, cardinal of St. Mark and chancellor of the Holy See, and Bernard, cardinal of St. Clement.

The cardinals found Frederick at Besançon, whither he had gone to arrange the county of Burgundy, which he had received along with Beatrice, and appear to have given umbrage to a prince already prone to take offence by the style of their address, in which they put themselves on a level with the emperor. “The most blessed Pope Hadrian and all the cardinals salute you”, said they, “he as your father, they as your brethren”. They then read the Pope’s letter. Expressing his astonishment that, despite a previous letter on the subject, the emperor has still left the outrage on Eskill unpunished, Hadrian declared that he was at a loss to understand his negligence, since he was not conscious of having done anything against the imperial majesty, but, on the contrary, had ever cherished him as his special son, and as a most Christian Prince. “You ought, most glorious son, to call to mind with what joy your mother, the holy Roman Church, received you the other year...what plenitude of dignity and honor she bestowed upon you, and how conferring upon you the imperial crown, she strove with maternal love to exalt your glory ... We do not regret to have fulfilled your desires in everything, but if you could possibly have received greater benefits (*beneficia*) at our hands, we should only have been too glad to have bestowed them, seeing what advantage could come to the Church of God and to us through you”.

Thereupon, whether simply because it had been resolved to pick a quarrel with the Holy See, or because the imperial chancellor, Reinald of Dassel, in translating the letter into German for the benefit of those who knew not Latin, had purposely or accidentally given it a wrong sense, the assembly became violently angry. They thought, or pretended to think, that the word *beneficia* had been used in its feudal sense of a fief (*lehen* in German), and that consequently the Pope had professed to be the emperor’s suzerain, and, as such, to have conferred the empire upon him as a fief. And when, as though poking the fire with a sword, one of the legates said to have asked: “From whom did he receive the empire, if not from the Pope?”. The anger of the assembled princes became tumultuous. Barbarossa himself is said to have blurted out in his rage: “Were we not in church, you should find how German steel bites”; and Otho of Wittlesbach, the Count Palatine, actually drew his sword, and, but for the emperor’s intervention, would have slain the legate on the spot.

The next day the legates were ordered to return direct to Rome, turning neither to the right nor to the left, nor stopping on the way. In giving this order Frederick’s chief object was no doubt to prevent the cardinals from showing to everyone what a childish or malicious interpretation had been given to the letter of which they had been the bearers, and from telling all they met that, in defiance of the law of nations, the sacred

property of ambassadors had been seized by the emperor. It would also appear that it was reported that he had forbidden any of his subjects to go to Rome.

When Barbarossa had thus rid himself of those who could best have given him the lie direct, he scattered broadcast a most misleading statement of what had occurred at the diet. Not one word did he say of the principal object of the coming of the papal legates, *viz.*, to protest against the ill-treatment of Eskill; but he gave out that the peace of the Church, which it was the business of the Empire to guard, was being broken by the head of the Church. He was “the cause of dissension, the seed of evil, the poison of pestiferous disease”, and his legates at Besançon, so the imperial manifesto insinuated, had declared that Frederick held “the imperial crown as a benefice from the lord Pope”. Upon these legates, averred the emperor, many letters similar to one another were found, as well as sealed but blank forms which could be filled up at their discretion, and which, in accordance with their usual custom, they could use to plunder the churches. In conclusion, after asserting that he held the kingdom and the Empire by the election of the princes from God alone, and that he was striving to rescue the honor and liberty of the churches from oppression, he called upon all to condole with him on the affront that had been put upon the Empire, and not to suffer its honor to be lessened by such an unheard-of innovation.

This intemperate document—in which, “much to his discredit”, Frederick not only “allowed the error as to *beneficia* to go uncorrected”, but even emphasised it—no doubt produced the desired effect upon those who were unacquainted with what had really taken place at Besançon. Much ill feeling at any rate was aroused against Rome.

Meanwhile, the legates had informed the Pope of what had happened, and, according to Rahewin, had made bad appear worse in order that he might act strongly in their behalf. Though an imperial minority among the cardinals accused the envoys of carelessness or incompetency, Hadrian stood by them, and at once wrote to the bishops of Germany exhorting them to bring Frederick back to a sense of his duty, and to insist on his causing the imperial chancellor and the Count Palatine to make condign satisfaction for the outrages they had offered to two such distinguished cardinals. They were also to impress upon the emperor that, whatever storms may arise, the Roman Church will ever remain firm on the rock on which God has set it.

Thus appealed to both by the emperor and by the Pope, the German bishops endeavored to please both parties, although they had the honesty to commence their reply to the Pope by acknowledging that “they were very weak and timid”. And they certainly proved their cowardice by proceeding to pretend that they too, who were supposed to understand Latin, believed Hadrian's letter to have been really ambiguous, and that “saving thy grace, most holy father, on account of the sinister interpretation which its ambiguity permits, we do not dare nor are we able to defend or to approve its language”. They had, however, they continued, received the Pope's letter with becoming reverence, and had admonished the emperor in accordance with its terms. In reply, he had assured them that he would pay due respect to his father, but that “the free crown of our Empire was a divine benefice only”, and that to the Pope it simply belonged to anoint him as emperor. He further declared that he had not dismissed the legates in contempt of his father and consecrator, but that he could not allow them to

proceed with the waitings they had in their possession or were about to compose to the dishonour of the Empire.

Then, after some quibbling with regard to Frederick's prohibition of intercourse with the Pope, the bishops proceeded to tell Hadrian that the emperor had denounced Innocent's picture of Lothaire's coronation, and the peace with William of Sicily. With regard to the Count Palatine and the chancellor, the former, they said, had left Germany for Italy to prepare for another expedition there, and the latter, averring that he had stood by the legates when their lives were in danger, now spoke in a most pacific strain.

In conclusion, they implored the Pope to pity their weakness, and to write to the emperor in a style which would remove the bitterness of his former letter.

According to Rahewin, it was the news which reached Hadrian that another expedition of Frederick into Italy was imminent that moved him to follow the advice of the German bishops and to write a conciliatory letter to the emperor. But, according to Hadrian himself, he acted in this matter "at the instigation of our beloved son, Henry, duke of Bavaria and Saxony". As bearers of this explanatory epistle, he selected Cardinals Henry of SS. Nereus and Achilles, and Hyacinth of S. Maria in Cosmedin, who, as the imperial historian would have us believe, were more accomplished diplomatists than Roland and Bernard. On their way north the legates had an interview with the imperial agents, the Count Palatine Otho and the chancellor Reinald, who had entered Italy to receive the submission of the cities in preparation for the coming of the emperor. In boastful strain the imperial envoys thereupon wrote to inform their master that "the whole country was trembling before them", and advised him on no account to receive the papal envoys into full favor at once, because "God had so improved the state of his affairs that if he chose he could both destroy Rome and work his will with regard to the Pope and the cardinals". They also told Frederick that, "on the Sunday on which Jubilate is sung (May 11)", they were expecting a number of senators and nobles from Rome, along with Otho, the nephew of Cardinal Octavian, who were to bring them favorable overtures from the people.

Animated by such sentiments, Barbarossa's agents naturally took no thought to provide for the safety of the Pope's legates. Nor did they trouble themselves when they were seized in the valley of the Adige by two robber-barons who imagined that, because the emperor was ill-disposed towards the Holy See, they would be permitted to perpetrate any outrage on it or its servants. The two cardinals remained in chains till the brother of Cardinal Hyacinth offered himself as a hostage for them. Fortunately, the barbarism of the counts was well punished by Henry the Lion, duke of Bavaria, who "for love of the Holy Roman Church, and the honour of the Empire" compelled them to make satisfaction for their iniquities.

It was at Augsburg that the new legates met Barbarossa, who, now free from the influence of his chancellor, Reinald, showed himself more reasonable. He must also have been mollified by the cardinals' demeanour, who, we are told, showed their respect for him by their looks, tone of voice, and opening words. This time they did not say that the cardinals saluted him as brothers, but as the lord and emperor of the city and the world, though they did unhesitatingly declare that it was in the full conviction that it had done no wrong that the Roman Church had unwillingly borne his indignation. They

then handed the Pope's letter to the venerable episcopal historian, Otto, bishop of Frising, to be read and interpreted. If it had fallen to the lot of this man ("who was deeply grieved at the quarrel between the Church and the Empire") to interpret Hadrian's previous letter, history would not have known any "Besançon incident".

The Pope commenced his letter by saying that from the beginning of his pontificate he had done his best for the honour of the emperor, and that consequently he was profoundly astonished at the treatment which had been meted out to two of the best and most distinguished of his brethren. And they had been thus discourteously treated, he understood, on account of the word *beneficium*, which ought not to have troubled the mind of anyone, much less that of an emperor. Hadrian then declared that the word ought to have been understood in its natural sense of good deed, which was the signification he had attached to it, and that he had not used any word in a feudal or technical sense. But, he added, if it were true that the emperor had restrained ecclesiastics from visiting the Roman Church, he trusted that he now recognised how unsuitably he had acted.

This gentle but dignified answer of the Pope turned away Frederick's wrath, and for a brief space the Church and the Empire were once more at peace.

But if Hadrian's letter furnished Frederick with a feigned pretext for a brief quarrel, the conduct of the latter in his second descent upon Italy provoked a deadly duel between himself and the Pope. His first Italian expedition had revealed to Barbarossa that the imperial authority in Italy, though readily enough acknowledged in theory, was in practice largely despised. He neither forgot nor forgave the treatment he had received, especially on his return from Rome, nor did the manner in which Milan had been able to flout his authority fade from his mind. It did not therefore require appeals for help from the cities oppressed by Milan and its allies to move him to undertake another Italian expedition to crush the proud cities that disputed his authority. Accordingly, from all parts of the empire he collected a great army which in July 1158 poured into Italy through all the passes of the Alps. Once in the plains of Lombardy, Frederick was joined by all the enemies of Milan, which soon saw its few loyal supporters overwhelmed, and the imperial army round its own walls. After a close siege Milan had to submit (September 8), though among the favourable terms it secured was one by which the imperial army was not to enter the city. On the other hand, the Milanese had to submit the names of their chief magistrates or consuls for the emperor's approval, and to give up all the regalian rights

All Lombardy seemed now awed into submission, and Frederick, dismissing the greater part of his forces, rebuilt the town of Lodi, which had been destroyed by the Milanese, and marched to the plains of Roncaglia, whither he had ordered all the states and nobles of Italy (Lombardy) to send envoys.

At the great assembly, which opened about the middle of November, Frederick endeavored to complete by law what he had begun by arms. With a view to establishing his authority on a firm legal basis, he gathered round him a number of jurists, especially from Bologna, who were called upon to lay down what were the rights included under the term *regalia*. Imbued with the revived study of the legislation of Justinian, a number of these lawyers, assisted by consuls of fourteen Italian cities, assigned to the emperor

rights which perhaps were not so excessive in themselves, as directly contrary to those which the Lombard cities had long possessed; and, what was worse, they based the emperor's claim to those rights on the most extravagant assertions of the imperial prerogatives. Even the archbishop of Milan, following the teaching of Irnerius, declared that "all the people's rights in lawmaking had been made over to him, and that his will was law", and some doctors went so far as to declare that "the emperor was really the lord of all property".

According to Rahewin the *regalia* or crown rights, which "had for a long time been lost to the Empire because they had been usurped and the kings had neglected to recover them", and which were assigned to Frederick by the diet, included "the right to appoint dukes, marquises, counts, and consuls (in the cities), to coin money, to levy tolls, to collect the *fodrum* (provisions for the support of the imperial forces on the march), customs and harbour dues ... to control mills, fish ponds, bridges and all the waterways, and to demand an annual tax not only from the land but also from each person".

In addition to these financial measures, Frederick, in the interest of law and order, forbade private wars, and, in the interest of strong government, proposed to place in each city *Podestàs* (Potestates in Latin) or magistrates exercising "both judicial and executive functions" in his name. Finally, he issued certain feudal regulations, and then broke up the diet, which proved to be the Empire's "most decisive but also its last triumph".

After the assembly had been dismissed, Frederick took up his winter quarters at Alba on the Tanaro in south Lombardy, whilst his agents without loss of time proceeded to institute the Podestàs and to collect the taxes. But the emperor soon found that it was one thing to order the payment of taxes, and another thing to collect them; one thing to say that Podestàs were to be instituted, and another thing to enforce their appointment; one thing to proclaim universal peace, and another to compel its observation. Many of the wealthy and democratic cities began to get very restive when they saw their revenues diverted into the imperial exchequer and their popular institutions superseded, although, in theory, none of them made any difficulty in accepting the imperial claims. Besides, their rivalries were fatal to peace. Disputes of all kinds clamoured for Frederick's settlement. Unfortunately for himself and for the general peace, he did not hold the scales fairly. He favored those who had supported him, and in the troubles which ensued "the balance of wrongdoing is on the whole on the side of the emperor".

Many cities refused to receive his Podestàs, and the state of affairs became suddenly critical when Milan decided that it did not become it "to obey the haughty Teutons". After it had had to suffer various grievances, some real and some no doubt imaginary, it broke out into open rebellion in the beginning of the year 1159. In April it was once again under the ban of the Empire, and soon beheld Frederick ravaging its territories. For some time this was all he was able to do as the greater part of his feudal forces had returned to Germany, and until their return he dare not attack Milan itself.

Meanwhile, Frederick was making another enemy besides the communes of Lombardy; he was driving Pope Hadrian to throw in his lot with the rebel cities of north Italy. Death unfortunately was busy about this time in removing from the emperor's

side men who, while thoroughly loyal to him, were also devoted sons of the Church, and were able to exercise some restraining influence over him when the Holy See was the object of his attack. The great Abbot Wibald had died in July 1158, and before the year closed Frederick's uncle, the historian, Bishop Otto of Frising, had breathed his last while reaffirming his profession of the Catholic faith according to the rule of the holy Roman Church. On August 12, 1158, had also died Anselm, archbishop of Ravenna, and, as he signed himself, "exarch of the same city (civitas)", whose strenuous assertion at Constantinople of the prerogatives of the Pope we had occasion to mention above. Anxious to have a useful partisan in such an important see as that of Ravenna, Frederick asked the Pope to allow Guido, the son of the count of Biandrate, to occupy it, as he had been duly elected by the whole Church of Ravenna. The emperor was anxious for Guido, as the young man's father, though acting with him, had great influence with the Lombard cities. But, even when asking for a favour, he could not avoid insinuating that he was giving a command; and this he did by violating the diplomatic etiquette of the day, and putting his own name before that of the Pope in the address of his letter. Taking no notice of this at the time, Hadrian, who wished to retain Guido in his service for the very same reasons that Frederick wanted to have the young man in his, replied that he had shown favour to Guido at the emperor's particular request, and that, because the young man's high qualities, as well as those of his noble and powerful parents would be of great value to the Roman Church, he had assigned a church to him, though he was not yet a deacon. Hence, he concluded, it would doubtless be to the advantage both of the emperor and of the young man himself if he were retained for advancement in the Roman Church.

Rahewin pretends that for this refusal the emperor ordered his notaries, when writing to Hadrian in his name, to place that of the Pope after his, and to address him in the second person singular instead of plural. But, as we have just seen, he had already put his name before the Pope's in his first letter to him on the subject of Guido.

It was really another cause of discontent with the Pope which urged Frederick to give this undignified instruction to his chancellor. And, according to Eberhard, bishop of Bamberg, writing to Cardinal Henry, but professing not to wish to try to palliate what was incapable of being excused, this cause was a letter written by the Pope to the emperor, which was delivered in an insolent manner by a fellow in rags (*pannosus*), who disappeared immediately after presenting it. In addition to this, the letter itself, which concerned a dispute between the cities of Brescia and Bergamo, "appeared to be harsh in tone, and to threaten the emperor with an interdict if he ventured himself to pass any decision on the case".

Unfortunately, the letter alluded to by the bishop is no longer extant, so that there is no means of judging what right the Pope may have had to write to the emperor in the style noted by Eberhard; but there is evidently some exaggeration with regard to the bearer of the missive. We know too much of the prudent and diplomatic character of Hadrian to believe that he would have prejudiced any case by an insolent delivery of a letter. It is possible that the bearer of the document was a monk, who from fear or from ignorance of what was expected of a papal messenger, may have been unwilling to remain in the imperial residence after he had surrendered the letter with which he had been entrusted.

However this may be, the bishop, after expressing his detestation of those who are sowing discord between the Empire and the priesthood, implores the cardinal to send worthy messengers who shall be bearers of peace. “You know the character of the emperor”, he added in conclusion; “he loves those who love him, and is distant to those who are distant to him, for he has not yet quite learned to love even his enemies”. At the same time he wrote to the Pope to express his fear lest serious trouble might arise out of the existing wordy warfare. “The emperor your son is, as you know, our lord (*dominus*), but you, like Christ, are our teacher and lord (*magister et dominus*). It is not for any of us to ask why you say this or do that”. Still, he ventures to suggest to the Pope that it is better to put out a fire at once than to stand discussing from what source it is coming. Hence he implores the Pope to write a plain, straightforward letter to the emperor recalling him to himself in a fatherly manner, and he assures him that he will find the emperor ready to show him due reverence.

Besides this interference of the Pope in the quarrel between Brescia and Bergamo, Rahewin insinuates that Hadrian had been detected urging Milan and other cities to further rebellion. But he only mentions this as a report, and the letters he proceeds to quote in connection with the rumour, *viz.*, those which have just been discussed, make no reference to such a charge against the Pope. However, if hitherto Hadrian had had no connection with the opposition offered to Frederick by some of the Lombard cities, the latter's high-handed action with regard to the crown-rights (*regalia*) assigned to him by the deputies at Roncaglia, was soon to force the Pope to make common cause with the cities which were in revolt.

In his exaction of the *regalia* Frederick appears to have acted as though he were the immediate lord of the States of the Church, or at least of the lands of the Countess Matilda. He seems to have lost sight of the truth that he was the Protector and not the direct ruler of the Patrimony of St. Peter; and to such an extent did he lose sight of it, that one historian plainly says that, “in violation of law and reason, he seized certain possessions of Blessed Peter”.

To protest against Frederick's action there appeared before the assembly, which in April 1159 placed Milan under the ban of the Empire, four cardinals, *viz.*, the ambitious Octavian, Henry, William, cardinal-deacon, formerly archdeacon of Pavia, and Guido of Crema. At any rate, such is the assertion of our chief authority Rahewin. Unfortunately, however, the worthy canon is a very much inferior historian to his patron and precursor, Bishop Otto; and if he succeeds in making it plain that he has no eyes for the faults of Barbarossa, he does not succeed in stating facts with clearness. In the present instance he states that four legates were sent by the Pope, and then gives us a number of undated letters which he says refer to this legation, and which not only speak of but two legates (Octavian and William), but do not all appear to be connected with one set of negotiations.

The first letter which he cites for our enlightenment is one from Eberhard, bishop of Bamberg, to his namesake the archbishop of Salzburg. Most unfortunately, he does not quote any letter of Hadrian in connection with these negotiations, nor, apparently, have any been preserved elsewhere, so that we cannot hear the Pope speaking in his own behalf.

The bishop, in the beginning of his letter, professed himself very much troubled by the state of affairs; for he feared, he said, an immediate rupture between the Empire and the Papacy. He then proceeded to set forth the claims put forward by Hadrian, which he regarded as a fruitful source of future trouble.

Unhappily, we do not know what those claims were in the Pope's own words. Though Eberhard, when enumerating them, dubbed them "excessive (*durissima*)", they make it plain that Frederick had been acting as the immediate ruler of the papal territories. Hadrian, for instance, claimed that the emperor should not send envoys to Rome without his knowledge, as the government of Rome (*omnis magistratus inibi*) and its regalia belonged to him. Purveyance (*fodrum*) was not to be demanded from the papal states (*de dominicalibus apostolici*) except on the occasion of the imperial coronation, and the bishops of Italy were to take to the emperor not the more solemn oath of homage or vassalage, but only that of fealty or allegiance. Finally, there must be restored to the Roman Church Tivoli, Ferrara, Massa (in Tuscany?), Ficorolii (Fiscaglia), all the country of the Countess Matilda, all the territory from Acquapendente (the town of the dripping waters, in the north of the modern province of Latium) to Rome, the duchy of Spoleto and the islands of Sardinia and Corsica.

In the discussion which ensued on these claims, Frederick declared that, since he was Roman emperor by the will of God, he would be but a shadow of a prince, and bear an empty name, if jurisdiction over the city of Rome were taken from him.

According to the letter we are following, Frederick at last offered to submit all these claims to arbitration if the cardinals would do the same. They, however, said that they had not been empowered to bind the Pope, and then in turn listened to the complaints of the emperor. They were that the Pope had not observed the treaty of Constance (1153), as he had made peace with the Romans and the Normans without the imperial assent; that cardinals were sent through the Empire without the emperor's consent; that the Pope heard unjust appeals and many similar things.

When these points had been submitted to the legates, they made haste to submit them to the Pope, and to ask him to send fresh cardinals to arrange matters. But to this, convinced as he doubtless was of the emperor's intention to persevere in the policy he had begun, Hadrian refused to comply.

Meanwhile, hoping to make capital out of the discord between Hadrian and Frederick, the Romans sent to the latter ambassadors who this time were favorably received. However, at the request of the cardinals, the emperor decided to send envoys to Rome in order, if possible, to make peace with the Pope; but, if not with the Pope, then with the Senate and the Romans.

Somewhat later, whilst the emperor was laying siege to Crema, an ally of the Milanese, the Romans, by way of improving the occasion, sent a second embassy to him. Though they apologised for their outbreak at the time of the emperor's coronation, attributing it to a few wicked persons, they did not fail to repeat that they were the source of Frederick's imperial power. With a view to being able to bring greater pressure on the Pope, Frederick listened graciously to the boastful Romans, gave them great presents, and sent back in their company Otho of Wittlesbach and other envoys. The instructions they had received were to come to terms with the Romans regarding

their Senate, and the reception of an (imperial) prefect, and, if possible, to make peace with the Pope. Well received by the Senate and people, the envoys at once opened negotiations with Hadrian, who had retired to Anagni in June, and, whilst the Romans were busy talking about the ancient glories of Rome, conducted themselves like kings, and contrived to make themselves the centre of affairs.

Hitherto, though he had made it sufficiently evident to Frederick that he would not allow him to ride rough-shod over his rights, Hadrian had confined himself to efforts to make peace between the rival Lombard cities and to verbal expostulation with the emperor. Convinced, however, at length that, by his arbitrary dealings with the cities which opposed him, by his utter disregard of papal rights over the inheritance of Matilda, and by his alliance with the rebellious Romans, Barbarossa's absolutism would stop at nothing, Hadrian decided to join his spiritual sword to the insurgent arms of north Italy. Whilst Frederick was still trying to reduce heroic Crema, Milan made an alliance with Brescia and Piacenza, and sent ambassadors to Hadrian to beg him to cement their league by his adhesion (c. August 1159). The allies undertook not to come to any agreement with the emperor without the consent of Hadrian or his successors, whilst on his side, though he did not confirm his promise on oath, Hadrian agreed to excommunicate Frederick within forty days.

It appears also that William of Sicily was a partner to the league against Frederick, and that, with the consent of all the cardinals except four, Hadrian sent him "the banner of Blessed Peter" by the hands of his chancellor, Cardinal Roland. That William should thus join with the Pope against Frederick was to have been expected, considering that since the Treaty of Benevento (1156), Hadrian had been engaged in loyally supporting the Sicilian king against the Greeks. Manuel Comnenus, not content to see Byzantine influence banished from Italy, but determined if possible to regain a footing in the peninsula, directed several expeditions against its Adriatic coast. Partly by diplomatic understandings with Frederick and partly by gold and force, he obtained possession of various cities both in localities dependent upon the Empire and in districts belonging to William. Hadrian at first endeavored to make peace between Manuel and William, and the Greek historian Nicetas Choniates tells of an embassy of the Pope "of old Rome" appearing in Constantinople to bring this about (1157). Though the ambassadors were favorably received, fighting went on, and we next find Hadrian endeavoring by prohibition and anathema to stop the progress of the Greeks, who were separated from the Church, and exhorting his people to help the Normans who were its members.

The Lombard envoys found Hadrian at Anagni, a town he was not destined to leave. He was taken suddenly ill with quinsy, and died before the expiration of the forty days in the evening of the feast of St. Giles (September 1, 1159).

According to the emperor and other Teutonic authorities who favoured the party of the antipope Victor IV, Roland and the other cardinals who supported Milan agreed, before the death of Hadrian, to elect as his successor only one who would be true to his policy. As will be set forth more at length when the troubled election of Alexander III is treated of, it does indeed seem not unlikely that there was at least an understanding among many of the cardinals that Octavian should not be elected. But whether there was

an election compact or not, there was certainly some difficulty about the choice of a burial-place for Hadrian.

It would appear that, with a view to having the election of his successor held at Anagni, and not at Rome where the power of the emperor's envoys was supreme, many of the cardinals wished to have the body of the late Pope buried at Anagni. But when the news of the death of Hadrian reached Rome, a very great number of people, including the senators, at once set out for Anagni. By their influence all opposition was beaten down, the cardinals agreed to return to the city, and to hold the election in the usual way, and the body of the deceased pontiff was solemnly conveyed to Rome. After it had been laid in an ancient sarcophagus of red Egyptian granite on which were carved two masks, two flowers, and a garland supported in the centre by the skull of an ox, it was placed near the tomb of Eugenius III in the oratory of our Lady in St. Peter's. During his brief pontificate Hadrian had won at least the respect of everyone, of friend and of foe alike, and all our authorities agree in telling of the honorable funeral that was accorded him (September 4). Nearly all the cardinals assisted at it, as did also the imperial ambassadors.

The mingled feelings of respect and love with which fearless Englishman was regarded by the Romans were shared in different degrees by the rest of Christendom, and have been so shared ever since. His death, writes his intimate friend, John of Salisbury, "has perturbed all the peoples and nations of the Christian faith, but it has stirred our England which gave him birth with grief still more bitter, and has watered our country with more abundant tears. His death was a cause of sorrow to all good men, but to none more than to me".

This touching testimony borne to the worth of Hadrian by his bosom friend has been echoed by his fellow-countrymen to this day, and even by those whose religious beliefs are not the same as his. "His life", writes Mr. Tarleton, "may be placed with the highest of those known to us for strength, honesty, and purity of motive. It is by studying the lives of men like him that we feel the influence which they leave behind them to succeeding generations. They teach us in grand simple language not to despair if the way seems hard and weary, but to step boldly out on our journey, remembering that lofty motive and high ideal will lead us on, and bring their reward."

The eulogies which have been passed on Hadrian by his fellow countrymen are repeated by the stranger. Noting that he "was shrewd, practical, and unyielding as Anglo-Saxons are wont to be", the German Gregorovius, though crediting him with arrogance, tells us that "his natural endowments were increased by the greatness to which his own merits had raised him, by knowledge of the world, and by a praiseworthy strength of character".

During the course of the demolition of old St. Peter's in 1607, the archaeologist Grimaldi very fortunately took notes of the opening and subsequent fate of the more important tombs which had accumulated there in the course of over a thousand years. When the sarcophagus of Hadrian was opened, his body was found entire, and clad in a silk chasuble of a dark colour, and is described as that of "an undersized man, wearing slippers of Turkish make, and a ring with a large emerald". After the closing of the

tomb, it was placed in the crypt of the new basilica, where it may still be seen and examined by the aid of the electric light.

Whilst casting a last look at the enduring monument that encloses the remains of the great English Pope, we may recall the still more enduring monument which he has left behind him in the hearts of the Norwegian people, typified today by the bust to “The good Bishop Nicholas”, which they have set up in their elegant cathedral at Trondheim.

CHAPTER IV ENGLAND AND IRELAND

When Henry II became king of England (December 19, 1154), he had the satisfaction of knowing that about two weeks before one of his subjects had mounted the chair of Peter. It may be presumed that he at once sent him a letter of congratulation, possibly by the embassy to which attention has already been drawn; and a document is extant which many have thought to be the letter which he is supposed to have despatched to him. It runs as follows: “A sweet breath of air”, wrote the king, “has breathed into our ears, inasmuch as we learn that the news of your elevation has scattered like a refulgent aurora the darkness of the desolation of the Church. The Apostolic See rejoices in having obtained such a consolation of her widowhood. All the churches rejoice at beholding the new light arise, and hope to behold it expand to broad day. But in particular our west rejoices that a new light has arisen to illuminate the earth, and that, by divine favor, the west has restored that sun of Christianity which had set in the east. Wherefore, most holy Father, we, sharing the general joy at your honour... will lay open to you our desires, confiding as we do with filial devotion in your paternal goodness... Among other desires of our heart, we hope that, as the Almighty ... has transplanted you from this land of ours into His orchard, you will take especial care to reform all the churches, so that all generations may call the country of your beatitude blessed. This too we thirst for ... that the spirit of tempests which is wont to rage furiously round the pinnacles of honor, may never wrest from you concern for your own sanctification, lest, by reason of any deficiency in you, the deepest abyss of disgrace should succeed to the highest summit of dignity. And this too we ardently long for, that, as the regulation of the Church universal belongs to you, you will take care to create cardinals who will be a real help to you, and will be full of zeal for souls; and that, in the collation of benefices, you will strive to prevent any unworthy person intruding into the Patrimony of the Crucified”.

Henry (?) then proceeded to beg the Pope to succour the Holy Land and the empire of Constantinople. In conclusion, he expressed a hope that he would so live and die “that your native land, which congratulates itself on your happy beginning, will find much more glory in the Lord in your happy end. Finally, we request your Paternity...

that you will be pleased to remember us, our family and kingdom, in your prayers and vows”.

Such is the document, without name or date, which has been imagined to have been sent by Henry to Hadrian. But the whole nature of its contents, its references to the appointment of cardinals, to the collation of benefices, and to the reduced state of the Byzantine empire, its sentiments wholly opposed to those of the dictatorial Angevin, show that, if it was not a mere student's exercise, it was in any case the production of a century later than the twelfth.

If Henry did write a congratulatory letter to Hadrian, the answer of the Pope is not forthcoming, though not a few of the documents which proceeded from Hadrian's chancery have reference to this country. One of the earliest of any particular importance is a strong encyclical addressed to the bishops of Germany and Sicily (?) as well as to those of England. Pointing out to them that it is his duty to see to the needs of the whole Church, he bids them excommunicate those who without the authority of their bishops do not hesitate to take possession of churches and benefices through the hands of laymen, and those who, to avoid correction, venture to betake themselves to the secular power, and strive to stir up the anger of the great ones of this world against the prelates of the Church. He concludes his trenchant letter by prohibiting under pain of anathema the consecration of any bishop or abbot whose election had not been wholly free and canonically approved.

Hadrian by this time (1156) knew well what kind of men he had to deal with in Henry II and in Barbarossa,—men who had little respect for established rights either in the Church or in the State; so that he took this early opportunity of showing them that the rights of the Church, at any rate, would be manfully upheld. A man "of heroic type" himself, he had no dread of men of the same calibre. He was aware that the treaty of Constance (1153) had been necessitated by Barbarossa's disregard of the rights of the Church in general and of the Concordat of Worms in particular. And the "Battle Abbey" dispute, which began during the year of the issue of the strong encyclical just quoted (1156), showed that Henry could act just as arbitrarily in ecclesiastical affairs as the emperor.

After the battle of Hastings, William the Conqueror built on its site an abbey, in order that the monks might thank God for his victory, and might pray for the souls of those who had fallen in the fight. Then, as was his wont, assuming an authority in ecclesiastical affairs for which there was absolutely no precedent, he granted it privileges which were not only unheard of before, but which were derogatory to the rights of the ordinary, *viz.*, the bishop of Chichester. It is true that he had the consent of Stigand, who was the ordinary at the time; but, as he was assuming powers that belonged to the Pope, it is no wonder that subsequent bishops of Chichester were not prepared to submit to a curtailment of their rights by virtue of royal charters. Securing the support of Eugenius III, Bishop Hilary endeavored to subject the abbey to his authority. Though he failed at first owing to the opposition of King Stephen, he renewed his attempt with the support of Hadrian, who commanded the abbot "and the Church committed to him" faithfully to obey his bishop (1156). Abbot Walter, however, brought the case before Henry II, who was moved to side with the abbot when the

Norman nobles identified his cause with that of the Normans in general. Protect the abbey, they said, “as the monument of your triumph and ours, against all its adversaries, and most especially against the machinations of the English”. Thereupon Hilary endeavored to put the case on its proper level. He pointed out that our Lord Jesus Christ had established two powers in the world, the spiritual and the material, that the bishops were the representatives of the former, and that “the Church of Rome, being invested with the apostleship of the Prince of the apostles, holds such great dignity of power throughout the world, that no bishop, no ecclesiastical person can, without his appointment or permission, be deposed from his office ... Neither is it lawful”, continued the bishop, “for any layman, no, not even for a king, to confer ecclesiastical liberties and dignities upon churches, nor to take them away when once conferred, unless by permission or confirmation of the said father, as ecclesiastical authority by the Roman law proves”. These bold words provoked a storm of angry words from Henry, who accused the bishop of wishing to deprive him of the royal prerogatives, and declared that he would himself decide on the merits of the case. Alarmed at this outburst of the passionate monarch, Hilary renounced his claim, and became reconciled with the abbot (1157). St. Thomas Becket, who was present at this trial, thus alludes to it long after in a letter to Pope Alexander, when impressing upon him Henry’s tyranny: “What success had the bishop of Chichester against the abbot of Battle when he mentioned the apostolic privileges on which he was relying, and denounced the abbot as excommunicated? He was forthwith compelled to communicate with him in the face of all present, without even the form of absolution, and to receive him to the kiss of peace. For so it pleased the king and the court, which dare not contradict him in anything”.

This tendency among the English bishops to submit to the illegal actions of an arbitrary monarch had already been stigmatised by Hadrian during the course of the Battle Abbey dispute. He had blamed Archbishop Theobald for “lowering the influence” of the Roman Church, since, “both in his case and in that of the king, appeals to Rome were so buried that no one dared to appeal to the Apostolic See either in his presence or in the king’s”. Moreover, added the indignant pontiff, “you are so slack in the administration of justice, and are said to be so devoted to the interests of the king and so afraid of him that, if ever we send you instructions to see that a man gets justice, he is never able to obtain it”. Hadrian brought this severe letter to a conclusion by impressing on Theobald that he would not remain unpunished if he did not amend his conduct.

Cases of all kinds from this country were however, of course laid before Hadrian, and his extant letters show him adjudicating on the action of bishops, calling on them or upon abbots to obey their canonical superiors, striving earnestly to keep the peace between England and France, and bestowing privileges. It is pleasing to note that, by virtue of one of his privileges, he may be said to have helped in the making of Oxford. The historians of that venerable city aver that the town seems to have grown up under the shadow of a nunnery, which is said to have been founded by St. Frideswyde as far back as the eighth century. Hence when, by a bull addressed to Prior Robert, Hadrian confirmed its possessions to St. Frideswyde’s monastery, he undoubtedly contributed to the steady growth of the city which depended upon it.

But the other relations of Hadrian with England have comparatively little interest for most people compared to that which centres around the bull *Laudabiliter* which connects the Pope with Henry's invasion of Ireland. A very large amount of literature has grown up around this document, with which it is neither possible nor even desirable to deal; for much of it has rather confused than enlightened the question. Nothing more will be attempted here than to give in the fewest words what appears to be clearly ascertained with regard to Hadrian's connection with Ireland.

Though possessed of ample dominions Henry was desirous of extending them, and on Michaelmas day (September 29, 1155) held a council at Winchester, where he deliberated with his nobility upon the conquest of Ireland, which he proposed to give to his brother William. But because the idea was displeasing to the empress his mother, the expedition was put off for the time. Henry, however, had no thought of abandoning his schemes; but, thinking no doubt that the opposition of his mother would be lessened if the Pope's approval were obtained, he sent an important embassy to Hadrian craving his permission to invade Ireland. He based his petition on his desire to extirpate the seeds of vice among the Irish people; and hence, rather hypocritically it is to be feared, he expressed a desire to the Pope of doing what he proposed in such a way as not to injure the Christian commonwealth. The important embassy was no doubt the one which started on October 9, 1155, under Abbot Robert, of which we have already spoken, and it is scarcely a stretch of the imagination to suppose that the affairs of Ireland were among "the important concerns of the king" entrusted to its management.

The ambassadors found the Pope at Benevento, where it is certain that he resided at least from November 1155 to July 1156, and he himself testifies to the fact that they actually appeared before him, and that they had been sent by English king. At Benevento the ambassadors also found John of Salisbury, one of the most learned and upright men of his age, and the friend and fellow-countryman of the Pope. Through his friendship with the Pope, John was able to obtain for them the principal favor they had come to seek. This he tells us himself in the last chapter of his philosophical work which he called *Metalogicus*, and which he wrote in 1159. He opens the chapter by saying that grief prevents him from writing more. There is war between the English and the French; his friend Pope Hadrian is dead; and his "father and lord", Archbishop Theobald, is dangerously ill, and has laid upon him the care of all the ecclesiastics. The death of the Pope especially distressed him; for, affirms John, "he declared in public as well as in private that he had a greater affection for me than for any other person in the world. He had formed such an opinion of me that he was delighted to open his heart and conscience to me, as often as opportunity offered. Though Roman pontiff, he was pleased to have me as guest at his table; and, in spite of my reluctance, he required that one plate and one cup should be in common between us. At my request he ceded and bestowed Ireland upon the illustrious king of England, Henry II, to be possessed by hereditary right, as his letters prove to this day. For all islands, in virtue of a very ancient law, are considered to belong to the Roman Church, through a donation of Constantine, who founded and endowed this Church. Moreover, Pope Hadrian sent by me a gold ring, adorned with a most beautiful emerald, by which investiture with the right of governing Ireland should be made; and this ring is still preserved by order in the public treasury".

It is, then, quite impossible to doubt that Hadrian made a feudal grant of Ireland to Henry; *i.e.*, he made over that island to the English king to be held as a fief under his suzerainty. No use was, however, made of the papal concession at the time, owing, it may be presumed, either to the continued opposition of the empress-mother, or to Henry's wish to get absolute possession of Ireland, and not to hold it as a mere vassal; or, what is perhaps still more likely, to the difficulties in which he was soon involved with his brother Geoffrey, and with Louis VII, of France concerning his Continental possessions.

While, then, it may be stated as certain that Henry received from Hadrian a concession regarding Ireland, there yet remains to inquire whether the grant itself has been preserved. It would seem that it has. About the year 1188 Giraldus Cambrensis wrote his Conquest of Ireland (*Expugnatio Hibernica*), and in this work, after telling us that Henry had obtained a privilege relating to Ireland from Hadrian through John of Salisbury, he proceeds to quote the following letter:—

“Hadrian, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our most dear Son in Christ, the illustrious King of the English, greeting and the Apostolical Benediction.

“The thoughts of your Highness are laudably and profitably directed to the greater glory of your name on earth, and to the increase of the reward of eternal happiness in heaven, when as a Catholic Prince you propose to yourself to extend the borders of the Church, to announce the truths of the Christian faith to ignorant and barbarous nations, and to root out the weeds of wickedness from the field of the Lord; and the more effectually to accomplish this, you implore the counsel and favour of the Holy See. In which matter we feel that the more discreet your proceedings, the, happier with God's aid will be the result; because those undertakings which proceed from the ardour of faith and the love of religion are sure always to have a prosperous end and issue.

“It is beyond all doubt, as your highness also does acknowledge, that Ireland, and all the islands upon which the Christ the Sun of Justice has shone, and which have received the knowledge of Christian faith, are subject to St. Peter and to the most holy Roman Church. Wherefore we are the more desirous to sow in them an acceptable seed and a plantation pleasing to God, as we see the more clearly, after close reflection, that this is required of us.

“Now, most dear Son in Christ, you have signified to us that you propose to enter the island of Ireland to establish the observance of law among its people, and to eradicate the weeds of vice; and that you are willing to pay from every house one penny (denarius) as an annual tribute to St. Peter, and to preserve the rights of the churches of the land whole and inviolate. We, therefore, receiving with due favour your pious and laudable desires, and graciously granting our consent to your petition, declare that it is pleasing and acceptable to us, that for the purpose of enlarging the limits of the Church, setting bounds to the torrent of vice, reforming evil manners, planting the seeds of virtue, and increasing Christian faith, you should enter that island and carry to effect those things which

belong to the service of God and for the salvation of that people and that the people of that land should honourably receive and reverence you as Lord : the rights of the churches being preserved, untouched, and entire, and reserving the annual tribute of one penny from every house to St. Peter, and the most holy Roman Church.

“If therefore you resolve to carry these designs into execution, let it be your study to form that people to good morals, and take such orders both by yourself and by those whom you shall find qualified in faith, in words, and in conduct, that the Church there may be adorned, and the practices of Christian faith be planted and increased; and let all that tends to the glory of God and the salvation of souls be so ordered by you, that you may deserve to obtain from God an increase of everlasting reward, and may secure on earth a glorious name throughout all time. Given at Rome”, etc.

This document, published by Giraldus in three of his works, is also found in Ralph de Diceto’s *Ymagines Historiarum*, which was compiled before 1199, and, as Ralph cannot be shown to have borrowed from Giraldus on any other occasion, it is probable that he did not copy from him on this one. Roger of Wendover also gives the bull, apparently from some source independent of Giraldus, and Cardinal Baronius drew it from an ancient Vatican codex. Further, what is much more important, the text of *Laudabiliter* appears in the Book of Leinster, which was “almost certainly” drawn up during the lifetime of Dermot MacMurrough (*d.* 1171), and probably by Dermot’s old tutor Aedh M’Crimthainn. So rapid and widespread a diffusion of the *Laudabiliter* letter quite precludes the idea of its having been a mere scholastic exercise or forgery of any kind.

Hadrian was undoubtedly moved to entrust Ireland to the Normans because he saw on the one hand the wretched condition of the country, and on the other what good the Normans had effected in south Italy and in England. He was, indeed, perfectly alive to their defects, but he had seen some kind of ecclesiastical and civil order developed by them out of the miserable chaos of southern Italy, and he had seen the English Church quite revived by the action of such Normans as Lanfranc and Anselm. Both England and Ireland had been dragged down to the lowest depths by the ravages of the Norsemen. The Normans, descendants of these very destroyers, had put new life into the English Church, and Hadrian hoped that they would do as much for the Irish Church, which was even in a worse condition than the English Church had been. The causes of degradation had been at work for a hundred years longer in Ireland than in England. The victory of Brian Boru, which had crushed the power of the Norsemen, had not brought unity to the Irish themselves. Their internal dissensions after the death of Brian had proved as fatal to Ireland’s prosperity as the swords of the Danes. When Hadrian became Pope its civil and ecclesiastical condition was still appalling and had been made well known to Rome by St. Malachy. It was therefore in the hope that the Normans would do for Ireland what they had done for England that Hadrian authorised their going thither, on condition that they should work for its improvement. That his

intentions were not fulfilled does not render them less estimable, or show that he was not justified in forming them.

But, as a matter of fact, Henry did not undertake to subdue Ireland on the strength of Hadrian's privilege, which soon became valueless by the death of its donor. When he did invade Ireland it was not because he had papal sanction to endeavour to improve its moral and political condition, but because circumstances forced his hand. In 1168 he had permitted Dermot MacMurrough, one of the many kings in Ireland, to enlist some of his barons to help him to recover the throne from which he had been driven.

Three years later (1171), jealous of the success which had attended the expedition of his vassals, and perhaps because he wished to avoid the legates whom Pope Alexander III had despatched to England to examine into the murder of St. Thomas Becket, Henry crossed over to Ireland (October). In a very short time he had received the homage of most of the chief men in the country, and on November 6 he received the submission of the Irish bishops and abbots at a council held at Cashel, presided over by Christian, bishop of Lismore, the papal legate. Various disciplinary canons were published by this synod which might have been productive of much good if Henry had remained long enough in the country to bring about order. But in about six months (April 1172) he left it to meet the Pope's legates in Normandy.

Meanwhile he despatched to Rome, by the hands of Ralph, archdeacon of Llandaff (the very man whom he had sent to hold the council of Cashel with the Irish bishops), the formal documents in which the Irish episcopate had recognised him and his heirs as kings of Ireland. Informed of the state of Ireland by the letters of the Irish bishops, and by the king's envoys and by "common report", Alexander complied to some extent with the wishes of Henry, and sent him various privileges (September 20, 1172).

The king at once sent these documents to Ireland by the hands of William Fitz-Audelin, his *Dapifer* (standard-bearer), who had been frequently employed by him on diplomatic missions in that country. Arrived in Ireland, the envoys laid before the Irish hierarchy both Alexander's letters and the letter of Hadrian, which they had taken from the archives of Winchester, where it had remained so long unused. The bishops received the documents at the council of Waterford (1173), and signified their assent to them.

With the letter of Hadrian the reader is already familiar, it remains, therefore, only to speak of the privileges granted by Pope Alexander. Henry brought the letters of both pontiffs before the Irish clergy to show that one of them had authorised the commencement of his undertaking, and that the other had approved of what he had already accomplished. Now, on the subject of the relations of Henry II to Ireland, we have four letters of Alexander III. Of these, three, found originally in the so-called *Liber niger Scaccarii* (Black Book of the Exchequer), which was published by Hearne, are all dated from Tusculum, September 20, 1172, and are accepted as genuine by all authorities of any standing. The fourth begins "Quoniam ea", and is the one quoted by Giraldus as having been read and accepted at the council of Waterford.

The first of the three letters of Pope Alexander is addressed to Henry. It opens by congratulating him on his successes in Ireland, where the people have abandoned themselves to vice and to mutual destruction, and thanking him for his efforts to lessen

the evils he found there. As penance for his sins he must persevere in his laudable beginnings for the good of the country, and must even extend the rights of the Roman Church in Ireland. The other two letters of September 20, 1172, are addressed to the kings and bishops of Ireland. The Pope is glad to hear that they have accepted Henry “as their King and Lord, because there will be greater peace and tranquility” in Ireland, and he trusts that they will faithfully submit to him.

The fourth letter confirms to Henry that title of King or Lord of Ireland which had been allowed him by Hadrian, and which its writer had already called upon the bishops and princes of Ireland to recognise.

“Alexander, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his most dear son in Christ, the illustrious King of the English, health and apostolical benediction.

Since those things deserve to be established for ever which are recognised as granted with good reason by our predecessors, We, following in the footsteps of the venerable Pope Adrian, and earnestly anxious for the fruit of our desire, do ratify and confirm the concession of the said Pope regarding the dominion of the kingdom of Ireland granted to you, saving to Blessed Peter and to the holy Roman Church, as well in England as in Ireland, the annual payment of one penny (denarius) from each house. So that the filthiness of that land being purged out, a barbarous nation, which is reckoned to bear the Christian name, may by your diligence, put on the comeliness of sound morality, and the Church of those parts, hitherto unordered, being brought into some proper form, that race may henceforth through you effectively obtain the title of Christian”.

In leaving the thorny path of the Irish expedition of Henry, we may remark that, if the wishes of the Popes had been put into effect, Ireland would have had a different history. In that case its princes and bishops would have acknowledged the suzerainty of Henry, who would have introduced into Ireland the tranquility which he established in England by the destruction of the castles which the barons had erected in England in the reign of Stephen. Then, with its people obedient to their native princes, who would have owed fealty to a suzerain capable of enforcing respect for law, Ireland would have attained, in the twelfth century, to that condition of things which earnest men are still endeavoring to bring about in the twentieth. We should have seen, in the twelfth century, Ireland enjoying local independence under a powerful and wealthy suzerain, and with this additional advantage which it would not have if that were effected now: in the twelfth century the suzerain would himself have been subject to the monitor of Europe, to the Pope of Rome, then looked up to as the supreme judge of kings and nations. But Henry did not accomplish what was expected of him by Hadrian IV and Alexander III. He did not set up a government in Ireland strong enough to compel both the Irish chieftain and the Anglo-Norman baron to keep the king’s peace, and to bow to the supremacy of the law. Some, indeed, think that he only made confusion worse confounded; but to such attention may be drawn to certain conclusions of Mr. Orpen. He has, he writes, “been led to regard the domination of the English Crown and of its ministers in Ireland during the thirteenth century, and indeed up to the invasion of Edward Bruce in the year 1315, as having been much more complete than has been

generally recognised, and to think that due credit has not been given to the new-rulers for creating the comparative peace and order and the manifest progress and prosperity that Ireland enjoyed during that period, wherever their rule was effective”.

With reluctance must we bring this biography to a close, just alluding to Hadrian’s support of the Templars. For this he was blamed by his candid critic, John of Salisbury. In reviewing the state of the religious orders of his day, Pope Hadrian, says John, found that the extensive papal privileges which they had received were being largely used to gratify avarice. He, accordingly, at first wished to recall them all, but, as that would have been impolitic and unjust, he decided to limit them. He hence decreed that the freedom from taxation often claimed by the religious orders should only extend to *novalia*, *i.e.*, to fallow-land which they had themselves brought under cultivation. By this regulation, adds John, they could enjoy their privileges without grave injury to the rights of others. John, however, proceeds to express his profound astonishment that “so great a Father” continued to allow the Templars to hold benefices with the cure of souls. For although the knights did not themselves undertake the cure of souls, the severe critic seemed to think that it was opposed to the canons that the Blood of Christ should be administered even by deputy by those whose profession it was to shed the blood of men.

Though neither the Templars nor the Hospitallers were without their faults, Hadrian was, not unnaturally, well disposed to both these Orders. They were the mainstay of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. They formed its regular army.

The only event connected with the life of Hadrian which William of Tyre narrates at any length is concerned with the Hospitallers; and, in what he has to tell us about it, we must not forget that the archiepiscopal historian looked at the episode from the point of view of a bishop. He complains of the insubordination of the Hospitallers towards bishops, and says that its cause, perhaps its innocent cause, was the Roman Church when it freed them from episcopal control.

On the occasion of a dispute concerning tithes between the Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Hospitallers, the latter, *according to William*, prevented him from preaching to the people not merely by the continued ringing of bells, but even by firing volleys of arrows into the church. Unable to obtain redress from the superiors of the Knights, the Patriarch with some of his suffragans went to Italy. They had, however, great difficulty in meeting Hadrian, as “some said” he purposely avoided them because, “it was said”, the Hospitallers had bribed him. At length they obtained a hearing from Hadrian at Ferentino (September 1155). But the case was given against them both by the Pope and by the whole body of the cardinals, with the exception of two, one of whom was the subsequent antipope Octavian, and the other, the lord John of S. Martino, who had formerly been the Patriarch's archdeacon. It is the same William who furnishes us with these particulars who has the hardihood to tell us that all the other cardinals were on the lookout for bribes.

And now, passing over the English Pope’s advocacy of the rights of the Genoese in the kingdom of Jerusalem, and of the primacy of Toledo, we will but pause to note that he did not show as much favour as his predecessors to the famous Gerhoh of Reichersberg. Though Gerhoh dedicated a treatise to him in which he called upon him to show that the zeal of his predecessors was astir in him, and though he even declared

that Hadrian was so animated by the spirit of the apostle Peter, nay, of Christ Himself, as to love and support those whom he knew to be good, and to be contending for the law of God, still he had sorrowfully to confess that Hadrian knew him not, and that consequently he had fallen into the hands of his enemies. Gerhoh attributes the Pope's neglect of him to the difficulties and troubles which surrounded him. But, though Gerhoh was careful to state that he wished never to differ from the Roman Church in matters of faith, a wise churchman like Hadrian may readily have regarded it as the soundest policy not to give any attention to the questions to which so bold a theoriser as Gerhoh wished to wring answers from him. Practical problems had a greater charm for Hadrian than brilliant schemes of reform, no matter how useful or even necessary, which were impractical at the moment.

We cannot do better, in bringing to a close our Life of Hadrian IV, than quote the words with which one of his modern English admirers and biographers concludes the preface to his Life of the same Pope: "If it is good for us to study the lives of those who by unsullied careers, have added lustre to their native country, and to revere their names, we Englishmen can surely spare some of our admiration for Nicholas Breakspear".

ALEXANDER III

(1159-1181)

CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS.

Emperor of the Romans.

Frederick I Barbarossa, 1152-1190

King of England.

Henry II, 1154-1189

Eastern Emperors.

Manuel I Comnenus, 1143-1180

Alexius II Comnenus, 1180-1183

Kings of France.

Louis VII the Young, 1137-1180

Philip II Augustus, 1180-1223

CHAPTER I

ROLANDO BANDINELLI AND HIS ELECTION AS POPE. ALEXANDER III AND THE SCHISM TILL THE ARRIVAL IN FRANCE (1159-1162)

The papal mantle which Hadrian had found so thorny, and the papal mitre which had been to him as a furnace of fire, were assumed by Roland (the son of Rainucci of Siena), whom more recent writers call Rolando Bandinelli, and attach to the family of the Paparoni. These insignia he was destined to wear with dignity and honor, if not with ease and comfort, for a longer time than the great majority of the successors of St. Peter. He was to be Pope for twenty two years.

As is usual with the Popes of this period, very little is known of Roland's early life, and of that little the chronological order does not appear to be certain.

For a time, at any rate, he seems to have been a professor of canon law at Bologna, whilst in his monastery of St. Felix in the same city was compiling his immortal *Decretum*. As we learn from a contemporary, Richard of Cluny, Rolando made a great reputation for himself as a canonist,—a reputation which was increased by his *Summa* and by his *Sentences*, a book which was discovered comparatively recently by Father Denifle in the public library of Nuremberg.

The position which Rolando held at Bologna would naturally lead one to expect that when he became Pope he would not forget professors and scholars. His pontifical acts prove that he did not, and show him one of the world's greatest practical benefactors in the cause of learning. On October 20, about the year 1171, he issued an important bull to the bishops of France. To explain its purport we will adopt the words of the historian of *the Universities of Europe*: "With the rapid spread of education in the twelfth century there grew up round the more famous churches an increasing number of masters anxious to obtain permission to teach scholars who could afford to pay something for their education. Hence it became usual for the *scholasticus* or chancellor to grant a formal permission to other masters to open schools for their own profit in the neighborhood of the church". These officials then began to exact fees for the *licentia docendi*. It was this practice which Alexander condemned. In a letter addressed to the bishops of France, he bade them forbid "the masters of the schools" in their respective dioceses daring to demand payment from such as wished a licence to teach, but to order them to allow all properly qualified persons who wished to do so to open schools without let or hindrance, lest learning which ought to be imparted gratis should seem to be offered for sale. On the other hand, in order to ensure efficiency, he would not allow anyone to teach without obtaining the licence of the *scholasticus*.

Besides this, Alexander threw his mantle over both the teachers and the taught. In the case of a disturbance at Rheims in which some students were injured and damage was done to the doors and windows of the schools, the Pope forbade "the liberty" of the students to be interfered with, as long as they were ready to submit to the jurisdiction of their masters. He interested himself equally in the teachers, endeavoring for instance to obtain ecclesiastical revenues for them, in order, as he says in one place, "that by the pity of the Church the poor may rejoice that learning is within their grasp".

Anxious, however, as he was that education should be wholly free, still, when ordering his legates to examine into the condition of the already famous schools at Paris, he specially forbade them to bear too hardly in this matter either *nominatim* on Master Peter, the chancellor of Paris, or on the masters in general.

The immense value to the cause of education of the interest of Alexander in the schools of France at this period cannot be overestimated. As we learn from himself, the Church of France was then specially distinguished for the number of its learned men. As a consequence, the steps of all the students of the West were turned towards that favored country. Alexander's concern for their welfare and for that of their instructors at once gave them a standing. In an age of violence it rendered the calling of the scholar and the position of the professor honorable in the eyes of all. Alexander was Europe's first

minister of education, and, in accordance with the best traditions of the Papacy, there was nothing mean about his educational policy. Free licence was to be given to all competent men to teach, and their instruction was, as far as ever possible, to be given gratuitously; but, at the same time, to ensure that the teachers were competent, no schools were to be opened without the permission of the recognized authorities. Many a modern minister of education might with advantage study the decrees of Alexander III for the advancement of learning.

But though a friend of learning, Alexander was no friend of licence, even in the domain of thought. Understanding that there were many loose opinions concerning the faith (*sententia de fide*) among the French professors, he summoned them before him to the number, it is said, of over three thousand. Then, in conjunction with the cardinals, he forbade them to waste their time in vain speculations and useless questions in the matter of theology (*omnes tropos et indisciplinatas questiones in theologia*). He ordered the bishops to suppress such idle theological discussions all over France; but, resting on one hundred and fifty authorities which were brought to his notice, he approved the proposition (*sententia*) which proclaimed the glory of the human nature which had been assumed by God (*de gloria hominis in Deum assumpti et in Deum nati*).

We have also seen that in his early manhood Alexander was distinguished for his skill in law. His papal legislation was to prove that his hand did not lose its cunning with age. As an ecclesiastical legislator he has been said to be “scarcely second to Innocent III”. His decrees, along with those of Innocent, were the chief sources of the Decretals of Gregory IX.

Besides being a professor at Bologna, Roland was a canon of Pisa. When Pope Eugenius III was at that city in the autumn of 1148, he heard much of this learned and popular cleric, and lost no time in bringing him to Rome. In quick succession he made him cardinal deacon of SS. Cosmas and Damian, cardinal-priest of St. Mark, and chancellor of the Apostolic See.

The man who thus quickly mounted the ladder of fame was, according to Boso, from whom we have these facts, of no small ability. Besides being a teacher of ready and polished speech, he was well read both in sacred and profane literature, and was endowed with the priestly virtues of prudence, chastity, sobriety, and generosity to the poor, about whom he ever showed himself solicitous. In addition to these qualities, he possessed, as we have already seen manifested at the court of Barbarossa, the virtue of fortitude in a marked degree. But if on the occasion referred to he allowed his zeal to outrun his discretion, when he became Pope the difficulties of his position compelled him so to regulate his ardent nature by prudence that, in the affair of St. Thomas Becket, he has even been accused of pusillanimity. While, however, the same undaunted soul animated Bandinelli whether as cardinal or as Pope, the cruel conditions under which most of his pontificate was passed forced him in later life to possess his soul in the strictest patience.

Of Roland’s career as cardinal of St Mark sufficient has been said in the foregoing pages; close attention must now be given to the circumstances of his election as Pope.

Whilst Hadrian IV lay ill at Anagni, the great majority of the cardinals around him were full of anxiety about the future. They knew that there was one among them who

was prepared to go all lengths to obtain the Papacy, who with the greed of a miser had been hoarding up money wherewith to further his ends, and who had been false to the cause of the Church in order to curry favor with the emperor. They thought of his descent from one of the noblest families of Rome, and they realized what influence that would give him among the Roman nobility. Nor, in fine, had they forgotten that there were two imperial ambassadors in Rome, the Count Palatine Otho and Guido, count of Biandrate, who would do all in their power to forward the wishes of their master in favor of Octavian.

It was only natural that they, full of such thoughts, should have made up their minds only to elect one of their own way of thinking, and in no case to elect the ambitious imperial candidate Octavian. Whether they came to a formal, definitely expressed agreement among themselves on this subject may be doubtful, though the supporters of Octavian declared that “the Sicilian party (*secta*)” took an oath in presence of Hadrian only to select a Pope out of their own number. And these same partisans would like us to believe further that before the cardinals left Anagni they all agreed not to bring the coming election to an end until a candidate should have been chosen unanimously.

The great majority of the cardinals were also anxious to have the new Pope elected at Anagni, as they would there be freer from external pressure. But this would not have suited Octavian, whose influence was all in Rome through his family connections and the imperial ambassadors; nor did the plan please the Romans, who had no wish to lose their privileges. Accordingly, on the death of Hadrian (September 4), the senators made it known that they would not suffer his body to be buried until the cardinals had assembled in Rome, and were prepared to proceed to the canonical election of the new Pope, after the funeral.

Seeing that there was no help for it, the cardinals went to Rome, but took the precaution of commissioning Cardinal Boso to take possession of the *munitio* of St. Peter, a charge which had already been given him by Pope Hadrian. On September 4 the body of that great pontiff was laid to rest in St. Peter's. On the following day the cardinals assembled behind the high altar of the basilica, its doors were fastened by the senators, and the process of electing the new Pope began at once. It is difficult to say exactly how many cardinals took part in the debate. Alexander says that nearly all the cardinals were present at Hadrian's funeral, so that we may perhaps presume that all the cardinals in Rome were present at the election. From the signatures attached to the encyclicals issued by the cardinals of the two parties soon after the election was over, we get the names of twenty-nine cardinals. If to these we add the names of Rolando and Octavian, it appears that at least thirty-one cardinals may possibly have taken part in this memorable election. There would appear, however, to be some doubt whether Imarus, bishop of Tusculum, was present at the final scene of the election. If we are to trust Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux, he left the assembly because he would not miss his dinner. At any rate, it seems certain that it was only after the election of Alexander that he went over to the party of Octavian.

In our account of the details of the election, the narrative of Gerhoh of Reichersberg will be followed as far as possible. His story is selected not merely

because it is more minute than the others, but also because it is more likely to be impartial than any of the others.

After the cardinals had assembled, a secret ballot was taken forthwith, from which, when its results were announced, it appeared that the larger and more influential party had voted for Rolando. "Very few" had voted for Octavian, and a certain number for Bernard, bishop of Porto. Thereupon, with a view to securing a unanimous election, those who had voted for Bernard either went over to Rolando's party or declared that they were prepared to accept whichever of the other two candidates was selected by the rest. By this means the number of those in favor of Octavian or not averse to him was raised to seven or nine.

Finally, on the third day, all the cardinals went over to Rolando except John of SS. Silvester and Martin and Guido of Crema of the title of St. Calixtus. These two obstinately declared that they would never abandon the candidature of Octavian. Seeing that further discussion with them was but a waste of time, the cardinals as a body, acting perfectly in accordance with canon law, ignored their opposition, and proceeded to carry out the formalities necessary to complete the election.

In accordance with custom, the archdeacon brought forward the scarlet mantle which was the distinctive papal dress. For a time the cardinal of St Mark resisted the attempt that was made to place it upon him, pleading his unfitness for the great burden of the Papacy. But when Octavian stepped forward and, in the emperor's name, forbade him to accept the mantle, the cardinals insisted, and Rolando bent his will and his head to receive it. At the sight of this, losing all self-control, Octavian suddenly seized the mantle, and after a struggle succeeded in possessing himself of it, only to have it torn from him by a senator. Thus baffled, he called to his chaplain to produce the mantle he had caused to be specially provided for the purpose, and, removing his hat, bent his head in order that it might be put through the aperture in the centre of the great cloak. But in the hurry of the moment it was, to the great amusement of most of the onlookers, put on so that the "hood", which ought to have been on Octavian's back, was on his chest. And, as though he was not looking foolish enough already, unable in his excitement to find the hood, he pulled up or off some of the lower fringes of the mantle and fitted them to his neck as best he could.

Then followed a scene of almost indescribable confusion. While some attempted to strip Octavian of the mantle the which he had so impudently assumed, he proclaimed himself as Pope Victor, and, intoning the Te Deum, rushed from behind the altar where the conclave was being held, and showed himself to a number of the clergy who in a remote part of the basilica were anxiously awaiting the result of the election. Seeing him in the papal mantle, they at once acclaimed him Pope, some, no doubt, in good faith. At the same moment the doors of the church were unbarred or burst open, and a crowd of armed men, partisans, for the most part at least, of Octavian, burst into St. Peter's. In an instant the peaceful basilica was instinct with the din of war. Its marble walls gleamed with the flashing of sword and spear, and its great rafters rang with their wild clang, and with the still wilder shouts that proclaimed Octavian Pope.

Thus acclaimed, Victor, after his mantle had been properly adjusted, was enthroned. Then, amid shouts of "Papa Victore san Piero l'elege", he was escorted in

triumph with a few priests to the Vatican palace, where he was gladdened by the accession to his party of Imarus, cardinal-bishop of Tusculum. Meanwhile, the terrified adherents of Alexander were only too thankful to be able to retire in safety to the fortress attached to St. Peter's, which was in the hands of Cardinal Boso.

There, relying on the imperial ambassadors (who declared that they would wage a vigorous warfare, *vivam guerram*, against Alexander), and on a number of the senators whose support he had bought, Octavian blockaded them for nine days (September 7-15) by means of his relations, of certain senators whom he had bribed, and of some of the lower orders of the people.

Meanwhile, he summoned the bishops of the Patrimony of St. Peter to come to his consecration. With the exception of the bishop of Ferentino, who had been his schoolfellow, and to whom he had made liberal promises, the other bishops, telling him that they must obey God rather than man, held aloof from him. Nor was his cause prospering within the city. The mass of the people were beginning to move in favor of his rival. Whenever he appeared he was greeted with cries of "Accursed one! (*Maledicte!* in allusion to his family name), son of the accursed one, thief of your comrade's cloak!, you shall never be Pope. We will have Alexander, whom God has chosen". A certain Britto had even the courage to upbraid him to his face in a number of rhyming couplets for dividing Christ's seamless garment, and to remind him of approaching death.

It is true that on September 15 "the tower of St. Peter" fell into the hands of his party, and that the Pope-elect had been conveyed to a stronger place across the Tiber. But, finding that the fickle public opinion of Rome was for the time still against him, Victor left the city by night, while the Pope-elect and his cardinals, released from their confinement, principally by the exertions of Odo Frangipane, were conducted with every manifestation of joy through the streets (September 17).

Rolando, however, knew full well that Rome was not a safe place for him. The imperial ambassadors were still there, and the influence of the family of Octavian was great. He accordingly at once left the city, honorably escorted by a large number of the nobility and militia of Rome, but, if the account of his enemies is to be accepted, dressed all in black and with an entire absence of the customary personal pomp. Moving along the old Appian Road, and passing the Three Taverns of St. Paul, he halted at Cisterna Neronis (the modern Cisterna seemingly), where, say the canons of St Peter's inaccurately enough, Nero hid when trying to escape from the pursuing Romans. Rolando selected this little town as a halting-place because it was subject to his partisans, the Frangipani. "But it was fitting", continue the canons with well-feigned indignation, "that they should stay at Cisterna, because they had abandoned the fountain of living waters, and had dug to themselves cisterns that could hold no water". On the following day (September 18), so the same canons assert, "the chancellor was invested with the stole and the pallium of error to the destruction and confusion of the Church, and there was first sung the *Te Deum*".

From Cisterna the Pope-elect made his way a little further south to Nympha (Ninfa), another small town equally under the sway of the Frangipani. And there, where now the malaria holds absolute sway, where the houses never echo to the sound of a

human voice, and where streets and churches are overgrown with grass and creepers, the splendid ceremony of the consecration and coronation was held. In presence of the neighboring bishops and of a number of clergy of the city, Alexander was duly consecrated by the three bishops who had the right to do so, *viz.*, by the bishops of Ostia, Porto, and Albano. The ceremony took place in the Church of St. Mary Major, of which a part is still standing, and in the apse of which may still be seen a fresco of the St. Cesarius in whose oratory on the Palatine the images of the emperors used to be placed.

Eight days after Alexander had been consecrated by the waters of Nympha, he solemnly excommunicated Octavian and his principal adherents, inasmuch as, despite due notice given, they had not submitted (September 27). Of this excommunication Octavian took no notice; but having at length, with great difficulty, secured the services of two bishops who were hostile to Alexander or his cause, he received episcopal consecration from Imarus, bishop of Tusculum, with their assistance (October 4). He then without delay presumed to excommunicate those who had excommunicated him. The schism which was to last eighteen years was consummated.

Before proceeding with the history of the schism we may pause to note that the disputed election of Alexander was a repetition of that of Innocent II, with this difference: the former was caused directly or indirectly by the emperor. As Boso truly wrote: "Octavian, as after events made plain, would never have inflicted such mischief on the Church unless he had cause to know that he might rely on the support of the Emperor Frederick if he seized the Papacy. There is good reason to believe that he had sworn to him that he would mount the papal throne by one means or another". Frederick knew that but for his early death Hadrian would have excommunicated him, and he was equally aware that Cardinal Rolando, if elected Pope, would pursue the policy of Hadrian. It was evidently his interest to prevent his election, and to secure that of Octavian, who had made his devotion to him manifest.

Hence, the moment he received the news of the death of Hadrian, he displayed the greatest activity. Declaring that it was necessary that the new Pope should be a man who would treat the Empire and its adherents (*fideles*) more honorably (*honestius tractaret*), he sent envoys everywhere to say that he had heard to his great sorrow that already opposing parties had been formed in the Roman Church with regard to the coming papal election. His messengers were further instructed to do all in their power to induce those to whom they were sent not to accept any candidate whose name might be put before them till after communication with their master, the emperor. Especially were they to secure the adhesion of the kings of France and England to this policy, so that no one would be proclaimed Pope except with their assent and his. In his statements to the people of the Germanic, portion of the Empire he was more explicit. He definitely affirmed: "We do not intend to acknowledge anyone as Pope but the one whom the faithful have chosen with unanimous consent to the honor of the Empire and to the peace and unity of the Church"

When after such declarations on the part of the emperor we find his ambassadors doing all in their power to bring about the election of his creature, it cannot be doubted that they were acting under his orders, conveyed either explicitly or implicitly. It was on

their advice, so it was said, that Octavian went to the conclave provided with a papal mantle; and, as we learn even from the antipope's partisans, the canons of St. Peter, it was upon the Count Palatine Otho that the inferior clergy called to elect Octavian when they burst into St. Peter's. In short, at every turn both before and after the election we find Frederick's ambassador, Count Otho, acting against Rolando, and hence we are justified in concluding, with our countryman John of Salisbury, that it was the emperor who "raised up for himself a Balaamitic prophet through whom he might curse the people of God", the son of Malediction, for whom the surname of Maledictus was reserved.

The schism, as we have said, was now consummated; and, to the great detriment of the Church, men saw two Popes each with his own cardinals, his own bishops, and his own kings, and with his own peoples who believed in him. It was not, however, the fault of Alexander if men were left in ignorance of the facts of his election. He at once dispatched letters in all directions, to the kings of England and of France, to Constance, the wife of Louis of France, and to bishops and abbots everywhere. In the plainest terms he bade all turn "from the simoniacal depravity of Octavian" and submit to himself. He and his cardinals also sent letters to the emperor, who was besieging Crema. But so furious was Frederick because his schemes had miscarried and Rolando had been elected that not only would he not receive Alexander's letters, but he even wished to hang their bearers. However, through the advice of Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony, and of Welf, duke of Bavaria, wiser counsels prevailed, and it was decided that the emperor should adopt the high role of arbitrator between the rival pontiffs.

Frederick accordingly addressed a letter to Alexander in which, styling him "Roland the chancellor", he called on "his erudition" to present himself at the council which he had summoned to meet at Pavia on the octave of the Epiphany (1160), and to which, he said, he had invited the kings and bishops of the West. His temper, however, prevented him from even making a pretence of impartiality; for the letters which he sent to Octavian at the same time and to the same intent gave him the title of Pope.

Though this arbitrary conduct on the part of the emperor, and the concurrent violent action of his agent Otho in the Campagna against Alexander, convinced the Pope's party that they had to dread the bitterest opposition of the powerful Frederick, they feared still more for the liberty of the Church. They therefore impressed upon Alexander that they were all prepared to suffer the last extremity in order to maintain the freedom of the Church. Thus reassured, he gave a spirited reply to Frederick's ambassadors, who found him in the strong hill-town of Anagni, whither the arms of Otho and the presence of Octavian in the opposite hill-town of Segni had forced him to retire. He would honor, he said, the emperor as the advocate and special defender of the Roman Church, but not to the detriment of the honor due to God. Hence he is astonished that, as though he had power over him, he should summon a council without his knowledge and should summon him before him. It is for the Roman Church to judge all the churches, but not to be judged herself; and, he concluded, he would suffer everything rather than that the rights of the Roman Church should be infringed.

Meanwhile, the bishops of Christendom especially those who were not in fear of Barbarossa, began to make manifest their adhesion to Alexander, and to persuade their

sovereigns to follow their example. The patriarch of Grado and his suffragans, and the archbishop of Pisa and his, lost no time in excommunicating Octavian. Many also of the bishops of Lombardy and Tuscany promptly rejected him, though some “from fear rather than from love” accepted him. Arnulf of Lisieux was the first to bring the truth of Alexander’s election before Henry, “our Prince”, as he calls him, and he assured the Pope that his sovereign, after some little hesitation, declared “that he would never acknowledge any other Pope” but Alexander. “It is true”, continued Arnulf, “that owing to messages he has received from the emperor to put off acknowledging you for a time, he has refrained from publicly professing his allegiance to you, but he has neither ceased to venerate you nor has he attempted to restrain us from so doing”. Hearing that the emperor had endeavored to win Henry over to Octavian, Archbishop Theobald wrote to him to say: “It is not right for your majesty, without consulting the Church of your kingdom, to impose upon it a man who has not been elected, and who, as is publicly averred, has dared to take so great an honor, not by God’s grace, but by the favor and power of an emperor”.

If Louis of France followed the example of Henry in at first only privately acknowledging Alexander, his real reason was the same as Henry’s. They were at war with each other at the time, and each feared that the other might seek the alliance of the emperor. But if in the beginning their homage was secret, Ferdinand II, king of Leon, and Geyza II of Hungary are said to have immediately acknowledged him publicly.

As the city of Crema made a more stubborn resistance than Frederick had expected, he had to defer the holding of the council at Pavia till February 5. He had summoned to it the “archbishops, bishops, abbots, and religious and God-fearing men of the whole of our empire and of other countries”, viz., England, France, Hungary, and Denmark. There were actually present at: the patriarch of Aquileia, fifty archbishops and bishops, delegates from the king of France and from six archbishops, and Victor and his cardinals, along with the canons of St. Peter and a number of the lay nobility of Rome.

Before entering into any detail regarding the assembly at Pavia, we may quote the summary of its doings furnished by our own historian, William of Newburgh. This will let us see not only English opinion on it, but what was thought about it by impartial and enlightened contemporaries. After telling of the double election, William proceeds: “This rent might soon have been made whole, and the few might have yielded had not the Emperor Frederick, hating Alexander from his ancient dislike to Rolando, determined on embracing and seconding by every possible means the cause of Octavian. At length he commanded all the bishops of his dominions, *i.e.*, the Italians and Germans, to assemble at Pavia, as if for discussing and investigating the claims of which party preponderated, but in fact in order that, by deposing Alexander, and approving his opponent, they might celebrate the premature victory of the aforesaid Victor. He ordered the antagonists themselves to be present, and to abide by the decree of the council. Victor, indeed, attended as though to stand by the decision, but Alexander not merely guardedly, but even openly refused the prejudgment, which, under the name of judgment, was being prepared for him. The bishops both from the German and the Italian empire assembled by the imperial order at Pavia, along with a multitude of prelates of inferior order, all on the side of Frederick, who with his dukes

was present in all his terrors. Whatever favored the cause of Alexander, as there was no person to plead for him, was either suppressed in silence, or craftily perverted, or turned against him; and what was wanting in truth to the merits of his adversary was supplied by art. In consequence of this, accepting Victor with all due solemnity as the genuine successor of St. Peter, the synod passed sentence on Alexander by a general decree as a schismatic and a rebel against God. The emperor, with the whole assembly of dukes and nobles, approved the acts of the council, and denounced punishment against all recusants”.

In this excellent version of the story of the council of Pavia, the judicious Yorkshireman has swept away the clouds of chicanery with which the partisans of Victor endeavored to obscure the truth, and has given us in a few words the net results of the work of the council it is opened.

The assembly was opened by Frederick, who declared that his imperial dignity gave him the right to summon councils, but that it was the business of the bishops to decide on ecclesiastical questions. He then left them to arrive at a foregone conclusion. However, the partisans of Victor did not get their way all at once. His claims had to be urged for seven days (February 5-11). Very many of the Lombard bishops maintained that it was not right to pass sentence on one who was absent. But this attempt to gain time was met by the Germans declaring that it was too burdensome and expensive for those who lived at the ends of the earth to have to attend distant assemblies, and that, if Rolando despised the summons of the emperor and the decision of the Church, no regard should be paid to his absence. Octavian, on the other hand, had presented himself for judgment. He should, therefore, be proclaimed the true Pope.

Among the arguments by which an attempt was made to establish the legality of Victor’s election, the one most insisted on was the fact that he had been the first to be clad with the papal mantle. This point, however, could not of itself have appealed even to the bishops most devoted to the emperor. What really moved them was the production of letters said to have been written by Alexander and his cardinals to the bishops and cities of Lombardy, in which, as the imperialists expressed it, “their plots against the Empire were clearly manifested”. Even if the letters were genuine—and it must be borne in mind that there was no one present to challenge them— they could not have affected the validity of a papal election. But their production was naturally calculated so to inflame the feelings of the Germans against their supposed writer, that very little argument would be required to convince them that he could not be the true Pope. They were easily persuaded to believe that priority in being clad with the red mantle was of paramount importance; that the few cardinals who had elected Octavian were the more respectable section, the senior pars, of the cardinals; that the canons of St. Peter had some influential voice in papal elections; that certain Roman clergy had not perjured themselves, or at least had not quibbled, when they swore that after Octavian’s election Rolando himself had bade them obey him; and that the subsequent adhesion of a number of the Roman people was quite enough to make amends for any original defect in their candidate’s canonical election. There were of course some, especially among the Italian bishops, whose party spirit did not blind their judgment to the extent required to make them ready to declare the election of Octavian valid. Many of these all at once began to make excuses and to leave the assembly. As soon, however,

as this manoeuvre made itself manifest, the emperor caused the doors of the church to be closed, and imperial pressure supplied what was wanting to the force of the arguments produced.

Accordingly the German remnant of the synod, which John of Salisbury declares to have been more like a theatrical show than a council, confirmed the election of “the lord Pope Victor as spiritual Father and universal Pontiff” and condemned “the chancellor Rolando as a conspirator, a schismatic, and as one who taught that discord and perjury were to be reckoned as blessings”. This decision, which we have given in the words of the emperor, was of course accepted by him and by his nobles (February 11).

On the following day, February 12, Victor was conducted in great state from the Church of St. Saviours outside the city to the cathedral. He was received by the emperor in front of it, helped by him to dismount from his horse, and led by him to the high altar. There his feet were kissed by Frederick and all present in the customary manner. To crown these imposing ceremonies, which proved quite incapable of procuring any general respect for him, Victor duly excommunicated “the leader of the other party” and his principal adherents, and sent legates to the different countries to inform their sovereigns of what had taken place at Pavia.

But, despite the imperial power, the council of Pavia was a failure. Frederick’s desire “to bend the independence of the Church to the councils of his bishops and to bring it under the imperial yoke” was grievously disappointed. The cardinals and bishops as a body “followed the poor Alexander, and preferred to be with him, exiles from the face of princes, rather than attach themselves to his rival and hold sway with the princes of the earth”. Men asked with scorn who had given the Germans a light to legislate for the universal Church; and they averred that their council had done no more than make the validity of Alexander’s election more obvious, and that the decline of the great Frederick’s power was to be reckoned from the date of his accepting Victor as the true Pope.

Meanwhile, Alexander was not idle. Even before the holding of the council of Pavia he had sent forth some of his cardinals to state his position. There were apparently five of them in north Italy whilst Frederick’s synod was sitting. Of these John of Anagni, of the title of S. Maria in Porticu, seems to have been very active, and is credited with having done much to promote the interests of the Lombard League, which Frederick now began to regard with the greatest concern. At any rate, a few days after the close of the assembly at Pavia, he did not hesitate to excommunicate not merely the antipope and his Lombard clerical and lay supporters, but Frederick himself, and to declare all his acts null and void till he should make peace with the Church.

This strong action of his legate was promptly followed by Alexander himself, after he had in vain tried to withdraw the emperor from his evil courses. At Anagni, on Maundy Thursday (March 24), he not only solemnly excommunicated Frederick, but he declared his subjects absolved from their allegiance to him, and sent legates to the different countries (to France, to Palestine, to Hungary, and even to Constantinople) to report all that had occurred.

It was now war to the death between Frederick and Alexander, and the former at once proceeded to make furious war both on Milan and his other enemies in arms, and on the unarmed ecclesiastics who adhered to Alexander. Those who would not acknowledge Octavian were banished, and their places filled by supporters of the antipope. In his pride Frederick is said to have threatened to destroy even kingdoms should they dare to uphold Alexander. But with all his exertion of tyrannical power he could not compel all the bishops and nobles of Germany even to regard Victor as the true Pope.

Meanwhile, in all the different countries of Christendom the question of the double election had been earnestly discussed. Both in France and in England most of the clergy embraced the cause of Alexander at an early period. The English were greatly influenced by Arnulf, bishop of Lisieux, and by Archbishop Theobald, and the French by the Cistercian St. Peter, archbishop of Tarentaise. Gained over by Cardinal Imurus the order of Cluny at first adhered to Octavian, but the Carthusians and Cistercians, now of greater influence than the Cluniacs, promptly declared for Alexander.

As soon as the council of Pavia was over, both the rival pontiffs dispatched their envoys to the different courts of Europe. To the kings of England and France went from Alexander cardinals Henry of Pisa, William of Pavia, and the cardinal-deacon Odo or Otho. These two sovereigns, though favorable to Alexander from the first, still, through suspicion of one another and respect for the emperor, put off, as we have already seen, publicly acknowledging either claimant. After the council of Pavia, however, it was necessary to take action, and the two kings decided to hold a joint council of the two kingdoms. In the meantime it was resolved to hold separate councils in order to ascertain the feeling of each nation. Archbishop Theobald at once summoned the bishops of England to meet in London, while, about the same time, they were informed by Arnulf that Henry was simply waiting for their assent to make public profession of his allegiance to Alexander. What his private opinions about the claims of Alexander are, continued the bishop, he has manifested by words and deeds. He has stated on oath that he will never acknowledge any other Pope than Alexander; and, whilst he receives his communications with respect, he will not as much as touch the letters of Octavian with his hands, but takes hold of them with a piece of stick, and throws them behind his back as far as he can.

The bishops of England, a country “always most devoted to the sublimity of the Apostolic See”, accordingly met together about the end of May under the presidency of their aged and infirm archbishop, and carefully considered the evidence relating to the schism, and the regulations of the Church affecting elections. The resulting debate soon showed that the great majority of the English hierarchy were in favor of Alexander. It was reported that one or two were disposed to favor Octavian, but the most influential and most numerous section supported the cause of his rival. The assembly did not pass a formal vote in favor of Alexander, as the king did not wish the joint decision of the French and English Church to be anticipated, but the archbishop made it clear to Henry that the bishops of England stood by Alexander.

A similar lead was given to Henry by the bishops of Normandy at Neuf Marché, and to Louis VII by the French bishops at Beauvais.

Among the other influences which moved the bishops of France to support Alexander were the words of the distinguished abbot, Peter de la Celle. Writing to Henry, bishop of Beauvais, he denounced Octavian as one of those who “without God would reign for Him”, and who would rend the seamless coat of Christ, a crime which “the unity of Catholic faith” accounts as worse than the piercing of Christ Himself on the Cross. From the holes of the nails and spear sprang our redemption, whereas from schism only comes “the loss of souls and the depravation of morals”. “You have”, he continued, addressing Henry, “Alexander, or, should I say, Peter; nay, rather you have Christ who has two servants. Peter and Alexander; I know your royal courage, your stouthearted courage against stiff-necked iniquity, and your ardent zeal. Do then your best in accordance with the dignity of your rank, with your noble blood, with the duty of your office, and with your profession as a Christian”.

The bishops of England and France at length met together at Beauvais about July 22. There were also present at the council the three cardinals who had been sent into France by Alexander, and Cardinals Guido and John who had elected Octavian, as well as envoys from the emperor and the king of Spain. The cause of the antipope was urged by Guido “with all his powers of genius and oratory. After he had concluded, William of Pavia most eloquent man rebutted every allegation in the most convincing manner and completely refuted nearly every word which the cardinal of Crema had uttered. At last the truth of the whole affair became so apparent that both kings no longer hesitated to abjure the cause of Octavian, and to acknowledge Alexander, and with their subject kingdoms henceforth to obey him as a father in the things that appertained to God”. The decision of the council was not, however, arrived at quite as simply as the words of William of Newburgh, just quoted, might lead one to suppose. The imperial party were able. They realized that an adverse verdict by an impartial and influential council would be fatal to the cause of Victor. They must, therefore, at least, prevent it from coming to any decision. There were also some among the bishops who were anxious not to have any master, and who consequently were desirous that there should not be a definitely recognized Pope. They accordingly urged that the question was obscure; that there was everything to gain by delay, as the death of one of the claimants might settle the difficulty; that, as far as the kings were concerned, they should remember that “the Roman Church always bore heavily on princes”; and that there was no cause for hurry, as the bishops in each kingdom could manage its religious affairs in the meanwhile. To this line of argument the envoys of Frederick and Victor at once attached themselves, and it seemed likely that the policy of procrastination could carry the day. The king of France declared that he would leave the settlement of the affair in the hands of the king of England, and would abide by his decision.

Here was our greedy king’s chance. In the year 1158 it had been arranged that in due course a marriage should take place between his son Henry and Margaret, the daughter of the French king. At that date Henry was only about three years old, and Margaret little more than six months. It was further arranged that when, with the consent of the Church, the marriage did take place, Henry should enter into possession of Le Vexin and its castles, which were to form her dower. With this agreement in view, Henry privately proposed to Alexander’s legates that if they would assent to the marriage taking place at once, he would acknowledge their master as the true Pope.

Anxious to prevent further delay in the public acceptance of Alexander by France and England, the legates gave their consent, and the council, following the example of Henry and Louis, recognized Alexander as Pope, and excommunicated the schismatics.

One result of the decision of the council at Beauvais was that the example of England and France was promptly followed by Ireland, Spain, and Norway. Before the year 1160 had passed away, the Latin Churches of Jerusalem and Antioch had submitted to the claims of Alexander, as had also the kingdoms of Denmark and of Hungary, the Greek emperor, and the whole Cistercian order, not to mention the two Sicilies. In a word, it may be said with William of Newburgh that “the whole Latin world, with the exception of the German provinces”, accepted Alexander. But the emperor, humorously continues our northern historian, “deeming it beneath his imperial majesty to be convinced even by reason, deferred for a longer time to yield to the evident truth”

Another result of the negotiations at Beauvais was not so satisfactory as the general acknowledgment of the true Pope. When Louis found that in consequence of the dispensation granted by Alexander’s cardinals, his little daughter had been married to the child, Prince Henry, and that the latter’s father had begun immediately to take possession of her dower, he was most indignant. Feeling that he had been tricked, he not only complained to the Pope of the action of the legates, but took up arms against the English king, and waged a war, fortunately of short duration, against him. Alexander was naturally much distressed at the way in which his staunchest friend had been duped, and commissioned Cardinal Jacinthus (Hyacinth) to make known to Louis how much he was grieved at the loss which the thoughtless conduct of his legates had brought upon the prince who was the most beloved by the Roman Church. He was, however, compelled to add by the same intermediary that he was in such straits that he could not comply with the king’s wishes. These were, no doubt, that he should institute proceedings against Henry. But not daring to take the English king to task, Alexander turned so fiercely on the unfortunate legates that Arnulf of Lisieux was forced to take up their defence; and, in his letter to the cardinals, so often quoted, urged that they had been placed in a most difficult position, and would never have granted the dispensation had they not been driven by hard necessity, and had they not felt sure of effecting great good.

Even in Italy and in Germany, the decision of the council of Beauvais infused new life into the partisans of Alexander. In Germany, Ebehard, archbishop of Salzburg, generally acknowledged to be one of the best bishops of the Empire, began with enthusiasm and success to consolidate a party favorable to Alexander. In Italy the Republic of Venice, if it had not done so already, acknowledged Alexander, as did also, by degrees at least, most of the bishops of Italy. But if the dawn of success encouraged Alexander’s party, the advent of difficulties did not dishearten Frederick. He carried on his campaign against Milan and the rebellious cities of Lombardy with vigour; and, by watching the passes of the Alps, by guarding the roads, and by seizing as much of the Patrimony of St. Peter as he could, he succeeded to a large extent in cutting off Alexander’s communications with Christendom, and in reducing him to the direst financial straits. Nothing is better calculated to give a satisfactory idea of Frederick’s method of dealing with Alexander than the narrative which our countryman Jocelin of

Brakelond has left us of a journey which his abbot Sampson made in Italy at this period. Sampson had occasion to go to Pope Alexander in connection with the church at Woolpit, and afterwards gave this account of his travels to his monks: "I journeyed to Rome in the time of the schism between Pope Alexander and Octavian: and I passed through Italy at the time when all clerks bearing letters of our lord the Pope Alexander were taken, and some were incarcerated, and some were hanged, and some with nose and lips cut off were sent back to the Pope to his shame and confusion. I, however, pretended to be a Scotchman, and used to shake my staff in the manner in which they use that weapon they call a *gaveloc* (pike) at those who mocked me, uttering threatening language after the manner of the Scotch. To those who met and questioned me as to who I was, I answered nothing but '*Ride, ride, Rome; turne Cantwereberi*'. Having obtained letters from the Pope, on my return I passed a certain castle, and behold the officers thereof seized me, saying: 'This vagabond who makes himself out to be a Scotchman, is either a spy or bears letters from the false Pope Alexander'. And while they examined my ragged clothes, and my leggings, and my breeches, and even the old shoes which I carried over my shoulders, after the fashion of the Scotch, I thrust my hand into the little wallet which I carried, wherein was contained the writing of our lord the Pope lying close to a little jug which I used for drinking; and, by the permission of God and St. Edmund, I drew out the writing along with the jug. Then, extending my arm aloft, I held the writ underneath the jug. They could see the jug plainly enough, but they did not find the writ. Whatever money I had about me they took away; and so it behoved me to beg from door to door until I arrived in England".

But Frederick was not content with stopping the Pope's supplies. He endeavored to rob him of the allegiance which the Christian world was laying at his feet, and for that purpose decided to hold a more imposing council than that of Pavia. Accordingly, Victor summoned the prelates "of the whole world" to meet at Cremona on May 21, 1161. But the council of Cremona brought no more advantage to Barbarossa's Pope than the council of Pavia. The bishops "of the whole world" did not come to it, and the necessities of the war with Milan caused its meeting to be deferred till June 17. Finally, it was held at New Lodi, and not at Cremona; and again, as at Pavia, it was attended only by bishops and princes of the Empire. Five senators of Rome were also present at the council, as were envoys from some of the kings, even, so it is said, from Henry and Louis. Though Victor assisted at the council, Frederick is said to have been its president. Details of this assembly are wanting; but after a session of three days (June 19-22) it reaffirmed the decrees of Pavia in Victor's favour.

Whatever gain the decision of Cremona-Lodi brought to the antipope, it was probably more than balanced by the news that Alexander had re-entered Rome. When Alexander had first retired into the Campagna, it was dominated by the Count Palatine Otho; but by degrees the tide turned, and the Pope became its master. This enabled him to return to Rome, and, on June 6, he was solemnly received by the fickle Romans at the Church of S. Maria Nuova (now S. Francesca Romana), near the stronghold of the Frangipani. But, though on the following Sunday he solemnized Mass at the Lateran basilica, the imperial faction grew too strong for him and he had to leave the city before the month had run its course.

However, in the midst of violent quarrels, anathemas, savage mutilations, and cruel wars, it is pleasant to be able to pause for a moment to tell of the advance of the arts of peace. The church of which mention has just been made had for some time before this year 1161 been undergoing extensive repairs. Its patrons, the Frangipani, had been adorning it with the mosaics which attract the attention of the traveller today, and on Alexander's first triumphal entry into Rome, they induced him to renew its dedication to the service of God. The mosaic work which they caused to be executed by the foreign artists introduced by Paschal II, still occupies the apse of the church. "It is unique in design and style", but not good; the flesh-tints "are of a flat and unrelieved yellowish tinge; the figure of the Saviour is long, lean, and ugly"; and the close dress of our Lady "is full of gilding and imitations of jewellery", while "the tormented lines of the drapery" cannot conceal the defective shapes of the principal figures. Still, despite the failure of the apsidal mosaic of S. Maria Nuova, we are assured that "it was really under this great Pope (Alexander III) that the Roman school attained to complete mastery in the handling of its peculiar style. The little city of Ninfa contains numerous structures of about his time, and everywhere in the Roman territory construction and decoration on a large scale was commenced. The superb cathedral of Terracina was built, and that of Anagni (where Alexander resided for a time) was completed (1179), and that of Civita Castellana partly constructed, entirely or in part by artists of the Roman school".

The short visit of the Pope to Rome just related would seem to have done him more harm than good. Not personally a rich man, and debarred from access to the ordinary sources of papal revenue which had been cut off by Frederick, Alexander had been very soon compelled to borrow money. Already in the February of this year, while thanking certain French bishops for the financial help they had already sent him, he tells them that he is compelled to ask them for further aid to enable him to pay his debts, reminding them that they should be very ready to assist him, because "the Roman Church was suffering not only for its own liberty, but also for that of all the churches".

Even if it be supposed that financial aid received from France enabled Alexander to enter Rome with money to spend, it is certain that he left it once more in debt. No sooner was he within the walls of the city than every Roman, as he expressed it himself, looked to see how much he had in his hand to give, and reached forth his outstretched palm to grasp all he could. Then to Alexander as to Jurgurtha of old came the thought to buy the whole venal city. But, though he is said to have expended "about eleven thousand talents of the money of Lucca", he failed to satiate the Romans' lust for gold, and so to buy their loyalty, and had to leave the city empty-handed.

His entry into Rome roused all the fury of the opposition, and the whole of the Patrimony from Acquapendente to Ceprano, with the exception of Orvieto, Anagni, Terracina and the "munitio Castrum", was overrun by the schismatics and their German allies. The financial distress of Alexander became acute, and for the first time do we read of a Pope's pecuniary affairs becoming so involved that he had to borrow more money to pay off debts already contracted. Alexander was reduced to begging the canons of Pisa to borrow money for him at reasonable interest in order that the monies due to Mancinus, a citizen of Lucca, might be paid in full. The Pope undertakes that he or his successors will refund what the Pisan canons borrow on his behalf.

We are here on the threshold of those financial troubles which, though for the most part brought on by others, were at no distant date to cause the Popes to have recourse to most unsatisfactory methods of raising money, and which were thus to prove one of the most potent agents in bringing about the religious catastrophe of the sixteenth century. Although, no doubt, the oppression of the powerful was the principal cause of the pecuniary difficulties in which the Popes were frequently involved during the Middle Ages, there can yet be no doubt that maladministration and speculation on the part of some of their officials was perhaps not infrequently another cause. And so at this very period Gerhoh of Reichersberg boldly declared that much of the money that went to Rome simply enriched some eight or twelve persons attached to the papal chancellery. The Provost was certainly a sensational and censorious writer, but at the same time it must be confessed that in this case he put his finger on a real sore.

Another result of the poverty of many of the Popes was that they were at length reduced to rewarding deserving men or those to whom they were under obligations at the expense of the churches of the different countries. One method adopted for this purpose was that of "Provisions". In opposition to the recognized rights of the bishops or of other patrons of benefices or *livings*, the Popes ultimately claimed the right of instituting or *providing* incumbents for them, who were to receive the *livings* as soon as they should become vacant. This system of "Provisions" cannot be said to be altogether objectionable in itself, as it could be used as a convenient way of rewarding such as had deserved well of the Church in any particular country; but it was a system obviously capable of being abused, and, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries especially, was in fact greatly abused. Foreigners were often appointed to *livings* by papal provision who either did not reside in the country whence they drew their revenues, or, if they did, were ignorant of the language and careless of the customs of the land in which they were supposed to be working for the good of souls. We mention this system here, not because Alexander abused it, but because, as far as we know, the first traces of it are to be found in his correspondence. In the course of the year 1171 he wrote to our King Henry commending to him a certain David, an Englishman, who had made his studies at Bologna, and had been one of the king's envoys to the Apostolic See, and informing him that, as David had shown himself possessed of excellent talents, he had himself named him a canon of Lincoln, and had nominated him for the next prebend which should be vacant.

As far, however, as Alexander's sad financial position in the year 1161 was concerned, there can be no doubt that Barbarossa's violence was accountable for it; and yet that prince endeavored to turn it against his victim. With a view to prevent Alexander's finding an asylum in France, he wrote to its chancellor to tell him that he was coming there to get money to pay off his debts, which amounted to more than twenty thousand pounds.

In the letter just quoted, Frederick with brutal frankness was able to inform his correspondent that his agents (*fideles*) had brought it about that Alexander could not find a place in the neighborhood of Rome where he could lay his head. Unable to withstand the imperial pressure, Alexander decided to go to France; and, appointing Julius, bishop of Praeneste, his vicar in Rome, put to sea from Terracina with his suite (*domestica familia*) in four fine galleys which had been provided for him by the king of

Sicily. Unfortunately, a violent storm arose soon after the ships had weighed anchor, and though the whole of the papal party and their effects were saved, the vessels themselves were completely wrecked. Fresh ships were, however, procured, and setting sail after Christmas from the mouth of the Olevola, near the promontory of Circe, the Pope landed safely at Genoa, where, despite Frederick's prohibition, he received a royal welcome (January 21, 1162). Leaving that hospitable city on March 25, Alexander sailed for the volcanic islet of Maguelonne, which he reached on April 11. Now but the veriest ghost of a town, Maguelonne, even in the twelfth century, was unsuited to lodge a Pope and all who wished to see him. Accordingly, mounted on a white palfrey, Alexander left it, and endeavored to make his way towards Montpellier; but so great was the crowd that pressed around him, eager to touch even the hem of his cloak, that he could scarcely proceed. At some distance from the city he was met by the governor, who, accompanied by the barons of the neighborhood, escorted him into the city, leading his horse. Among those who came to greet the Pope, Boso names with evident interest a "certain Saracen prince with his companions", and tells how with bent knee and head "he adored the Pope as the holy and pious God of the Christians", and then harangued him in his own language in most grandiloquent terms which were explained by an interpreter. Alexander returned a gracious reply, and placed the dusky prince among the honored ones at his feet.

CHAPTER II

ALEXANDER'S SOJOURN IN FRANCE

The first Sunday that Alexander passed at Montpellier (April 15) he said Mass before an enormous number of people, and took the opportunity to explain to them the circumstances of his election, and to excommunicate once more both Octavian and Frederick. Whilst news of his arrival in Provence was spreading in all directions, he sent legates to arrange with Louis as to where it would be suitable for him to take up his abode. The archbishops and bishops of France soon gathered round him, and with them on May 17 he solemnly renewed the excommunication of Octavian.

But while Alexander was thus establishing his position in France, Barbarossa was not idle. Realizing that he could not impose his creature on Christendom, he took up a new position. It was clear, he urged, that the claims of both the candidates for the Papacy were doubtful. It would, therefore, be best for the king of France, with Alexander in his company, to meet him and Octavian; and then, if necessary, the combined Churches of Gaul, Italy, and Germany could depose both claimants, and elect a new Pope altogether. According to Boso, the emperor devised this scheme because, though troubled in conscience, he was too proud to undo what he had done, and on the other hand, because he feared the loss of his imperial crown should Alexander gain the

day. Whether Frederick had any such apprehension or not, he certainly succeeded, through Manasses, bishop of Orleans, and Henry, count of Champagne, in gaining over Louis to his way of thinking, because, says the papal biographer, the French king was a man “of dove-like simplicity”. It seems, moreover, that though Louis had sent envoys to greet Alexander, he afterwards had some misunderstanding with him, and, in a moment of irritation, had regretted his acknowledgment of his claims. There is indeed evidence enough that some trouble had arisen between them. At any rate, Alexander completely failed to devise any effective means of preventing the proposed interview between Frederick and Louis. He wrote, it is true, to certain bishops to beg them to use their influence to stop the meeting, and he had an interview with Louis at Souvigny, a priory of Cluny in the diocese of Clermont, near the left bank of the Allier (in August). But when he found that Louis was definitely committed to meet the emperor, Alexander at once made it quite plain to the French King that he would not present himself for judgment before any assembly, though he would willingly send some of his cardinals to explain the validity of his election, and the complete futility of the pretensions of Octavian. With this Louis was fain to be content; and, while he went to Dijon to meet the emperor, Alexander retired to the abbey of Déols, on the Indre, in the diocese of Bourges.

The conference between the two monarchs was arranged to take place on the bridge of St. Jean de Losne, a little town on the Saone, between Dijon and Dole in Burgundy (August 29). But it was destined to be a dismal failure. It had never been the Emperor’s intention that the assembly should hold an impartial inquiry, and Louis was soon to find that he had been duped by the emperor and those whom he had gained over to his side, Manasses and Count Henry, a relation of the antipope. Louis, indeed, must have realized even before the meeting that he had made a mistake in agreeing to reconsider his position. The report of his vacillation had caused the greatest consternation throughout Italy and France, and not only the Frangipani, Alexander’s supporters in Rome, but even the Senate had written to him to urge him to persevere in his original devotion to the true Pope. His own brother, Henry, archbishop of Rheims, and other bishops had endeavored to make him understand to what an extent Manasses and the count of Champagne had committed him. What they failed to make known to him was brought home to him by the negotiations at St. Jean. He soon found he had been betrayed.

Barbarossa was now at the height of his power. He had, by the complete destruction of Milan and the dispersion of its people (March 1162), everywhere throughout Lombardy suppressed the popular governments and established his authority. Confident now of the success of his great schemes of universal domination, he left Lombardy after four years of war (1158-1162) and, with Octavian in his train, marched towards Dole with a powerful army. Pressed by Alexander, Ebehard, the holy bishop of Salzburg, had made a last effort to detach the emperor from Octavian before they left Italy. But, though listened to with respect, he had failed in his purpose, and Frederick crossed the Alps with the firm resolve to bring about the deposition of Alexander, if not the recognition of Octavian.

But with the razing of Milan to the ground had touched the acme of his power. The conference of St Jean marked the beginning of his fall. In the first place, he had

difficulties with his creature Octavian. When the antipope found that Alexander had again disdained to submit his claims to any human tribunal, he began to feel keenly his own dependent position, and reproached the emperor with once more wishing to submit his cause to trial. However, the emperor succeeded in inducing him to accompany him to the bridge in the middle of the night, so that he could say that he had fulfilled his part of the contract. He then called upon Louis, in accordance with the agreement made by his plenipotentiary, Count Henry, to acknowledge Victor, as he had failed to present Alexander for trial; and, to the astonishment of the king, the said count declared that if the French king did not fulfill his engagement, he was bound to acknowledge Frederick as his suzerain for the future. The scales fell at last from the eyes of Louis. He realized that he had been betrayed by the count of Champagne, and that he was in the power of the emperor, who had come to the conference with a large army. He accordingly pleaded for delay, and weakly offered to yield himself up to the emperor if he did not produce Alexander for trial before the close of the time agreed upon.

But if Louis of France was completely dazed by the turn which events had taken, and by the treachery in the midst of which he found himself, not so was Pope Alexander. Of course he refused to appear before the emperor; but, besides hastily dispatching messengers to Henry of England, then in Normandy, he engaged him to march at once to the help of Louis. Disconcerted at the news that Henry had promised armed support to the French king, and feeling the pinch of famine, as his great army had exhausted the supplies of the locality, Frederick found it necessary to order the withdrawal of the bulk of his forces.

However, he left behind to finish the negotiations his chancellor, Reinald of Dassel, the archbishop-elect of Cologne, the chief supporter of the schism. Reinald, as was usual with him, at once took a high tone when the French king returned to reopen the conference. It belonged, he said, only to the bishops subject to the Empire to decide on cases connected with the Pope; and hence the French king and his clergy must receive their decision. Other kings, he argued, would resent imperial interference in any episcopal difficulty in their territories, and so they must not think of interfering in the case of the Bishop of Rome. His contention, then, was the old Carolingian one that the Papacy was an imperial bishopric concerning which other sovereigns had no rights; and so sound did he think his point of view that we are assured that he expressed it in Latin, in French, and in German. But Louis, now feeling strong in the alliance of Henry II, simply asked if the bishops of his kingdom also were not of those sheep whom Christ had committed to St. Peter, and then rode away. Frederick himself afterwards followed the same line of argument as his chancellor, and declared that “the kings of the provinces” had not responded to his invitation to come to the conference because, to the detriment of his rights, they themselves wanted to elect the Roman Pontiff.

When the conference came to its abrupt close, the emperor caused his bishops and princes once more to the Pope, declare Victor “universal Pope, and Alexander and his followers schismatics”; and then, retiring “with his victorious eagles”, he took or sent his Pope back to Italy, as even in Germany “no respect was paid” to him.

No sooner, on the other hand, had Louis left the bridge of St. Jean than, whilst awaiting the arrival of Henry, he began to raise troops and to strengthen the

fortifications of the frontier. Meanwhile the English king, before joining Louis, whom the Pope had endeavored to render kindly disposed towards him, visited Alexander at the monastery of Deols on the Indre, on the opposite bank of the river to the famous stronghold of Chateauroux (Castrum Radulphi), September 18. After staying three days with the Pope, and giving him a substantial sum of money, Henry proceeded to meet the French king; and at Choisi (Cociacum, near Blois) the kings of England and France, “who always devoutly protect and venerate the Church of Rome”, received Alexander on his way to Tours. And they received him, we are told with the respect to which he was entitled. Acting as his grooms, the two kings held the bridle-reins of his horse, the one on the right hand, the other on the left, and so conducted him to a tent which had been prepared for him. But the Pope did not bring the kings together merely that they might honor him. Before he left them to proceed to Tours “a firm peace was established between them by his mediation, and by God’s favor”. As soon as this most desirable end had been accomplished, Alexander moved down the Loire to Tours, and either there or at Paris passed the greater part of the next nine months. Whilst he abode on the pleasant banks of the broad and swift-flowing Loire, he was able to get a taste, at least, of the sweets of peace. The difficulties with Henry of England, in which the struggles of St. Thomas for ecclesiastical liberty were soon to involve him, had not yet arisen.

The one important event in which he took part during these months was the council over which he presided at Tours in the month of May. However, before the council assembled, he went to Paris to have an interview with the French king, no doubt regarding the holding of the said synod. Some miles outside the city he was met by Louis and a host of his nobles. After the French monarch had greeted the Pope in the usual reverent and affectionate manner, the two, surrounded by the clergy of the district and by the nobility, entered Paris in great state. Alexander spent the whole of Lent in the city, and on *Laetare* Sunday (March 3) blessed as usual the Golden Rose, which he sent to Louis, “as he knew of no one so worthy to receive it” as the king of the French. The Rose itself, so he tells the king, represents Christ, “the flower of the field, and the lily of the valleys” (Canticles II. 1); its material, gold, shows forth the King; the red with which it is tinged proclaims the Passion of Christ; and the sweet fragrance that comes from it signifies His glorious resurrection.

On May 19 there assembled at Tours seventeen cardinals, one hundred and twenty-four bishops, four hundred and fourteen abbots, and a very large number of the inferior clergy and of the laity. Among the assembled prelates there were, by the permission of Henry, the archbishops of Canterbury and York and a number of the bishops and abbots of England, though to ensure their presence Alexander had had to agree that their coming should not in any way prejudice the rights of King Henry or of his successors nor introduce any new custom into the kingdom. The fathers of this most influential assembly naturally concerned themselves in the first place with the schism. Octavian, along with Reinald of Dassel, Hugh, abbot of Cluny, and other leaders of the schism were once more declared excommunicated, and the ordinations held by Octavian and other heretics and schismatics were decreed to be null and void. But the council also issued many most useful canons. The clergy, for instance, were forbidden to practise usury in any form, and monks were prohibited from leaving their cloister and devoting themselves to the study of medicine or of law. Again, too, we hear of the

secret heresy which was spreading in the district of Toulouse and throughout Gascony. The faithful are forbidden to hold any manner of intercourse with its disciples, and princes are called upon to imprison such as they may discover, and to confiscate their goods.

When this important council had finished its work the two kings told the Pope that any place he might choose in their dominions for his future prolonged residence was at his disposal. He thereupon selected Sens, in the sweet valley of the placid Yonne; because, says Boso, "it was a famous metropolis, convenient for travellers, and situated in a fertile district". Herefrom October 1163 to Easter 1165 Alexander passed most of his time, awaiting the development of events in Italy.

Through envy of the greatness of Milan many of the Lombard cities looked on with indifference when Barbarossa was besieging it, and not a few of them hailed its destruction with delight. But they soon found that with Milan they had all fallen, and that they had all put their necks beneath the hard German yoke. The podestas or governors whom the emperor had set over the various cities oppressed them in the harshest manner, and when in August 1163 Frederick again entered Italy, they received very little satisfaction from him. He accepted the stories of his podestas, and devoted all his attention to making preparations for subduing the Norman kingdom of the two Sicilies. But before he could march against William he had to reckon with the hostility of Venice, and with the Greeks, whose money had put them in possession of Ancona, and was at the service of all his enemies. Venice he decided to leave alone, for the present at least. In its lagoons it was almost inaccessible, and, if not itself interfered with, would probably remain quiet. He would crush the Greeks first and then the Normans. His designs, however, proved harder of accomplishment than he had imagined. In the beginning of the year 1164, whilst Ancona was yet unsubdued, an organized opposition to him declared itself in a part of Lombardy hitherto tranquil. Four cities of the Veronese March, Treviso, Vicenza, Padua and Verona itself, formed a league with Venice to resist, if not imperial prerogatives, at least imperial oppression, especially when that came from an emperor who was not in communion with the Church. The nucleus of the Lombard League had sprung into being.

Soon after the rising in the Veronese March another severe blow was dealt to the imperial cause. The antipope Victor died at Lucca on April 20. A story was current, says Boso, that whilst on his deathbed Victor cried out for a Catholic priest, but that the schismatics would not allow one to come near him. The English cardinal, however, did not himself believe the report, but says very plainly that Victor "went down to the lower regions impenitent and excommunicated". Fuller details of the death of the antipope were furnished to St. Thomas Becket by one of his agents at the papal court. According to this writer, the unhappy antipope went mad, and for fifteen days before he died was so insane as to know neither God nor himself. After his death, the canons of the cathedral and the regular canons of the Church of St. Frediano, despite all pressure, refused to have the body of the schismatic in their midst, and it had to be taken outside the city, where it was at last buried "by some miserable monks"

The effects of the antipope were taken to the emperor. Overwhelmed with debt, Victor had been living for some time on plunder, and had hardly anything to leave but

his *capella* and a few horses. When news of the death of Octavian reached Sens, the cardinals were not unnaturally moved to express their satisfaction. But they were severely rebuked by Alexander, who was grieved for the miserable end of his foe. "And with good reason", continues the worthy writer we are quoting, "for the loss of a soul, where crime is not washed away by sorrow, is irreparable. Nor do we know of an instance of an heresiarch or author of a schism ever doing penance except on compulsion, and contrition such as this is of no value in the eyes of God".

As soon as the death of Victor became known, the arch-chancellor, Reinald of Dassel, hurried to Lucca, and with the aid of the other schismatical cardinal, John of SS. Sylvester and Martin, elected his colleague Guido of Crema as Pope Paschal III (April 22). Four days afterwards this pontifical sham was consecrated by the bishop of Liege. Word of what had been thus hastily and despotically accomplished was at once sent to the emperor at Pavia. Though Frederick is said to have afterwards upbraided Reinald for forcing his hand, he expressed his approval of what had been done, and his loyal acceptance of Paschal III as the true Pope.

Certain it is that if Barbarossa made his first great political mistake in acknowledging Victor, he made a much greater one in supporting Paschal III. But he had gratified his dislike of the ex-chancellor Rolando, and had made another sensational assertion of his pretensions with regard to his rights over the Church. And that was enough. He was, however, soon to learn that justice will not be flouted even by the most powerful. One misfortune after another was to teach him that "he who exalteth himself shall be humbled". To begin with, he was unable to quell the rising in the Veronese March. He had but few Germans with him and, finding that his Italian allies were becoming so lukewarm in his service that he dared not trust them, he had to retire from the face of the Veronese without risking a battle. There was nothing for it but that he should return to Germany and raise a fresh army. Accordingly, in November (1164) he once more recrossed the Alps, leaving such cities as were still subject to him to the tender mercy of his podestas and the collectors of his dues.

During the two years that Frederick was on this occasion absent from Italy, Lombardy was so grievously oppressed that loyalty to the Empire was thoroughly undermined. His agents exacted more than seven times what was the emperor's due, and oppressed bishops, marquises, counts, consuls, and captains of the cities, and, in a word, almost all the Lombards both great and small. This they did because the Lombards, through love or fear of the emperor, were unwilling to defend themselves from their exactions. And although they said among themselves that it was better to die than to endure such disgraceful oppression, still they put off taking vengeance for this treatment or even thinking about taking it. This was because they looked forward daily to the return of the emperor, saying that they did not believe that the evil which was wrought by his agents had his sanction, and that when the emperor comes he will put an end to all the trouble.

Among those who suffered especially at the hands of the imperial officials were the personal friends of Alexander; for, by a refinement of cruelty, practised also about this time by Henry II towards St. Thomas, penalties which could not be inflicted on Alexander himself were inflicted on his relatives, in order that he might be tortured in

them. For the liberty of the Church, sighed the Pope (February 26, 1164), we have to endure all things. “We have been brought from affluence to poverty, from leisure to toil, from genial society to solitude, from happiness and joy to the depth of misery; and, to pass over everything else, those who are related to me by blood have been stripped of their all by the emperor, have been driven from their houses, and forced to leave wife and child, have been sent into exile”.

Whilst the Lombards, in the midst of their miseries, were buoying themselves up with hopes destined never to be realized, Frederick was preparing an army which was designed to rivet their chains still tighter, and was endeavoring to force a general recognition of his wretched antipope, Paschal. In accordance with his orders, a great diet assembled at Wurzburg (May 23), and he endeavored to obtain from it a spontaneous acknowledgment of his new Pope. But it soon appeared that, if the German bishops had for the most part been ready to receive Victor, concerting the validity of whose election something might perhaps be urged, they were not willing to accept such an obviously uncanonical election as that of Paschal. Even his relative Conrad, the archbishop-elect of Mainz, in returning from a pilgrimage to Compostela, had, probably on hearing of the death of Victor, already acknowledged Alexander (1164), and, as his friend St. Thomas Becket wrote, “had deservedly become great in the eyes of the Pope”.

Frederick’s hope, however, was in Henry II. The struggle between that cruel and licentious monarch and St. Thomas Becket was now at its height, and Henry, finding that he could not by ordinary means force Alexander to abandon the archbishop’s cause, thought that he might accomplish his end by adhering to the antipope. Accordingly, when the notorious archbishop-elect of Cologne, Reinald of Dassel, came to him at Westminster in the beginning of 1165 to treat of a marriage between his daughter and Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony, it is known that the two discussed the question of Henry’s acknowledging Paschal. And although the justiciar, Robert, earl of Leicester, would not “that archs-chismatic, and although the altars where his party had said Mass were destroyed, Reinald was able to boast at the diet of Wurzburg that he had won over the English king to the cause of Paschal. At any rate, Henry subsequently wrote to tell Barbarossa’s chancellor that he was waiting for an opportunity to break with Alexander, who dared to support the traitor Thomas against him, and his ambassadors presented themselves at the assembly of Wurzburg, and, in their master’s name, declared on oath that he would acknowledge Paschal, and no longer recognize Alexander. This declaration could not have been without its influence on some of the members of the assembly, and on the prestige of Paschal, though Henry himself, finding that his bishops would not follow him, and that he had made a mistake, afterwards attributed the initiative in the matter to his envoys themselves. Then, shuffling out of all responsibility in the matter as well as he could, the unscrupulous monarch left his principal envoy, the perjured John of Oxford, to clear himself before Alexander by a series of false oaths. We may, therefore, safely go further, and assert that it was the arrival of Reinald and the English envoys that turned the scale, and put an end to all the hopes of a peaceful settlement of the schism which had been raised by the early debates of the Diet.

To move the assembly to conform to his wishes, which were to keep the Church in subjection to himself, Frederick, with his hands on a number of relics, declared on oath that he would never acknowledge Alexander, but that he accepted Paschal as the

universal and Catholic Father. But, as even Reinald of Dassel asserted, the more influential part of the Empire was in favor of Alexander, and some of the principal bishops began to urge one reason after another why they should not follow the emperor in the oath he had taken. However, by a free use of threats, the emperor secured the adhesion to his oath of most of the assembly, though some of the bishops affixed such clauses to their signatures as to render them valueless.

The diet was scarcely over, ere Conrad, archbishop-elect of Mainz, fled, in order to attach himself to Pope Alexander. Frederick, however, before the close of the year, replaced him by Count Christian de Buch, a dissolute man, but an able general, soon to be known as Antichrist. Then, in order to show that the decrees of the diet were not to remain a dead letter, he ravaged the diocese of Salzburg with fire and sword, because its archbishop, Conrad, would have none of his antipope.

No doubt the energetic measures of Frederick caused some revival of interest in the schism in Germany, but any consolation that this may have brought to him was more than counterbalanced by the news that reached him from Italy. There hatred of his rule was growing steadily, and all his Italian enemies were anxious for the return of Alexander to Italy. He alone could serve as the strong hinge on which the opposition to him could safely hang. Even the Romans were longing for his residence in their midst. They were finding out that the absence of the Pope meant the ruin of the city. No longer, for instance, did pilgrims from this country spend of the island's wealth in Rome. The very *schola* of the English, with its church and hospice, was falling to decay.

Besides, a more active papal vicar appeared in Rome in 1164 to replace Julius of Praeneste, who had died there apparently in the April of that year. This was John, the cardinal of SS. John and Paul. Aided by money and address, he caused the mass of the Roman people to take the customary oath of allegiance to Alexander before the close of the year (1164); to choose a senate according to his liking; and to recover from the schismatics the basilica of St. Peter, and the county of Sabina. At the same time negotiations to promote a general defensive league throughout Lombardy were being actively pushed forward.

Accordingly, the Romans sent envoys to Sens to beg the Pope to return to Rome, inasmuch as the headship of the Church had been fixed by God Himself in the Eternal City. By hearkening to their request, he would be consulting "the best interests not only of the Roman people but of all the churches and peoples of Italy, who, from his return to Rome and his reoccupying the chair of Peter, looked, under God, for peace for themselves and for tranquillity for the whole world" (1165). At the same time they promised to receive him with "honor and devotion".

Alexander resolved to accept their invitation, and forthwith began to treat with different Italian states for ships, and to move slowly south towards Montpellier. Arrived there, and knowing the constant efforts that Frederick was making to debauch the loyalty of Louis to him, he did not fail before his departure to exhort that monarch to fidelity to the Roman Church.

Meanwhile, as soon as Frederick heard of the Pope's intention to return to Italy, he strained every nerve to frustrate it. He is said to have tried to bribe the governor of Montpellier to betray the Pope, and it seems certain that he employed pirates or

privateers to seize the papal galleys on the high seas. At length, however, after many alarms, Alexander was able to set sail from Maguelonne (October 1165), and to reach Messina in safety (November).

In Sicily he received a royal welcome. The king (William I) ordered him to be treated as his father and lord, “from whom he held Sicily and all his territories”, and to be furnished with money and ships. With these latter, and accompanied by a number of the Sicilian magnates, he set sail for the mouth of the Tiber, which he reached on the feast of St. Cecily (November 22).

In the meantime Frederick had on land also essayed to make it impossible for Alexander to reach Rome. After the diet of Wurzburg, he dispatched his trusted Christian de Buch with his antipope into Italy. That energetic general pushed rapidly south, established Paschal at Viterbo, and ravaged the country round Rome and all Campania except Anagni. And whilst the anti-archbishop was reducing the Romans to such straits that they were glad to buy a temporary truce, the antipope lived, like his predecessor, by plundering all the pilgrims and merchants he could capture. But at length the victorious career of Christian was checked. A Sicilian army appeared in Campania, and, in conjunction with the Romans, forced the German back into Tuscany.

It was at this juncture that Alexander disembarked at Ostia, and on the following day advanced towards Rome. At some distance from the city he was met by the senators, by the nobles and by a great multitude of the clergy and people. With olive branches in their hands they escorted him to the Lateran Gate, where he was met by an organized procession. There were the clergy in their festal vestments, the Jews bearing as usual a copy of the Law, the standard-bearers of the different regions, and all the functionaries of the city. With songs of praise they led Alexander to the Lateran palace, giving him such a welcome as no Pope had received for years.

CHAPTER III

RETURN OF ALEXANDER TO ROME, 1166-1178

ALEXANDER had not long been back in Rome ere he was distressed by the news that William I, called ‘The Bad’, had died (May 7, 1166). Though local difficulties had prevented him from being of much assistance to Alexander till towards the very end of his life, he had always been ready to afford him what help he could. And even at the point of death he did not forget his needs, for he gave forty thousand marks to Cardinal John of Naples for the Pope’s use, and his son and successor in Sicily (William II) sent as much for the same purpose.

The money must have been most useful to the Pope; for with the “cremated (of Crema)” Guido at Viterbo blocking access to Rome from the North, and with the

general anarchy in the Patrimony brought about by the schism, money remained as scarce as it was necessary. At the beginning of the year Alexander was in sore need of it. In a letter to his firm friend Henry, archbishop of Rheims, he says that the interest he has to pay swallows up all the alms that are sent to him, and deprives him of the necessaries of life. He begs him to procure for him a hundred marks of silver from the one through whom the archbishop had already presented him with a hundred and fifty pounds. He also asks him to raise money for him from the clergy of his diocese, for “our debts are so heavy, and the importunity of our creditors so great, that unless we are helped by your liberality we shall not be able to maintain the city in its present tranquility”.

The gold of Sicily enabled Alexander not only to keep peace within the city itself, but also to render his position safer by the capture of Albano; for both our king and the emperor, relying on the lying vaticinations of certain German prophetesses, hoped to seize the person of the Pope and then to wring from him what they desired.

Before this capture, the Veronese league had also been successful in seizing places that were in the hands of Frederick’s supporters, and in strongly fortifying the defile of Chiusa, by which he usually entered Italy.

But though one pass was closed to Frederick, still, urged on, so it was said, by Reinald, he once more entered Italy with a powerful army, resolved “to set the heresiarch of Crema in the seat of Peter, and to seize, or expel or slay the Vicar of Christ”. His hosts poured into the territory of Brescia by the Camonica, down which runs the Oglio to empty itself into the beautiful lake of Iseo.

At first the emperor seems to have behaved with moderation, and to have listened with sympathy to the complaints brought before him about the rapacity and cruelty of his podestats; but he soon exasperated the Lombards by making not the slightest effort to redress any of their grievances.

So far, indeed, was Barbarossa from taking any steps to forces and remedy the excesses complained of, that in the early part of the new year he proceeded to aggravate them. Dividing his army into two parts, he sent one division under Christian, the archbishop of Mainz, to Rome. This truculent prelate was to expel Alexander, and to enthrone the antipope Paschal. He himself, with the other division, marched into the Romagna. There he spent some months engaged in wringing money from its cities, and finally in laying siege to Ancona, which was still in the hands of the Greek emperor Manuel, who was constantly endeavoring to form alliances with the Pope and the Trench king against him.

But the limit of human endurance had now been reached by many of the Lombards whom he had left in his rear, especially by the exiled Milanese, who had been made to suffer cruelly for their former resistance. In the Benedictine monastery of St. James of Pontidas, in the diocese of Bergamo, there met together in the early April of 1167 a number of deputies from the Milanese and from the cities of Cremona, Bergamo, Brescia, Mantua, and Ferrara. Encouraged by envoys from the Veronese League, they resolved to rebuild Milan, and, saving the loyalty they owed to the emperor, to stand by one another, and rather to die than bear any further oppression from Frederick or his

creatures. The rebuilding of Milan was commenced forthwith, and on April 28, 1167, the exiles returned to their city.

The Lombard cities were perhaps emboldened to take these strong steps because they had heard that Alexander had just absolved them from their allegiance to Frederick, whom he had declared deposed from his imperial rank. It is true that John of Salisbury is the only author who tells us of this drastic measure; but, as he henceforth always speaks of Frederick as “ex-augustus”, and as he is one of the best informed writers of his age, there does not seem to be any reason to call his assertion in question.

Whilst Frederick was spending his time ingloriously in the Romagna, the warlike archbishops, Reinald of Cologne and Christian of Mainz, compelled the Pisans to swear to acknowledge the antipope Paschal and to cooperate with them by means of their fleet. After that Christian set out to join the emperor at Ancona; and Reinald, advancing through Tuscany, captured Civita Vecchia (May), and then marched into Tusculum (May).

At this juncture, when Alexander could descry Frederick’s forces from the walls of Rome, and when the troops or allies of the Byzantine emperor on the walls of Ancona were being made to feel Barbarossa’s missiles, Manuel resumed with energy the negotiations he had been carrying on with Louis of France and with Alexander when he was in France. The envoy chosen by Manuel was Jordan, the son of Robert, once Prince of Capua. After he had offered the Pope a number of splendid presents, he declared in the first place that his imperial master was most desirous of effecting a union between the Greek Church and the Roman Church, “the mother of all the churches”, in order that, as of old, the Greeks and Latins might live under one observance of the divine law and under one Church Head”. In the next place, “because the time seemed fitting”, he begged that the crown of the Roman Empire should be given back to Manuel by the Apostolic See, “since it did not belong to the German Frederick, but to his master”. If Alexander would agree to make this restoration, the Byzantine monarch undertook to furnish such supplies of men and money as would avail not merely to secure him the crown, but to subject not only Rome, but all Italy “to the service of the Church”. The proposition with regard to the union of the churches was received with the greatest satisfaction; but, even though Alexander knew at the moment that Frederick was undermining with gold the loyalty of his people, he did not see his way to undo the work of his predecessors, and to transfer the seat of empire to the East. With a view, however, to keeping up the negotiations with regard to the union of the churches, he sent envoys to Constantinople.

Now that, as we have seen, the people of Tusculum had received within their walls the small German force of Reinald, the Romans thought that they had a sound excuse for gratifying their old jealousy against their rival. Since the republican idea had taken possession of them, they had been consumed with a desire of going forth to conquer as did the Romans of old. It was in vain that Alexander implored them to live at peace with their neighbors, so that they might be the better able to resist the master foe. It was in vain that he offered them as much money as the Church could afford if they would act thus, and strive to attach the adjoining towns to them by peaceful methods. For once their desire for glory and revenge was stronger than their greed. Accordingly,

despite the prohibition of the Pope, they declared war on the Tusculans, both because they were harboring the Germans, and because they would not pay the excessive tribute demanded of them by the Romans. On one bright morning in May, with hearts as blithe as the larks which sang over their heads, the Romans poured out of the Porta Latina and swarmed across the rolling Campagna, now gay with flowers and “white to harvest”. From their heights the anxious Tusculans, with their Count, Rainone, could see that their enemies were to be counted by the tens of thousands, and that they were destroying everything as they marched along. In alarm they sent off a hasty message to Frederick, who was still before Ancona, imploring immediate help. The emperor at once dispatched to Tusculum a select body of troopers, who, about three o'clock on Whit Monday afternoon (May 29), were able without difficulty to effect a junction with Rainone—so carelessly were the Romans conducting the siege of the city. However, they made up for this want of military discipline and science by immediately attacking the exhausted Germans. But almost at the first charge of Barbarossa’s veterans the Romans broke and fled. All across the Campagna, through what the peasantry still call “la valle dei morte”, and through the gullies that intersect the Campagna, did the Germans pursue the flying Romans, and the slaughter of the fugitives continued till the shades of night or the walls of Rome shielded the remnant of them from the German swords.

According to a letter of Reinald which furnishes many details of this famous fight, the Romans, in addition to the loss of all their accoutrements, out of 30,000 men lost over 9000 killed and more than 5000 prisoners. Boso, in more general terms, says that scarce a third of the Romans escaped, and that, since the day when Hannibal overthrew the hosts of Rome at Cannae, so many of its inhabitants had never perished in a single battle. A later chronicler gives us a sequel to this battle, more picturesque, it is to be feared, than accurate. Giovanni Villani (d. 1348) says that the defeat was brought about by the treachery of the Colonnas, “who were always with the emperor and against the Church”, and that in consequence the Romans expelled them from the city, and destroyed an ancient castle which belonged to them, and which was called *l'Agosta*, i.e., the Mausoleum of Augustus, in the north of the Campus Martius.

Both Alexander and Frederick were quick to grasp the significance of this severe defeat of the Romans. The Pope, though deeply moved by the general grief, began at once to take measures for the effective guarding of the city, for the repair of the weaker portions of its walls, and for obtaining help from without. Frederick, on his part, thinking the opportunity a favorable one to seize Rome, and to install his antipope in St. Peter’s, as he had often promised, hastened to come to terms with Ancona, which he could not capture. Thence he made a forced march to the West, and appeared before the city towards the end of July. Encamping on Monte Malo, he found already engaged in besieging Rome, not merely his own Germans, but the men of Tivoli, Albano, and other cities of the Campagna, all anxious to avenge themselves on the Romans. The emperor began his assault on the city by a fierce attack on the gates of the Leonine city opposite his camp. When these were carried, he attempted to storm St. Peter’s. Time after time, however, were his soldiers driven back until, in desperation, he ordered fire to be set to the oratory of S. Maria in Turri which formed part of the *quadriporticus* which surrounded the atrium of the basilica. When this little church had been burnt along with

its gates of bronze (on which in letters of silver might have been read the names of the cities given by Charlemagne to Pope Hadrian), and along with its pictures of our Lord and St. Peter elaborately decorated with pure gold—then the gallant defenders of the basilica surrendered. They were afraid that, if they held out any longer, the whole of St. Peter’s would be burnt to the ground.

The capitulation took place on July 29. The next day the antipope said Mass in St. Peter’s, and crowned Frederick with the golden circlet of the Patricius (*circulum aureum*); and two days afterwards (August 1), he placed the imperial crowns both on the emperor and on the Empress Beatrice.

Alarmed at this success of Frederick, Alexander retired “to the safe quarters” of the Frangipani, and with his suite occupied S. Maria Nova, the turns Cartularia (once part of the palace of John VII) and the Colosseum. Fortunately for him, the king of Sicily, hearing of his peril, at once dispatched two swift galleys to Rome with a considerable sum of money. The money Alexander took gladly, but he would not accept the king’s offer to go on board the galleys, and sail for his dominions. On the contrary, he sent back the ships with his thanks, while with the money he confirmed in their loyalty the Frangipani, the Pierleoni, the Corsi, and the keepers of the gates.

Thus again baulked of his expected prey, the emperor sent a hurried message to Pisa to send eight galleys to his help with all speed, and soon the Romans were horrified at seeing an armed Pisan galley, with colours dying, anchor off the Marmorata. This apparition proved too much for the loyalty and courage of the Romans. They began to listen to Frederick’s suggestion to depose both Guido and Alexander, and to elect a new Pope, and to treat of terms of peace. They were to be loyal to Frederick, not to choose a senate without his consent, to wage war on Oddo Frangipane and his associates, and on his side the emperor was not to interfere with their civic privileges.

Realizing what would be the issue of these negotiations, Alexander, disguised as a pilgrim, and accompanied by only one or two attendants, contrived to escape from the city by boat under the very eyes of the Pisan sailors. It would appear that the fugitives first put ashore at the promontory of Circe; for Boso depicts the Pope as *vanishing* from Rome, and then three days later as appearing at a fountain at the foot of Monte Circe (Circello) having a meal with his companions. But the Pope did not remain long at Circe. He pushed rapidly on, escorted by the clergy of the district, to the patrimony of Benevento, where the cardinals made haste to join him as soon as they could. In electing to retire to his own city of Benevento near the Norman territory rather than to a city actually within the dominions of William II, Alexander was consulting his independence more than his safety. His residence in France had taught him the difficulties engendered by complete dependence on a powerful benefactor.

Frederick was now triumphant. He entered Rome at the head of his exulting troops. Fifty senators were appointed in accordance with his will, and his antipope was installed in the Lateran palace. Rome was in his hands, north Italy was at his feet, and where north Italy was he would soon place south Italy. But the city bells that rang out joyously to celebrate his glory abruptly changed their tone, and solemnly began to toll forth his doom. He had been crowned on August the first. On the second, heavy showers of rain were followed by a sultry heat. On the third a virulent form of malaria

struck the German army with appalling suddenness and violence. For three days Frederick faced the fiery fever whilst his men fell around him by thousands. Then in despair he fled; but the raging fever followed him, and his mighty host was reduced to dust and ashes.

Suddenly, says Morena, who was in Rome at the time, from out a clear sky rain began to fall, and as the rain fell a most awful plague arose. It smote the imperial army from the highest to the lowest. Among its early victims were Reinald of Dassel, the godless archbishop of Cologne⁴ (*d.* August 14), the mainstay of the schism, Daniel, the bishop of Prague, in whose train was the historian Vincent, Frederick, duke of Swabia, the son of Conrad III, and a host of other notables. Barbarossa, "like a tower wrapped in flames", hurried north with the hostages he had received from the Romans, losing from twenty to twenty-five thousand men; and though, says John of Salisbury, "the stench from the corpses of his soldiers ever arose in his nostrils, he would not as yet acknowledge the hand of God and confess his sin".

But if Frederick did not see or believe that the hand of God was heavy upon him, he could not hide from himself that the hands of men were busy against him. As he marched wearily northwards, with his friends, his counsellors and his soldiers dying around him, some cities were bold enough to refuse him admittance within their walls, and when he reached Pavia he found himself almost surrounded with enemies. Everywhere the Lombard cities threw off any pretence of dependence upon him; they expelled his schismatical bishops, introduced such as were in communion with Alexander, and joined the League already in existence. In impotent rage, Frederick convened such a diet as he could, and, casting down his glove before the assembly, declared all the Lombard cities who were opposed to him under the ban of the Empire (September 20), and even made a vain attempt to take the field against the Milanese.

Not in the least daunted by being placed under the ban, fifteen of the principal cities of Lombardy formed a definite league for twenty years to stand by each other and to resist all attempts to make them submit to any conditions not required of them by previous emperors (December 1, 1167). The sword was now finally tempered which was to cut down the ambition of Barbarossa.

When the winter of 1167-1168 had passed, and spring came, the Lombard League began to put its forces in the field, and soon there were no less than twenty thousand men under arms. Frederick's position was desperate; the more so that his cruelty had even irritated the people of Pavia, and that many of the passes of the Alps were in the hands of his enemies. Whilst, however, he was carrying on negotiations with a view to crossing the Alps by Susa, he made a show of treating with the Pope about a reconciliation. When this became known, the Lombards ceased to press him; but no sooner did he learn that an Alpine pass was open to him, than, saying that he would only treat with an angel from heaven, he hurried secretly north, and at length, in the disguise of a servant, the mighty Augustus managed to cross the Alps into Burgundy (March). Thence he betook himself into Germany, to find it in a great state of disorder and hostile to himself.

No sooner did the Lombards find that he had left Italy, than they took vengeance on those who had helped him, made preparations to besiege Pavia, and tried to induce

Alexander to come among them, and thus encourage them by his presence. Meanwhile, to show how much he was the centre of their hopes, they resolved to build a strong city of strategic importance between Pavia and Asti, and to call it Alessandria after his name. It was to be placed near a district where the imperialists were still strong, where a check could be put on the Marquis of Montferrat, one of the last of the independent feudal barons, and where it would serve as a bulwark against a German army entering Italy by the valleys of Savoy, and guard the road leading to Genoa and the sea. Accordingly, they chose as the site for their new city the neighborhood of the castle of Rovereto, situated in the midst of a fertile locality, at the junction of the two rivers Tanaro and Bormida. The building of the new city was begun in May, and, in fear of an attack from the people of Pavia, many of its houses were hastily roofed over with thatch, which caused the Pavese to call it a "city of straw". But it was destined neither to prove a reed shaken by the wind, nor to accept the appellation of Cesarea which the imperialists tried to fasten upon it. The people from the surrounding districts flocked into the newly risen Alessandria in such numbers that in a year's time it was said to be able to put fifteen thousand men into the field. In the course of the second year of its life its consuls came to the Pope at Benevento, and made their city tributary to him. Every family, according to its wealth, was to pay one or three denary to the Holy See every year on the feast of St Martin. Alexander on his side afterwards made the new city the seat of a bishopric.

When the terrible havoc which the plague made in his army forced Frederick to leave the neighborhood of Rome, he took Paschal III with him, but left him at Viterbo with the hostages which the Romans had given him as a guarantee that they would observe the agreement they had made with him. The antipope, however, with the aid of the imperialists, soon returned to the Leonine city (1167). There the Pope's vicar in Rome, the bishop of Albano, and the Romans suffered him to remain whilst they entered into vain negotiations with him for the surrender of their hostages whom he held fast

But he durst not stir out of the tower of Stephen Theobaldus, where he had taken up his abode, and, stricken first with gout or some disease which lamed him, and then with cancer and pleurisy, he died a miserable death (September 20, 1168) and was buried in St. Peter's.

On the death of Octavian the schismatical party had found it difficult to find him a successor. They had now to seek in the highways and byways for one who was willing to replace Guido. At length they found a certain John, at one time abbot of Struma, in Hungary, whom Alexander's biographer, Boso, naturally no friend of John; describes as "an apostate, and an impure, greedy, vagabond". This abbot was hailed by his electors as Calixtus III; and, again according to the same authority, was acknowledged by the scum of clerical and lay society, who supported him, as they had supported his predecessor, by robbing the pilgrim and the traveller. Even this puppet was in due course acknowledged by the obstinate emperor, who ordered his officials to support him.

During the six years that followed the flight of Frederick from Italy, there was a pause in the death-grapple between the Church and the Empire. In England, indeed,

during this interval, the struggle for ecclesiastical, and, it may be added, for civil liberty, which was going on at the same time, culminated in the martyrdom of St. Thomas Becket (December 29, 1170). But, to borrow a phrase from John of Salisbury, “for a while the whole world was silent”. The silence cannot be called absolute; but whether we consider the emperor and the Lombard League on the one hand, or the Pope and the Romans on the other, the years in question marked a period of comparative rest. Preparations, however, for the renewal of the conflict were in progress in the meanwhile, nor were there wanting indications of what was to come.

One of the many stories told by the monk Caesar of Heisterbach, who wrote under Honorius III, will show the kind of *peace* that reigned during the Empire at this period. During the time of the schism between Alexander and Calixtus (of which Frederick was the author and defender), says Caesar, everyone in the Empire was commanded to swear fealty to the Pope whom the emperor had created or go into exile. The monks of Hemmenrode among others declared “they would never recede from the unity of the Church”, and they were ordered to leave the Empire forthwith. Whilst they were preparing to go into France, one of the brethren asked a venerable monk who was always lost in contemplation, “Do you not know, father, that we have to leave this place?” “Fear not”, replied the holy man, “God will not desert those who trust in Him. Sing with deep sorrow the Antiphon of the *Magnificat*, and the Lord will console you”. This they did, calling on Him who held the earth in the hollow of His hand to hear their tearful prayers.

God heard their sorrowful cries, and changed the heart of the emperor, who bade them remain, and pray for the Empire. Whence, concludes the pious monk, you may argue how efficacious before God are the tears of sorrow

When Frederick returned to Germany after the annihilation of his army, he had much to do. He had in the first place to recover prestige, because it not unnaturally seemed to most men that the hand of God was against him. He had, moreover, to make peace between some of his most powerful feudatories who were at war with one another, and he had to gather together a fresh army. But he was equal to the occasion. No man was ever more indomitable in devising means to pursue a chimera, or more undaunted in his resolve to overcome insurmountable obstacles, than Barbarossa. For in all that he did during these six years he kept two ends ever before his eyes. He would humble Alexander by making Christendom acknowledge the antipope, and he would subdue to his will the cities of Lombardy. He began by making peace between his relative Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony and Bavaria, the most powerful of his subjects, and Albert the Bear, the founder of the house of Brandenburg. Nor, in the hope of gaining his immediate end, which was to ensure the whole-hearted support of Henry, did he hesitate unduly to increase his power. In place of Reinald of Dassel he promoted another of his partisans (Philip of Heinsberg) to the see of Cologne, and he did all he could to place in the hands of adherents the offices which the plague had made vacant, and to put at his own disposal domains which the same cause had left ownerless. To secure the succession to the Empire in his own family, he succeeded in getting his son Henry, though only four years of age, recognized as king (1169), and, to quiet the consciences of such as were troubled by his recognition of antipopes, “the Teutonic tyrant” opened negotiations with the Pope. He was anxious, or pretended to be, that his

little son should be accepted as emperor by Alexander, and should receive regal consecration at the hands of Catholic bishops. Accordingly, he selected as his ambassadors to Alexander men who were known to be devoted to him; but, in order to breed distrust between the Lombard League and the Pope, they were instructed to make known to the Pope alone the offers of peace with which they were entrusted. Alexander, however, was as far-seeing as Frederick, and immediately requested the League to send envoys who along with him might treat of peace with the emperor's ambassadors (March 1170). The Lombards at once complied with the Pope's wishes, and, in presence of their envoys, Alexander met Ebehard II bishop of Bamberg, and the other imperial ambassadors at Veroli. But the bishop was not empowered to do more than make on Frederick's part some ambiguous offer of obedience to the Pope. The embassy, of course, came to naught, as its author intended it should do; for, before it, he had dispatched most distinguished envoys to Henry of England to offer an alliance against the Pope and against Louis of France (*c.* September 1168); and, after it, he declared, as he had done before, that he would never recognize Alexander as Pope (1170).

All Frederick's foreign relations at this time were equally complicated or tortuous. At one moment, for instance, he receives graciously the Greek emperor Manuel's ambassadors who came to treat of a marriage between his daughter and Frederick's son (1171), and yet, soon after, in a diet of Worms (March 1172) he succeeds in inducing the princes of the Empire to promise to join him in another expedition into Italy in two years' time, because the papal party were desirous of giving the imperial crown to the Greek, and he declares war upon him. And, about the same time that he was allying himself with Henry of England against Louis of France, he was trying to negotiate a marriage between his son and the daughter of the French king. Provided he strengthened his hand at the moment, he appears to have been utterly reckless of the means he employed for the purpose.

Whilst Frederick was thus straining every nerve to increase his power so that he might again make an attempt to bend the Lombard cities to his will, they were endeavoring to make good the losses he had already inflicted upon town and country, and to prepare for the fresh attack upon their liberties which they perceived was soon to come. Although fierce internal struggles were rife in Tuscany and in the Romagna, the League steadily spread. At an important assembly at Modena (October 1173), fresh cities joined it, and it became known as the League of Lombardy, of the March (of Treviso), of Romagna, of Verona, and of Venice. Alexander throughout steadily supported the aims of the League. His legates were constantly in their midst, and were instructed to excommunicate any who should conspire against the federation.

If Frederick in his fierce hatred of Alexander was ready to go to any extreme, so also was Henry II, in his hatred of St. Thomas. It was during the interval of which we are now treating that the quarrel between the two last named reached its height. To humble St. Thomas, Henry turned to the Italian cities after he had failed to effect his purpose by alliances with Frederick and the schismatics. He offered thousands of marks to Milan, to Cremona, to Parma, and to Bologna if they would in any way obtain from the Pope the deposition or the translation of the archbishop. But though the king succeeded in interesting them in his behalf, they remained as true to the Pope as Alexander was true to them.

The Romans had, of course, not forgotten the terrible defeat that the people of Tusculum and Albano, with the aid of the Germans, had inflicted on them in the May of 1167. As soon as they had somewhat recovered themselves from their defeat and from the plague of 1167, which affected them as well as the Germans, they prepared for vengeance. As their hatred and jealousy of Tusculum occupied the first place among their passions, they were content to ally themselves with that very Christian, archbishop of Mainz, who had been the cause of their defeat. Issuing forth from behind their strong walls—this time with more determination and less pomp—they succeeded in destroying Albano, but were compelled for the time to retire from Tusculum, as it was supported by troops sent by Alexander (1169).

But it was not long before the Romans returned to the attack. So hard did they press the Tusculans that both the people and Rainone, their count, made over their city to the Pope, who made his solemn entry into it on September 17, 1170, and occupied till January 1173. This surrender of the city only inflamed the hatred of the Romans still more; and they told the Pope that, unless he abandoned the place, they would do him all the mischief in their power. It was to no purpose that, as was his wont, Alexander pointed out to them with equal mildness and firmness that the Apostolic See must continue to be just towards the city, but that now that it was in the hands of the Roman Church, he would see that it would henceforth benefit and not harm the Romans. But in this instance a mild answer failed to turn away wrath, because, says Boso, whom we are quoting, and who here speaks like all the Independent writers of his age: “the Romans are seditious among themselves, and jealous of their neighbors. They know not either how to be subject, or how to command. They are faithless to their rulers, and unbearable to their inferiors. While their words are of the grandest, their deeds are of the smallest”.

Hostilities were accordingly kept up between the Tusculans and the Romans. At length, however, after repeated efforts on the part of the Pope, a peace was agreed to on condition that, if the Tusculans would consent to the destruction of a portion of their walls by the Romans as a concession to their *amour propre*, the Romans on their side would let bygones be bygones, would henceforth live at peace with the Tusculans, and as his obedient subjects would receive him back into the city. But when once they had begun the destruction of the walls, they thought no more of their oaths, but, disregarding the remonstrances of Alexander, they destroyed the whole circuit of the city’s walls under his very eyes. Even this outrage, continues Boso, Alexander bore “like the vicar of Christ”, and, in a very different spirit to that which animated his predecessor (Hadrian IV) on a similar occasion, refrained from punishing the perjured Romans, but retired quietly to Segni (January 1173).

The action of the Romans in this affair of the destruction of the walls of Tusculum is typical of the crooked policy of many of the great ones of their age, and is thus well commented on by Testa : “With an imperial prefect in Rome, they went forth to make war on those who were faithful to the Empire. They did not admit into their city the Pope, whose censures they feared, nor, on the other hand, did they adhere to the antipope, whom they allowed to remain in their city; and, whilst they themselves were not free, they sought to subjugate their neighbors”.

It was also during this interval of comparative rest that the Greek emperor renewed his attempts to induce the Pope to acknowledge him as emperor of the West in place of Frederick. His envoys, who brought with them an immense sum of money for the Pope, said that their master was anxious to afford the Pope that protection which, by virtue of his office, Frederick ought to have given him, and to bring back the Greek Church to unity with that of Rome. They therefore begged the Pope to deprive Frederick of the imperial crown, and, as justice required, to restore it to their master. Should he grant their request, Manuel would supply him with all the men and money of which he stood in need. But, as far at least as the bestowing of the imperial crown was concerned, Alexander declined to entertain the Greek emperor's proposals, and sent him back all his money. However, in the vain hope of effecting the reconciliation of the Greek Church, he sent fresh nuncios to Constantinople (1170).

At length the indomitable Barbarossa had overcome all his difficulties, including an attack of gout, and in the month of September once again set out for Italy with a most powerful army. Entering Italy as he had last left it, viz., by the pass of Mont Cenis, because that pass was under the control of his allies, Frederick advanced towards Alessandria, burning and subduing the smaller towns as he marched along. With the aid of soldiers also from one or two Italian cities like Pavia, he commenced the siege of Alessandria, expecting soon to be able to capture "the city of straw". But the city of straw was defended by men of iron; and, though Frederick tried every means, even, so it is said, treachery, he failed to take the place. To add to his difficulties, the forces of the cities of the League began to assemble in March, and on April 6 they encamped in strength at Tortona, some ten miles from the imperial army (1175).

Frederick had lost heavily owing to the severity of the winter as well as to the vigour of the defence, and dared not allow himself to be caught between the people of Alessandria and the troops of the League. Deeply mortified, he had to raise the siege, fall back upon Pavia, and profess to be willing to treat about peace. "Saving the rights of the Empire", he declared he was ready to submit his cause to arbitration, and the League on their side made the same profession, "saving the freedom of the Church of Rome and their own". Accordingly, on April 16 an armistice was agreed to till the middle of May, and it was arranged that the matters in dispute between the emperor and the League should be submitted to six arbitrators, three to be chosen by each side, and that "all the consuls of Cremona" should be called in to settle any point on which the six could not agree.

Conferences were opened at once. The Pope was asked to send legates to assist at them, and proposals of peace were drawn up by both parties. The first point insisted on by the Lombards was that Frederick should make peace with the "holy Roman Church, the mother of all the faithful, and with its pontiff the lord Alexander". The next was that they should render to Frederick no more than those dues which their forefathers had paid to his predecessors from the time of the death of "the later Henry" (Henry V). The cities of the League were to be allowed to retain and even improve their fortifications, to continue in their League, and ever to remain in the unity of the Church. On the other hand, they were to furnish the emperor with the customary supplies when he went to Rome "for the sake of receiving the crown". His vassals were to offer him homage, and, in accordance with custom, accompany him to Rome. Though he professed some of

these conditions very hard, Frederick wrote to the League to say that he was ready to accept them (June 1175), and awaited the arrival of the Pope's legates.

Unwilling to lose an opportunity of making peace, Alexander, in response to the emperor's request, dispatched Hubaldus, bishop of Ostia (afterwards Lucius III), and Bernard, bishop of Porto. They were everywhere received with the greatest honor as they journeyed North, giving the sacrament of Confirmation as they went along. Frederick also received them with honor, uncovering in their presence, and expressing to them in German his pleasure at their arrival. On their side the legates trusted that God would move the emperor to make peace with the Church, so that they might without any scruples be able to return his greetings. They pointed out the harm which the schism had done both to the Church and to the Empire, and urged that, as all the world had accepted Alexander, the emperor ought not to assail the unity of the Church any longer. Frederick was touched, or pretended to be touched, by their words, and promised peace.

But when it came to the final settlement of the terms between the Empire on the one hand, and the League and the Pope and his other allies, the King of Sicily and the Greek emperor Manuel, on the other, Frederick would only grant to the cities the privileges they possessed in the time of Charlemagne or of Otho. He insisted too on the demolition of the hated Alessandria, and demanded from the Church "what had never been conceded to any layman". It was plain that neither peace at any price nor peace at the Lombards' price was to Frederick's taste, so that the legates returned to the Pope, and the Lombard League prepared for war.

At this juncture the emperor was badly in need of time. After the hardships which his vassals had endured, and the losses they had sustained during the months they had besieged Alessandria, they had tired of the campaign, and many of them had returned to Germany either with or without the emperor's permission. Frederick had, therefore, to send for fresh troops. Pending their arrival, he not merely continued negotiations for peace, but endeavored to break the union between the Pope and the League. As the Lombards themselves afterwards impressed upon the Pope when he met them at Ferrara (1177): "The emperor often offered to make peace with us but taking into consideration either the Church or you. But we preferred to have war along with the unity of the Church, rather than peace with its disunion".

The war which the Lombards preferred was what they got. All during the winter of 1175-6, hostilities on a comparatively small scale went on between them and Frederick. At length in May, by the Splugen Pass and the vale of Chiavenna, or, according to others, by the Lukmanier Pass, a fresh German army descended into Italy and was met by the emperor at Como. The cities of the League flew to arms, and assembled at Milan. With their Carroccio, or Banner-car, in their midst the Milanese and their allies went forth on May 29, 1176, to battle for freedom.

The two armies met in the great plain fifteen miles from Milan in the neighborhood of Legnano, Busto Arsizio, and Borsano, and, before the sun went down on that eventful day, a decisive check had been given to the oppressive power of one of the greatest of the world's absolute princes. The host of Frederick was broken to pieces, and he himself, after being unhorsed in the fight, and thought to be dead, only reached Pavia after three days of almost solitary wandering.

Whilst the Milanese were distributing to the Pope and to their allies the immense spoils which the victory of Legnano had placed at their disposal, and whilst they were carving on their gates memorials of their success, the emperor began to believe, with most of his people, that his repeated misfortunes were sent to him by God as a punishment for his treatment of Pope Alexander. His belief was quickened by the refusal of his cousin, Henry the Lion, and other princes to follow him any longer unless he made peace with the Church. He accordingly once more set on foot negotiations for the healing of the schism. But at first he was only so far sincere as to wish to be healed to the profit of his own adherents. Hence, though he gave out that he was definitely bent on peace, and though he sent (October) a most important embassy to Alexander at Anagni, he did not cease meanwhile endeavoring to sow distrust between him and his allies. The Pope, however, lost no time in assuring the Lombards that he could never be induced to agree to any peace that did not include them, the king of Sicily and the other allies of the Church; and still further to convince them of his sincerity, he told them that, despite his age, he would journey to the north and consult with them in person about the peace.

But Frederick's plenipotentiaries seem to have been more in earnest than their master. It was universally agreed, they said, that God had appointed two principal powers to rule the world, viz., the sacerdotal and the regal; and therefore they were anxious for these two powers to be at peace again; because, unless there was concord between them, the whole world resounded with the din of war. Alexander thereupon assured the envoys that nothing gave him greater pleasure than to hear that the emperor, whom he recognized as the greatest of earthly princes, was anxious for peace. But if, he continued, he desires peace with the Church, that peace must include "all those who have helped us, particularly the king of Sicily, the Lombards, and the emperor of Constantinople".

To this the plenipotentiaries assented, but requested that the draft of the terms of peace with the Church should be drawn up in secret. For more than fifteen days were the terms discussed; but at last the *Instrumentum pacis Anagninae* in twenty-eight clauses was agreed to. Of these the principal ones were that the emperor should recognize Alexander as the true Pope, give peace to the Church, and restore to it the prefectship and everything else (including the lands of the Countess Matilda) which he had taken from it. Peace was also to be granted to the king of Sicily, to the emperor of Constantinople, and "to those who had helped the Roman Church". Most of the clauses concerned the rights to be conceded, or not to be conceded, to individuals.

For instance, the militant Christian, chancellor of the emperor, who was one of the plenipotentiaries, was to be recognized as archbishop of Mainz, whereas the first suitable vacant German see was to be granted to Conrad, who had lost that see owing to his loyalty to the Pope, and an abbacy was to be granted "to him who calls himself Calixtus". A six years' truce between the emperor and the Lombards was to begin from the 1st of August 1177.

It was also arranged that the final conclusion of the treaty should be deferred until the Pope had in person interviewed the emperor and the Lombards. Meanwhile, the imperial plenipotentiaries in a document the original of which is still preserved in the

Vatican archives, guaranteed on their master's behalf the observance of the principal articles of the treaty, and gave the Pope and the cardinals all the requisite safe-conducts for their journey to Bologna, or Ravenna or Venice or to wherever else the course of the negotiations might lead them.

Sending on six cardinals to notify his coming both to the emperor and to the Lombards, and appointing a vicar in Rome, Alexander left Anagni in the beginning of December, spent Christmas at Benevento, and reached the harbor of Vesta (Viesti), on the promontory of Mons Garganus, in the beginning of February. There he found a fleet of seven galleys which the king of Sicily had sent for his use. On board were William's envoys, one of whom was Romuald, archbishop of Salerno, the learned historian whose chronicle we have quoted so often, and who has left us a most valuable narrative of the peace of Venice. For thirty days a storm prevented the papal party from moving; and, whilst the Pope was fretting under this untoward delay, he was distressed by the news that the emperor had succeeded in detaching Cremona and Tortona from the League. At length, however, the storm abated, and with a favorable southerly wind Alexander put to sea on Ash Wednesday, after he had been duly reminded of his frail mortality by the imposition of the ashes (March 9. 1117). At this point the Englishman's love of the sea breaks out in the papal biographer, and he enthusiastically descants on the glorious sight presented by eleven war galleys and two merchantmen laden with provisions and the Pope's white horses, ploughing the deep blue sea under a bright sun with swelling sails in all the pomp of war. But by midday all was changed. The wind veered to the north, and soon the war galleys were rowing for life or death, while the merchantmen had to turn back to Vesta. The warships, however, reached the little isle of Pelagosa in safety, and a cheerful and plentiful meal soon restored the spirits of the Pope, which sea-sickness and the fast of Lent had somewhat broken. When night came on the wind again changed to the south, and the war galleys again put to sea, and, following the swifter ship of the Pope, which carried "a great light" to guide them, all reached the isle of Lissa about the middle of the following day (March 10). Then, skirting a number of the other Dalmatian islands, the whole fleet sailed into the harbor of Zara, "the first of the cities of Hungary" (March 13).

The enthusiasm of the clergy and people knew no bounds, for a Pope had never before visited their city. They gave thanks to the Lord "who in their times had deigned to visit them in the person of His servant Alexander, the successor of Blessed Peter". They set the Pope on a white horse, and with canticles of joy sung "in their own Slavonic tongue", led him to the cathedral church of Blessed Anastasia, "where the virgin martyr lies honorably buried". After transacting various business for four days, Alexander again put to sea, and, sailing "through the islands of the Slavs, and coasting by the small maritime cities of Istria, he reached the monastery of St. Nicholas on the Lido, part of the strip of land which extends along the mouth of the lagoon, and forms the outer bulwark of Venice against the sea" (March 23).

On the following day Alexander was solemnly escorted to Venice. He was taken in the Doge's gondola, which was gloriously bedecked for the occasion. The Doge, Sebastian Ziani, sat on his right, and the Patriarch of Grado, Henry Dandolo, on his left. After a visit to the Church of St. Mark, which with its whole adjoining square was densely crowded with people to welcome the Pope, he adjourned to the palace of the

Patriarch. There he found envoys from the emperor who wished to meet the Pope not at Bologna, but at Ravenna or Venice. But, as the two cardinals whom Alexander had sent to Frederick about the safe-conducts had agreed with the Lombards and with the emperor himself that the meeting should take place at Bologna, the Pope declared that he could not alter the arrangement without consulting his friends. In order, however, not to delay the negotiations for peace, he would, he said, at once proceed to Ferrara, and would summon the rectors of Lombardy to meet him there on Passion Sunday (April 10).

Meanwhile, on *Laetare* Sunday (April 3) the Pope sang High Mass in St. Mark's, preached to the people, who regarded him as an angel from heaven, and blessed and carried procession as usual the Golden Rose. This beautiful and large ornament which, says the Venetian historian, is wont to be given to emperors or kings, was presented by Alexander to the Doge.

A few days later (April 9), with a glorious fleet of galleys delightful to behold, the Pope left Venice, sailed to Lauretum (Loreo), and hence up the Po to his own city of Ferrara. When Alexander reached that low-lying now decaying town (April 10), it was crowded with people who had flocked thither because it was Sunday, and a fair was being held. From the assembled thousands he received an enthusiastic welcome, and in the course of the week met the envoys of the emperor, of the king of Sicily, and of the Lombards in the Church of St. George where, centuries after, Eugenius IV opened the council of Ferrara-Florence: Representing the Lombards were the patriarch of Aquileia, and the archbishops of Ravenna and Milan with their suffragans, and the rectors of the cities with their marquises and counts. Our historian, Romuald of Salerno, and Roger, count of Andria, spoke for William of Sicily, and there stood for the emperor the archbishops of Mainz, Cologne, Trier, Besançon, Magdeburg, and Salzburg, with some of their suffragans, and the elect of Worms and the protonotary Wortwin.

At a preliminary meeting between Alexander and the Lombards, the Pope opened the proceedings by explaining how the emperor, who, as the advocate of the Church ought to have protected it, had been the means of dividing it. The schism, he continued, during the eighteen years of its existence, had proved most disastrous to faith, to morals, and to the general prosperity. But the emperor is now desirous of peace; for the power of God has brought it about that an aged unarmed priest has been able without a blow to overthrow the might of the emperor. "His envoys sought us at Anagni, and wished to make peace only with the Church and the king of Sicily; but we, knowing how you had fought for the Church and for the liberty of Italy, would have none of it without you. Hence, in spite of our age, have we braved the tempest to come to you, that we might make a peace which would be acceptable to us all"

Thereupon the Lombards, who, says Romuald, are as skilled in warring with words as in fighting with the sword, thus made answer to the Pope: "Holy Father and Lord, all Italy bends before you in thanksgiving, and rejoices that you have come to save your sons from the wolf. But that the wolf might not oppress Italy and destroy the liberty of the Church, we have opposed to it our bodies, our money, and our swords. hence, then, is it only right that you should not make peace without us who have suffered even more than you have, and who have often refused to make peace without

you. We have preferred war with the unity of the Church to peace with its division. We are prepared, they went on to say, to render to the emperor his ancient rights, but we are resolved to maintain the liberties we have received from our fathers”.

A day or two after this plain speaking, seven representatives of the Church and seven of the Lombards, with the two envoys of the king of Sicily, met seven envoys of the emperor and had a heated discussion as to where the meeting of the Pope and the emperor for the final settlement of the peace should take place. The wishes of the Pope finally prevailed, and it was agreed that they should meet at Venice if the Venetians would grant the necessary safe-conducts and if the emperor would agree not to enter the Venetian territories till the Pope should give his assent. The allies feared the personal influence of Frederick, and the sequel showed that their fears were not groundless, Venice was chosen because, according to one historian, it was dependent on God alone, and because, according to its own historian, it was safe for all and abounded with all necessaries, and was blessed with a quiet and peace-loving people.

After keeping Easter with great pomp at Ferrara, and receiving all the requisite assurances from the Venetians, Alexander with the various envoys once again betook himself to their city, and by May 11 was installed in the palace of the patriarch near which now stands the Rialto bridge. By the direction of the Pope, the plenipotentiaries met in the chapel of the palace twice a day, and gave their first attention to settling the terms of peace between the emperor and the Lombards. As a conclusion to long discussions, Christian of Mainz laid three proposals before the Lombard envoys. They were to agree to render to the emperor the regalia and his other rights which they were withholding from him, or were loyally to accept the decision of the jurists at Roncaglia, or were to conduct themselves towards him in the same manner as their ancestors had done towards the senior Henry, *i.e.*, seemingly to the Emperor Henry IV.

With regard to the first proposal, the Lombards replied that it affected very many cities, and they accordingly asked for time, in order that the points in dispute might be debated before a judge recognized by both parties. As for the second, they said that many of the cities were not represented at Roncaglia, and that what was there decided was rather an imperial decree than a judicial sentence. Finally, they could not agree to render to the emperor the rights which their ancestors were said to have rendered to Henry IV, because there was no one now living to tell them what those rights were. Besides, Henry IV was not a lord, but a tyrant. They were, however, ready to continue to render to Frederick the rights which had been yielded to the emperor since the time “of the younger Henry” (Henry V).

The replies of the Lombard envoys to the conditions of peace proposed by those of Frederick showed plainly enough that it would be no easy matter to arrange terms which would be satisfactory to the emperor and to the communes alike. As this became more and more apparent, both parties agreed to refer the matter to the Pope.

Realizing then that the points in dispute between the emperor and the Lombards were many and various, and could not be settled at a single conference, Alexander proposed that, for the full discussion of the different questions, a truce of six years should meanwhile be agreed upon between them, and a truce of fifteen years between the emperor and the king of Sicily.

This proposed change of the whole programme necessitated an appeal to the emperor, and it was agreed that to facilitate the negotiators he should come from Cesena to Chioggia. When, however, Frederick came so close to Venice, the imperial party there bade him enter the city without the Pope's leave or licence, and inspired him with the hope of yet being able, with their assistance, to make peace with the Church and the Lombards on his own terms. To give his party's plans a little time to mature, Barbarossa began to procrastinate, while his imperial allies strove to persuade their countrymen that the heat and the mosquitoes made Chioggia a wholly unfit place for the residence of the emperor, and that he ought to be brought into the city

The news of this intrigue caused the greatest alarm. The Lombard envoys at once took ship and sailed to Treviso, and the Pope was in the greatest consternation. But the situation was saved by the Normans. They told Alexander that they had four armed galleys at his disposal with which he could leave Venice either with or without the permission of the Venetians; they reminded the Venetians that the friendship of the king of Sicily meant more to them than that of the emperor; and, when the Venetians talked of refusing them leave to depart, they ordered their trumpets to ring out. their galleys to be got ready for sea, and their arms and everything to be put on board. This prompt action brought the Venetians to their senses. They bade the Doge hold firm to his undertaking not to admit the emperor into the city against the wish of the Pope, and, if need be, put to death those who would have the contrary. This support of the great body of the people was exactly what the Doge wanted, and he lost no time in asking the Pope's pardon for what had occurred, and implored him to prevent the departure of the Normans.

At the Pope's request they agreed to postpone their departure, while the Doge, to restore confidence, caused a herald to proclaim on the Rialto that no one should dare mention the coming of the emperor till the time appointed by the Pope.

But Barbarossa's intrigue had not ended merely in turning the Venetians against him. It had disgusted his chancellor and the other ecclesiastical princes who were really anxious for peace, and who felt themselves committed by the Pact of Anagni. They, therefore, while acknowledging to Frederick that he was their lord in temporal matters, plainly told him that he was not the lord of their souls, and that they were unwilling to lose them for his sake. "Wherefore your Imperial Highness must understand that for the future we will recognize Alexander as Pope of the Catholic Church, and that henceforth we will obey him in spiritual concerns. But the idol you have set up in Tuscany we will adore no longer".

Realizing at length that straightforward dealing was the only policy, Frederick embraced it frankly, and commissioned Count Henry of Diessen to go to the Pope, and in his master's name take an oath to him that, from the time when he himself should come to Venice, he would faithfully observe the terms of the peace which the plenipotentiaries should have arranged with regard to the Church, the king of Sicily, and the Lombards.

Confidence was at once restored, the Lombards returned, the count took the oath, and the Emperor was then conducted in great state to St. Nicholas on the Lido. On the next day (Sunday, July 24) the Pope went early to St Mark's, and dispatched Hubald of

Ostia and other cardinals to absolve Frederick and his counsellors from the sentence of excommunication long before passed upon them. The oath taken on this occasion by the chancellor Christian was characteristic of the man. With his hand on the Gospels he declared: "That all may know that I am Christian in name and in fact, I abjure Octavian of Crema and John of Struma and their supporters, and I acknowledge Alexander and his successors as the true Popes".

After Alexander had said Mass in St. Mark's, he took his place on a lofty throne which had been erected for him in front of the cathedral, and there, surrounded by a host of bishops, he awaited the arrival of the emperor. Presently, about nine o'clock, the ducal gondola came alongside the Molo (the Marmoreum), the landing-place near St. Mark's. It contained the emperor, the Doge, and the cardinals who had removed the sentence of excommunication. Between two gigantic masts which bore large splendid banners of St. Mark, the emperor stepped on shore, and, escorted "by seven archbishops and canons of the cathedral", he made his way to the Pope's throne through the enormous crowds which the solemn occasion had drawn together.

When he came before the aged pontiff, "touched", says the Norman archbishop, "by the Holy Spirit, he venerated God in Pope Alexander", and, casting aside his imperial mantle of purple, threw himself at his feet. With tears in his eyes the Pope raised him up, and kissed him on the cheek. The Te Deum was at once intoned by the Germans, whilst the emperor led the Pope inside the cathedral to receive his blessing. After offering not a few presents at the altar, the emperor adjourned to the palace of the Doge, and the Pope to that of the Patriarch.

The next day, at the special request of the emperor, the Pope sang High Mass in St. Mark's. So great was the crowd in the cathedral that a number of laymen had taken possession of the sanctuary itself. Thereupon with great humility, as we are reminded, Frederick himself, laying aside his mantle, assumed the position of verger, drove the laymen from the choir, and cleared the way for the pontiff as he advanced in solemn procession to the altar. Taking his place in the sanctuary, and listening to the chanting of his countrymen, the emperor heard the Pope's Mass with great devotion. After the singing of the Gospel the Pope preached to the people, and commissioned the Patriarch of Aquileia to explain his sermon to Frederick in German. When the Credo had been sung, the Emperor and the princes of the Empire made their offerings at the Pope's feet. At the close of Mass, Frederick led the Pope to the door of the church, held his stirrup whilst he mounted his white horse, led it for a short distance, and then, with the Pope's blessing, returned to the palace of the Doge.

It was on the first of August that the peace for which many had worked so hard was solemnly ratified at a council held in the great hall of the Patriarch's palace in presence of the Pope, the emperor, the envoys of the king of Sicily, the rectors of the Lombards, and a large number of people. Alexander opened the proceedings by an address in which he thanked God for bringing the emperor back again to the fold of the Church. Frederick in his turn thanked God on whose hands are the hearts of princes, for sending wise men from the ends of the earth to remove the darkness from his heart; for he had found, he said, that the imperial dignity had not saved him from the vice of ignorance which designing men had involved him. For the future, however, he would

recognize Alexander and his successors as lawful Popes, and would grant peace to the Church, to the king of Sicily, and to the Lombards as had been arranged.

Thereupon Count Henry of Diessen came forward, and on the emperor's behalf and on that of his son King Henry swore to keep peace with the Church, and to observe the fifteen years' truce with William of Sicily and the six years' truce with the League. After this oath had been repeated by twelve of the ecclesiastical and lay princes of the Empire, corresponding oaths were taken by the opposite party, viz., by the envoys of the king of Sicily and by the rectors of the Lombards.

The taking of the oaths was followed by the formal submission to the Pope of a very large number of the ecclesiastical supporters of the schism, who abjured the antipopes and proclaimed their ordinations null and void.

But the peace was not concluded without many heartburnings. Conrad of Mainz was not unnaturally aggrieved that the former schismatic Christian should be allowed to retain the archbishopric which really belonged to him. The Pope, however, made a strong appeal to him, assuring him that Frederick would not make peace with the Church unless Christian were allowed to retain the see. Thus appealed to, Conrad resigned his see, declaring that it belonged to his office as a bishop to seek not his own but the interests of Jesus Christ. To compensate him, however, the Pope and the emperor agreed to give him the see of Salzburg, which its incumbent, Albert, the son of the king of Bohemia, had also resigned into Alexander's hands.

On the last day of the council, which was on the vigil of the Assumption (Sunday, August 14), the Church of St. Mark's was once again filled to overflowing. After the solemn recitation of the Litanies and the delivery of a long sermon on the peace, the Pope ordered lighted candles to be placed in the hands of all present, and then proclaimed : "In the name of God Almighty, of Blessed Mary ever Virgin, of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul and all the Saints, we excommunicate, and separate from the bosom of Mother Church all persons who shall dare in any way to break the peace which has been made between the Church and the Empire, and the king of Sicily and the Lombards. And as these candles are extinguished, so may their souls be deprived of the bright vision of eternal life". The candles were at once dashed to the ground, and with a loud voice the emperor, along with the others, cried, "So be it! So be it!"

A day or two after this imposing ceremony letters were sent to the Pope from the emperor and from the chief princes of the Empire setting forth the blessings brought by the peace, and their firm intention of standing by it; for, said Frederick, "the imperial majesty has been established on the earth by the King of Kings that through it the whole world may enjoy the blessings of peace".

But though the most important clauses of the Pact of Anagni had thus been solemnly ratified, Frederick was loath to agree to all the others. Hence before the full text of the peace was finally elaborated, and before he left Venice, he approached the Pope with a view to procuring the modification of clause six of the Pact. This clause had set forth that "the emperor was to restore to the Pope and to the Roman Church the lands of the Countess Matilda as they were held by the Roman Church in the days of the Emperor Lothaire, of King Conrad, and even during (part of) the reign of the Emperor

Frederick himself". But Frederick maintained that they belonged essentially to the Empire. He also, on the same grounds, objected to the Pope's keeping Sussubium, which had been lost to the Roman Church, but which had recently been restored to it by the last of its counts. Not to endanger the peace, Alexander agreed to submit the question of these territories to a number of commissioners to be appointed by the emperor and himself. So little, however, was Frederick even now prepared to be balked of his will that not long after he had left Venice (September 18) he took forcible possession of Sussubium, and, despite Alexander's protest, kept it.

The Pope did not immediately follow the emperor's example in leaving Venice, but thence directed both the restoration of the various ecclesiastics who had been expelled from their positions during the course of the schism, and the expulsion of intruders. As a mark of special affection for the Venetians, whose loyalty had so much contributed to make the peace negotiations successful, Alexander granted to all who visited the Church of St. Mark's on Ascension day, and who confessed their sins and were truly sorry for them, a plenary indulgence, or, as he is said to have expressed it, an indulgence *de poena et de culpa*.

After his reception of Frederick at the doors of St. Mark in July, Alexander had also been occupied in informing the Christian world of that peace concerning the conclusion of which he had felt doubts even as late as April 30, when he was in Ferrara. As early as July 26 and the four following days he dispatched letters to the archbishop of York and to other archbishops, to various abbots and to the general chapter of the Cistercian Order, to tell them of his reconciliation with Frederick. And a few days before he left Venice he was engaged in instructing one of his legates to inform the Lombard League of certain details connected with the six years' truce between it and the emperor. At length, after receiving many presents from the Venetians, Alexander and a large portion of his suite left their city on board the galleys which they had provided for them (October 16) and by December 14 the Pope was back again in Anagni.

If the Peace of Venice, with its complement the Peace of Constance (1183), was one of the most memorable events in the history not only of Italy, but in that of the world—for it was the beginning of the legal grants of personal freedom to the great masses of the people—it was of the first importance to Pope Alexander. Though, despite it, he failed to keep Sussubium, and was unable to get control over the lands of the Countess Matilda, he had won imperial recognition of the inherent freedom of the Church, and of the sovereign rights of the Pope within the city of Rome and in the other parts of the Patrimony. The emperor had practically acknowledged that the Church was independent within its own sphere, that there was a spiritual sword as well as a temporal sword, and that he had no right to handle the former Frederick had, moreover, professed that it was no part of the imperial prerogative to make or unmake Popes, and so Alexander was now able freely to exercise those rights of supreme spiritual jurisdiction which his valid election had already conferred upon him. The Peace of Venice provided him both with the leisure and with the unhampered authority necessary to deal with the scandals which even ordinary times are ever springing up, either as annuals or perennials, among the children of men, but which had increased apace during the schism. Finally, by its restoring to the Popes the right of choosing the Prefect of Rome,

Alexander had, as far as the emperor was concerned at least, recovered his power of supreme jurisdiction in his city.

What he had thus regained from the emperor by treaty he was soon to recover in fact from the Roman people. Beholding the collapse of the schism, and reflecting on the spiritual and temporal loss which the absence of the Pope from Rome entailed upon its inhabitants, the Romans sent an embassy to Alexander imploring him, in the name of the clergy, Senate, and people, to return to his city. But, mindful of their proverbial fickleness, and of how they had treated him soon after they had brought him back from France, Alexander would not consent to return to them until they had given him substantial guarantees of good faith. After much discussion among them it was finally agreed, by the decision of the whole people, that the senators should do homage to the Pope, that they should surrender the sovereign rights of the Pope which they had usurped, and that they should not interfere with anyone who came to see him

When representative men had sworn to observe these terms, Alexander left Tusculum for Rome on the feast of St. Gregory (March 12), and was received with more honor than had been paid to any Pope within the memory of man. At some distance from the city he was met by the clergy bearing banners and crosses, by the senators and the nobility accompanied by the militia of the city in all their martial accoutrements and with trumpets blowing, and by the mass of the people bearing olive branches, and chanting the customary *laudes*. So great were the crowds gazing upon the face of the Pope as though it were “the face of Jesus Christ, whose place on earth he bore”, and endeavoring to kiss his feet, that his white palfrey could scarcely make its way among them, and his hand was wearied with bestowing blessings. It was not till three o'clock in the afternoon that he reached the Lateran gate. Thence he went at once to the church that bears the same name, and, having once again blessed the assembled multitude, retired to rest. His ten years of exile in the Campagna were over. At this point, with the remark that henceforth Alexander performed the regular stations going to Sancta Croce on Laetare Sunday and to St. Peter's on Passion Sunday, and that, as was then generally customary with sovereigns, he wore his crown on Plaster Sunday, not only does the narrative of Boso come to an end, but unfortunately the *Liber Pontificalis* also, at least till the fifteenth century.

CHAPTER IV

THE LAST YEARS OF ALEXANDER III

AMONG the many others whose position was affected by the Peace of Venice was the antipope John of Struma. Not feeling safe in Viterbo, as its people were turning against him, he fled to Monte Albano (near Nomentum, Mentana), on the advice of John, the exiled prefect of Rome. John Maledictus, a member of the house of Vico,

which protected Calixtus, had been appointed prefect by the emperor but had been expelled by the citizens. Put the antipope and the ex-prefect had now the energetic Archbishop Christian to deal with. His troops at once laid siege to Albano, while he himself, in the Pope's name, received the submission of the people of Viterbo. The ex-prefect, however, and the nobles of Viterbo would not submit, but allied themselves to the son of the marquis of Montferrat and asked the help of the senators and people of Rome. Thereupon the Romans, "after their wonted manner", says Archbishop Romuald, "not keeping their faith with the Pope", despite his prohibition, marched out to ally themselves with the nobles. To avoid bloodshed Alexander sent word to the chancellor Christian and to the people of Viterbo to remain within the walls. His wise advice was obeyed, and the Romans, not daring to attack the strong city, after ravaging the country round, returned to their city, and the opposition of the nobles collapsed. John Maledictus made his peace with the Pope, and recovered his position as prefect.

After Viterbo had thus completely fallen under the sway of the Pope, the situation of the antipope became desperate. Leaving Monte Albano, he made his way to Tusculum, whither, to avoid the August heat of Rome, Alexander had retired. Throwing himself at the Pope's feet, he renounced the schism and implored forgiveness. Without a word of reproach, Alexander received him as the prodigal son (August 29), for some time kept him by his side, and then made him governor of Benevento.

About a year later, soon after some of his enemies had by surprise captured and imprisoned Christian, a few of the unruly barons of the Campagna had the effrontery to attempt to set up another antipope. In September (1179) they set up a certain Lando of Sezza as Innocent III. His chief supporter was a brother of the antipope Octavian. Out of hatred of Alexander, this baron gave Lando a strong castle which he had at Palombara, and from which the antipope ravaged the neighborhood. Cardinal Hugo, however, in a few months contrived to get possession of the fortress by bribing its defenders, and the miserable Lando, with his chief adherents, was shut up for life in the monastery of La Cava (January 1180).

Meanwhile, Alexander was fully occupied in making preparations to hold a General Council. He was induced to summon such a council not merely because a clause in the Treaty of Anagni (n. 25) enacted that first a large council and afterwards a general council should excommunicate all who should break the Peace of Venice, but because he thought that the influence of such an assembly would be a powerful means of counteracting the abuses which the schism had suffered to grow. For, adds the English historian, Roger of Hoveden, "when a violent disease is rapidly making its way to the very vitals of the world there is no remedy so efficacious as the agreement of numbers".

Accordingly, in the month of September the Pope dispatched letters and legates in all directions to summon to Rome for the first Sunday in the Lent of 1179 the bishops of the East and West and of all Italy. The legates sent to this country were Albert de Suma and Peter of St Agatha. The first had to summon the prelates of Normandy and England, and the second those of Scotland, Galloway, the Isle of Man, and Ireland. But before Peter was allowed by Henry to pass through England he had to take an oath that, during

his legation, he would not attempt anything to the detriment of the kingdom, and that he would return through it on his homeward journey.

The preparations for the council made a great impression all over Europe. “Behold”, wrote Abbot Peter de la Celle to the chancellor-cardinal Albert, “how the great hen of apostolic authority, in virtue of submissive obedience, gathers its chickens beneath the wings of its protection and wisdom. Behold how the aged Jacob, full of days (Alexander III), after his long wrestle with the angel of schism, looking for the salvation of God, calls his sons to bless them. Great indeed is the preparation for the Roman Council”. The worthy abbot only hopes that the council will not have been called in vain, but that it will cut down the *insane superstitions* that are daily springing up all over the Christian world.

As the result of the Pope’s vigorous action there assembled in the Lateran in the month of March over three hundred bishops from all parts and a very large number of abbots, making altogether about a thousand prelates. In addition to this very great number of bishops and abbots and to a host of inferior clergy, there were also present envoys from nearly all the emperors, kings, and princes of the whole of Christendom. The eleventh General Council was really a magnificent Diet of the Christian world. Almost all that we know about the work of this august assembly is that it held three sessions, and that at its last it issued some twenty-eight important canons called by our historians the decrees of Pope Alexander.

Of these enactments, which by their practical worth reflect such credit on this great Christian Parliament, and which give us such a valuable insight into the customs and aspirations of Europe, only the more important can be named here. The evils of the late schism naturally turned the thoughts of the assembled fathers to the consideration of the means to be taken to prevent its recurrence. It was resolved, for instance, that the candidate elected by two-thirds of the cardinals should be recognized by the universal Church. This was decreed without prejudice to the custom regulating elections in other churches where a simple majority was sufficient; “for”, ran the decree, “if any dispute should arise with regard to such elections, it can be settled by the decision of a superior. But a special rule is made for the Roman Church because recourse cannot be had to a superior”. The ordinations and ecclesiastical acts generally of the recent antipopes were declared null and void. Various regulations were issued with regard to bishops. They were to be men of good life, and not less than thirty years of age; they were forbidden to be a burden on visitation by travelling with a large following. An attempt was also made to stop abuses in the matter of appeals; abuses in which all parties participated,—the inferior clergy, the episcopate, and the See of Rome itself. Superiors on the one hand were forbidden to try to hinder proper appeals by suspending or excommunicating the appellant, and subordinates on the other hand were forbidden to appeal before their case had been examined. But nothing was done to stop that abuse of appeals to Rome about which St. Bernard had complained so bitterly. No doubt, in view of the unrestrained tyranny then so widespread, it was felt not to be sound policy to hamper appeals to the Holy See. Simony in the administration of the sacraments or in any other form was strictly forbidden, as was also the holding of several benefices by one person, or the promising of one before it was vacant, or the abuse of privileges by monks, templars, or hospitallers.

Many canons also aimed at the protection and advancement of the interests of the poor. The terrible ravages, for instance, of mercenary soldiers, the forerunners of the Great Companies, were strongly denounced. These men, whom the council called men of Brabant, and of Aragon and Navarre, Basques and Coterells, were a terror to all peaceful citizens, so that even before this the Emperor Frederick had made an agreement with Louis of France to exterminate them (1171-72). The council declared that they showed no deference to churches or monasteries, and, indifferent to age and sex alike, spared neither widows and orphans, nor children and old men. The Fathers excommunicated them, and those who kept or supported them; and called on all Christians to take up arms against them; and granted an indulgence of two years' penance or more to such as thus fought against them.

The eighteenth canon, also in favor of the poor, did the greatest honor to the Pope and his counsellors. It ran thus: Since the Church of God, like an affectionate mother, is bound to provide for the poor as well in matters which concern the body as in those which redound to the profit of the soul; therefore, lest the opportunity of reading and improving be denied to poor persons who cannot be assisted from the resources of their parents, we command that in each cathedral church some competent benefice be assigned to a master, who may gratuitously teach as well the clerks of the same church as indigent scholars. In other churches, too, if any such provision shall have been made in former times, let it be restored. Let no one, moreover, make any demand whatsoever for licence to teach, nor interdict any competent person requesting such a licence.

The interests of the poor were also safeguarded by the decree against usurers, and by the one which prohibited excessive taxation of Church property which was meant for the support of the clergy and of the poor and for the upkeep of the fabrics devoted to the use of both. Even the poorest of the poor were not forgotten, and this glorious Diet of Christendom could find time to think of the poor lepers, "We, therefore, in our apostolic benignity", ran another decree, "direct that wherever a sufficient number (of lepers) are congregated in a community, and are able to establish a church with a cemetery for themselves, and to enjoy the ministrations of a priest of their own, they shall be permitted to have one. We also appoint that they be not compelled to pay tithes for their gardens and the pasturage of their animals". The renewal of the Truce of God was also to the benefit of the poor, as was also the second part of a decree directed against supplying shipbuilding material to the Saracens, which condemned both unwarrantable interference with Christians who "for business or other honorable causes are employed in navigation", and despoiling shipwrecked Christians of their goods. Again, also for the benefit of the poor and the defenseless and for the good of trade, this council, renewing a canon of the preceding ecumenical council, decreed continual security for clerics, pilgrims, merchants, and husbandmen with their cattle, and enacted that tolls were not to be increased nor imposed except by proper authority.

Just noticing that this council also forbade laymen to judge clerics, we may pass on to the last decree, which was an important one. It was directed against the rapidly increasing sect of the Cathar afterwards called more commonly Albigensians, in the south of France, a sect as inimical to sound morality as to the Catholic faith. It will be observed that this decree, while deprecating the use of severe corporal punishment in matters connected with religion, gives a hint to the heretics that it may be employed

against them. The decree was as follows: “Although the discipline of the Church, says Blessed Leo, content with the judgment of priests, avoids punishments stained with blood, still it may be so assisted by the laws of Catholic princes that men may be often induced to seek a salutary remedy when they fear that corporal punishment is hanging over them. Wherefore, since in Gascony, in the Albigeois, in the neighborhood of Toulouse and other places, the damnable perversity of the heretics (whom some call Cathari, or Patetini, or Publicani, and others by other names) has so gained in strength that they no longer practise their wickedness in secret, but proclaim their errors openly, and draw weak and simple people to agree with them,—we anathematize them and those who defend or receive or transact business with them. And if they die in their sins Mass must not be offered up for them, nor can they receive Christian burial”.

Regarding these heretics more will be said when, under Innocent III, it will be necessary to give an account of the Crusade against them. Meanwhile, it may suffice here to note that, calling themselves “Good Men” (Cathari or Puritans), they became at length known to others by the general name of Albigensians, from the town of Albi which was one of their principal centres. Although, from the fact that they declared it unlawful to take an oath, and because they appear to have imagined that it was lawful for them to say they believed one thing, and really to believe another, it was not easy to ascertain their exact creed, still there can be no doubt that we know the chief tenets held by most of these heretics. Many of them were examined very carefully, and condemned at a council held at Lombers, a small town in the diocese of Albi, during the reign of Alexander, but whether in 1165 or 1176 is not clear. Despite this condemnation, the heresy continued to spread, and attracted the attention of the kings of France and England. At first, on the invitation of Raymond V, count of Toulouse, they thought of expelling the heretics by force, but were persuaded to send wise men to convert them to the Christian faith. They accordingly, at the instance of the Pope, dispatched to Toulouse, Peter, cardinal-priest of St. Chrysogonus and papal legate, several bishops, Henry, abbot of Clairvaux, and others (1178).

From the acts of the council of Lombers, and from the letters of Peter and Henry concerting the council they held at Toulouse, it may be safely laid down that the “Good Men” believed, like the Manichees of old, in two Gods, one good and the other bad. They rejected the Old Testament, and, while they had a kind of hierarchy among themselves, either did not recognize a regular priesthood at all, or held that if priests sinned they were incapable of performing their sacred functions, and were not to be obeyed. They objected to infant baptism, defied the Real Presence, and, worst of all, as far as practice at any rate was concerned, asserted that the state of matrimony was unholy. Finally, like most other early followers of new heresies, they were abusive, and had recourse to violence as soon as they dared.

With the *Acta* of the councils of Lombers and Toulouse before him, and bearing in mind the letter of the church of Liege to Lucius II on the subject of the heretics of France, Alexander and the council had no choice but strongly to condemn and to threaten the Albigensians, some of whose tenets were so dangerous to public morality. Considering the ideas of the age on the absolute necessity of maintaining unity of faith in the interests of public order, inasmuch as the Church and European society were then practically one and the same, the wonder is not that the Council anathematized heretics

whose doctrines were as opposed to fatherland as to faith, but that they did not at once urge Louis and Henry to carry out their original intention, and to exterminate them

After the close of this important council, Alexander was, as we have seen, occupied for a time with the submission or subjugation of the antipopes John and Lando. He was also concerned in endeavoring to secure loyal adherence to the "Great Peace". In July (1179) he left Rome to avoid the great heats, and spent the summer at Segni and Anagni. Never, however, did he return to the unruly city, but spent the remainder of his life first in that part of the Campagna which is south of Rome, and then in its more northerly portion. It is highly likely that the capture of Christian of Mainz, of which we have already spoken, emboldened the Romans to renew their turbulent opposition to Alexander, of whose peace loving nature they took advantage, and who was too gentle to impose himself upon them by force.

At length, "worn out by old age and disease, Alexander walked the way of all flesh and departed to the Lord" on the last day of August 1181 at the small ravine protected hill-town of Civita Castellana.

The body of the late Pope was brought to Rome. It was not, however, met by a whole respectful people, but by a number of "senseless Romans who, not content with flinging curses on Alexander's name, threw mud and stones on the bier which carried his corpse, and scarcely suffered it to be buried in the Lateran basilica". It was placed before the pulpit of the Church, *i.e.* says John the Deacon, close to the route we take when going to the curia.

The epitaph sets forth that this tomb contains the mortal remains of Alexander, who was the glory of the clergy and of the Church, and the father of the city and the world. Hence the clergy, the city, and the world are in grief at their father's loss. He, however, has not perished, because imperishable virtue has given him life. His generosity, his care of his people, his modesty, and his uprightness have secured him a place among the angels. "If you would know who and whence he was, learn that his name was Roland, and Tuscan Siena his birthplace. SS. Felix and Adauctus (August 30) escorted him to the joys of heaven; joined with whom he has been made happy with them".

It would serve no useful purpose to comment on the manner in which "quidam insipientes Romani" have treated many of the best of the Popes from the days when some of them crucified St. Peter on a cross of wood to our own times, when some of their worthless descendants endeavor to crucify his successors by filthy prints and foul language. It will be more to the point to note that all responsible authors, whether ancient or modern, may be said to agree in praising both the character and deeds of Alexander III.

Gregorovius regards Alexander as "one of the greatest of the Popes", whose long struggle with Frederick "covered him with glory", which was the more brilliant in that he "himself was endowed with true dignity". Alexander, however, himself was very modest about his own powers. Once, we are told, when he was called a good Pope, he said that he would deserve to be so called "if he knew how to preach, and to administer justice, and to be a good confessor".

CHAPTER V
ENGLAND, (ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY), IRELAND AND
SCOTLAND.

After some little hesitation, Henry II of England, as we have seen, acknowledged Alexander II. as the true Pope. Hence, quite early in his pontificate, we find Alexander congratulating himself that “the magnificent Henry, king of the English, the most serene prince in the world, was firmly rooted in the unity of the Catholic Church”. And so, in order to give a proof of his goodwill towards a loyal nation, we find him, also at an early date in his reign, canonizing King Edward the Confessor at the request of Henry and the clergy of the country. In thus complying with the wishes of “our most dear son in Christ, the illustrious Henry, king of the English”, and of his prelates, the Pope declared that he was influenced by “that constant devotion and firm faith which they had displayed towards their mother, the holy Roman Church”. But he was to discover very speedily that Henry, king of the English, was as undutiful a son as Frederick, king of the Romans, and that, if the two shepherds of the English flock, the Pope and the king, were to pipe different tunes, the greater number of the English prelates would dance to the music of the one who grasped the sword and held the money-bags.

When Henry wrote to beg the Pope to place his holy ancestor King Edward “in the catalogue of the saints”, he declared that “because it was the desire of his heart ever with sincere affection to love our holy mother the Roman Church, to be dutiful to her, and with disinterested affection always to be loyal to Alexander himself—it was also his wish that all those whom the favor of heaven had made subject to his power should honor the Apostolic See as the emblem (or depository) of Divine Power, and with him to show it due obedience”. Alexander was, however, destined to learn that Henry was prepared to be affectionate to the Roman Church, and to obey her when she was ready to conform to his views, but that he was quite ready to withdraw himself and his people also, if he could, from that subjection which he acknowledged was her due, when she found it necessary to oppose him. Similarly, the English bishops, when the barque of the Church in this land was in smooth waters, boldly professed to Alexander that “the Church of the English was devoted to the Roman Church above all things”; but when storms arose most of them were to give practical proof that their chief devotion was, after all, to their own interests, and not to those of the Church of God.

Pleasant relations between England and Rome continued till the year 1163, and Alexander ceased not to grant favors to the English Church. In the first quarter of that year (March 19), acting in response to the joint request of Henry and Becket, he approved of the translation of the learned and austere though ambitious Gilbert Foliot from the see of Hereford to that of London. But he had occasion, before the year had expired, to urge him to exhort the king to be more careful of the liberties of the Church than heretofore. The clouds of the great storm which was to attract the attention of the

whole of Europe, and was to end in the death of Thomas of London, had begun to gather, and the keen watchman on the highest tower of the Church had noted them.

When Alexander was elected Pope, the Chancellor of England was the deacon Thomas of London, a man of about forty years of age, and already known as “the light of the clergy, the glory of the English people, the right hand of the king, and the model of virtue, the one who swept away laws that were unjust, and made such as were equitable, and to whom all had access save the wicked”. Besides being the right hand of King Henry II, he was also in his time the right hand of Archbishop Theobald (d. 1161), in whose service he had become acquainted with Rome and the papal court, and in whose company he had served his apprenticeship to exile. He had already in an age of legists shown himself an able lawgiver; at a period when diplomacy was becoming a science, he had proved himself an accomplished diplomat; and in days when every man’s trade was that of arms, he had displayed the qualities of a skillful and daring officer. In his person he was tall and handsome, in his manners courtly and engaging, splendid in his habits of life, chaste in his morals, and manly, frank, and straightforward in his character. He was the beloved of the poor and the weak, the admired of the great and of the small. Loyalty was of the very marrow of his bones, and, while never losing sight of God, he served first his king and then the Church with all the ardour of his noble and great soul. From being a lawyer, a statesman, and a soldier, he was to become a magnificent prelate, a self-denying saint, and an heroic martyr. He was indeed an Admirable Crichton—of whom we have in our own times seen more than a shadow in the late Cardinal Vaughan.

If in some particulars Henry, the Angevin king of England, resembled his once trusted counsellor, he was in most respects very unlike the friend he grew to hate with all the fierce animosity of a nature which, so said discerning legend, had drawn its brutal passions from a demon ancestress. He was, it is true, learned above the princes of his time, and he was energetic with the feverish restlessness of a caged leopard. He was a brave soldier, a good lawyer, and a diplomat; but, if his diplomacy was able, it was absolutely unscrupulous. He was as ready to employ perjury as gold to gain his ends. If he had a zeal for justice, it was to centre all things in himself; for, except to self, he was false to all—false to his friend, false to his wife, and false also to his word. Coarse was his body, and coarse were his passions. In his paroxysms of rage he would chew straw on the ground like a brute beast; and his impurities led him to be accused to his face, in a conference at which the king of France was present, of perfidy, adultery and incest. He had no man’s love, not even that of his children, nor has any man at any time ever made a hero of him. Henry’s was indeed a powerful nature, but too brutal to win either enduring love or lasting admiration. He was a ruler of men because he could fascinate them when he chose, and, moreover, could make them fear him. In almost its last words our earliest national chronicle says of him: “No man durst do other than good for the great awe of him”.

And yet this tyrant was not wholly cruel or always fierce. He was a friend of the gentle St. Hugh of Lincoln, was kind to the poor and good to monasteries and charitable institutions. The grip of his demon ancestress was not always able to harden the heart of Henry of Anjou.

After the death of Theobald, Henry made known to his faithful chancellor that he wished him to become archbishop in his stead. But his chancellor knew both himself and his king too well to be willing to accept the exalted position. He pointed out that his life had not been a fitting preparation for the episcopate, and, moreover, that his elevation would break their friendship. "I know", he said, "that in matters ecclesiastical you will ask many things from me which I shall not be able to concede, and then those who are jealous of me will take occasion of my refusal to incite you to withdraw your favor from me, and to hate me for ever".

To these prophetic words, however, Henry paid no heed. With the aid of the papal legate, Cardinal Henry of Pisa, he succeeded in inducing Thomas to consent to his wishes, and then used all his influence to secure the election of his favorite, through whom he hoped to rule both Church and State. His efforts were not in vain. Though Thomas of London was not a monk, he was unanimously elected by the monks of Canterbury, and, with the exception of the disappointed Gilbert Foliot, the choice of the monks was approved by the bishops assembled at Westminster. Before the dispersion of this assembly, which was presided over by the child king Henry and his advisers acting for the sovereign, it was addressed by the aged bishop of Winchester. This was the once magnificent prelate, Henry of Blois, brother of King Stephen, whom we have seen exercising so much political and ecclesiastical influence in England as legate of the Pope, but who now, chastened by years and by intercourse with the venerable Peter of Cluny, thought only of his duties as a bishop. Bearing no malice against the newly elected archbishop who was credited with being the one by whose agency the Pope had deprived him of his legatine authority, and had restored it to Canterbury, he secured a most important concession for him. Our chancellor, said he to the bishops and barons who stood around him, the first man in the realm, whom by common consent we have elected as our father, has had control of the privy purse and of the revenues of the land. We ought, therefore, now to hold him absolved from any further responsibility with regard to these matters; for it would not be proper for the Church to make a father of one who was still a servant of finance, and for his past dealings with it still liable to be called to account. To this reasonable request a ready assent was given by Henry's representatives.

Consecrated on June 2, 1162, Thomas at once sent an important embassy for his pallium to Pope Alexander, at Montpelier, whither he had recently escaped from Italy. The most distinguished of his envoys was John of Salisbury, soon to be known as "the right eye and arm of the new archbishop". It was to him that Alexander entrusted for St. Thomas "that mysterious and remarkable symbol of an archbishop": the pallium. The archbishop received it with the greatest devotion on his knees and with bare feet. Fitz-Stephens, full of the symbolical feeling of the Middle Ages, if not of Christian archaeology, assures us that there was good reason for this, inasmuch as the pallium was instituted to take the place of the gold plate which hung over the forehead of the high priest, and on which were engraved the words "Holy to the Lord". The two pendants signify the Old and the New Law, and (by the crosses upon them) remind one of the Passion of Christ; and the little pins by which the pallium is fastened typify the nails by which the body of Christ was fastened to the cross.

It is the general assertion of the new archbishop's biographers that after his consecration a marked change made itself manifest in his mode of life. "In his ordination", says Fitz-Stephens, "he received, along with the visible anointing of the Sacrament, the invisible unction of divine grace, and putting off the worldly habits which he had had as chancellor, he strove to acquire what was necessary to make a worthy archbishop". It must, however, be remarked that, in forming their estimate of Becket's character, many misunderstand these words. To avoid this misconception it should be borne in mind that, even before he became a priest and a bishop, the life of Thomas of London, if somewhat worldly, had always been thoroughly good. The radical change which his consecration wrought in him did not consist in a sudden and complete alteration in his character and in his external conduct, but in a wholly different view of his relations to the things of this world, and of his duties and obligations to his Creator. Before his consecration, the leading idea of his life, to which he was loyally true, was the temporal prosperity of the land, and the worldly advantage of his king; after his consecration, he was equally staunch to the interests of the Church and to the cause of God. If our knowledge of human nature had not taught us to expect that the saint's change of mind would not manifest itself to others immediately, by being at once visible in every department of his external deportment, we must be thankful that his biographers have enlightened us in this particular. We are told, for instance, that the monks found it necessary to urge him to modify somewhat the splendor of his dress, and his friendly mentor John of Salisbury thought it needful to impress upon him that prayer was more incumbent upon him than the study even of canon law, and that meditation on the morals of St. Gregory the Great would benefit him more than the philosophy of the schools. But Thomas had planted the seed in his soul which would in time burst through his earthly dress, and merit to bring forth the bright red flower of martyrdom.

Meanwhile, trouble between the king and the archbishop was beginning. Henry was annoyed when his confidant, in order to be freer to devote himself to his episcopal duties, resigned the chancellorship, and he was irritated against him by the interested complaints of the usurpers of Church property or of ecclesiastical rights whom the archbishop had promptly excommunicated or had summarily dispossessed of their ill-gotten gains. Joining themselves to such of the clergy as were jealous of the archbishop, or whose lax lives caused them to dread his discipline, these expelled plunderers persuaded the king that the archbishop was striving to annul the customs of the realm and the donations of the king, and to subject not merely the clergy; but the people also, to canon law. A year, however, went by without anything occurring serious enough to snap the bond of friendship between Becket and the king. On the archbishop's return from the council of Tours (June 1163), where the Pope had received him as though, among the assembled Fathers, he had the rights of the first born, Henry welcomed him with the affection of a son.

However, within a few days after this friendly meeting of the king and the archbishop, a serious dispute occurred between them. The king wished to make an illegal appropriation of money, but was successfully resisted by St. Thomas, if not to his own advantage, at any rate to that of the nation (July 1163). Henry was very angry; for he realized that there was a man in England who would strive to prevent him from being

absolute even in the State, and who would assuredly do anything but help him to enslave the Church. Now, at length, thoroughly comprehending what an obstacle he had placed in the way of his attaining supreme power in Church and State alike, he resolved at all costs to crush the man he had raised to power. With this end in view, and as a step forward in his path of absolutism, he attacked the criminal jurisdiction claimed by the ecclesiastical courts. He pretended that with the kind of punishments inflicted by the clergy on their erring brethren, viz., degradation, imprisonment, and the like, it was impossible to repress serious crime among clerics. And he maintained, with considerable exaggeration of statement, that serious crimes were on the increase among them.

Clerics, therefore (and it must be borne in mind that all were counted as such who had received the tonsure), if guilty of grave offences against the civil law, must, said the king, be punished by the civil law. Henry accordingly proposed that a cleric accused of a serious crime against the law of the land should first be brought before the civil court in order that the accusation against him might therein be stated. If it appeared that there was a case, the accused was then to be handed over to the ecclesiastical courts for trial, and the king's officers were to watch the procedure, and at once to arrest the accused if convicted. In the event of the clerics being condemned, he was to be degraded, and then handed over to the civil authorities to be punished as though he were a layman. The idea, says Maitland, who has the honor of having made the king's scheme clear, is this: "accusation and plea in the temporal court; trial, conviction, degradation in the ecclesiastical court; sentence in the temporal court to the layman's punishment".

Now, it must be observed that this proposed mode of dealing with criminous clerks was an innovation, and was opposed not only to the laws of all the other Christian countries, but to the laws of England—even to such as were proclaimed by William the Conqueror. The archbishop, however, might well have accepted it, for it did not directly contravene the canon law of Gratian, and it was, in the main, the method of procedure which Innocent III, not long after this, ordered to be taken against clerical forgers of papal bulls. Moreover, Henry's scheme against criminous clerks did not fall under the condemnation of Alexander when he forbade the trial of clerics by laymen, for it did not propose that an accused cleric should be tried in a lay court, but in an ecclesiastical court and by canon law.

Hence, perchance, if this measure had stood by itself, the archbishop might have been well advised to accept it; but it soon became manifest that it was only one item in a scheme of legislation which Henry had devised in order to transfer to himself the power of the Pope in the Church of this country. Henry II was to be the whole State. He was to be the Lord of the souls as well as of the bodies of his subjects; to be, as he is said to have boasted that he was, in his own realm : King, Legate apostolic, Patriarch, Emperor, Everything.

To clear the approach to the goal at which he was aiming, Henry induced the bishops of England, including even St. Thomas, to promise to observe what he euphemistically called the customs of the realm, but what were really the usurpations of his Norman predecessors, with certain additions of his own. He then embodied the said

customs in sixteen chapters, which, from the place where they were produced (January 1164), came to be known as the *Constitutions of Clarendon*.

Of these new customs some were directly aimed at the power of the Pope, and others at the then recognized liberties of the Church in this country. The two articles that most overtly attacked papal authority were the fourth and the eighth. The former forbade bishops to leave the country without the licence of the king, and laid down that, if permission were granted, they were to undertake when abroad “not to procure ill or hurt to king or kingdom”. The drift of this article is plain enough. Robert of Gloucester, writing in the days of Henry’s grandson (Henry III), says it was designed to place the king “in the Pope’s stead”. Its signification was emphasized by the eighth article, which regulated appeals. If they were not decided at once in the archbishop’s court, they were to be referred back to it by the king’s orders, and were in no case “to proceed further without the assent of the king”. Could Henry have established these two articles, the authority of the Pope in this country would have been rendered wholly ineffective. The king could then at any time have prevented the bishops from obeying the summons of the Pope to meet him in council or for any purpose whatsoever, and from carrying out any of his decrees which he might choose to consider as likely to bring “ill or hurt” to himself or to his kingdom. And if appeals were not to be carried beyond the archbishop’s court, and the king were to be able, through a subservient archbishop, to enforce the derision of them there, he would have had no superior in Church matters in the land. And the fact that Henry afterwards chose to declare that his legislation was simply designed to prevent civil causes from being referred to Rome, is sufficient evidence against what authority his *Constitutions* were in reality knowingly and deliberately levelled. Nor on his side was Becket under any illusion as to the bearings of these articles; and he ceased not to proclaim to the Pope that it was for the Church of Rome that he was contending even unto death. The great churchmen abroad were equally clear that it was the power of the Pope that Henry was attacking, and that it was for the “privileges of the Apostolic See that St. Thomas was contending”. “As the strength of the limbs flows from the head”, says one of them, “so the safety of all the churches proceeds from the holy Roman See, which is their head. A noble member of that body is the see of Canterbury. (But) the king of England is doing his best not to rend and cripple her, but to destroy her, so that the authority of the Apostolic See will speedily be annihilated, and his own will become law in all his dominions. The noble archbishop of Canterbury is exiled amongst us, because he dared to uphold the apostolic privileges”.

Even the first article struck a blow at the Pope’s position with regard to the Church of England. It laid down that disputes concerning advowsons and presentation to churches were to be settled in the king’s court. Now as the letters of John of Salisbury, when secretary to Archbishop Theobald, show that such appeals were often referred to Rome, there is no need to pause in order to show that the opening clause of the *Constitutions* affected the see of Rome. The other articles had only an indirect influence on the rights of the Pope in England. Such were the articles on criminous clerks, which we have already discussed; those which forbade the king’s tenants *in capite* or his servants, to be excommunicated without application to him; and that which

sanctioned the gross abuse of the king's taking the revenues of vacant bishoprics and abbeys, and interference with the freedom of ecclesiastical elections.

The archbishop had been induced to promise to observe the customs of the country by deceit of one kind or another. But when he heard them deliberately read up, after they had been reduced to writing, he began to realize that he had been led much further than he had intended to go. Accordingly he refused to set his seal to them, listened with humility to the upbraidings of his cross-bearer for betraying the Church, repented of what he had done, and declared he would "sit in silent grief till the Orient from on high should have visited him, so that he might merit to be absolved by God and by the Pope". The absolution of the Pope was not long in coming. Letting the archbishop understand that he had learnt that the action he had taken had not been deliberate: "We, trusting in the merits of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, absolve you from what you have done, commanding you not on that account to abstain from saying Mass" (April 1, 1164). Moreover, about a month before this, Alexander had himself distinctly declined to listen to Henry's request for a papal confirmation of the customs, had forbidden the bishops of England to observe them, and had ordered them to strive to procure their withdrawal.

Thus encouraged by apostolic authority, the archbishop resumed his normal work in his diocese, observing such of the royal and ecclesiastical customs as were good, but pruning away as bastard slips, in order that they might not strike deep root, such as had been introduced to the detriment of the Church and to the dishonor of the clergy

Bent, however, on working his will, Henry, unable to overcome the archbishop by a frontal attack, endeavored to overthrow him by a flank manoeuvre of pitiless baseness. Pretending that he had not authorized the freeing of his late chancellor from being liable to be called to account for his money transactions during his term of office, the king suddenly, at the council of Northampton (October 1164) required St. Thomas to give an account of one large sum of money after another. For the sake of peace, the saint and the aged Henry of Winchester offered the king two thousand marks to avoid further vexation. Their offers were despised. The king demanded sureties for extravagant sums which it was wholly impossible for the archbishop to find. Accordingly, seeing that Henry was bent on his ruin, and had won over nearly the whole hierarchy to his side, St. Thomas forbade the bishops to join in judging him, appealed to the Pope, and left the assembly. Then, as he had been warned that, if he escaped imprisonment, he would be slain by wicked men, "as though without the king's knowledge", he fled during the night, and succeeded in reaching Flanders in safety. As soon as possible after his escape, he wrote to inform the Pope that he had fled to him, "the last refuge of the distressed", that they were his privileges which were being attacked, and that those most to blame were the bishops who had betrayed him (November 1164)

The cause of the archbishop was now in the hands of Alexander, and in them it remained till the time of the saint's reconciliation with the king shortly before his martyrdom (1170). And it must be confessed that during those six years the papal hands proved to be very weak. Both before and after the archbishop's flight, his friends impressed upon him that he need not look for any help from the papal curia. "The papal court", wrote one of the saint's envoys to his master, "loudly extol in you that courage

of which they are themselves so deficient". "Look not for any help from the court of Rome", is the warning given to him by John of Poitiers and by John of Salisbury; "for", adds the latter, "the king's envoys will pour out money like water, and money Rome has never despised". Alexander had himself revealed his policy to the archbishop when, while calling him "a great pillar of the Church", he laid it down that it was necessary for both of them by prudent concession to soothe the anger of the king. He never, it is true, approved of what was wrong, but he neither gave wholehearted support to St. Thomas, nor showed an uncompromising opposition to the injustices and aggressions of Henry. He endeavored to defend the lamb without striking the wolf. The one end of his diplomacy was to preserve at least the semblance of peace, and to prevent matters from going to extremities. He accordingly aimed at giving sufficient encouragement to St. Thomas and his party to prevent their giving up the cause of the Church in despair, but not enough to make them bold enough to use all the weapons of the Church against Henry. And, on the other hand, by judiciously blending the bitter with the sweet, he strove to hold the king so balanced between hope and fear that he would not be seriously tempted to join the schismatics. The very last letter of the Pope which we have quoted furnishes us with an admirable example of his style of diplomacy throughout the six years' strife between Becket and Henry. While, on the one hand, he refused to listen to Henry's earnest petition that he would confirm the customs, on the other, weighing the dangers of the times, he encouraged him by passing over St. Thomas, and naming the king's ally, Roger of York, as apostolic legate in England. Similarly with regard to the archbishop. He is a great pillar of the Church, he allows; but he and others had promised to observe the customs which he (the Pope) had had to decline to confirm. Further, it is true, he admits, that he has granted the legation to Roger, but he will not fail to advance the interests of the archbishop with the king as far as he can, and he will devote all necessary care to the preservation of the rights of his church. Hence, too, as we learn from other letters, though he had at one time granted Roger permission to have his cross carried before him throughout the whole of England, he afterwards forbade him to exercise this privilege in the province of Canterbury; and, with regard to the legation, he assured St. Thomas that the king's envoys had sworn that the apostolic letters conferring it on Roger would not be delivered to him without the knowledge and consent of the archbishop of Canterbury; for he had not the smallest intention of subjecting his see to any other authority save that of the Roman pontiff. Accordingly, as soon as he had heard that the commission had been delivered, he made haste to exempt the see of Canterbury from the authority of the new legate.

Before, however, we pass a sweeping condemnation on what certainly seems to be the overcautious policy of Alexander in dealing with the aggressions of Henry, it is only fair to cast a glance at the situation in which the Pope himself was placed, and to consider how destitute he was of means of striking an effective blow at that powerful and unscrupulous monarch. When the quarrel between Henry and Becket broke out, Alexander was fighting for his own position against a bold and warlike emperor, and against an antipope. He was, moreover, an exile, and in the deepest poverty, and was altogether dependent on the king of France for a home. As the quarrel progressed, he was able, indeed, to return to Italy, but either the emperor or the Romans prevented him from holding Rome for any length of time, and forced him to remain in exile in the Campagna. Furthermore, he entertained a feeling of gratitude to Henry, whose

acceptance of his claims had done so much to secure his general recognition as Supreme Pontiff. Besides, he knew well that he had no strong party to support him in England. The mass both of the clergy and of the people were devoted to the archbishop, but in the twelfth century they counted for very little in the political balance of this country. Henry, on the contrary, had on his side most of the powerful nobility, whether in the Church or in the State. Relying on this support, the English king, in order to put pressure on the Pope, did not hesitate to open negotiations with the schismatics, and even to threaten to drag the nation after him into apostasy. If it be granted that such threats were largely mere idle words, they at least show how thoroughly unscrupulous Henry was in pursuing his ends, and prepare us to find that he was never backward in endeavoring, either by gold to tempt men from the path of duty, or by perjury to lead them onto his snares. John of Oxford, surnamed *Jurator*, the perjurer was his favourite envoy. He said nothing when one of his ambassadors betrayed Alexander's affairs to the antipope Calixtus, and he was audacious enough to attempt to bribe cities, and to buy the pope himself.

If, then, Alexander was driven well-nigh to the utmost limit of caution by the insolently aggressive conduct of Henry, he was perhaps at times pushed beyond its bounds into sheer pusillanimity, on the one hand, by that weakness of his *sides* of which Eugenius III had with grim humour complained, and on the other by the excessive daring of the guide who loudly called upon him to follow wherever he might lead. Such a legate as Cardinal William of Pavia seems always to have been prepared to sell himself for a price, and St. Thomas, at least in the early part of the struggle, seems, like a spirited war-horse, almost to have longed to be in the danger which he scented from afar. The Head of the Church may well be excused for not always following the lead of so impetuous a steed. One of the truest of the saint's friends, John of Salisbury, even whilst urging him to follow a certain line of conduct, had to declare that he stood in need not of the spur but of the rein, and that he had frequently severely rebuked him when, not taking time, person, and place sufficiently into account, he irritated the king and his party by a rather over-hasty zeal.

Reverting to the course of our narrative, we are taken back to the flight of St. Thomas from England after the council of Northampton. Henry was furious at the archbishop's escape, at once confiscated all his goods, and sent envoys to the king of France and to the Pope to prejudice them against his enemy. But, despite their gold, his agents failed to influence either Louis or Alexander. The latter would only so far agree to Henry's request as to promise to send two legates to inquire into the whole question of the dispute between him and St. Thomas, but he would not consent that any decision they might arrive at in the king's presence should be final. "This is my glory", said he, "which I will not give to another. When the archbishop is to be judged, he shall be judged by us; for justice will not allow us to send him back to England to be tried by his adversaries in the midst of his enemies".

Four days after the abortive interview between Henry's envoys and Alexander, St. Thomas arrived at Sens, and laid before the Pope a copy of the Constitutions, averring that they were the sole cause why Henry was infuriated against him, and that because he refused his assent to them, "contrary as they were to the laws of God and to the decrees of the Popes, he had come to seek the sole but wanted refuge of the papal presence". He

then resigned his see into Alexander's hands, and begged him to name a cardinal-bishop, a stronger and more learned man than himself, as metropolitan of the English. But, despite those whom we may call the king's cardinals, but whom Alan of Tewkesbury calls the Pharisees, the Pope would not accept the resignation. "You have become", he said, "a partner in our exile. As long as we have breath in our body we will never fail you". Then, while six of the articles of the Constitutions were declared tolerable, the rest of them were solemnly condemned.

On this occasion, however, the Pope took no further action, and St Thomas retired to the great Cistercian abbey of Pontigny, there to be generously entertained for two years (November 30, 1164). But Henry, enraged at the failure of his embassies to Louis and the Pope, with a refinement of cruelty worthy of Nero, seized all the relations and friends of Becket, old and young, men and women, even such as were with child or had infants at their breasts, and, in the depth of winter, cast them helpless on the shores of France. Before they were exiled they were forced to swear that they would present themselves to the saint. What must have been the agony of the archbishop when over four hundred of those who were near or dear to him from any cause appeared before him in suffering and in destitution! The greatest kindness was shown to these unfortunate people by Louis and his subjects; but as years went by their charity began to cool, and great was the misery endured by some of the sufferers.

Not content with this savage measure, Henry issued what Roger of Hoveden calls "a shocking and execrable edict against Pope Alexander and Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury", *i.e.*, he issued orders to the sheriffs to imprison anyone, cleric or lay, who should dare to appeal to Rome, and then, as we have seen, opened negotiations with the schismatics with a view to recognizing the antipope, Paschal III (1165).

But opposition from both the clergy and laity convinced him that any attempt to induce the nation to reject Alexander would fail; and letters which were received by his chief episcopal supporters from the Pope made it plain that the latter would act whenever he had a fair opportunity. Writing to Foliot, Alexander said: "You are doubtless aware how the aforesaid king has fallen away from his former devotion to the Church by forbidding appeals and visits to us, by communicating with schismatics and with those who are excommunicated, and by allying himself with them, and by compelling our venerable brother Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, to leave the kingdom, he has shown himself in the light of a persecutor". The bishop must admonish the king on these matters, and let him know that, despite the gratitude which the Pope owes him, his patience in enduring his evil conduct cannot last for ever (June 1165).

But it was not the impatience of Alexander that Henry had to fear; it was that of the archbishop which was dreaded by Pope and king alike. And so the former, whilst about this same time (June 1165) declaring null the sentence of confiscation of his goods, which had been presumptuously passed upon their archbishop by the bishops and barons of England, urged Becket to do nothing against the king or his domains till the following Easter (April 24, 1166).

In the meantime, however, he did not forget the interests of the saint who had resolved to suffer exile rather than consent to what would turn to our injury or to that of the Church, but, on his way back to Rome, wrote to Louis to beg him to grant some

bishopric or abbacy to the archbishop for his support, and to Foliot and the bishops of England urging them to zeal in his behalf, or to respect his rights.

After Alexander returned to Rome (November 1165), and found himself more or less independent in the home of the Popes on the Caelian, he felt more at liberty to act with greater firmness in behalf of St. Thomas. Letters were accordingly dispatched to him in which he was advised that, if he thought the time opportune, he should not delay “to execute ecclesiastical justice” on such as refused to offer suitable satisfaction for having plundered the possessions of the church of Canterbury. On his side, the Pope would confirm his sentence. Even with regard to the person of the king, Alexander declared that he would not interfere with the lights which his episcopal position gave him. Furthermore, he ordered the restoration of all the property which had been taken from the archbishop’s subjects; forbade Roger of York, or any of the bishops, to crown the new king without the permission of Canterbury (April 5); named St Thomas primate of England; and soon afterwards, on Easter day (April 24), appointed him papal legate for the whole country, except for the archdiocese of York; and even declared that he would not leave Henry’s conduct unpunished much longer (May 16).

Now, feeling that he had Rome behind him, Thomas began to write directly to the king. During the months of April and May he sent to Henry three letters, which became more threatening in tone as first one and then another was left unanswered. He begged the king to set the Church in his realms at liberty, reminding him of his promises when he was anointed king, and warning him, in words which proved prophetic, that the sword would never depart from his house if he did not. He further begged the king to grant him an interview, and concluded by assuring him that, if he did not permit him to return, and to do his duty freely, “he might take it as certain that he would feel the avenging severity of God”.

A little later (towards the end of May), he wrote to urge his suffragans to be loyal to the Church of Rome, which was “the head of all the churches, and the fount of a Catholic doctrine”, and to which all cases of first importance must be referred. But in England, he continued, “many attacks are made on the prerogatives of St. Peter”, and those whom penance or piety would take to Rome are plundered and prevented from accomplishing their journey. In virtue of obedience, therefore, he bade the bishops excommunicate such as practise these acts of violence

But all efforts that the archbishop could make, and he spared none, moved neither bishop nor king, and he went to Vezelay to draw, as he said, against the king and his domains the sword of the Spirit, which is sharper than any two-edged sword, in order that the ruin of the flesh might save the soul.

Meanwhile, threatened by the Pope, and especially by the archbishop, Henry began to realize that the season of impunity which he had hitherto enjoyed was drawing to an end. He was furious, and at a council at Chinon in Touraine (June 1), called his advisers “traitors who had not zeal enough to rid him of one troublesome man”. All, however, that they could suggest was an appeal to Rome against the archbishop’s threatened excommunication, before the sentence was passed; because they knew that, in the case of excommunication, an appeal could only stand if made before the blow was struck. And so, notes John of Salisbury, it came to pass that “he who had

endeavored to stop the right of appeal to Rome, had to confirm it, when he was compelled to appeal to save himself". His envoys, accordingly, hastened to Pontigny, only to find that they were too late Becket had left it for Vezelay

On the borders of Burgundy and Nivernois are a number of dome-like heights, for the most part beautifully crested with woods. Among them, however, is one crowned not by nature's hand with the tall green tree, but by the skill of man with lordly stone. Still toweling over the valleys of the Cure and the Yonne, as when it vibrated to the solemn accents of St. Thomas, stands the glorious Romanesque abbey Church of St Mary Magdalen. Now it is all too large for the few people whose homes cling round its base; but in the twelfth century it was needed to accommodate the people of one of the most important towns of France. On the Whit Sunday (June 12) of 1166 the crowds that poured through its great west portals were more numerous than usual, for again were the words of a saint and a hero to echo beneath its lofty arches. Some twenty years before, many of the citizens of Vezelay had heard with enthusiastic rapture the inspired accents of St. Bernard: and now both they and the neighboring people were listening with bated breath to the most renowned bishop of Christendom pronouncing sentence of excommunication against the ministers of the most powerful sovereign in Europe. The divers nations expected, indeed, that Henry himself was to be excommunicated; and when St. Thomas set out for Vezelay, and prayed for light and strength at Soissons on his way thither, it had been his intention to pronounce the dread sentence of the Church against his king. But before he reached the city, word had been brought to him that his lord and one time friend was on a bed of sickness. The heart of the saint was touched. Henry he could not excommunicate. But first one of his counsellors and then another were declared to be expelled from the fold of the Church, and, by the authority of the Roman pontiff, handed over to the powers of darkness. John of Oxford, the Jurator, and Richard of Ilchester were banned for communicating with the schismatic Reinald of Cologne and for their share in the diet of Wurzburg; Richard de Luci and others for aiding and abetting the king anent the Constitutions; and Ranulf de Broc and others for usurping the property of the church of Canterbury. Henry himself was threatened with the like sentence unless he repented, and his Constitutions, especially the articles condemned by the Roman Church, were also denounced.

Despite the fact that Alexander confirmed these excommunications, Henry did all he could to have them disregarded, and to make their authors feel the weight of his wrath. He ordered the ports to be watched min order to prevent the entry into England of letters from the Pope or the archbishop, diverted Peter's Pence into his own coffers, threatened to drive the Cistercians from England if they gave any further shelter to St Thomas at Pontigny, suspended the clergy from the obedience they owed the archbishop, and authorized another appeal to the Pope. The bishops of England accordingly met, and on June 24 appealed to the Pope, fixing Ascension Day (1167) as the term of their appeal. They opposed to him, as they explained to their archbishop, "the remedy of an appeal, lest he should involve in disgraceful trouble their king, their country, themselves, and their churches, and the Pope and the holy Roman Church".

In November the archbishop left Pontigny, in order not to involve his hosts in his persecution. But Louis of France lost no time in providing for him, and the saint passed the remainder of his period of exile in the monastery of St Columba, on the banks of the

Yonne near Sens. Henry, however, could do more than secure the expulsion of the archbishop from his monastic home. By means of the perjurer John of Oxford he obtained a notable success at Rome. Alexander's position was again in jeopardy. Frederick re-entered Italy in November 1166, and in the following month the Pope suspended Becket's powers by the appointment of a Legatine Commission to examine the case between him and the king, and, despite the archbishop's protests, named as partner with Cardinal Otho of Ostia on the Commission the weak and venal William of Pavia.

Though there can be no doubt that the mere nomination of this Commission did harm to the cause the Pope really had at heart, Alexander had no intention of going as far as Henry hoped. He was again carrying out the policy we have already outlined as peculiarly his. He both gratified and disappointed the king of the English, and depressed and then encouraged the archbishop of Canterbury. Henry, who had been more than pleased with Alexander's concessions, found that the Commission he had procured at such cost was practically valueless, because the Pope, on account, as he said, of representations made to him, had instructed the two cardinals "not to do anything of importance in the king's territories, and on no account even to enter those territories unless the archbishop be first completely reconciled to him". St. Thomas, on the other hand, aggrieved with the best reason at the appointment of the Commission, and especially at the nomination on it of his enemy, William of Pavia, was consoled by the thought that the possibilities of the Commission were in his hands.

No doubt Alexander knew as well as St Thomas that peace must be wrung from tyrants by an appeal not to raw but to force, and did not expect that any good would come from his Commission. At any rate, no good did come from it. The king of the English and the archbishop of Canterbury were not divided on a few unimportant questions which a little kindly condescension on the part of the one, and some becoming humility on the part of the other, could have caused to vanish. Compromise was impossible. It was not, as many seem to imagine, simply an affair of criminous clerks. It was, as we have seen, a vital question of principle. Henry was striving to win for himself both the tribute due to Caesar and the homage due to the Church, and of this he made no secret. St. Thomas, on the other hand, was prepared to die that the homage due to the Church which Christ had founded should be rendered to the Head which He had established, viz., to the Pope. He was ready to lay down his life that there might be in the Church freedom of communication between its Head and its members. "For" as John of Salisbury pertinently asked "how can faith be preserved unsullied, when subjects are not permitted to obey their shepherds and rulers in the things that pertain to God?"

Hence, though the cardinals interviewed both Becket and the king, the former would not accept the customs, which tore the rights of the Pope to shreds, and the latter would not yield anything save in ambiguous words, but seemed to seek for nothing except the head of the archbishop on a charger.

The close of the Commission would mean the restoration of the archbishop's normal rights. With good reason was this dreaded by the pusillanimous English episcopate. They again, in violation of all canon law, appealed to the Pope against any

adverse sentence which their archbishop might pronounce against them, and the cardinals, exceeding their powers, forbade the archbishop, “on the Pope’s authority, to pronounce any interdict against the kingdom of England or its people”. More than doubtful as to how far the cardinals were authorized to issue such a prohibition, Henry again set his agents to work in Rome, and, so it is said, by bribing the Pope’s entourage, he succeeded in inducing Alexander to confirm the action of his legates. The Pope’s one aim, as we have said, was to prevent the struggle between the king and the archbishop from proceeding to extremities, and he thought that the game of procrastination would suit him as well as it would suit Henry.

Protests, however, especially from France, were poured in upon him for thus tying the hands of the archbishop, and he hastened to explain that his powers were only suspended till the Lent of 1169, and that they had been suspended only because Henry’s envoys had assured him that their master was about to make another attempt at reconciliation with the archbishop.

To further this reconciliation, Alexander dispatched Simon of Mont Dieu and Bernard de la Coudre (de Corilo), a monk of Grammont, to act as intermediaries between the king and the archbishop. They took with them not only letters of warning to present to the king, but also threatening letters in case the former proved inefficacious. Although the Commissioners managed at Montmirail in Main to make peace between the kings of England and France, they were wholly unable to reconcile Henry and Becket, though they brought about a meeting between them (January 6, 1169). The archbishop, of course, would not give an undertaking to observe the customs unconditionally, because, as he told the Pope, if he did, the authority of the Holy See in England would be reduced to a vanishing point. And on his side the king would not accept the archbishop’s undertaking to observe the customs, “saving his Order, or the honour of God”. As Becket himself expressed it Henry would not be reconciled to him “because we were not prepared to give an absolute promise to receive his customs, some of which would annihilate the authority of the Apostolic See and destroy the liberty of the Church”. Finding that they could extract nothing from Henry but ambiguous words, the papal envoys gave up making any further attempts to lead him into the way of peace.

By the arrival of the Lent of 1160, Becket’s full spiritual powers were again at his own disposal. This his enemies, and especially the lean and hungry Gilbert Foliot, knew full well, and in the beginning of the holy season he endeavored to anticipate the sentence he knew would fall upon him. He again set up an appeal to Rome. But of this trying his archbishop took no notice, but solemnly excommunicated him and others on Palm Sunday (April 13). This blow he followed up on Ascension day by further excommunications.

The struggle between the archbishop and the king now entered upon its acute stage, and from this time till after Becket’s martyrdom embassies to and from Rome, and letters to and from the Pope, followed one another in rapid and bewildering succession. The excommunications caused the greatest excitement. Those who had been sentenced endeavored still further to inflame the king against Becket in order that he might be the more energetic in their behalf. Henry, however, did not require much

rousing. All his resources, his money and his influence at Rome, were placed at the disposal of those who had been punished by the archbishop.

Alexander, again alarmed at the turn the struggle was taking, appointed fresh envoys to mediate between the disputants, and begged the archbishop to suspend his sentence against Gilbert. The envoys were the subdeacon Gratian, a nephew of Eugenius III and a notary of the Holy See, and Vivian, archdeacon of Orvieto, who was wont to act as advocate in the Roman curia. Both were men learned in the law, but Vivian was suspected, though without reason, of not being above taking a bribe. They had several interviews with Henry during the month of August, and met his blustering with quiet firmness. "By God's eyes", swore our blasphemous monarch with his usual oath, "I will let you see!". "Use no threats to us", replied Gratian, "we fear them not. We come from a court which is wont to give orders to emperors and to kings". Henry, however, continued in his usual style. At one moment he would declare that he cared not an egg for then excommunication, and that if they ventured to lay an interdict on his kingdom, he, who could take the strongest castle in a day, would soon seize the cleric who dared to publish it. But at another, he would proclaim that he ought to be ready to concede much to the prayer of the Pope, for he was his lord and father, and then he would pretend to grant all that was required of him.

Gratian, however, found that he was listening only to idle words; for no sooner had Henry professed his readiness to give up his customs, then he signified his intention of retaining his prerogatives. Accordingly, at the close of September, Gratian returned to his master.

Once again free to act by the collapse of this third embassy, the archbishop proceeded to threaten to lay England under an interdict unless Henry came to terms before the Feast of the Purification (February 2, 1170), and, if that did not avail, he made it known that the king himself would be excommunicated.

As far as in him lay, Henry endeavored to render the archbishop's threatened sentence impotent. He renewed and extended the orders he had already issued to render inoperative the power of the Pope or of the archbishop in England. Bearers of their letters or of letters to them were to be imprisoned, the goods of such as observed the interdict or favored the Pope or the archbishop were to be confiscated to the crown, and Peter's Pence was to be expanded at the king's order.

When Gratian left France in September, Vivian remained behind still hoping to bring about a reconciliation. But though he brought the king and the archbishop together at Montmartre (November 18, 1169), he effected nothing, but went away saying that Henry was the greatest liar on earth.

Alexander, however, still thinking that the resources of a fourth diplomacy were not exhausted, named a new commission mission, consisting of Rotrou, archbishop of Rouen, and of Bernard, bishop of Nevers (January 1170). Their instructions were to lay an interdict on Henry's continental dominions if, after forty days, the king should continue to refuse to be reconciled with the archbishop, and to restore their property to those clerics whom he had robbed of it. But, true to his policy of treating both the king and the archbishop to the sweet and to the bitter, he authorized Rotrou to absolve the ambitious Foliot (February 12). Though he no doubt took this high-handed step with a

view to promote the cause of peace, as Henry had repeatedly declared that he would never receive the archbishop into favor as long as Foliot was excommunicated, it was assuredly a mistake, and naturally gave Becket the greatest pain. "I know not how it is", he wrote to Cardinal Albert in deep vexation of spirit, "that the cause of Christ is ever being sacrificed in the Roman court, so that Barabbas escapes, and Christ is slain. It is by the authority of the curia that our exile and the misery of the Church have been prolonged for six years. For my part, I will never trouble it more". In the bitterness of his soul he could not make sufficient allowance for the Pope, then an exile like himself, and in difficulties with the Romans. He could scarcely realize the troubles in which Alexander was perpetually immersed, and how hard it was for him to find out the truth, perpetually besieged as he was by the perjured agents of a lying king. Alexander still had to do rather what he could than what he would.

The next step in the great struggle, and it proved a decisive one, was taken by our Protean sovereign. He decided to crown his son Henry, and to make him the nominal ruler of England. Probably many motives urged him to take this step. Perhaps the first was his desire to establish his dynasty in England as firmly as possible whilst he lived; but no doubt an additional very strong motive was a wish to strike another blow, with as much impunity as possible, against his archbishop, and against the independence of the Church in England. He realized that the Pope was beginning to speak with a stronger voice, and that, if he remained king of England, an interdict would soon be placed on the country. He accordingly asked the Pope to grant permission to Roger of York to crown his son; and his envoys, we are assured, boldly asserted that they had received the desired permission. This, like so much else that was said by Henry's agents, was false; for on February 26, Alexander expressly forbade Roger "to crown the king of England's son". But it was very difficult to place the Pope's letters in York's hands, because the ports were very strictly watched. However, they were delivered to the archbishop of York and to the bishop of London on the Saturday before the Sunday of the coronation of the said king. None the less was he crowned (June 14), and received his share of the territories which Henry then nominally made over to his sons.

The king had now to face the consequences of this utter disregard of the authority of Rome and Canterbury in his son's coronation. The Pope, declaring that the cause of the archbishop was his cause and that of the Church, and apologizing to him if the difficulties in which he has been placed have made him appear remiss in his support, suspended Roger of York, and excommunicated Gilbert of London and Jocelin of Salisbury for their disobedience in the crowning of the young Henry, till such times as they should make satisfaction to the archbishop of Canterbury. However, before the dispatch of these letters, Henry had become reconciled to the archbishop. The Pope's threat of interdict was hanging over him, and St. Thomas was preparing to put it into effect, when it was suggested to him "that there was no use keeping the archbishop out of the country, but that he would be much better kept in it. The king was quick to understand the hint, and promptly arranged a meeting with the archbishop". A conference was accordingly held between them in a place which was afterwards known to the people of the country as "the Valley of the Traitors". It was near the castle of Fréteval, in the district of Chartres. Henry showed himself most gracious. In the words of the archbishop: "he did not even allude to the *customs*. He exacted no oath from us or

from anyone belonging to us. He granted to us the possessions which he had taken from our Church during the course of the quarrel, according to the enumeration of them in our own schedule, and promised peace and a safe return to all of us”.

But no sooner had the archbishop sent his agents to England to reclaim the confiscated property, when appeared that he had obtained from Henry as usual nothing but words. His rights were contemned, and his officials and tenants outraged. Moreover, there was brought to light a design of the king to get the elections to the vacant sees in England held abroad, and the chosen candidates consecrated by the Pope “to the detriment of the church of Canterbury and its archbishop”. Hence, though the archbishop’s agents showed to his adherents in England the king’s letters patent, they would not believe that any real reconciliation had taken place; nor indeed would some of the cardinals of Rome, Alexander himself became indignant at the reports of the king’s unfaithfulness which reached him, and wrote thus to the archbishop: “in case the king refuse to fulfill the peace which he has arranged with you, by restoring to you and yours all the rights and possessions you have been deprived of, we grant you plenary authority, in accordance with the functions committed to you, to execute, without appeal, the sentence of the Church on the persons and places subject to your legation, excepting only on the king, his wife, and his sons (October)”. In the following month he so far at the archbishop’s request, modified his letters of September against the bishops who had crowned Henry, as to leave their execution in the hands of Becket. It must be carefully noted that this concession was not granted by Alexander till November 24, and hence could not have been in the archbishop’s hands when he published the original September letters.

The more vigorously the Pope acted, the more anxious did Henry become that the archbishop should return to England, and though St. Thomas found the king untrue to one engagement after another, and though he received one warning after another not to return to England, he declared that he would go there to die. Accordingly, acting on the conditions of his reconciliation with Henry, he sent forward the Pope’s letters which suspended Roger of York, and recalled London and Salisbury, under sentence of excommunication for their share in the coronation (November 30), and, embarking at Witsand, landed at Sandwich on December the first.

The news of the excommunication of the bishops and the landing of the archbishop caused the greatest excitement. The people were delighted beyond measure; but the false bishops, and all such as had benefited by the archbishop’s difficulties with the king, were furious. The latter at once thought of force, the former of guile. Immediately, therefore, on the archbishop’s landing, the episcopal party endeavored to impose on his foreign companions “an oath to which”, wrote the saint to the Pope, “for the sake of precedent I could not consent, as it was a profession of allegiance to our kings alone, without any exception in your favour or in that of anyone else. If such an oath were exacted from the clergy of the realm, your authority would be at an end or would be very much curtailed”.

These words are another manifestation of the fact that the chief end which St. Thomas had in view in his six years’ struggle against the arbitrary will of a tyrannical king was the maintenance of the free exercise of the Pope’s spiritual authority in this

land. For that he contended both before his exile and during its long duration, and for that he strove on his return. Hence, when laying before the young king in England the grievances under which were groaning both the whole English Church and the church of Canterbury in particular, he complained bitterly of the closing of the ports. "Since those on this side of the Channel cannot leave the island, and those on the other side cannot come to it, the liberty of the English Church is imprisoned in order that it may not be subject to the jurisdiction of the successors of Blessed Peter, and the power of the Roman Church is diminished in order that it may not be able to continue the ordinary dispatch of its mandates".

Throughout the whole of this history of the struggle of St. Thomas against Henry, special attention has been called to the fact that the real object of the contest between them was the authority of the Pope in "our" land. This has been insisted upon because it is so generally lost sight of. It is not, however, supposed that the claims of the Pope were the only ones for which the archbishop contended. He strove too for what was bound up with the authority of the Pope; he strove for the independence of the English Church, for the rights of the clerical order, for the privileges of his see, and last, but not least, for the rights of the great mass of the people,—“the little people, *minutus populous*”, as the chroniclers call them. St. Thomas was, therefore, the true champion not only of the Pope and the Church, but of the people.

Whether Becket was wise or not in publishing the Pope's letters against the English bishops at this time, he was fully resolved to abide by the consequences of his act. Accordingly when in their master's name the king's officials called on him to absolve the bishops, he replied that it was not in his power to loose where the Pope had bound; for he was evidently not yet in possession of Alexander's letter of November 24, giving him discretionary power in this matter. If, however, he said, they would take an oath to obey the papal decision in their case, he would in the meantime take upon himself to enter into communion with them.

This condition, at once reasonable and in accordance with custom, commended itself to most of the bishops, for they did not think it right, in order to preserve the customs of the realm, to put themselves in opposition to the Church, and to impugn the decrees of the Pope. But the arguments of their evil genius, Roger of York, prevailed over them; they crossed the sea, and appealed to the king, telling him he would have no peace as long as Thomas lived. Henry flew into one of his paroxysms of rage, and, as he had done more than once before, railed against devoted followers who would not lid him of a single priest.

This time his evil words bore evil fruit. Four knights set out for England, burst into the archbishop's presence, and bade him absolve the bishops. "Whoever", replied the intrepid prelate, "has presumed to violate the commands of the holy Roman See, and the rights of the Church of Christ, and will not make satisfaction, him will I not spare whoever he is".—"From whom then", cried Fitz-Urse, one of the four, "do you hold your archbishopric?"—"Its spirituals from God and the Pope, its temporalities from the king".—"Will you not acknowledge that you hold everything from the king?"—"Never! We must render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's". And when they proceeded to threaten him, he quietly continued "Were all the

swords of England to hang over my head, they could not deter me from rendering homage to God and obedience to the Pope”.

There is no call for us to tell the rest. At nightfall of December 29, 1170, one of England’s noblest sons laid down his life in his cathedral of Canterbury for the preservation in this land of the rights of Alexander III, successor of St. Peter. Or, as it is far otherwise expressed by Robert de Monte: “On the fifth day after Christmas the very flower of the world was plucked from it, and on the self-same day began to be the fruit of heaven”.

Hardly had the savage cries of the brutal murderers of St. Thomas ceased to echo in the dim recesses of his cathedral, than well-nigh every vaulted roof in Christendom rang with denunciations of the tyrant who was felt to be responsible for the sacrilege. “The report of this dreadful outrage”, writes William of Newburgh, “quickly pervading every district of the Western world, sullied the illustrious king of England, and so obscured his fair fame among Christian potentates that, as it could scarcely be believed to have been perpetrated without his consent and mandate, he was attacked by the imprecations of almost all, and it was deemed fitting that he should be publicly banned”. Hence while every chronicler in Europe was in his quiet cell recording the martyrdom, the men of action, especially those in France, were busy either calling on the Pope to act, or acting themselves. William, archbishop of Sens, at once published the threatened papal interdict over Henry’s continental dominions; for, as he said, he knew “that the man who would not obey the Pope’s orders was a pagan”. The king of France, and the procurator of his kingdom, Theobald, count of Blois, called on the Pope to “unsheathe the sword of Peter and avenge the martyr of Canterbury”, and the bishops of Louis’s realm imitated his example.

Whether Henry was really grieved or not when he heard of the death of the archbishop he found it advisable to feign profound affliction, and sent an important embassy to propitiate the Pope. Alexander, at any rate, seems to have been overwhelmed with sorrow when the news of the archbishop’s martyrdom reached him. He was a prey to remorse. He felt that the saint’s cruel death was the result of his half-hearted measures in his behalf. For eight days he would not see anyone, and gave a general order that no Englishman should be admitted into his presence.

Most of the cardinals even refused to see Henry’s embassy. But the ambassadors did not lose heart, and at length contrived to get a hearing from some of their master’s old supporters among the cardinals. They assured them that Henry neither wished nor ordered the archbishop’s death, though they did not deny that by the angry words he had uttered he had indirectly been the cause of his death. All, however, that they could obtain from their friends was that the Pope would see them on Maunday Thursday (March 25).

Alexander would only receive the envoys from England at a public audience. Utterly dissatisfied with the short letter, full of gross misstatements, which Henry had sent to him, he was only mollified when the envoys swore that their master and the bishops would in their own persons take an oath to abide by the Pope’s decision on the matter. Alexander, accordingly, contented himself at first with excommunicating in general terms the murderers of the archbishop, and their aiders and abettors. After

Easter, however, he went further; he confirmed the interdict of the archbishop of Sens, and Becket's suspension of York, London, and Salisbury; and ordered Henry to refrain from entering a church till he should send legates to see if he were sufficiently humble (May).

These legates he was in no hurry to dispatch. He would give Henry time to reflect on the difference between himself, the most powerful monarch in Europe, deprived of a right which belonged to the meanest of his subjects, and the archbishop he had done to death, upon whose memory the fame of an heroic death and the glory of miracles wrought at his tomb were causing honor to be poured from every country in Europe.

Apparently it was not till the autumn that Alexander dispatched cardinals Albert of St. Lawrence in Lucina, afterwards Gregory VIII, and Theodwine of St. Vitalis, to inquire into the guilt and dispositions of Henry. When they reached Normandy, they found that Henry was in Ireland, whither some, probably without reason, thought he had betaken himself to avoid rendering the account demanded of him. The legates at once notified him of their arrival, and meanwhile entered into negotiations with the monks of Canterbury for the reconciliation of the cathedral (December 21, 1171). It was not till May that Henry was able to return to Normandy and meet the legates. The first conference between them took place at Savigny, and, as we learn from the king himself, he found the cardinals very uncompromising. However, at a second meeting at Avranches, after Henry had sworn that he had not ordered or wished the death of St. Thomas, but that he had used angry words which had incited some of his followers, conditions were agreed upon. According to Henry himself, he promised to support two hundred soldiers for a year in the Holy Land; to permit appeals to Rome; to give up the customs which had been introduced in his time ("which I consider", he interjected, "are either very few or none at all"); and to restore the possessions of the church of Canterbury and those of the exiles. Furthermore, as the actual formula of his oath shows, he agreed to take the cross for three years, and, along with Henry Curt Mantle, not to recede from the obedience of Alexander (May 22).

After this oath had been duly sworn, Henry was solemnly introduced into the cathedral by the cardinals, and absolved from all ecclesiastical censures. Of this ancient church, which looked out so gloriously to the towering rock and fortress of Mont St. Michel and to the isles of the sea, the violence of the French Revolution has not left a stone upon a stone. But a modern inscription marks the spot where on Sunday, May 22, 1172, Henry "received on his knees the papal absolution at the hands of the Pope's legates".

In the interval between the martyrdom of St. Thomas and this absolution of Henry, the unworthy bishops, Roger of York, Foliot of London, and Jocelin of Salisbury had also, with the Pope's consent, been freed from ecclesiastical censures. They had sworn that they were not privy to the archbishop's death, had not received in time the Pope's letter forbidding them to crown Henry Curt Mantle, and had not on the occasion of the coronation bound themselves to observe the Constitutions of Clarendon.

It had hardly become generally known that Thomas Becket had closed his vigorous struggle for ecclesiastical liberty by martyrdom, than a strong cry arose from all sides, especially from the Gallican Church, to the apostolic throne, calling on

Alexander to proclaim him a saint. Nor were the archbishop's friends slow to express their dissatisfaction that their demands were not complied with immediately. Unable, however, wrote Alexander to the chapter of Canterbury, "to resist the public fame of the archbishop's miracles, and the testimony of our beloved sons, the cardinals Albert and Theodwine, and others in whom we place full confidence, and having moreover taken counsel with our brethren in the Church, before a large multitude of the clergy and of the laity, we have solemnly canonized him, and we command you and the whole English Church by apostolical authority to solemnize his feast on the day on which he finished his life by a glorious martyrdom".

After Rome had thus spoken, devotion to St. Thomas grew apace throughout all Europe, but especially, of course, in England. As the old Icelandic saga expresses it : "The love and miracles of the holy Thomas so enkindled the hearts of the English people, that, by the consent and agreement of the lord Pope, they will endure no longer that their most glorious father shall lie so low in the crypt as when first he was entombed, but rather desire that he be honored and raised into a worthy place, in order that all folk may bow to him, and become partakers of his merits". Pope Honorius III was accordingly approached, and on January 25, 1220, he issued a *bull* authorizing the translation of the relics to a more honorable position, and granted an indulgence of a year and forty days to those who should visit the new shrine.

From the foregoing one thing at least is clear. As far as St. Thomas himself was concerned, he did not die in vain. Till the end of time there will be those who will call him blessed. But it is almost equally clear that he did not die in vain as far as others were concerned. He was beyond all doubt a martyr to civil as well as to religious liberty. The Constitutions of Clarendon, so far from becoming the law of the land, were wholly rejected in theory, and even in the arbitrary practice of our Angevin kings were considerably modified. The story too of his heroic resistance to the arbitrary will of a tyrant fired the hearts of men; and from his death our oppressed countrymen drew their courage to rise against the violator of their most cherished liberties, and to wring Magna Carta from the strong grasp of John Tackland. Had Henry VIII been met by a St. Thomas, the laws of that lustful tyrant against the Roman See would in all probability never have found a place among the statutes of our realm, nor would the head of Charles I have been demanded by a people resolved not to be again deprived by force of their civil and religious freedom.

When the cardinals Albert and Theodwine were on the eve of their return to Rome, they issued a letter to the clergy of the vacant sees in England informing them that the king had granted that the election to bishoprics should be free, and bidding them choose suitable candidates. As usual Henry's words had no relation to his intending acts, and he succeeded in forcing his own creatures into all the vacant sees except that of Canterbury. Odo, the prior of Canterbury, was a man of character, and, boldly standing out for a free election, brought about the rejection of the king's candidate, the plastic bishop of Bayeux (1172). In the following year various attempts were made in vain to fill the see; but at length, on June 3, all, monks, bishops, and the elder king, agreed to the election of Richard, prior of Dover. Preparations were being made for his consecration when a letter was received by the monks of Canterbury from Henry Curt Mantle. It set forth that it appeared that his father was attempting to place both in

Canterbury and in other sees unsuitable persons. “By our regal unction we have received the care of the whole kingdom, and such things must not be done without our consent”. Wherefore we have appealed to the Roman See, and have lodged this our appeal in the hands of the cardinal legates Albert and Theodwine. The appeal of the young king was met by a counter-appeal on the part of the monks and the bishops; and the archbishop-elect betook himself to Rome. Alexander sustained the election, and on April 7, 1174, himself consecrated Richard at Anagni, granting him the primacy and the office of apostolic legate. Gervase of Canterbury closes his account of these transactions with a remark which serves to remind us of the general situation of the Church in the year 1174. He tells us that the journey to and from Rome cost Richard a very large sum of money, “for the emperor’s chancellor, through hatred of Pope Alexander, had effectively blockaded the passes of the Alps, and it was with the greatest difficulty that any of our people could get to him by sea”.

The attentive reader will have noticed that in this affair of the election of Richard and the other new bishops there was dissension between Henry Curt Mantle and his father, and he would have thought more seriously of it had we already quoted a letter of one of the bishops-elect to the elder Henry. The document explained that Alexander only granted the office of legate to Richard because the envoys of Henry II earnestly desired that “he should have full power of inflicting ecclesiastical vengeance upon those men of your realms who have raised the heel against your innocence”. And it went on to say that the Pope refused to settle the question of the other elections “until such time as your sun shall have been brought to a reconciliation”.

The fact is that Henry Curt Mantle was in rebellion. Henry II of England was to be punished for his evil deeds in the same way as Henry IV of Germany had been. His sons were to scourge him before he bared his shoulders to the monks of Canterbury. The prophetic warnings of St. Thomas were to be realized. In the second year of his exile he had begged Henry to give freedom to the Church, and had added: “If you do not, I fear that the sword will never depart from your house”.

Of a pliable disposition, the younger Henry, urged on by some of the nobles he disliked the strong rule of his father, demanded some portion of his inheritance in which he might exercise independent power. When his request was refused, he fled to the court of Louis, and was joined by his brothers Richard and Geoffrey. Civil war at once broke out in England and Normandy, and the kings of France and Scotland invaded Henry’s territories.

This was a cruel blow to Henry, who was at least a fond father, and in his despair he turned to these he had himself wronged—to Alexander and to St. Thomas. He poured out his grief to the Pope, imploring his counsel. “The kingdom of England”, he pleaded, “is under your jurisdiction, and as far as feudal claims are concerned I am answerable only to you. Let England now learn what the Roman pontiff can do, and, since he does not use a material sword, let him defend the Patrimony of Blessed Peter with the sword of the Spirit. Turn the hearts of the children to their father and I will obey your directions in everything”.

The Pope did not turn a deaf ear to the desolate father, but dispatched the saintly Peter, archbishop of Tarentaise, to the king of the French in order to promote peace

between Henry and his sons. A conference was held in September (1173), and Henry, after generously offering revenues and castles to his sons, undertook to submit himself entirely to the arbitration of the papal legates in the matter of the amount of money he ought to give. But, as the chronicler adds, it did not suit the designs of the king of France that the sons should make peace with the father. The conference was broken up, and the war was renewed.

In the midst of his troubles the unhappy father turned also to the friend he had done to death, and made his famous penitential pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Thomas in July 1174. He was rewarded for his humility by learning that the invading king of the Scots had been taken prisoner at Alnwick, at the very time he was hearing Mass at the saint's tomb. Within three weeks of his penance all England was at peace.

Meanwhile, Alexander did not despair of reconciling the rebellious princes with their father, and commissioned another legate, Peter, of the title of St. Chrysogonus, to proceed to France. This time the exertions of the papal envoy were crowned with success, and for the time there was peace throughout Henry's vast dominions (September 29, 1174).

Hoping, no doubt, that Henry would be grateful for his assistance in this important matter, Alexander hearkened to the king's request, and sent him as apostolic legate his relative Hugo Pierleone, the cardinal-deacon of St. Angelo. Henry appears to have been particularly anxious to have the question of the criminous clerks settled in a manner that would be acceptable to the Pope and to himself, and to bring about some understanding between Canterbury and York, who were quarrelling as usual. Accordingly, he gave a royal welcome to Hugo, who came with full powers from Rome, and in sign thereof with the white horse and all the other insignia that belonged to the Pope alone (October 1175)

After summoning the bishops of England to meet him in synod in the spring of the following year, the legate spent the interval in making an official visitation of the cathedrals and greater abbeys of the country. In obedience to the cardinal's summons, there met together in the chapel of St. Catherine at Westminster the bishops of England. But the rivalry of York and Canterbury prevented the synod from getting further than its inauguration. The question at once arose as to whether Richard or Roger was to sit at the right hand of the legate. Neither of the prelates would give way, and both of them appealed to the Pope. But, as the partisans of Canterbury were in the majority, Roger was very severely handled, and his vestments torn. The cardinal was justly indignant at this unseemly spectacle, told the people that he could not publish the laws that were to have been drawn up for the good of the Church, and, asking for permission to return, took off the insignia of his office. The entreaties of the king and the bishops, however, prevailed upon him to resume them.

The mission of Hugo, however, was not a failure, because something at least of what should have been decided at Westminster was settled between the king and the legate. Writing to the Pope, Henry stated that, influenced by his devotion to the Roman Church and by the words of his friend and relative the apostolic legate Hugo, he had made a number of concessions. In future, clerics were not to be brought before lay tribunals except for breaches of the forest laws, or except for cases concerning lay fiefs

where service was due to a lay lord. He also agreed not to keep bishoprics and abbeys vacant for more than a year; not to compel clerics to trial by combat; and not only to inflict the ordinary punishment on such as had been convicted of the murder of a cleric before the king's justiciary in presence of an official of the bishop, but also to deprive them of their inheritance for ever. Some of the clergy at the time condemned the first article, ostensibly no doubt on principle, but it would seem really because many of them were fond of hunting. Now, as the canons forbade the clergy to hunt, was only reasonable for the legate to allow their being punished for breaking them. Similarly, as the archbishop himself, finding that canonical penances were not enough to restrain would be murderers of clerics, wished for their punishment by the civil tribunals, the legate deserves praise rather than blame for obtaining the gratification of his desires.

As well after as before the abortive council of Westminster, Hugo officially visited the various churches, and left England on July 3, 1176. It might almost be thought that at this time Alexander was solely occupied with the affairs of England. Whilst Hugo was still in England, he had commissioned Cardinal Peter of St. Chrysogonus to lay this country under an interdict if Henry refused either to return Adelais (or Alice) to her father Louis of France, or, as agreed, to give his son Richard to her in marriage. Although the mission of the cardinal had no result, as far as Adelais was concerned, except a futile promise on Henry's part that the marriage should take place, it ended, as we have seen, in the Peace of Yvry (September 1177), by which the kings of France and England bound themselves to take the cross and to be friends.

In the midst of these negotiations, and soon after Cardinal Hugo had left England, another legate landed on our shore (c. July 22, 1176). This was Vivian, cardinal of St. Stefano Rotondo, who came with a legatine commission for Ireland, Scotland, and the neighboring islands. As King Henry had not asked for him, he received a very different reception to that accorded to Hugo, and, before being allowed to proceed, had to swear that in the performance of his office he would do nothing against the king or his kingdom.

Proceeding to Scotland, he embarked at Whithorn for the Isle of Man (December 1176). Thence, after causing its King Godred to enter the legitimate bonds of matrimony, he proceeded to Ireland (c. January 6), where, as usual at this period, he found war going on. John de Courci was engaged in invading Ulster, and although Vivian or his suit suffered considerable annoyance at the hands of some of John's troops, the legate used all his eloquence to try to effect a treaty between King Roderick (Rory MacDonlevy) and John, on condition that the Irish should pay a yearly tribute. But he spoke in vain, and, though he bade the Irish fight for their country, and gave them his blessing, the mail clad knights and the English archers were too strong for them. De Courci took and defeated Roderick, capturing the bishop of his capital (Down). Unable to effect anything more than the release of the bishop, Vivian proceeded to Dublin, and held a synod of the bishops and clergy of Ireland (March 13).

According to Giraldus, Vivian there made a public declaration of the right of the king of England to Ireland and the confirmation of the Pope, and strictly commanded and enjoined both the clergy and the people, under pain of excommunication, on no rash pretence to presume to withdraw their allegiance. Even if the legate did make this

declaration, he would appear to have expressed his disapproval of such wanton raids as that of de Courci; for we are told that Henry's officers bade him either leave the country or act along with them.

Vivian accordingly returned to England, and, under Henry's protection, set out for Scotland, because the chief object of his coming to these shores had been to regulate the relations of the Scottish Church to the English Church. Henry had taken advantage of the capture of the Scotch king, William the Lion, to force from him an acknowledgment of his suzerainty, and of the ancient rights of the English over the Scotch Church (December 1174). At a council held at Northampton (January 1176), to which King William and the bishops of Scotland were summoned, the latter were formally called upon to render that obedience to the Church of England to which they were traditionally bound. The Scottish prelates promptly rejoined that they owed no such obedience; and when Roger of York attempted to prove that both custom and pontifical bulls showed that the bishops of Whithorn (Candida Cassa, or Galloway) and Glasgow were subject to his jurisdiction, Jocelin, bishop of the latter see, replied: "The Church of Glasgow is the special daughter of the Roman Church and is exempt from the jurisdiction of any bishop; and if in the past the Church of York had some authority over that of Glasgow, it is certain that it has none now". Whatever case Roger might have had was ruined by Richard, archbishop of Canterbury, who wished that the Scottish Church should be subject to him. He therefore persuaded Henry to allow the Scottish bishops to depart without offering any subjection to the Church of England.

No sooner had they returned home, than they sent envoys secretly to Alexander and begged him to take them under his protection, and secure them from any dependence on the English Church. The embassy of Vivian was the Pope's reply to this petition. However, before the cardinal legate was dispatched by Alexander, the latter received a letter, brought by agents of Roger of York, purporting to have come from the king of Scotland. In this letter William acknowledged the subjection of the Scottish Church, and asked the Pope to confirm the jurisdiction of York over it. But such a document is inconsistent with what we have seen both Hoveden and Benedict relate about the final issue of the council of Northampton, and its authenticity was suspected by Alexander. In a letter which he addressed to Roger of York (March 13, 1176), he said that he could not altogether comply with the king's demands, as the seal of his letter was broken; and then added, very diplomatically, that he is sending Roger a copy of the king's letter in order that he may keep it as evidence. As the manuscript evidence for the genuineness of this letter of William is allowed to be good, it is quite possible that the king may have been forced to write it after the council at Northampton. At any rate, a few months later, after Vivian had left him for the North, Alexander, evidently aware of the state of the case, notified the Scotch bishops that he had meanwhile forbidden Roger to exercise any jurisdiction over them, July 30, 1176.

Vivian held his council at Edinburgh on August 1, 1177. It is not known whether he touched on the question of the independence of the Scotch Church. Perhaps his oath to Henry may have prevented him from coming to any decision on the subject. But it is quite possible that, when Benedict says that on the close of the council the Pope recalled Vivian owing to his rapacity, he is simply calumniating the cardinal because he proclaimed the dependence of the Scotch Church on the Pope alone. All we really know

about this council is that Vivian repealed some decrees and published some new ones. It was afterwards pretended that among the latter some were aimed at certain privileges of the Cistercians. But, when Alexander reaffirmed their immunities, he declared that he did not believe that Vivian would have presumed to make such decrees, thereby contravening well-known papal pronouncements.

With a repetition of the statement already made, *viz.*, that the dependence of the Scotch Church on Rome alone was decided by Clement III, we must terminate our account of Alexander's relations with these islands; for, if we were to attempt to treat of all of them the end would be too long a coming, and sufficient has been said to illustrate them.

THE EAST

For the sake of furnishing a fuller idea of the magnitude of the task on which Alexander was engaged, we will give an outline at least of other important affairs to which he had to give his attention. The history of his relations with the Western Roman Empire has already shown him in contact with the Eastern Roman Empire. While he was wisely guiding the destinies of the Roman Church, the childish vanity and rashness, the shameless licentiousness and the empty-headed extravagance of Manuel I, Comnenus, was finally, despite his great personal strength and courage, ruining the empire of Byzantium. His defeat by the Sultan of Iconium and his Seljoukian Turks at Myriokephalon in Phrygia was fatal (1176), and when he died in 1180 the power and the glory of the Byzantine Empire perished. To him, with his inflated ideas of his own power and importance, the pretensions of Frederick Barbarossa to universal dominion were intolerable, and, as we have seen, he supported the Italian cities against him, giving them of the money of which he had none to spare. To humble Frederick he recognized Alexander as true Pope, and endeavored to unite the Pope with him against his rival. Throughout almost the whole of Alexander's pontificate ambassadors were constantly passing between the Byzantine and papal courts. Indignant, or at least feigning to be so, at Frederick's interference in papal elections, Manuel had acknowledged Alexander as the true Pope, and Greek vanity pretended that he had restored him to the throne whence Frederick had driven him. To gain the goodwill of the Romans, the Basileus gave his niece in marriage to Odo Frangipane; and he had the satisfaction of seeing his image, like those of his predecessors in days long gone by, honorably received in Rome

To win over the Pope he sent him a great sum of money, and an offer to avenge him on Frederick, and to unite the two churches under him as they used to be, if only he would acknowledge him as sole emperor (1168). But Alexander was cautious. Though Frederick had treated him shamefully, he had no mind to break the convention by which Eugenius III and Frederick had agreed not to let the Greek into Italy (1153). He accordingly returned the money to the ambassadors, and, whilst urging that the emperor's propositions necessitated great care and prudence, sent two cardinals to Constantinople. He also encouraged Hugh Etherianus, the Tuscan, who at Manuel's request had written a work to show that, according to the Greek Fathers themselves, the

Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and from the Son; and he begged him to urge the Greek emperor to work for the unity of the churches.

Here we may anticipate the course of events a little to tell what came of the efforts of Manuel and Alexander to bring about the union of the Greek and Latin Churches. Throughout all his reign Manuel had favored the Latins. He had been twice married and had on both occasions chosen a Latin princess. He had also espoused his children to Latins, and employed Latins as far as ever he could. In the eyes of his Greek subjects this was to pour oil on the flames. They hated the Latins already on religious grounds. In their arrogance, says William of Tyre, they call those “heretics who do not follow their frivolous traditions, whereas they themselves rather deserve the name for inventing or following new and pestilential opinions against the Roman Church and the faith of the apostles Peter and Paul, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail (St. Matt. XVI. 18)”. The favor shown to the Latins by Manuel inflamed this hatred to a white heat, and the disorders that followed Manuel’s death (1180) gave them an opportunity of gratifying their malevolent feelings. Alexius II, Manuel’s son and successor, was but a boy on his father’s death, and the usual troubles of a child’s rule began at once. Under the pretence of delivering the youthful emperor from evil counsellors, the unprincipled Andronicus, cousin of Manuel, forced his way into the city. The greatest confusion followed, and the populace, taking advantage of it, turned against the Latins. According to a distinguished Greek contemporary, there was some justification for this, as the Latins were not merely in favor of the ruling dynasty, but had been induced to engage to take up arms in its behalf by a promise of being allowed to plunder and rule the city. However this may be, certain it is that the sixty thousand Latins were not in arms when Andronicus burst into the city, and even Eustathius himself cannot find words to express the barbarous treatment meted out to the unfortunate Latins. Not only were their houses and many of their ships burnt, but their women and children were slaughtered before their eyes with the most revolting barbarity. The most distinguished victim of the massacre was Cardinal John, “whom the Roman pontiff had dispatched to Constantinople, at the petition of the Emperor Manuel, to bring the Greek Church under the laws and authority of the Church of Rome”. When urged to fly, he would do no more than put on his sacred vestments, saying, “Be flight far from me. I stand here for the unity of the Church by the command of the lord Pope Alexander”. Not content with murdering the intrepid cardinal, clad though he was in his priestly robes, the Greeks dragged his body, tied to a dog, through the streets of the city, and then half burnt it, and threw it into a hole. In their agony the Latins called on God to avenge them, and in the sack of Constantinople by the Latins (1204), and in the capture of his own city of Thessalonica, Eustathius saw the answer to those prayers.

Alarmed at the terrible defeat of Manuel at Myriokephalon, and at the advance of the great Saladin, Alexander issued, a few months before his death, his last call to the Crusades, and there is also extant one of the last letters written by Manuel. It was addressed “to the most holy Pope”, by Manuel, “in Christ our Lord, faithful emperor, born in the purple, ruler, sublime, powerful Augustus, autocrator of the Romans, Comnenus”. It is a request that the Pope will cause a legate to accompany the Crusaders in order to prevent them from working any harm to the Empire.

Matthew Paris has preserved for us a most interesting notice of that Sultan of Iconium whose troops inflicted on the army of Manuel the dread defeat of Myriokephalon. Convinced of the truth of Christianity, and anxious to receive baptism, Kilij Arslan II (1155-92) sent to Alexander for instruction in the Christian faith. In fulfillment of the wishes of the Sultan, the Pope sent to him not only a well-qualified teacher, but a short treatise of his own on the Catholic doctrine. Written to a Moslem, the treatise naturally develops at considerable length the dogmas of the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation and human life of God the Son, and the portion of Our Lady. Following the papal exhortations, the Sultan, we are assured by the same historian, received baptism, though secretly, for fear of his unbelieving subjects. But in this Matthew Paris is probably mistaken, for the Sultan of Iconium though he promised help to the Christians, proved a traitor, “a deceitful man, thirsting for Christian blood”, who “under a fraudulent pretext professed friendship towards us, and, concealing the malignant venom of his heart, sought thereby to destroy us when off our guard”. So writes the contemporary eyewitness Geoffrey of Vinsauf, or whoever was the author of the *Itinerarium Ricardi*.

But the name of Alexander is connected with a much more famous Eastern potentate than the Sultan of Iconium. He corresponded with that Prester John whose royal and priestly dignity, and whose vast kingdom, variously assigned to northern Asia, to India, and to Africa, fired the imagination of the Middle Ages.

When the historian, Bishop Otto of Frising, visited Pope Eugenius III at Viterbo (1145), he met the bishop of Gabala. From him he heard of “a certain John” or “Prester John” (Presbyter Johannes), who lived “beyond Persia and Armenia in the remotest East”; who, “at once king and priest, was along with his people a Christian, though a Nestorian”, and who had only been prevented by unaffordable rivers from marching to deliver Jerusalem from the domination of the Moslem.

The missionary zeal of the Nestorians had at one time been very great, and the remarkable bilingual inscription of Si-Ngan-Fou (781) is a standing proof of their having established Christianity in China in the eighth century. They had, indeed, made converts in China in the preceding century. In the same age they were followed by the Moslems, and all the way from the Asiatic borders of the Eastern Roman empire into China, a traveller in the early Middle Ages would have found throughout that immense tract of country communities of Christians, of Moslems, and of heathens. In northern Asia, in the neighborhood of the great lake of Baikal, near the upper Orkhon, and between the rivers Kerulen and Selegna which flow into Baikal, our voyager would, in the early part of the eleventh century, have encountered the Karait Turks who, along with their khan or king, professed the Nestorian faith.

If, then, it cannot be doubted that a Moslem Sultan of the Seljukian Turks consulted Alexander III about the Catholic faith, it cannot be said to be improbable that a Nestorian khan of Karait Turks should have done the same (c. 1176). For if the Crusades turned the attention of the West to the affairs of the East, they also caused the peoples of the East to be curious about those of the West. At any rate, as may be gathered from a letter of Alexander, among those Westerns who now began to penetrate into the Far East, was the Pope’s own physician, Philip. On his return he assured the

Pope that he had conversed with the chief men of “John, the magnificent king of the Indians, and most holy of priests”, and that they had assured him that it was their ruler’s wish “to be instructed in the Catholic and Apostolic doctrines, and that it was his fervent desire that he and the realms entrusted to him should never hold any doctrine at variance with those of the Apostolic See”. Alexander, accordingly, wrote to the aforesaid “illustrious John”, and, impressing upon him that the Apostolic See was “the head and mistress of all those who believed in Christ”, assured him that he had heard from common report of his good deeds since he became a Christian, and from his own physician of his desire for instruction in the Catholic faith, and for a place at Jerusalem in which good men from his kingdom might be fully taught the true faith. Despite, therefore, “the far distant and unknown countries” in which he lived, he had decided, he continued, to send him the said Philip, who might instruct him in those articles in which he was not in unison with the Christian and Catholic faith. In return, the Pope begged him to send him properly authenticated persons and letters so that he might learn his wishes fully.

But to this letter, “given at Venice on the Rialto”, no answer ever came. We know not whether Master Philip ever saw the face of the Karait Togroul. For he it was who was seemingly the original Prester John, and who, from the fact that he had received the title of *Ouang* or *Awang* (king) from the emperor of China, was known to the Moslem chroniclers as Ong Khan. At any rate, the Popes had begun to correspond with rulers in the remote East, and at intervals all through the Middle Ages intercourse was renewed between them and the peoples of Far Cathay, and hopes were entertained not only that they would become Catholics (if not so already), but that they would deliver the Holy Land from the Moslem.

If the voice of Alexander made itself heard in the distant East, it also resounded in Ultima Thule; and amidst the ice and snows of the North his words roused his lieutenants to struggle for the complete emancipation of the Church. Even in Iceland, as well as in Norway and Sweden, the authority of Alexander made itself felt. In his name Thorlac, bishop of Scalholt in Iceland, made an attempt—which, however, was only partially successful—to free the lands of the Church from lay control (1179). He urged, to quote the interesting words of his biographer, “that the ordinance of the Apostles themselves gave him power over all that belonged to God without any distinction. The holy Fathers of the Church, and the Popes, the successors of the Apostles, have bidden and ordained the same throughout all Christendom in the canon law; and now the Pope (Alexander) has also bidden Archbishop Eystein to carry out the same rule in Norway, and it has been accepted there. Wherefore it is not lawful nor is it to be borne that this poor country should not stand under the same law as holdeth good there”

Passing over Alexander’s consecrating Eystein (1161), and giving him the pallium, and his sending the legate Stephen to Norway (1163), we will note that in August 1164, at “the prayers of Charles (Swerkerson), the illustrious king of the Swedes and Goths, and of the bishops of his kingdom”, he erected Upsala into a metropolitan see with four suffragans. Though Stephen, the first metropolitan, received the pallium, he was not exempted from submission to the southern archbishop of Lund, who was recognized by the Pope as the primate of Sweden.

Among the extant letters of Alexander to the new metropolitan, there is one on the subject of the nation which adjoined the Swedes on the north, and occupied the country to the east of them on the opposite shore of the Gulf of Bothnia, viz. the Finns. Under Eric IX (1150-60), known in Sweden as St. Eric, in whose reign Christianity was first firmly established in Upper Sweden, the piracies of the heathen Finns forced the Swedes to take up arms against them. Vanquished by Eric, they were forced to receive baptism (c. 1157). But it has always been difficult to coerce the Finns, and they murdered their first apostle Henry, bishop of Upsala (1158). Oppressed, however, by enemies in their turn, the Finns adopted the cunning policy of promising faithfully to practise the Christian faith when they needed the help of the Swedes, and then of returning to heathenism and persecuting the teachers of Christianity as soon as the need of assistance had passed away. Archbishop Stephen reported this conduct of the Finns to the Pope, and asked his advice. Alexander thereupon pointed out to him and to Duke Guthermus that they should not suffer the Christian name to be thus mocked, and bade them in future only to afford the desired help if the Finns gave sufficient security of their intention of abiding by their promises. But the Finns were very restless. Crusades had to be organized against them by the rulers of Sweden, and Christian colonies planted among them; and yet it was not till the very close of the thirteenth century that they were really Christians obedient to their bishop at Abo.

On the southern coasts of the Gulf of Finland was another branch of the Finns, known as the Esthonians. The latter were often in alliance with their brethren of Finland, and with them frequently perpetrated the greatest cruelties on their Christian neighbors. The letters of Alexander often mention them. Anxious to assist in their conversion, he wrote to the archbishop of Drontheim, in Norway, begging him to let a certain monk of the name of Nicholas, himself an Esthonian, go to help Bishop Fulk, who was desirous of becoming the apostle of Esthonia. "For", says the Pope, "the laws of God and of man and the call of charity require us to work for the common good, and to employ all our anxious care for the conversion of the infidel to the knowledge of the true light, and to the culture and teaching of the doctrine of the Christian faith". It was not, however, till the next century that the savage Esthonians were converted to the faith of Christ, and then, too, not without the aid of the sword. Meanwhile, Alexander had to strive to unite against them all the Christian countries of the North, offering an indulgence of a year to all such as confessed and repented of their sins, and fought against "the ferocity of the Esthonians".

Did space permit, we could tell much of what the guiding and elevating hand of Alexander effected in Spain and Portugal, in Hungary and Dalmatia, and in the country of "Culin, the great Ban of Bosnia".

Space must, however, be found to show that the hand that could strike and threaten emperors and kings could protect the weak and the poor. Among the weak we may reckon the Jews, concerning whose relations with Alexander, a Jewish contemporary, the famous traveller, Benjamin of Tudela, has left us some interesting information. "Rome", he wrote, "is the head of the kingdoms of Christendom, and contains about two hundred Jews, who occupy an honorable position and pay no tribute, and amongst them are officials of the Pope Alexander, the spiritual head of all Christendom. Great scholars reside here, at the head of them being Rabbi Daniel, the

chief rabbi, and R. Jechiel, an official of the Pope. He is a handsome young man of intelligence and wisdom, and he has the entry of the Pope's palace; for he is the steward of his house and of all that he has"

Besides thus showing by example how the Jews ought to be treated, Alexander's public decrees in their behalf proved him a much more enlightened ruler than the mass of his contemporaries. The Jews were not to be compelled to receive baptism, were not to be robbed, wounded, or slain, or deprived of any of the privileges they had been wont to enjoy in any country. He was opposed, however, to Christians being regular servants of Jews, or paying homage to them, or to Jews having Christian slaves, or being allowed to retain any pecuniary hold over parish churches, or to build new synagogues.

The confidence which the Jews had in Pope Alexander was shared by heretics. Some of the latter had fled to him from the kingdom of Louis of France, and, professing their unwillingness to return, wished "to receive just judgment from the Pope"

As usual with the successors of St. Peter, Alexander was a friend of the poor, and endeavored to further their interests both directly and indirectly. He praises Casimir, duke of Poland, for abolishing such customs as enabled the nobles to seize the grain or the horses of the poor agricultural labourers; he condemned usury, and commended the archbishop of Narbonne and several bishops of the south of France for their zeal in lessening oppressive tolls; he opposed slavery on the ground that God is the common Father of all, and that we are all free by nature; and finally, as a glorious proof that nothing that was for man's advantage was beneath his notice, he confirmed regulations for the improvement of the cultivation of the vine. In addition to his other labours, Alexander, as will perhaps have been already observed, embraced those of a peacemaker. And he sought to make peace not merely for its own sake, but also in the interests of war; for he laboured to put an end to hostilities between Christian princes in order that they might be free to take up arms against the Turk.

Could anything more be wanting to justify the following reflections of an able modern historian on the position of the Popes in Europe at this time, reflections evoked by consideration of some phases of the career of this very Alexander whose truly universal interests we have been considering? "It was not only the care of all the churches", writes Miss Kate Norgate, "that rested upon a medieval Pope, but the care of all the states as well. The court of Rome had grown into the final court of appeal for all Christendom; the Pope was expected to be the universal referee, arbitrator, and peacemaker of Europe, to hold the balance between contending parties, to penetrate and disentangle the intricacies of political situations which baffled the skill of the most experienced diplomatists, to exercise a sort of equitable jurisdiction on a vast scale over the whole range of political as well as social life"

Here must we tear ourselves away from the learned and "the holy and just" Rolando Bandinelli, whom Gregorovius hails as "one of the greatest of all Popes", in whom he recognises a man "endowed with true dignity", and whom he regards as "the most fortunate of Popes". So great were the merits of Alexander that they commended themselves even to Voltaire. According to him, mankind owed more to Alexander than to any other man in the Middle Ages, and he maintained that, if men had not lost their rights, it was principally owing to the exertions of Alexander III.

LUCIUS III

A.D. 1181-1185

EASTERN EMPERORS

Alexius II (Comnenus), 1 180-3

Andronicus I (Comnenus), 1 183-5

Isaac II (Angelus), 1185-95.

KINGS OF JERUSALEM.

Baldwin IV (the Leper), 1173-85.

Baldwin V (the Child), 1 185-86.

LUCIUS III, the first of five Popes whose average reign was only a little over four years, was a native of Lucca, the son of a distinguished citizen Bonagiunta, and originally bore the name of Ubaldus (or Humbald) Allucingolus. He is said to have been born in 1097: and the assertion may well be true, for we know that he was very old when he was elected Pope. After receiving his general education in the city of his birth, he was trained in canon law, in the most learned city of Pisa. Calle thence to Rome, he was made cardinal-priest of Santa Prassede by Innocent II (1141), and by Eugenius III (1159) cardinal-bishop of the sees of Ostia and Velletri, which had been united by that pontiff (1150). The talents of Ubaldus induced various Popes to send him to Constantinople, Palermo, and other places on important legations, and he was named at the peace congress of Venice one of the commissioners to arbitrate on the donation of the Countess Matilda.

Two days after the death of Alexander he was unanimously elected Pope (September 1), and, in allusion to his native town, took the name of Lucius III. He was crowned on the following Sunday (September 6) at his episcopal city of Velletri. The ceremony of his enthronisation was performed by Theodwine of Porto and the archpriest of Ostia, "according to custom"; the custom being that, when the bishop of Ostia was not available for this purpose, he should be represented by his archpriest.

According to Ptolemy, Lucca's chief historian (d. 1327), the records of that city furnished him with such facts regarding Lucius III as sufficed to show that when he

became Pope he did not forget the land of his birth. He granted privileges to its churches and to its coinage. From the seventh century under the Lombards, Lucca had enjoyed the privilege of coining money. With the concurrence of the Emperor Frederick and his son Henry, Lucius decreed that the products of the Lucchese mint should be the coins of recognised currency in Tuscany, Campania, the March of Ancona (Marchia), and in Rome and its district. Frederick had already made a similar decree with regard to the money of Pavia and Lombardy. Pilgrims to Rome also (Romipetae) were to use the money of Lucca.

A month or two after his consecration Lucius went to Rome, and it has been conjectured that it was the influence of Christian, archbishop of Mainz, which enabled him to do so. Certain it is that it was during the course of the year 1181 that Christian was released from captivity, and that he afterwards exerted himself in the Pope's behalf. It may well be, therefore, that his recovered power effected the establishment of Lucius in Rome. But in any case the Pope was not fated to stop there long, and the whole of his pontificate was embittered by the conduct of the Romans. It would appear that, in his relations with the people of Rome, Lucius was not of so accommodating a temper as Alexander II, and it is said that he refused to grant them certain privileges which his predecessors had granted them. But Tusculum would appear to have been again the real cause of the trouble between the Pope and his people. Because Lucius, following the dictates of justice and the example of his predecessors, would not gratify the venomous but childish hatred of the Romans for Tusculum, he had to leave the city (March 1182) and spend the rest of his days in exile.

A mutilated portion of the last fragment of the *Annales Romani* which has come down to our times informs us of the cause of the quarrel between Rome and Tusculum in the year 1182. Word was brought to the Romans that the people of Tusculum were repairing the walls which, as we have seen, they had so treacherously dismantled. Straightway, leaving the government of Rome in the hands of twenty-five senators, the Roman militia marched out against Tusculum, and, putting to the sword all its people whom they managed to surprise, drove the rest into the citadel. To this they laid immediate siege, and gave its gallant defenders no rest by day or night

Reduced to the last extremity by the attacks of the Romans from without and by thirst and disease from within, the Tusculans contrived to inform the Pope at Velletri of their sad condition. Lucius, accordingly, after a vain appeal to the Senate, turned to Archbishop Christian, who, despite the summer heat, at once raised a considerable force (1183) and advanced on Rome. The mere terror of his name was quite enough for the effervescing courage of the Romans, and twice did it suffice to put them to flight. Ravaging the district round Rome, as the Romans had ravaged the district round Tusculum, the archbishop marched to that little city, and assisted at the reconstruction of its walls.

Unfortunately, however, for the cause of the Pope, the heats were too much for Christian. Roman fever did what Roman valour could not effect: it struck down the warlike prelate. Face to face with death, the poor archbishop could not but reflect on the great difference there had been between his life of war and licence and his profession. Accordingly, he confessed his sins to the Pope himself, resigned all his dignities into his

hands, resolved to take the cross should God spare his life, and received also from the Pope the Viaticum and Extreme Unction. But the hour of Christian had come, and he died on August 25, 1183. Consoled by his edifying death, but anxious for his salvation on account of his evil life, Lucius exhorted the clergy of Germany to pray for his soul, that their prayers might avail with God both for the pardon of Christian and, as a reward for their piety, for their own salvation.

Deprived of his powerful protector, Lucius appealed in vain to various princes for help. From England, as we shall see later, he received some money, but no one at first sent him troops. The Romans had now their own way, and a brutal use they made of their opportunities. Taking the field in the spring (1184), they devastated the territory of Tusculum; but, unable to capture the city, they devoted to the flames the hill cities of Paliano, Serrone, and Praeneste (Penestrum?). Especially did they rage against any clerical adherents of the Pope. On one of their raids they captured a number of clerics. Putting out the eyes of all of them except one, they set on their heads paper mitres on each of which the name of some cardinal was written. The mitre of the cleric whose eyes had been spared bore the inscription, "Lucius, the wicked simoniac". Then, mounted on asses with their faces towards the tails, the poor sightless men, placed under the guidance of the one who had not been deprived of his eyes, were sent off to the Pope.

Horrified at this worse than brutal deed, Lucius anathematised its perpetrators, forbade all pilgrimages to the "shrine of the apostles, and, justly" thinking that it was hopeless to dream of reconciliation with the Romans, shook off the dust from beneath his feet against them, and betook himself to Lombardy to seek help from the emperor (June 1184). He journeyed north by the east coast, consecrating churches as he went along. The most curious record of these consecrations is a contemporary inscription in the exterior wall of the duomo of Modena. After setting forth the fact of the Pope's consecrating the Church of St. Geminiano, the inscription tells of his triumphant departure from the city, when he was accompanied by over two thousand men with lighted tapers (July 14).

Before Lucius met the emperor, he had induced Count Berthold of Kunsberg, Frederick's representative in Italy, to march to the defence of Tusculum, and to recover the fortress of Rocca di Papa which, overlooked by Mount Algidus, and strongly situated on an isolated cone of rock at the margin of the amphitheatre known as the Camp of Hannibal, lorded it over a portion of the Campagna. But the fortress on the side of Monte Cavo was too well defended to be captured by the legate, and he had to content himself with harrying the cattle of the Romans.

Thus held in check by the count the valiant Romans began to wish for peace, and, readily accepting the money which England and other countries had presented to the Pope, they agreed to a suspension of hostilities. Hoveden, indeed, whom we are quoting, calls this arrangement between the Romans and the Pope "a peace necessary to himself and to the Roman Church". But we shall have to wait for the days of Clement III before an understanding, which could be truly described as a peace, was arrived at between the Pope and the citizens of Rome.

When Lucius reached the north of Italy he found settled peace between the Empire and the communes. In the preceding year (1183) the peace of Constance had put the seal on that of Venice. The Lombard communes had won their freedom, and the great war was at an end, the war in which quite an exceptional share of sympathy can be accorded to all the parties concerned. The great figure of Barbarossa ... upholding what he regarded as the sacred rights of the Empire; the steadfast and lofty-minded pontiff, the champion of the freedom of the Church and of the liberties of the communes; the nameless heroes, with their watchword of Liberty, who closed round the war-car of Milan at Legnano; the unknown statesmen who planned the league, all alike deserve our admiration, and compel our respect. But though Barbarossa did not again wage the same fierce war on the Church, it cannot be said that he displayed the same good feeling towards the Papacy as he did towards the free cities of the Lombard plain.

Lucius reached Verona on July 22, and received a splendid reception from its people. About three months later he was joined by the emperor, who was as anxious to interview the Pope as Lucius was to meet him. Many most important questions were debated between them, of which some concerned fundamental points of hierarchical government or of civil policy on which the Church and the Empire were in complete opposition, and of which others regarded general questions of civil and ecclesiastical policy on which both powers were agreed. Questions of the former kind dealt with episcopal elections and the relation of the kingdom of Sicily to the Empire, whereas the Crusades and the treatment of heretics appertained to the latter category.

On the death of Arnold, archbishop of Trier (1183), took place a double election, and, as is usual in such cases, it is not easy to ascertain the truth about it. However, as the author of the *Gesta Trevirorum*, who strongly favours the candidate accepted by the emperor, frankly allows that no sooner was Arnold dead than imperial emissaries presented themselves, and, setting aside Arnold's will, violently seized his property, we may be allowed to suspect undue imperial interference, and to prefer the narratives of Arnold of Lubeck and of the biographer of St. Hildegard to that of the author of the *Gesta*. According to both the last-named authors, one Volmar (or Volcmar) was first elected, and that, too, by the larger and more responsible party. The other side, however, alleging that his election was void because his party had anticipated the time at which it had been agreed to hold the election, maintained that their candidate Rudolf was properly elected because he had been chosen at the appointed time. Volmar at once appealed to the Pope, and Rudolf to the emperor, on the ground that, according to the Concordat of Worms (1122), the emperor had certain rights in the case of disputed elections. The Concordat had, in fact, laid down that elections to prelacies had to be free, but that, if any disagreement arose, the emperor, acting on the advice of the metropolitan and the bishops of the province, should support the party which had more justice on its side. But whatever rights the Concordat had given Frederick, there is no evidence that he attempted to fulfil the conditions according to which they had been granted to him. The *Gesta*, indeed, asserts that the emperor acted in accordance with the decision of the Princes, but says nothing of an episcopal examination into the facts of the case. At any rate, Frederick granted Rudolf the investiture of the temporalities of the see, and asked the Pope to consecrate him. The affair was ardently discussed at Verona, and, as Lucius was convinced that Volmar's election was canonical, he would not

comply with the emperor's wishes. The result was that, as both Pope and emperor felt that their rights were deeply involved in the case, neither of them would give way, and no decision on the matter was come to at Verona. The schism lasted for seven years, and, as Volmar endeavored to enlist in his cause the kings of France and England, the double election of Trier embraced half Europe.

Frederick, and especially his son Henry, who had already given every indication of the possession of a haughty, savage temper that would brook no opposition, soon had recourse to violence. The emperor threatened with flogging or death anyone who should be found carrying letters of appeal to Rome, and his son, "violating the rights of the city of Trier", plundered the houses of Volmar's adherents. To this Urban III, the successor of Lucius, replied by declaring the election of Rudolf null and void, and by consecrating Volmar with his own hands, though, according to the very partial Gesta, he had previously sworn not to do so. The emperor retorted by forcing the people of Trier to receive Rudolf, while the Pope proceeded to appoint Volmar his legate. Elated by this new authority, Volmar summoned the suffragans of the archdiocese to meet him in council, and, freely launching sentences of excommunication, caused dreadful confusion. And although by an alliance between Philip Augustus and Frederick he was deprived of the protection of France, he secured that of England and of the archbishop of Cologne (December 1187). However, on the death of Urban, who is said by the Gesta to have opposed Frederick on principle because he had grievously maltreated some of his relations when he captured Milan, Volmar did not find so much favour with his short-lived successor, Gregory VIII. Indeed, that pontiff sternly forbade him to issue any more sentences of excommunication without the consent of the Holy See. Besides, with him everything had to give way to the Crusades. Jerusalem had been captured by Saladin (1187), and it was necessary to pacify the emperor at all costs in order that he might lead a new Crusade for the recovery of the Holy Land.

The long dispute, however, was only settled in the pontificate of Clement III. Distressed at the disastrous consequences which had followed the quarrel between the Church and the Empire on this election question, Clement continued the work of his immediate predecessor, and strove hard to prevent the rise therefrom of any further evils. To facilitate the settlement of the difficulty, he summoned the archbishop (Volmar) to Rome. But, for some unexplained reason, Volmar would not obey the summons. Clement, therefore, addressed a letter to the chapter of Trier and to the people of the archdiocese absolving them from all obedience either in spiritual or temporal concerns to Volmar or to Rudolf, and "by virtue of his authority" he deprived the archbishop of all rights in the diocese of Trier.

Finally, all who, simply by reason of the schism, had suffered in their goods or privileges were to be compensated, and as to Volmar, "the Apostolic See", said the Pope, "will provide for him honourably elsewhere" The whole affair terminated by the election of "the lord John, chancellor of the Empire", who was universally accepted.

The next item discussed at Verona between Frederick and Lucius, on which they were in absolute disagreement, was the question of the marriage between Frederick's son Henry and Constance, heir to the crown of Sicily. For some years past Frederick, unable to effect his purpose by force of arms, had been striving to absorb the kingdom

of Sicily by marriage. He attempted to bring about a marriage between its king, William II, and one of his daughters. This scheme was checked by Alexander III, who helped to wed to the Sicilian king, Jane, daughter of Henry II of England (February 1177). Foiled in this direction, Frederick afterwards proposed to William a matrimonial alliance between his son Henry and the king's aunt Constance, then the heir-presumptive to the throne of Sicily. According to Peter of Eboli, Pope Lucius promoted this scheme; but, considering the whole course of papal policy, this is to the last degree unlikely, and, as Peter shows himself ill-informed in the very passage where he makes this assertion, no weight need be attached to it. William listened to the proposal, and the engagement was solemnly proclaimed at Augsburg (October 1184). But it was only after the death of Lucius that, in presence of two papal legates, the marriage was celebrated at Milan (January 27, 1186) which was to bring so much trouble to the Papacy, and was to end the Norman rule in Sicily.

But if Lucius and Frederick took very different views of some matters, there were others on which they were in complete accord. They were both agreed that something must be done for the Holy Land. For many years the power of the renowned Saladin, Sultan of Egypt, had been steadily increasing, and one misfortune after another had been dogging the rulers of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. Baldwin IV (1173-1185) was a leper, and as the disease soon rendered him incapable, Guy of Lusignan, the husband of Baldwin's sister Sibyl, was declared regent. But Guy appears to have been incompetent. The regency was taken from him, and given to Raymond III, count of Tripoli (1184). The following year Baldwin the Leper died, and in the year after that the young Baldwin V, the child of Sibyl and Guy, also died. With great unwillingness on the part of many, Sibyl was crowned queen of the Latin kingdom (September 1198), and her weak husband, Guy of Lusignan, became king, the last Christian king who actually ruled in Jerusalem. For some years before this, despairing but almost fruitless appeals for help had been addressed to the princes of Europe. A very special attempt to obtain assistance was made in the year 1184, when Heraclius, patriarch of Jerusalem, and the Grand Masters of the Templars and Hospitallers appeared before the Pope and the emperor at Verona. To their entreaties the Pope added his, and, though unable or unwilling to act at once (perhaps because he thought that immediate help was not required), Barbarossa nevertheless promised to take the cross in due course.

Among those whom the meeting of the Pope and the emperor had drawn to Verona was an envoy of Saladin himself. He had come with letters to the Pope from the great Sultan and from his brother Seif ed Din (Safadin), at this time representing Saladin in Egypt. Lucius and Alexander before him had written to these two potentates in the interests of peace and of an exchange of prisoners, and they returned most courteous replies. Saladin, styling himself the most powerful of all the kings of the East, begins his letter by saying that he is aware that by the will of God the Pope occupies the highest position in the world, and that all Christians obey him. He has therefore listened with all respect to what the Pope had to say concerning peace, but he must point out that the prisoners he holds are persons of importance, whereas those held by the Christians are men of no account. The prisoners should therefore be valued for ransom purposes, and the side which had the less valuable number of prisoners should pay the difference

in money to the other side. The Sultan concludes by saying that the more important matters have been committed to the ears of the Pope's legate, Oliver Vitalis.

The letter addressed by Saladin's brother "lord of all the Saracens", to Lucius, "the supreme lord of Christendom", while full of "his most victorious brother", is practically to the same effect.

Lucius, however, understood perfectly well that he was getting from the Saracen rulers nothing more than honied words. Any doubt he might have entertained on the subject was set at rest by the words of Saladin's envoy. He declared that his master styled himself the "glorious Joseph of Egypt", and claimed Jerusalem as his by hereditary right from Sara. Accordingly, disappointed that Frederick did not immediately assume the cross, Lucius dispatched the patriarch Heraclius and his companions to England, and entrusted them with a letter to Henry, grandson of Fulk, the late king of Jerusalem, first-cousin to the then reigning King Baldwin IV, and already pledged to the defence of the Holy Land. By it he endeavored to persuade that monarch to put his promises into effect, and to march without delay to the succour of "the land of Jerusalem ... which is now tottering to its fall". He assured Henry that Christendom looked up to the kings of England as the most distinguished for glory in arms and nobleness of spirit, and urged him to stretch forth his mighty arm to protect "the members of Him who has in His mercy allowed you to reach such a height of glory ... Saladin is to such a degree putting forth all the might of his wickedness for the destruction of the faithful, that, unless the vehement onset of his malice is checked the land that was consecrated by the shedding of the vivifying Blood will be polluted by the contact of his most abominable superstitions". But though Henry granted his subjects permission to assure the cross, and gave large sums of money towards the expenses of a crusade, the patriarch could not induce either Henry or Philip of France to take command of an expedition against Saladin

Another very important point also on which both Pope and emperor were agreed was the necessity of checking the spread of certain heresies. It was therefore decreed by the Pope, "with the support of the emperor and the advice of the bishops", that all heresies were to be condemned, especially the Cathari, "those who falsely call themselves Humiliati or the Poor Men of Lyons", the Arnoldists, etc. Those also were anathematised who presumed to preach without permission of the proper authorities, who put forward doctrines on the sacraments of baptism, matrimony, etc., other than those taught by "the holy Roman Church"; and who protected "the consoled (consolati), the believers (credentes), and the perfect (perfecti)".

The decrees against preaching without proper authority were levelled especially against the Waldenses and the Humiliati. Alexander III, who had summoned the former to Rome, was very much affected by the voluntary renunciation of his property which Peter Waldo, their founder, had made, and had even contemplated allowing his followers to preach if they were requested to do so by the parish priests. But, though he had approved the rule of life of the Humiliati, he had expressly forbidden them "to form conventicles, or to preach in public". Both sets of these new sectaries, however, soon disobeyed the Pope's injunctions, and brought on themselves the condemnation of Church and State alike.

This decree, however, did not content itself with subjecting these heretics to spiritual punishments; it proceeded to condemn them to temporal punishments, invoking the aid of the secular arm against them, and instituting an inquisition. Clerics found guilty of the aforesaid errors were, unless repentant, to be degraded and then “left to the discretion of the secular power to receive due punishment”. Laymen also under similar circumstances were left to the same discretion. Even suspects were to be treated in like manner unless they proved their innocence. Such as were convicted of having relapsed into a heresy which they had previously abjured, were to be at once handed over to the secular judgment without more ado. And bishops who refrained from publishing these penalties were to be suspended for three years.

“To this”, continues the decree, “with the advice (*consilio*) of the bishops, and by the suggestion of the emperor and the princes, we add that every bishop by himself ... or by other trustworthy and fit persons, shall once or twice a year visit any parish in which heretics may be reported to reside, and there call upon three or more respectable persons (*boni testimonii viros*), or, if advisable, upon the whole neighborhood, to take an oath that if any one shall know that there are heretics in the place, or any persons holding secret conventicles, or differing in life and manners from the common conversation of the faithful, he will make it his business to point them out to the bishop. All civil authorities were to aid the ecclesiastical authorities in their efforts against heresy when called upon to do so. Finally, it was decided that “all favourers of heretics, as being condemned to perpetual infamy, are not to be admitted as advocates and witnesses, or to other public offices”.

If these decrees be compared with those of Alexander III on the same subject, it will be observed that the antagonism of the Church and State towards heretics is becoming more uncompromising. Unquestionably the cause of this was the baleful dogmas and secret methods of the Cathari, and the subversive doctrines of the followers of Arnold of Brescia.

In the tenth and eleventh centuries there were in Eastern Europe certain sectaries, of whom the chief were the Paulicians and the Bogomils (Friends of God), who held in common, if not the Manichaeian dualistic doctrine of two eternal principles, one good and one evil, at least dogmas opposed to Church authority and to the sacramental system. They were bitterly persecuted by the Byzantine emperors. To escape the avenging sword of the Basileus of Constantinople, many of them fled to the West, and began in secret to spread their mischievous opinions. They engendered the Cathari; or, at any rate, they infused new life into existing remnants of Manichaeian sects which then developed into those bodies of heretics that about this time came to be known as Cathari.

Now, in order to estimate fairly the action of the Church and State in dealing with heretics at this period, it must be borne in mind that the then dominant sect was that of these very Cathari, and that their doctrines did not differ merely speculatively from those of the Catholic Church, but were in actual practice opposed not only to the possibility of an organised Church or State, but to the very existence of the human race. Passing over their abuse of the Church of Rome, and their denial of its most characteristic dogmas, it will be enough if we point out here that, by their refusal to take

oaths, they aimed a death-blow at the whole of Western society, which in the Middle Ages was regulated by the feudal oath; that their denial of the right of the State to take life for any cause told in the same direction; and finally, that their antipathy to sexual relations, and their inculcation of the *Endura*, *i.e.*, suicide, to prevent consent to temptation, were opposed to the continuation of the human race. Nor must it be thought that these doctrines were the vagaries of individual teachers among the Cathari or Albigensians, or that they were forced deductions from practically harmless principles. They were the natural deductions from their fundamental dogma that matter, as created by the eternal principle of evil, was evil in itself, and that contact with it was therefore evil. Hence to hold property was evil, as was also to kill any living thing, except a reptile, because it might be animated by a human soul imprisoned within it as a punishment. Hence also, as we have seen, marital relations, and indeed all family ties, were evil. No wonder then that Maitland, the one of all our historians who has made the most careful examination of the doctrines of the Cathari or Albigensians, concludes that they “were either hypocritical impostors or misguided fanatics”.

Obviously neither the Church nor the State could allow such doctrines to be freely propagated; but neither had the elaborate machinery of complete police supervision, of compulsory education and the rest for dealing with extravagant doctrines, which is in the hands of the modern legislator. Consequently, the men who held these “most depraved doctrines” were not merely excommunicated by the Church, but, with its consent, “they and their goods were placed under the ban of the Empire”

In the decrees of Alexander III and Lucius III against heretics we are watching a change in the policy of the Church in its treatment of them. Considering, on the one hand, the circumstances of the age, its defective legislative and administrative appliances, and its more ordinary use of violent methods; and, on the other hand, considering the outrageous nature of the doctrines of the chief heresies of the age, the employment of force in coping with heretics may possibly have been necessary. But in any case the necessity was regrettable. Not only was such persecution as Alexander sanctioned opposed to the best traditions of the Church, but it opened the way to worse. The emperor Frederick II was soon to decree the death penalty against heresy, which, along with the use of torture, was to be approved by the Popes, and then, despite all papal efforts to the contrary, States were to end by using the excuse of proceeding against heretics to further the objects of their diplomacy, whether good or bad.

In the days of pagan persecution, and even for some time after Constantine’s Edict of Toleration, the Fathers of the Church condemned the use of force in the domain of conscience. “Force and violence are useless”, wrote Lactantius, “for religion cannot be forced”. But when the emperors, become Christian, began to declare themselves “bishops in externals”, and to proclaim that it was their first duty to guard the true religion, and when there sprang up such anti-Christian and anti-social sects as those of the Manicheans and Priscillianists, they made laws against heretics involving exile, confiscation, or even death. But, though in view of the violent conduct of the Circumcelliones even St. Augustine was led to approve of a moderate severity against heretics, still he and the great Fathers of the Church generally were opposed to the infliction of the death penalty. From this teaching it resulted that from the sixth to the beginning of the eleventh century, *i.e.*, during the early Middle Ages, there was hardly

any persecution of heretics, except from time to time of such as were regarded as Manicheans

But, as we have seen, in the eleventh century teachers holding Manichaean opinions came from Eastern Europe, and caused a brisk revival in the West of their pestilential doctrines. The new sectaries were at once persecuted; but for a century and a half the persecution was of a desultory nature, and was rather the outcome of popular outbreaks than the result of definite ecclesiastical or civil legislation or administration. In fact, during that period what little persecution took place was inflicted rather in opposition to the Church than with its permission. It was the period during which "lynch law" seemed sufficient to ensure public morality.

From the year 1150 to 1250, however, the case was very different. The struggle between the Church and the Empire which was then so keen brought about a lowered tone in the spiritual life and relaxed ecclesiastical watchfulness over the sheep of Christ. The wolves became much more numerous and bolder, and both Church and State seemed to think that violence was the readiest way to drive them off. The legislation of Alexander III and Lucius III shows the Church calling in the aid of the secular arm, though not sanctioning the imposition of the death penalty. But, once called in, the secular authority soon got beyond the control of the Church. Finding that the persecution of heretics could be used for State purposes, Frederick II decreed that obstinate heretics should be put to death. Like his famous namesake the first Frederick, Frederick II was greatly influenced by the revived study of the ancient imperial legislation, and at this period canon law and civil law were exerting very considerable influence on each other. And in this case canon law followed the civil law. Gregory IX placed the Inquisition in the hands of the Dominicans and Franciscans, and sanctioned the enforcing of the law of Frederick II. Innocent IV followed in his wake, and, by allowing the use of torture in the examination of heretics, brought the canon law affecting heretics into line with the ordinary procedure of the civil law in dealing with criminals.

It was then "during the thirteenth century that there were established throughout Christendom laws or customs by which heretics were condemned to the flames, and that the pain of fire became everywhere the legal punishment for heresy"

It is no doubt very sad to have to chronicle this rapidly increasing severity against heretics; but at the same time it is necessary to emphasise the fact that the heretics against whom this fierce persecution was directed were not speculative seekers after truth like Peter Abelard, but, for the most part, active disturbers of public order or morality. On this point we have the unexceptional testimony of H. C. Lea. "However much", he writes, "we may deprecate the means used for the suppression (of Catharism), and commiserate those who suffered for conscience' sake, we cannot but admit that the cause of orthodoxy was in this case the cause of progress and civilisation. Had Catharism become dominant, or even had it been allowed to exist on equal terms, its influence could not have failed to prove disastrous. Its asceticism with regard to commerce between the sexes, if strictly enforced, could only have led to the extinction of the race. Its condemnation of the visible universe, and of matter in general as the work of Satan, rendered sinful all striving after material improvement, and the

conscientious belief in such a creed could only lead man back, in time, to his original condition of savagism. It was not only a revolt against the Church, but a renunciation of man's dominion over nature"

Whether or not the Popes of this age could have coped with these anti-social sects in any other way than by coercion is perhaps doubtful. At any rate it is certain that the method of forcible repression commended itself to the most enlightened men of the age, and that in the matter of decreeing the more terrible punishments against heretics the State led the way.

After the assembly of Verona was dismissed, and the Pope and the emperor had parted, envoys were constantly passing between them. The young King Henry VI was the cause of many of these embassies. On the one hand, his disorderly and arbitrary conduct caused complaints about him to be brought before his father and before the Pope. On the other hand, Frederick, blind to his son's serious faults and only anxious to fix the imperial line in his own family, begged the Pope to crown him emperor. Acting, however, on the advice not only of the cardinals, but also on that of some of the princes of the Empire who were anxious to preserve their liberties, Lucius finally declared that there could not be two emperors reigning together, and that, if the son were to be invested with the insignia of Empire, it would be necessary for the father to lay them down.

Further negotiations between Frederick and Lucius were closed by the death at Verona of the aged pontiff on November 25. His body was interred in a marble sarcophagus before the high altar of the cathedral, and on his tomb was inscribed the date of his death and an epitaph which set forth that Lucca had given him birth, Ostia the pontificate, Rome the Papacy, and Verona death; or that rather, in truer language, it was Verona which had given him his true birth, Ostia anxieties, Rome exile, and Lucca death.

When the cathedral was restored by Bishop Gilberti (1524-1543), he placed the body of the Pope beneath the pavement in the middle of the sanctuary. A slab of red Veronese marble recorded the fact that it covered the bones of Pope Lucius, to whom Verona, where he died, had given shelter when he had been driven from Rome. Beneath that slab the remains of Lucius III would probably have remained unseen till t-day, but for a great storm (February 25, 1879), which, in blowing down part of the apse of the cathedral, hurled a large fragment of stone on to the tomb of the Pope, and smashed to atoms the slab of Bishop Gilberti. When the debris was removed, the original tombstone, also of red Veronese marble, and partially broken, and showing the figure of Pope Lucius in high relief, was, to the profound astonishment of all present, brought to light. Though the actual tomb of the Pope was left undisturbed, and was re-covered with a fresh marble slab, the original tombstone was carefully built into the wall of the cathedral beneath the window of the altar of St. Agatha, where it may still be seen.

The funeral oration over the body of Pope Lucius was preached by the Pisan cardinal Pandulf Mosca. After calling on the assembled multitude once again to kiss the feet of the Pope, before the earth should cover his sweet face, the cardinal speaks of the deceased pontiff as his father and faithful friend and adviser, and as the meek and lowly pastor whose loss the Church justly mourns. He was the father of the poor, continued

the preacher, and he daily fed them with his own hands; and, from the trials and troubles to which he was daily exposed, he was a true martyr, and if he was not actually handed over to the beasts, still, by the insults and injuries heaped upon him, he became the outcast of this world.

Among the insults cast upon the Pope was the following pasquinade, composed no doubt in Rome. At any rate, the version here given is taken from a Roman chronicle of the time:

The lucius (the pike) is the tyrant of the waters,
 from which our Lucius differs but little.
 The latter devours men, the former lies in wait for fish;
 but the man is ever hungry, whereas the fish is sometimes sated.
 If the two be fairly weighed, it will be found that the one
 that naturally lacks reason has the greater share of it.

Our biography of Lucius III will be brought to a close by a few words concerning that pontiff's relations to the British Isles. Although Pope Lucius did not, generally speaking, show himself too much disposed to listen to the innumerable requests of King Henry, he could not refuse to work in his behalf when his unnatural sons rebelled against him (1183). He accordingly issued a bull to the effect that whoever disturbed the peace of the king should be excommunicated without appeal. On the strength of this pronouncement, Richard, archbishop of Canterbury, and a number of English and Norman bishops assembled at Caen, and declared all such excommunicated as should prevent peace between the king and his sons (May 26). But, showing himself a true father, when the unfortunate young rebellious king died in the midst of his revolt (June 11, 1183), the Pope did not forget his helpless widow (Margaret). He implored Henry so to provide for her and hers "as not to leave them any excuse for complaining, and so as not to have himself to fear a severe sentence from the Father of the orphan and the Judge of widows"

On the death of Archbishop Richard (February 1184), the Pope wrote to the suffragans of the church of Canterbury, and to the Prior and monks of the same church, bidding them, "all things to the contrary notwithstanding", to elect a successor to the deceased prelate within two months after the receipt of his letter. But the divergent views of the bishops and of the monks of Christchurch as to their respective rights in the election of an archbishop of Canterbury not merely caused the Pope's injunctions to be disobeyed, but nearly brought about a schism. The monks contended that they had a right to the first voice in the election, and produced a charter of the king himself confirming freedom of election to them. The bishops, however, maintained that such a charter was illegal and injurious to the Church of England, as the choice of their metropolitan belonged to them. After much disputing between the contending parties, Henry summoned the bishops and monks to meet in council at London to elect an

archbishop (December). In this assembly matters were brought to a head by Gilbert Foliot, who, declaring that ancient custom gave the first voice in the election to the bishop of London, proposed the holy and learned Baldwin, bishop of Worcester, as the new archbishop. The bishops accepted his nomination, and the king and his sons followed their example.

In writing “to their Father and supreme Pontiff Lucius”, to inform him of what they had done in accordance with his urgent order, and to beg him confirm their action, the bishops assured the Pope that the monks not only raised no objection to their nominee, but even loudly praised him. But whatever the monks did or did not do at the joint assembly in London, it was not long before they declared that they appealed to the Pope, and before they elected as archbishop Theobald, cardinal-bishop of Ostia, who had formerly been abbot of Cluny and was very friendly to them. Henry, however, followed the angry monks to Canterbury, and persuaded them to elect Baldwin themselves. This they did, and, singing the *Te Deum*, they presented the bishop of Worcester to the king as their candidate, and wrote to ask the Pope to confirm their choice. The archbishop elect also at once sent envoys to Lucius to inform him of his election, and to beg the pallium. This was readily granted by Lucius, and on May 19, 1185, Baldwin was installed in his cathedral with the greatest honor.

Henry’s interference with the election of the archbishop of Dublin was much more direct than in that of the archbishop of Canterbury. On the death of St. Lawrence O Toole (1180), the English king resolved to replace him by a Norman, and to secure that the Norman archbishop should be independent of Armagh. Ten months after the saint’s death the Dublin chapter was summoned to meet at Evesham in Worcestershire, and there, through Henry's influence, elected his quondam agent the deacon John Comyn, the man who in the course of the Becket controversy was accused of betraying the affairs of Pope Alexander III to the antipope. He was consecrated bishop by Lucius himself on Palm Sunday (March 21, 1182)

In the Register (or *Liber Niger Alani*) of Archbishop Alan of Dublin (1529-34) there is preserved a privilege of Pope Lucius confirming the archbishop in his possession of the see of Dublin ... (April 13, 1182). It placed certain restrictions on the Celtic monks, who seem to have been asserting daring claims as to their exemption from episcopal supervision, and concluded by prohibiting the old Celtic abuse, which flourished not only in Ireland but also in Wales, of the hereditary possession of benefices, handed down as of right from father to son. It subjected to the metropolitan jurisdiction of Dublin the dioceses of Wexford or Ferns, Ossory, Leighlin, Kildare, and the diocese of the Isles, or Glendalough; and, by the following clause, originated between Dublin and Armagh the same controversies that we have seen in such vigour between York and Canterbury. “By virtue of the holy canons, no prelate was to presume to hold synods or exercise any kind of jurisdiction within the province of the archbishop of Dublin, unless he were the bishop of the province or some person enjoined to do so by the Roman pontiff”.

On the death of Richard, bishop of St. Andrews, in 1178, the Chapter, without consulting the king, elected as his successor John Scot, the nephew of Matthew, bishop of Aberdeen. William the Lion, however, angry at being thus slighted, swore by the arm

of St. James that John should never rule the see of St. Andrews, and caused his chaplain Hugh to be consecrated bishop and put in possession of the see in spite of John's appeal to Rome. Thereupon Alexander III sent a legate, Alexius, to examine into the affair. After careful inquiry the legate confirmed the election of John, and, with the permission of the king, through the advice of the bishops of his kingdom, caused him to be consecrated (June 1180). But, whether from instability of purpose, or because, from want of tact, Alexius provoked to anger the heart of the king. William promptly repented of any assent he had given to John's consecration, and commanded him to leave the kingdom. Pope Alexander himself now took up the cause of Bishop John, and, addressing a letter to the Scotch hierarchy, commanded them, under peril of their orders and benefices, to put on the spirit of fortitude, to restore John to his see, to labour prudently and manfully for the upholding of the rights of the Church, and to endeavour to soothe the irritation of the king. But, if he will not be pacified, "they must obey God and the holy Roman Church rather than man". At the same time he wrote to the king himself reminding him of the efforts he had made for his peace and freedom, bidding him recognize Bishop John, and notifying him that, in the event of his refusal to do so, he had commissioned Roger, archbishop of York, his legate in Scotland, to excommunicate him and to lay his kingdom under an interdict. "Know, moreover", concluded the Pope, "that, if you persist in your violent measures, we who formerly laboured in order that your realm might enjoy the blessings of liberty, will in the future toil that it may be reduced to its former servitude".

But the king of the Scots would not cast away the cloak of his resolve either by reason of the sunshine of flattery or because of the angry winds of threats. He expelled John and his uncle Matthew from his dominions, and from York there fell excommunication upon him and interdict on his kingdom.

In the midst of negotiations reopened through the mediation of Henry II of England, Pope Alexander and Archbishop Roger both died, and William at once sent an important embassy to lay his case before the new Pope Lucius. The Scottish envoys were completely successful in their mission. Not only were the excommunication and interdict removed, and the Scottish bishops commanded to treat William "as a Catholic king in communion with the Apostolic See" (1182), but his returning envoys brought with them for their master the Golden Rose.

During the course of the same year (1182), Lucius sent legates, Roland, bishop-elect of Dol, and Silvanus, abbot of Rievaulx, to bring about an understanding between the two candidates for the see of St. Andrews. They proposed, with the consent of the king and bishop, John Scot, that Hugh should resign the see of St. Andrews, and that John should accept that of Dunkeld along with the chancellorship. In this, however, Hugh would not agree, but in his turn appealed to Rome; for he knew that the king was with him all the time.

Appeal had been made to Rome, and so to Rome the two disputants went. Acting on the advice of the cardinals, Lucius caused the two claimants to resign the bishopric of St. Andrews into his hands, and then assigned it to Hugh, allotting to John the bishopric of Dunkeld and the other posts and revenues which had been offered him by King William (c. June 1183). Even so the affair was not settled. As the king would not

fulfil all his promises to John, the latter revived his claims to the see of St. Andrews, and appealed to Urban III, the successor of Lucius. Both bishops appeared before the Pope, who was so far influenced by John's pleading that he gave him power, whilst Hugh was collecting further evidence, to rule the diocese of St. Andrews in the meantime. Hugh was ordered, when he had prepared his case, to return to Rome along with John, and the bishop of Glasgow and others were ordered to excommunicate him if he failed. At the appointed time John obeyed the Pope's directions, and appeared in Rome; but Hugh failed to do so, and was therefore excommunicated in accordance with the tenour of the apostolic mandate.

When John returned to Scotland, he did so with a letter from Clement III, as Urban III had died in the meantime. The letter, which was addressed to Jocelin, bishop of Glasgow, to Matthew, bishop of Aberdeen, and others, declared that for his contumaciousness Hugh was to be for ever deprived of the bishopric of St. Andrews, and suspended from his episcopal functions at the pleasure of the Apostolic See. The said bishops were, moreover, to cause the chapter to elect a new bishop for the vacant see, and to induce them, if possible, to choose John of Dunkeld. Another letter begged the Scottish king to receive John kindly, as the Roman Church had really been compelled to punish Hugh, in whose behalf, out of deference to the king, the Holy See, "not without the censure of many", had done much (1188).

At the same time he dispatched two stronger letters to Scotland, no doubt only to be used if the others failed in their effect. The first was addressed to the chapter of St. Andrews, and contemplated the possibility of its not electing John. The document declared that any other election would be null and void, and that they must accept John as their bishop. The second was addressed to Jocelin of Glasgow and other bishops and abbots, and, in view of the possibility of William's not listening to the papal exhortations, instructed them to excommunicate him once more, and to lay the kingdom under an interdict.

The close of this tedious affair shall be given in the exact words of Roger of Hoveden, who is our chief authority for it: "When the king of the Scots heard this, being prevailed upon by the advice of his counsellors, he received the before-named John into his favour, and allowed him peaceably to hold the bishopric of Dunkeld, and all the revenues which he had before his consecration, on condition, however, that he should refrain from aspiring to the bishopric of St. Andrews. Accordingly, although he was fortified in his claim by the aforesaid letters of the lord Pope, he submitted to the will of the king knowing that : Better is a dry morsel with joy, than a house full of victims and strife" (Prov. XVII. 1).

Hugh, however, who was formerly styled bishop of St. Andrews, on being degraded and anathematised, went to Rome, and, after giving security (*cautio*) that he would abide by the decision of the Church, was absolved by Pope Clement (*c.* August 1188). But he survived his absolution only a few days; for in the month of August there was such a pestilence in Rome and in its territories, that many cardinals and men of the more wealthy classes died, and a countless number of the common people, along with Hugh and nearly all his household (August 4).

“On this the king of Scotland gave the bishopric of St. Andrews to Roger, son of Robert, Earl of Leicester . . . in the presence of John of Dunkeld, who raised no objections”.

Should the earnest or curious reader wish to know how Lucius, during his short pontificate, dealt with Sardinia, which belonged to the Roman Church, granting spiritual jurisdiction over it to the archbishop of Pisa, and with Sweden; how he worked to stop wars; how he authorised the building of a hospice at Besançon where pilgrims going to Rome or Jerusalem might be entertained; how he was hampered in his efforts to administer justice by forged papal documents; how he invoked the rector of the Lombard League to prevent the consuls of Lodi and other places from oppressing churches; and how he also was in communication with the emperor of Constantinople, if he would know all this, let him consult for himself the references we have given below.

URBAN III.

A.D. 1185-1187

IN the course of the weeks immediately following January 25, 1186, the prelates of the Christian world received the following letter: “Urban bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his venerable brethren the archbishops and bishops, and to his beloved sons the abbots, priors, and other prelates of churches who shall receive these letters, health and the apostolic benediction”.

“The high counsels of heaven have founded on a rock that most holy Roman Church which we, though unfit, have been called upon to rule. Wherefore our universal Mother, the Church, so keeps with her the ever lasting Saviour that, despite all changes of times and circumstances, she can never leave the path of the one faith and love. By the frequent changes of her rulers, or by the malice of the world, the Church may suffer much, but God never abandons her. Hence though a few short days ago she was troubled by the death of our holy father Lucius, Divine Providence has preserved her in the bonds of peace, so that after the sadness of the evening comes the joy of the morning, and like a beautiful dove rejoicing in her sighs she has kept her snowy whiteness without spot or stain. After the death and burial of our predecessor Lucius of happy memory, the brethren met to discuss the election of a successor, and such a unanimous feeling manifested itself among them that it must be thought to have been brought about by Him in whose hands are the hearts of men. At any rate they made choice of us, and though unworthy we accepted the burden they laid upon us, lest delay might bring trouble upon the Church”

The letter concluded by asking for prayers for Pope Lucius, and for loyal devotion to his successor, in virtue of the love and respect entertained by all for the Apostolic See. “Given at Verona on the second of the Ides of January (January 12)”

The hearing of this beautiful letter read in their churches would probably be the first indication received by many that the see of Peter was then occupied by the Lombard Humbert or Hubert Crivelli of Milan. Humbert’s family was evidently well supplied with the goods of this world, and, as we first meet with him as archdeacon of Bourges, we may perchance conjecture that he went to complete his studies at Paris. It was when archdeacon of Bourges that he came into personal contact with St. Thomas Becket. He at once conceived a profound admiration for the splendid character of the archbishop, became his devoted friend, and merited to be praised by him to the Pope. The archdeacon, wrote St. Thomas, is “one approved to us in all things, and a partner of our sufferings. One more loyal to your Holiness and the Church could not possibly be

found". So closely did he attach himself to our archbishop that the Icelandic Saga of St. Thomas says that he was one of the saint's household, i.e. he was one of the learned circle, one of the *eruditi* whom the archbishop of Canterbury gathered round him. The saint's biographer, Herbert de Bosham, has left us a brief notice of each of these *eruditi*. He reserves the place of honour, *viz.*, the last, for Humbert ("who was exceptionally dear to our lord"), because "he is singularly great and gloriously singular, and also because he was one of the last to be invited to our lord's intimate friendship. He is great both in word and in deed. And as he has advanced from virtue to virtue, so has he mounted the ladder of ecclesiastical fame. Whilst we were still in exile, he was at first archdeacon of Bourges, and then, at the summons of our lord, he joined our circle, and as it were became one of us. Then his distinguished merits caused him to be promoted to the see of Milan, wherein he was born. Thence, in the first or second year of his archbishopric, was he drawn to be the father and patron of all; and today, become the chief pastor of the Roman See and the ruler of the whole Church, he is, in fact and in name, Urban (urbane)".

To this brief sketch we have a word or two to add from other sources. Whether or not in consequence of the eulogy passed on Humbert by St. Thomas, certain it is that he was made cardinal-priest of S. Lorenzo in Damaso about 1183, for we learn from Pope Urban himself that it was in that church that he mounted the first step of the papal throne.

Humbert's promotion was now rapid. He became arch-bishop of Milan in January 1185, and Pope at Verona by unanimous vote on the very day of the death of Lucius III (December 25, 1185). The new pontiff took the name of Urban; but it was not long before the imperialists, reviving an old joke, called him "Turbanus", because, as they said, he strove to "perturb the Church to the discredit of the emperor". He was crowned on December 1 in the Church of St. Peter "on the brow of the hill". This is no doubt the old Church of "S. Pietro in Castello", which was the cathedral for some hundreds of years after the Catholics had been expelled from S. Stefano by Theodoric the Arian Goth. After a brief return to the last-named church, the episcopal chair was transferred to the Church of S. Maria Matricolare (on the opposite or right bank of the rushing Adige), which was reconsecrated by Urban himself in 1187 and is still the cathedral.

Of the many letters of congratulation which Urban no doubt received on his election, chance has preserved one from Baldwin, archbishop of Canterbury. "The House of God", began Baldwin, "has ever received from Peter and his successors guidance and security. And what branches owe to the trunk, members to the head, rays to the sun, streams to the source, this is due to the eminence of the Apostolic See from all the Churches which throughout the world have been founded by the Christian religion". He rejoices that God has set upon the chair of the saints one "who is anxious to be of service, who knows how to rule, and who is distinguished by his prudence and character". He rejoices too in the unanimity of Urban's election, and hopes that God will long preserve him in happiness and the Church in peace. Finally, in return for what the Apostolic See has done for him, he professes his complete devotion to the Pope, offering him "whatever is due from a servant to his master, from a pupil to his master, and from a son to his father".

In announcing his election to the Emperor Frederick, Urban added the following to the words in which he proclaimed his accession to the rest of the world: "We feel now greatly encouraged by the fact that Divine Providence has arranged that your presence in our neighbourhood; should be a support to our inexperience, and you should be the more willing to lend us a helping hand seeing that our heart is full of love of the imperial dignity. For this dignity we are ready to do all we can, in order that, to the increase of your honour, we may join the Church and the Empire in lasting affection". He proceeded to say that it was his wish to complete anything to the honour of the Empire left undone by his predecessor, and begged the emperor not to listen to those who would detract him, but to lend him his sustaining arm.

Unfortunately, however, the Pope's intentions and wishes were not destined to be fulfilled. The Church and the Empire were soon at enmity, and the Germans declared that the fault lay with Urban, who hated them because at the capture of Milan some of his relatives had been mal treated by Frederick. However, from the letter just cited, there would not seem to be any reason for supposing that Urban's private feelings towards Frederick were the real cause of the quarrel between the Church and the Empire which occupied most of his short pontificate. There were reasons enough of public policy to account for it. Besides that perennial source of trouble, the inheritance of Matilda, there were the question of the Sicilian marriage and the affair of Volmar, as well as certain minor questions, to breed bad blood between Urban and Frederick. Trained in the school of St. Thomas Becket, Humbert Crivelli had no fear of boldly opposing Frederick's arbitrary conduct.

Unable, as we have seen, to prevent the marriage between Henry and Constance, Urban sent legates to Milan to assist at it (January 27, 1186), but, "following the lead of his predecessor", he refused to crown the bride groom emperor. And when Frederick proclaimed him "Caesar" and king of Italy, and caused him to be crowned king by the patriarch of Aquileia without the consent of Urban (who was still archbishop of Milan, and thus had the right to crown the king of Italy), the breach between the emperor and the Pope widened. The Pope suspended the bishops who had taken part in the coronation, and added fuel to the fire, according to the imperialists, by supporting Cremona, then under the ban of the Empire, and certainly by consecrating Volmar to the see of Trier (June). Frederick was furious, "and from that day", says a contemporary historian, "the quarrel between him and the Pope became open, and great trouble arose in the Church of God. For when the hinges of the world ceased to work together, great confusion arose among its less important parts, *i.e.*, among the prelates anxious to please one side or the other".

More or less at the outset of the quarrel the Emperor Frederick returned to Germany (summer, 1186), and left Italy at the mercy of his son, whose chief manner of working his will was by the employment of brutal violence. He caused a bishop to be insulted and beaten because, as he held no lands of the sovereign, he maintained that he received his full episcopal investiture from the Pope. He made it impossible for Urban or for any of his court to venture outside the walls of Verona; he robbed and then cut off the nose of one of the Pope's officials; and, acting under his father's orders, he led a large army into the Pope's territories, and, striving by grants of privilege to attach the

Romans to the imperial cause, he helped them to lay waste the districts which remained true to the Pope with fire and sword, and cut off all communication with him.

Frederick meanwhile had returned to Germany on account of the growing discontent with his treatment of the German Church, and, the better to accomplish his purposes, had caused all the passes of the Alps and the main roads to be guarded so that no one from Germany might be able to approach the Pope. His violent and lawless conduct is best detailed by our own historian Gervase of Canterbury : "He forbade any appeals to be carried to the Pope from any part of the Empire, prevented appeals from other countries from reaching him", and maltreated, in some cases even unto death, "any whom he caught journeying to or from the Pope". This he did especially at the cities of Ivrea and Turin, which the traveller first encounters when he enters Italy by the Mons Jovis (the Great St. Bernard) or by the valley of Maurienne (Morian), *i.e.*, by Mont Cenis. He also took possession of various cities and estates that belonged to the Pope, and proposed to take away all that he had".

The emperor's chief opponent in Germany was Philip, archbishop of Cologne, whom Urban had made his legate in order that, as the passes of the Alps were closed, he might receive the appeals which would naturally be addressed to the Apostolic See. Finding that he could not win Philip over to his side, the emperor forbade him to present himself at the diet which he had summoned to meet at Geilenhusen (November 1186). In the absence of the legate, Frederick contrived to win the bishops over to his side, and, at the suggestion of Conrad of Mainz, a letter was written to the Pope in their name in which he was asked to come to terms with the emperor.

Convinced as he was that he was to a large extent fighting their battles, Urban was bitterly disappointed when he received the letter of the German bishops. Nevertheless, we are told, he persisted in his resolve; and duly, but in vain, cited the emperor to give satisfaction regarding the inheritance of Matilda and the other points mentioned above. As Frederick showed no inclination to make peace on the lines desired by the Pope, the latter prepared to launch a sentence of excommunication against him. But here he had to reckon with the people of Verona. They came to him and, reminding him that they were bound to the emperor, implored him not to excommunicate him in their city. Under the circumstances Urban could not but oblige them. Accordingly, he left their friendly walls, and like Alexander III set out for Venice, that he might be able to carry out his intention in a free city. But when he reached Ferrara, about the beginning of October, he fell ill and, worn out with age, died (October 20, 1187) before a fresh embassy, which Frederick had sent to treat of peace, had reached him.

Jerusalem had fallen into the hands of Saladin on October 2, and many annalists assure us that Urban died broken-hearted at the news. But our historian, William of Newburgh, takes special note that the Pope had died before the sad news reached the west of Europe, and so he was spared the wound which the evil tidings from the East would have inflicted on him. Besides, another contemporary, Peter of Blois (*d.* 1212), whom we may also call our countryman, because he spent in England nearly all his working life, tells us, of his own personal knowledge, the cause of Urban's death. He was, he says, riding with Urban when he left Verona for Ferrara, and, in reference to the dispute between the monks of Canterbury and Archbishop Baldwin, which will be

mentioned presently, was striving to induce the Pope to take a kindly view of the latter. But, because the agents of the monks had succeeded in prejudicing or enlightening him against the archbishop, Urban broke out: "May I never mount a horse again if I do not speedily depose him from his archbishopric!". He had no sooner said this than the gold cross which was being carried before him broke, and that very day at "Sutoro" or "Futuro" he was seized with dysentery, had to be taken by water to Ferrara, and there died before he could again mount a horse.

The funeral obsequies of the departed pontiff, whom Gervase calls "the comfort of the afflicted", were celebrated by the worthy people of Ferrara "with the greatest magnificence and with the burning of countless tapers for seven days".

The body of the Pope was laid to rest behind the high altar of the cathedral. But the tomb in which it now rests is not the original one; for the inscription on it shows that it only dates from 1305, and is no doubt the red marble one which was known to Pipino. It is an unornamented but handsome sarcophagus resting on four columns.

In England the news of the election of the eloquent and business-like Hubert Crivelli, the friend of its martyred archbishop, was received with profound satisfaction. King Henry was as pleased to hear the news as any of his people, and we are told that he at once sent envoys to Pope Urban, and obtained many things from him which Pope Lucius had firmly refused, one of which was that any of his sons whom he should select might be crowned king of Ireland. This request was conceded by the lord Pope, who confirmed it by a bull, and in proof of his assent and confirmation sent him a crown of peacocks feathers set in gold. Later on, in the beginning of the year 1187, he sent two legates to England, Octavian, cardinal-deacon of SS. Sergius and Bacchus, and Hugh of Nonant, afterwards (1188) bishop of Coventry. They were given a legatine commission for Ireland, where they were to crown Prince John. A splendid reception was given to them at Westminster Abbey, and they immediately assumed great state. By the Pope's authority they caused their crosses to be carried before them wherever they went, and always wore their mitres and scarlet robes; and they gave out that they had been commissioned by the Pope to hear any cases that were to be referred to him. This roused the jealousy of Archbishop Baldwin, himself a "legate of the Apostolic See". Accordingly, with his suffragans he approached the king, and persuaded him that the stay of the two legates would only result in loss to the country, and that he had better take them with him to Normandy to make peace between him and the king of France. Nothing loath, for he was as usual too busy with his continental dominions to attend to Ireland, Henry took the two legates with him, not to Ireland, but to France. The negotiations, however, with the French king were unsuccessful, and the papal legates had to return without accomplishing anything.

In the preceding paragraph the title of "legate of the Apostolic See" was given to Archbishop Baldwin. In the time of Urban's predecessor, Henry II had written to ask that the archbishop of Canterbury might be named the Pope's legate in England. His letter was received by Urban, who in his reply observes with special emphasis that since the *magisterium ecclesiae* is continuous, though the persons exercising it change, King Henry is to expect always the same goodness at the hands of the Apostolic See; and although it is without precedent that petitions addressed to a dying pontiff should be

acceded to without a renewal of the request to his successor, nevertheless in the present case the Pope departs from the rule in order to give the king a signal proof of his fatherly love. On this account he is willing to grant the king the request he made to his predecessor, and he herewith nominates the archbishop apostolic legate in the province of Canterbury (December 17, 1185).

But before Urban died he was far more disposed to lessen than to increase the dignity of Archbishop Baldwin. We have already heard him threatening to depose him altogether. The cause of this change of feeling in the Pope towards the archbishop was his disobedience to the mandates of the Holy See in connection with the great dispute which began in his time between the archbishop of Canterbury and the monks of Christ Church in the same city, and which was destined to last for fifteen years. Into the details of this famous quarrel it is quite impossible to enter here. It was conducted with considerable skill and pertinacity by both sides, though unfortunately with great bitterness, especially by the archbishop. Of this we can judge not merely from the narratives of contemporary historians, but especially from the dossier of the affair, which was collected between the years 1201 and 1205 by one Reginald, and which was edited with his customary care and ability by the late Bishop Stubbs. The fact that Reginald's collection of documents regarding the dispute occupies five hundred and thirty-eight closely printed octavo pages, supplies an abundantly sufficient reason of the impossibility of our giving anything like a complete account of the struggle.

The real cause of the quarrel between the archbishops and the monks was a determination on the part of the former to be absolute masters in their own cathedral, which they could not easily be when a body of monks, with independent revenues of their own, had acquired many prescriptive rights over it; and, on the part of the monks, a fixed resolve not to give up the very smallest of what they believed to be their rights and privileges. If, then, the cause of the quarrel was profound, those who took part in it were numerous and influential. The bishops, who thought that they should have a leading voice in the election of their archbishop, sided for the most part with their metropolitan, and our Angevin kings, anxious to restrict the power of the Pope, who was the sole resource of the monks against the archbishop, generally supported the Canterbury prelate who was ordinarily their nominee. Outside the country the dispute attracted the attention and interest not merely, as was to be expected, of Pope and cardinal, but of the princes and prelates of the Empire, of France, and of Sicily; and, both at home and abroad, the great congregation of Cluny naturally extended their sympathy to the monks, whilst the Cistercians were to some extent drawn towards the archbishop, who was one of themselves.

It is perhaps easy to suppose that the exhibition of a little tact on both sides, and a mutual readiness to an adjustment of legitimate claims by compromise, might have averted quarrels and lawsuits which were directly to involve five Popes, two archbishops of Canterbury, and two kings of England; and, besides reducing the monks from affluence to beggary, were to bring upon them much misery at home from the violence of their powerful foes, and sufferings and even death abroad from the plagues and fevers of Rome in summer, or the frost and snow in the Alpine passes in winter. Five of the monks who had gone to Rome to conduct the appeal of the monastery died there at one time of the plague, and the letter of another monk to his brethren at home

lets us see what it was to cross the Great St. Bernard in winter. When, wrote the monk John to his subprior, “I was on the Mons Jovis, the mountains towering above me directed my thoughts to heaven, and I felt nearer to it; but the sight of the deep dark valleys beneath me, dragged me down to hell, and I prayed that God would send me back to my brethren, that they might not ‘come into this place of torments’ (St. Luke XVI. 28). Truly that is a place of torments where hard ice covers the rocky ground, where it is too slippery to stand, and where death waits you if you fall. When I took out of my wallet some parchment to write to you, I found that the ink-bottle which hung at my waist contained only a hard dry solid, and that my fingers were too stiff to write. My beard too was stiff with the frost, and icicles formed by my frozen breath made it twice as long”.

It is not difficult, we say, to imagine that mutual consideration and Christian forbearance might have prevented so much strife, such loss of money, and such misery. But, human nature being what it is, there are some differences between men so knotty that it seems they can only be loosed by violence. And it would appear that the views of the archbishops of Canterbury on the one hand, and those of the monks of Christ Church on the other, were so divergent, that only force could bring them into line.

The ill feeling between the archbishop and the monks of Canterbury became acute when Baldwin began to make preparations for building a great collegiate church at Hakington, a suburb to the north of Canterbury, not much more than a quarter of a mile from the cathedral (*c.* November 1186). The monks saw in the archbishop's action an attempt to establish a new cathedral, and thus gradually to deprive them of their privileges. Nor does it appear that their suspicions were ever categorically declared by the archbishop to be without foundation. However, he proclaimed that the way in which his predecessors had alienated diocesan property for the benefit of the monks had rendered him unable to reward those who served him faithfully; and, under the plea of powers obtained from Rome, he had already (December 1185) seized the xenia or Easter and Christmas offerings from their manors which St. Anselm had made over to the monks, and four churches which Archbishop Richard had also made over to them. He opened his attack upon the privileges of the monks “by those crooked ways in which a man cannot walk at once honestly and successfully”

The monks now formally appealed to the Pope (December 1186), and the quarrel began in earnest. On May 9, 1187, there was issued the first papal mandate to stop the building of the church, and the establishment of canons in connection with it. The execution of this and other similar mandates of Urban himself and of Clement III and Celestine III was opposed by Baldwin by every legal artifice, by a constant use of the spiritual power and material force which he had at his own disposal, and by procuring the assistance of the secular arm. In his head strong violence he forgot the obedience he had sworn to the Pope, turned a deaf ear to the advice of even St. Hugh of Lincoln, would not listen to his fellow Cistercians urging him to refrain from the building of the new church, did not hesitate to interpolate letters, and did not conduct his case at Rome in good faith.

On their side the monks may have once or twice met violence with fraud. They were undoubtedly very free with their criticisms, and may perhaps from time to time

have unduly pressed a point against the archbishop. But the instance of bad faith urged against them cannot be called serious, and for the principal point which the archbishop declared was wrongly urged against him there was plenty of prima facie evidence. The monks contended that the action of the archbishop proved that, in conjunction with the king, he was endeavouring to form a fresh patriarchate, and to throw off that subjection which he owed to Rome. This assertion they repeated over and over again, with the obvious intention of inducing the Pope to act vigorously in their behalf. Nevertheless, their statements in this respect are borne out by the testimony of a member of the Roman court writing from England what "he saw and heard". But this charge Baldwin rebutted with vigour. He told Pope Clement that he was well aware that the monks were using all their exertions to prove that he was a rebel against the Holy See. But, he continued, "we know and publicly acknowledge that obedience is due to the Roman Church not in consequence of any ideas of man, but by virtue of the decision of Christ, and is a fundamental point of Christian faith and evangelical discipline. In vain should we have lived if, in the evening of our life, when it behoves us to have more special care of our eternal salvation, we should conceive a spirit of rebellion against the Roman Church. Most holy Father, far be it from us to dream of such a thing, and far be it from your Holiness to think us so foolish and so wicked as to attempt anything contrary to what is right or contrary to the most Holy See".

At length, however, the persistent assertion of their claims by the monks met with its reward. In July 1191 the church at Hackington was demolished, some nine months after Baldwin had, it is to be hoped, expiated his faults by his death in Palestine in the cause of the Crusade (November 1190). But though Henry II and Baldwin had passed away, some at least of their ideas survived them, and were taken up by their respective successors Richard I and Hubert Walter. The latter determined to carry out at Lambeth what Baldwin had failed to do at Hackington. Needless to say, the monks were just as much opposed to a cathedral church at Lambeth as at Hackington, and lost no time in again appealing to the Pope. They had not to wait so long for justice this time. Although Archbishop Walter was more diplomatic than Baldwin, and King Richard was a man of more reckless daring than his father, they had to encounter one who was inferior to neither of them either in diplomatic ability or in true courage. They had to face the great pontiff Innocent III. One vigorous letter followed another in rapid succession from his chancellor, addressed to the archbishop, to the king, and to the monastery. On November 28, 1198, he pronounced his definitive sentence. His letter was received by the archbishop at Lambeth on January 2, and before the end of the month the church at Lambeth had shared the fate of that at Hackington. Hubert Walter had been dumbfounded by the prompt punishments inflicted by Innocent, and, with bated breath, had told the bishop of Norwich that his agents in Rome had informed him that the Pope had suspended two patriarchs and two archbishops, though their envoys were in Rome ready to answer for them, and had sent a legate into Spain to excommunicate two kings, though their ambassadors were also in Rome in their behalf. He was soon to threaten our own King Richard for his treatment of the monks of Christ Church.

The archbishop had, however, not made complete satisfaction to the monks. He had not restored the disputed churches to them, nor had he destroyed the collegiate buildings in connection with the church at Lambeth. A new appeal on the part of the

monks, and a fresh petition to the Pope from the archbishop, was followed by mandates from the Pope to St. Hugh of Lincoln and others bidding them examine into the whole situation, and, ordering that, if the affair was not settled by Martinmas, it must be transferred to Rome, as he cannot hear the case mentioned without a blush of shame. This was enough. Arbitrators were chosen, and on November 6, 1200, they gave judgment. They decided that the archbishop might build a small church at Lambeth, but not on the site of the one which had been destroyed by the orders of the Pope; that he might instal therein Premonstratensian but not secular canons; and that he might endow it, but not with more than 100 a year, from revenues belonging to the see but not to the monastery. Moreover the archbishop was not to ordain or celebrate any important episcopal function therein. After the death of the existing incumbents, the four disputed churches were to be divided between the monastery and the archbishop; who was to retain the xenia during his lifetime. Finally, it was decided that both parties should seek confirmation of the award from the Pope and the king. Innocent's approval was issued on June 30, 1201; the cause was ended; and it may be taken for granted that the reader will not care to hear corresponding details of a similar dispute between Hugh de Nonant, bishop of Coventry, and his monastic chapter (*c.* 1190). It may be noted in conclusion that the general justice of the claims of the monks is attested not only by the final decision of the arbitrators, but by that of all the Popes who heard them except Gregory VIII, of whose limited support of Baldwin it was said that it was given more for love of the person than of the cause. And even Peter of Blois, one of the chief agents employed by the enemies of the monks, lived to profess his grief to them for having opposed them. He was compelled, he declared, by King Henry to act against them.

Although Hungary and Spalato, Sardinia and Pisa, must be left and Poland and Scotland are calling out to us to tell what Urban did for them, we must turn a deaf ear to their cries, and bring our life of Urban to a close. But as signs of the times in which he lived we will add that he forbade the wearing of "precious furs" by certain nuns, extended his patronage to the famous prophet and mystic Joachim of Fiore who came to visit him, encouraged bridge-building, and, while he would not allow clerical forgers to be put to death or mutilated, he consented to their being branded after they had been degraded.

GREGORY VIII.

A.D. 1187.

WHILST the stout-hearted Urban lay dying at Ferrara, there was travelling thither with the proverbial speed of bad news the sad story of the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin (October 2, 1187), which was destined not only to rouse Europe to the utmost pitch of religious and warlike enthusiasm, but at once to influence the election of a successor to Urban. Inspired with his strong ideas on the best way of procuring freedom for the Church, the cardinal-bishops, priests, and deacons who met together on the day following Urban's death (October 21) decided to choose as Pope one like to him. Accordingly, among the three at first selected, Henry, cardinal-bishop of Albano, seems to have been the most prominent, and the most likely to have been elected. But Henry was a man whose whole soul was in the Holy Land, and the news of the fall of Jerusalem had so taken possession of him that he was resolved, as far as in him lay, that everything should be sacrificed to the interests of a new Crusade. The strong policy of Urban which had so irritated the emperor must be abandoned, and a Pope must be chosen of a more amiable and pacific temper, one who was known to be on good terms with him. When therefore it was proposed that the three selected candidates should withdraw in order that their respective claims might be discussed, Henry of Albano stepped forward: "What need is there for us to withdraw?" he asked. "I assure you that I will never accept the dignity; and my lord of Palestrina is, on account of his weak health, wholly unfit to bear the burden of the Papacy. There remains then the chancellor. Amongst us there is no one so suitable as he. He knows full well the rights and customs of the Roman Church, and is beloved by the princes of the earth. As for myself", he concluded, "I am the servant of the cross of Christ, ready to go forth to preach it to kings and peoples".

The disinterested words of the bishop of Albano carried conviction; and the choice of the cardinals fell upon the chancellor of the Roman Church, whom contemporary authors seem to call simply Albert, but later authors Albert de Morra (Mora), or even de Spinaccio. The new Pope was saluted as Gregory VIII, and was crowned four days after his election (October 25).

It is certain that Albert was a native of Benevento, for so it is stated by many of his contemporaries; but that he was the son of Sartorius de Morra, and belonged to a noble Neapolitan family of that name, does not appear to be quite so well established. He took the religious habit in the famous monastery of St. Martin of Laon, the eldest daughter of Prémontré, and regarded as the second mother of the Premonstratensian

order. All through his life Albert retained his love for his first monastic home, and every year received from it the habit of the order.

From his signature, found attached to some of the bulls of Hadrian IV, it is clear that our Premonstratensian canon was created cardinal-deacon of the title of St. Hadrian early in the year 1157, and that he entered the papal chancellery in the same year as vice-chancellor to Rolando (Alexander III). In the following year he was named cardinal-priest of St. Lawrence in Lucina, and as such was sent as legate to Hungary (1167). During the course of his legation he had occasion to spend some time at Spalato. His affability gained the hearts of all with whom he came in contact, and the clergy unanimously chose him to fill their vacant archiepiscopal chair. But when the mass of the people were called upon to confirm the election, they displayed the usual fickleness of crowds, which, says the archdeacon of Spalato, are wont "to despise those they know and to seek after those of whom they know nothing; to reject the certain and to love the uncertain". In great excitement they cried out that they loved and revered the cardinal, but did not wish to have him as their archbishop. "Men of Spalato", replied the cardinal, wreathed in smiles, "it becomes not the wise to make a great ado about nothing. Touching this election, my desires are the same as yours. I do not, however, decline it on account of your outcries, but because I believe that the work of the universal Church on which I am engaged is more meritorious in the eyes of God". Turning then to the clergy, he continued: "For your true love I thank you, but I beg you choose another archbishop". Any hesitation on the part of the clergy to accede to the cardinal's wishes was stifled by a mandate from Pope Alexander forbidding Albert to accept the proffered archbishopric.

In 1178 Albert became the last *chancellor* of the Roman Church till the title was revived by our present Holy Father, Pius X. After the days of the chancellorship of Albert de Morra, the head of the papal chancellery only took the title of vice-chancellor.

Albert was still chancellor when he was nominated by Alexander III to pronounce the absolution of Henry II after the murder of St. Thomas Becket. This appointment drew upon him the notice of John of Salisbury, who wrote that "the Pope is a holy and just man, and, as is said by many, he has an imitator in the lord Albert".

Seeing that by his book of rules regarding the style of papal bulls (concerning which something will be said presently) Albert added lustre to the papal chancellery, a few words on that venerable establishment, even by his time probably about a thousand years old, will not be out of place.

Our knowledge, indeed, of the pontifical chancellery during the era of the pagan persecutions rests more on conjecture and inference than on actual historical data. Still, satisfactory indications of its existence are not wanting to support the obvious contention that the position and needs of the Roman Church even in that early period must have engendered a chancellery of some kind. From the earliest days of the propagation of Christianity the Church of Rome became a centre of Christian correspondence and a medium of communication between the different churches. All are aware that the apostles St. Peter and Paul wrote letters to and from Rome. St. Clement, the disciple of the latter and the third bishop of Rome, in order to quell dissensions in the Church of Corinth, wrote letters to it in the name of the Church of

Rome which even in the days of Eusebius, the father of Church History, were still publicly read in most of the churches. St. Ignatius, the second successor of St. Peter in the see of Antioch, and the correspondent of St. Polycarp, “who had been taught by the apostles themselves”, sent an important letter to the Romans. What need to mention further the letter of the Church of Lyons to Pope Eleutherius (177-192), recommending to him St. Irenaeus, who in his youth had listened to Polycarp, who in turn “had conversed familiarly with many who had seen Christ?”. Still keeping strictly to apostolic times, we find Rome also the recognised medium of communication between the churches. Hermas, the disciple of St. Paul (Rom. XVI. 14) and the author of the mystical *Pastor*, tells us in one of his Visions that the *Church of God*, who appeared to him in the guise of an aged woman, asked him if he had yet delivered her book to the priests (elders) of the Church, and then bade him send it to Clement: “for he shall send it to the foreign cities, because it is entrusted to him to do so”.

If it be reasonably argued that, to deal with and store up such correspondence as we have mentioned, a secretary and a single case would be more than sufficient, it will nevertheless have to be acknowledged that the facts which will now be detailed imply that the bishops of Rome must, even before the end of the second century, have employed a number of amanuenses, and must have set aside some place in which to keep the records of the religious, administrative, and financial affairs with which they had to deal. But, given a number of official scribes, and a place in which they can work and keep the implements of their work, and you have a chancellery possibly of a primitive kind, but still a chancellery.

Writing to Pope Soter (168-177), Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, notes that it was a custom of the Roman Church “from the very beginning” to send contributions “to many churches in every city”, and to the brethren condemned to the mines. Considering that Eusebius informs us that the Romans kept up this practice even to the persecution in his own day, and that they also had to provide for the poor at home, it will be obvious that the splendid charity of the Roman Church must of itself have involved a very considerable amount of correspondence. Much notarial work was also required for the collection of the acts of the martyrs, and their despatch to other churches, and for the drawing up of the various kinds of *litterae formulae* (commendatory or introductory letters) of which St. Paul himself has left us examples, of which there is frequent mention soon after the era of the persecutions, and concerning which the *Liber Pontificalis* would have us believe that Pope St. Sixtus I issued a decree. The great controversies regarding Easter and heretical baptism caused a large number of letters to be expedited and received by the Roman Church. Without going into more minute details, we may then safely assert that, even before the Peace of Constantine, there was in Rome an establishment of some kind which may fairly be called a papal chancellery. And we may be sure that, if it had any elaborate organisation at all, it was modelled on that of the imperial chancellery, as it certainly was in later times. Further, it would seem from what will be said presently of the work of Pope Damasus for the Roman archives, that the early chancellery had its home in connection with the church afterwards known as S. Lorenzo in Damaso in the ninth civil region near the theatre of Pompey.

The terrible persecution of Diocletian either completely destroyed or wholly disorganised the working machinery of the Roman Church. But when Constantine’s

edict of toleration brought peace to the universal Church, the feeling of security for life and limb then first experienced by the Christian body, naturally begot a more regular intercourse between its head and members, and consequently threw an increased epistolary burden upon the Holy See. This was met not merely by the immediate reestablishment of such a chancellery as the Popes possessed during the epoch of the persecutions, but, in a very short time, by the foundation of a more effective one, more completely modelled on that of the Empire. This was the more necessary as Constantine and his successors entrusted various civil powers to the Catholic bishops which must have involved considerable work with written documents. Already under Pope Julius (337-352) we find formal mention of the papal chancellery and an indication of the various classes of work transacted by it, and of its officials and their chief, “the *primicerius* of the notaries”, who, as time went on, was to become the chief minister of the Popes. Not many years later, Pope Damasus (336-384) built at the apse of the church that still bears his name (S. Lorenzo in Damaso) a new home for the scribes and librarians of the Roman Church. Here with their books and papers they remained till perhaps about the fifth century, when they themselves and the implements of their work were translated to the Lateran.

This “chartulary of the Roman See”, as St. Jerome calls it, in which might be read the letters of the Popes, was even in the time of Pope Damasus most busy. It had to answer “synodal questions addressed to the Holy See from East and West”.

Henceforth there is frequent mention of the *archivum* or *chartarium* of the Roman Church, and of the papal letters to be found therein. There is specific evidence that, as early as the days of Pope Gelasius I (492-496), certain letters of the Popes were not merely preserved in any kind of order, but that they were regularly registered in books more or less in chronological order, *i.e.*, that they were formed into *Regesta*.

It was also in the days of the same Pope Gelasius that the officials of the papal chancellery dealt with the revenues of the Holy See in a similar manner to that in which they dealt with its letters. They made *regesta* of the latter, and compiled *polyptici*, or revenue-account books, for the former. John the Deacon assures us that St. Gregory I calculated his quarterly payments to the clergy secular and regular, and to charities within and without the city of Rome, “on the *polypticus* of Pope Gelasius”. It was also from the chancellery that was issued to the *defensors* their *breve patrimonii* or schedule of all the properties committed to their charge.

There is no need to continue adducing evidence of the existence of a papal chancellery and of its activity after the peace of Constantine. The letters of St. Gregory I require no supplementing in this respect; but from them and from other sources a few interesting particulars of the usages of the establishment may be culled.

Till the beginning of the eleventh century the documents issued by the papal notaries were almost invariably written on strips of papyrus from one to several yards in length. So regular was this custom that, if by any chance a letter was despatched by them written on parchment, they were careful to draw special attention to the fact, in order to prevent correspondents from supposing that the document was a forgery. After the middle of the eleventh century the papal letters were engrossed on parchment, though after the return of the Popes from Avignon in the second half of the fourteenth

century a strong linen paper was used for the first copy of the letters which were to be preserved in the papal archives.

For many centuries the letters of the Popes were, like other ancient documents, written out in the large round characters known as uncial. But in the seventh century a new type of character was introduced from Lombardy. It was known as the *littera Romana*, and was used by the papal scribes till the twelfth century, though they were gradually altering it into the Roman minuscule or small cursive hand which they then adopted.

To attest the authenticity of the letters which they issued, the notaries of the papal chancery attached to them a stamped leaden seal, *i.e.*, a *bullae*. One of our northern historians, Hugh the Cantor, states that the Romans of his day (1123) asserted that Blessed Gregory (590-604) introduced this custom, and that some of his privileges, sealed with the leaden *bullae*, were still preserved in the Roman Church. This assertion is supported by the fact that *bullae*, or authentic copies of them, are in existence which go back not merely to the beginning of the seventh century, but even into the sixth. It would seem that, in the thirteenth century at least, letters addressed to the interested parties with the object of asserting their rights had their *bullae* fastened to them by pieces of silk, but that the *bullae* of mandatory letters were attached with threads of hemp. About the following century, as it would seem, the papal letters themselves began to be popularly styled *bullae* (bulls) from the seals affixed to them; but it appears that they have never been so designated officially. As we have already noted, papal letters up to the days of Alexander III were all open or patent, but after his time the less important ones were often folded, and were known as close letters.

The earliest papal letters were dated according to consulships. At the end of the fifth century the *indiction* appears; and by the middle of the next century the years of the reign of the Byzantine emperor. But, after the year 726, the emperor's name does not always appear, and after 772 it disappears altogether, and is replaced by the years of the Pope's pontificate. With Charlemagne's creation as emperor (800), the Popes again use the years of the emperor to date their letters; but, after Benedict IX (1033-1048), they have never used the name of any temporal ruler for that purpose. Under John XIII (965-972), several bulls were issued dated by the years of our Lord. After the reign of St. Leo IX this usage became frequent, but not regular till after the time of Eugenius IV.

At first the name of the Pope was made to follow that of his correspondent ; but after the tenth century it was always put first, and was normally followed, since the ninth century, by the title of "servant of the servants of God."

In order now to introduce the special service rendered by Albert de Morra to the papal chancery, a few words must be said on the *cursus*. In classical times there were not wanting critics of style to point out that, in order to render the close of a clause or sentence pleasing to the ear, it was necessary to observe a certain order of long and short syllables, *i.e.*, to follow a certain metrical arrangement. If this was done, the termination of clauses would ring pleasantly: the *cursus* was saved. This "use of metrical cadences in prose for rhetorical effect" is traced to Thrasymachus, the butt of Plato, and was frequently used by the ancients.

As time went on, less and less attention was paid to metrical length of syllables, and more and more to stress of the voice, to accent; and hence in the Middle Ages the metrical *cursus*, the metrical arrangement of dactyls and spondees, was replaced by a regular sequence of accented and unaccented syllables, by the rhythmical *cursus*.

The Fathers of the Church and the Popes naturally conformed to the ideas of beauty of style prevalent in their day, and observed, for the most part, first the metrical, and, later, the rhythmical, *cursus*. Pope Leo the Great was very careful in his written compositions to give his clauses the artistic finish of the *cursus*, and so it came to pass that, in the Middle Ages, those who paid attention to style recommended the observance of the Leonine *cursus*.

From the fourth century, then, till the seventh the *cursus* was practised in the papal chancellery; and, generally speaking, the *cursus* was classical or metrical. During most of the seventh and eighth centuries till the Carolingian Renaissance the cultured habits of the pontifical notaries disappeared under the stress of Lombard roughness. With the anarchy of the tenth century the ordered march of the *cursus* suffered the same fate as every other kind of order. But, under the vivifying hand of Hildebrand, dignity returned to the chancellery of the Popes. Gregory's second successor, Urban II, named a certain John of Gaeta (afterwards Gelasius II) his chancellor, in order especially that "he might reintroduce the Leonine *cursus* into the papal letters"; for it was known that he was the disciple of Alberic of Monte Cassino (fl. 1075-1110), who had written an *Ars dictandi* to improve the art of letter-writing.

When, then, Albert de Morra became chancellor of the Roman Church (1178-1187), not only did he further that development of rhythmical style in the papal letters which had once again renewed its youth at the close of the eleventh century, but he published a set of rules in order to guide the apostolic notaries in their efforts to render the papal bulls pleasingly sonorous. This was all the more desirable because, as we have noted, they were destined in almost every case, sooner or later, to be read up aloud. The effect of the teaching and writings of Albert on the pontifical chancellery was so great that its peculiar style came to be known after him as the stylus *Gregorianus*, and served as the model of epistolary correspondence through out Europe.

After, therefore, the *dictatores*, Albert and his disciple Transmond, had issued their rules for the *cursus*, "a new era opened for the papal chancellery" under Innocent III, and the rhythmical style of the papal letters became so perfect that the absence of it is enough to detect a forgery or a false reading. *Fieri non valebat* (*cursus velox*), *predecessorum suorum* (*cursus planus* or ordinary), and *posset supponere* (*cursus tardus*) are examples from a letter of Innocent III of the only three kinds of accented conclusions to clauses or sentences which were tolerated in the papal chancellery of the thirteenth century.

The details of Albert's rules cannot be given here. We may, however, note that the masters (*dictatores*) of elegant diction in the thirteenth century were very anxious to avoid what they regarded as undignified haste in composition, and they were, therefore, very cautious in their use of what they understood by the dactyl, viz., any word (dictid) of three syllables the penultimate of which was short.

The systematic use of these regular cadences in pontifical bulls declined with nearly everything else which was of value in the fourteenth century, and they continued to be less and less employed till the close of the sixteenth century, when they ceased to be used at all. The renaissance of classical learning was fatal to the epistolary ideas of the Middle Ages.

One result of the scrupulous use of the *cursus* was to render the papal letters prolix and involved. But these defects were thought to be more than compensated by the harmonious elegance of sound which employment of the *cursus* imparted to them, and by the difficulty which its imitation presented to the forger in his attempts to copy the productions of the papal chancellery.

To lead up to the work of Albert de Morra in the papal chancellery, it was thought desirable briefly to sketch the history of that institution. It may now perhaps be permissible again to interrupt the narrative of Albert's career in order to give an idea of the constitution in his time of that Roman Church of which he was so distinguished a member. The survival to our own days of several contemporary documents treating of it must serve as the reason for this second excursus.

Two writers, John the Deacon and Peter Mallius, dedicated to Alexander III accounts of the Lateran basilica and of St. Peter's respectively. Both of them have left us notices of the constitution of the Roman Church.

Following the order of John the Deacon, we have to note in the first instance that there were seven cardinal-bishops, and that they were attached to the Lateran basilica in order that in turn they might in the Pope's place celebrate Mass at the chief altar week by week. They divided, we are told, the offerings with the canons of the basilica, and returned to their sees when their week was over to await the recurrence of their turn. The authority just cited, after enumerating the bishop of Ostia as one of the Pope's vicars, adds that it is his duty to consecrate the Pope; and the *Liber Pontificalis* assures us that it was Pope Mark (336) who authorised that bishop to wear the pallium in view of this privilege.

In addition to the cardinal-bishops were twenty-eight cardinal-priests, divided into four groups of seven each, connected respectively with St. Mary Major's, St. Peter's, St. Paul's, and St. Lawrence's outside the walls.

The deaconries, eighteen in number, were presided over by as many cardinal-deacons, of whom the chief was the archdeacon of S, Maria in Domnica. Of these eighteen deacons, twelve are described as Regionary, and six as Palatine. The members of the first group sang the Gospel at the "stations", those of the second at the Lateran; all of them were canons of the Lateran, and are set down as having the right of sitting in judgment over all the Western bishops in all synods or councils.

There were also twenty-one subdeacons. Of these seven being Regionary were assigned to the seven ecclesiastical divisions of Rome. They were appointed to sing the Epistle and lessons at the "stations". Seven more were Palatine, and were attached to the Lateran, and the remaining seven formed the *Schola Cantorum*, which only sang when the Pope himself celebrated. It was also the duty of the Palatine subdeacons to read the

epistle when the Pope dined “ad prandium Domni Apostolici”, and in company with the other cardinals to assist the Pope whenever he said Mass.

There are also in the Roman Church, concludes the description of it said to have been written by Richard of Cluny, “acolytes (*acolythi praesentes, idest ceroferarii*, candle-bearers), readers, exorcists, doorkeepers, each of whom endeavours to fulfil his duties as they have been prescribed by his superiors”.

Turning now to the civil side of the Roman Church, we find the following statements in John the Deacon: “In the Roman Empire and in the Roman Church of today there are seven Palatine judges, who are known as *Ordinarii*, who assist at the consecration of the emperor, and who, with the Roman clergy, elect the Pope”. Other judges are called *Consulares*, and are apportioned to circuits; and others again, created by the consuls, are known as *Pedanei*. The names of the Palatine judges are as follows: The first and second are the *Primicerius* and *Secundicerius* (of the notaries), and take their name from their office. Standing on the right hand and on the left of the emperor they seem in a sense to reign with him, for without them the emperor cannot issue any important decree. Moreover, in the Roman Church in all processions they take precedence of the bishops and of the other magnates, both in the matter of escorting the Pope, and, on the greater feasts, of reading the eighth lesson. The third is the *Arcarius* (treasurer), the chief of the papal exchequer; the fourth is the *Saccellarius* (paymaster), who gives their pay to the soldiers, and in Rome on the Saturday of the scrutinies distributes alms, and bestows their stipends (*presbyteria*) on the bishop s clergy and on the civil functionaries (*ordinariis*); the fifth is the *Protoscriniarius*, who presides over the notaries (*scriniarii*), who are called *tabelliones* (scriveners); the sixth is the *Primus Defensor* or chief of the defensors or advocates; and the seventh is the *Admiculator*, whose duty it is to watch over the interests of orphans and widows, of those in distress, and of captives. These officials, says John the Deacon, have no criminal jurisdiction, nor do they ever pronounce a capital sentence. This is done by the judges who are called consuls, who punish offenders according to the degree of their guilt.

When it became known that the amiable and literary chancellor had been elected Pope, many were highly delighted. They expected much from his known prudence and singleness of purpose. Men who preferred peace to all things rejoiced at his accession; and men of letters lost no time in dedicating their works to one whose pacific character they felt assured would bring leisure for reading and writing. The historian Godfrey of Viterbo, whom we have frequently quoted, at once dedicated his Pantheon to the new Pope. In his preface he observes that “as the Roman Church is recognised to stand above all the princes of the earth, so it is desirable that they and all the churches of the world should be adorned by its authoritative teaching, inasmuch as there is no pure doctrine to be given to the thirsty which is not drawn from the springs of its wisdom. Wherefore, if anyone composes a new history, right reason suggests that, before it be submitted to the public, it should be presented for papal examination. Then, if it be thought worthy, it may receive approbation and authority from him to whom all things in heaven and on earth have been committed by God. Wherefore, most revered father, do I present this little work of mine ... to your favour . . . that it may receive the amendment or the approbation of the holy Roman Church”.

Gregory's first object was to make it known that he intended to devote his attention solely to the internal reform of the Church and to the Crusades. He saw, says Robert of Auxerre, that the vineyard of the Lord was being devastated "by ambition and avarice, and by luxury and heresy", and he was more anxious by spiritual means to restore all things in Christ than by contentious methods to strive even for the just temporal rights of the Holy See. Accordingly, when he received the imperial envoys whom Frederick had despatched to his predecessor, he made known to them that peace was his object, that the papal claims would not be pushed, and that all question of excommunicating the emperor was at an end. "A son of peace was he", exclaims a German contemporary historian, "an Israelite in whom there was no guile".

The pacific attitude of the Pope, and the emperor's own wish for peace, as he was now really anxious to proceed to the Holy Land, smoothed away all difficulties. Frederick at once commissioned his lieutenants, especially Leo de Monumento, "the worthy consul of the Romans", and Count Anselm, to see to it that the Pope and the Roman curia might be able to journey anywhere throughout the Empire in full security, and that their travelling expenses were defrayed from the imperial treasury.

No sooner had the Pope secured Frederick's goodwill by his tacit undertaking not to pursue the vexed questions which were agitating the Papacy and the Empire on his accession, than he devoted himself with his whole soul to rousing Christendom to make a supreme effort to recover the Holy Sepulchre. He first turned to those around him, and, fired by his zeal, the cardinals pledged themselves no more to think of wealth and luxury, but to take the cross themselves and to devote themselves to inducing others to do likewise. They further engaged not to receive presents from litigants, and not to mount a horse "so long as the land on which the Lord's foot had trod should be under the feet of the enemy". With the consent of the Pope they also proclaimed a general truce for seven years, on the understanding that anyone who violated it was to be "subject to the curse of God, and of our lord the Pope, and to the excommunication of all the prelates of the Universal Church".

Gregory next applied himself to rousing the whole of Christendom; for he was broken-hearted at the alarming loss of prestige which the fall of Jerusalem brought on the Christian name. Even before he was consecrated he addressed a letter to all the faithful of Christ. He told them of the disasters which had overwhelmed the Christians of Palestine, and exhorted them to take the cross, while warning them at the same time not to set out with luxurious appointments, but in such guise as would show forth the sorrow of their hearts. As soon as he was consecrated, in notifying his election to the German prelates, he urged them to work themselves for the liberation of the Holy Land, and to move the emperor, the nobles, "and all the people of the Teutonic kingdom" to do likewise. He then issued letter after letter on the same subject to all the nations of Christendom, conjuring the people to march to the succour of the Holy Land, because such a course was prompted by the dictates not only of faith, but "of our common humanity. For", insisted Gregory, "every person of ordinary discretion is well able to estimate both the greatness of the danger and the fierceness of the barbarians who thirst for Christian blood, who exert all their strength in profaning the holy places, and who use all their endeavours to sweep away the name of God from off the earth." He earnestly exhorted all to repent of their sins, and to cease from dissensions lest the little

of the Holy Land that was still left to the Christians might be lost, and the enemy might be then able to turn their forces against other nations. Finally, to those, “who with a contrite heart and humble spirit should undertake the labour of this journey, and who should die in true repentance for their sins and in the true faith”, he offered a plenary indulgence and life eternal, and, whether they lived or died, a remission of all penances imposed upon them for the sins they had confessed.

He next enjoined that “for the next five years” all should fast on Fridays, and that all in good health should abstain from flesh meat on Wednesdays and Saturdays. In addition the Pope prescribed “for ourself and our Brethren” an extra abstinence day on Mondays, and certain prayers which had to be recited everywhere. Throughout the all too brief period of his pontificate he bewailed, so we are told, the sad lot of Zion. “May my eyes, he cried, never cease to shed tears both by day and by night; for the daughter of my people has been cruelly wounded. To the very end of his life he would not suffer himself to be consoled, because the sins of his children had caused them to be led captive”.

Whilst the papal chancellery was hard at work sending copies of Gregory’s encyclicals in all directions, and after he had himself commissioned legates to the different countries to preach the Crusade, and, for the despatch of business, had confirmed all that his predecessor had decided within the last three months of his life, and had forbidden any trifling appeals to be carried to him, he left Ferrara about the middle of November. His goal was Pisa. Always a practical man, he was not content with dictating letters. He must be up and doing; he must strive to effect that peace and concord among Christian peoples for which he had appealed. If he could only make peace between Pisa and Genoa, then almost the greatest maritime powers in Europe, the cause he had so much at heart would be greatly advanced.

On his way to Pisa he held a council at Parma, despatched more letters on the subject of the Crusade, and proceeded to Lucca. Before he left that ancient city he caused the tomb of Octavian (Victor IV) to be broken open, and, as a warning to others, ordered the bones of the antipope to be cast out of the church in which they had been interred.

Arrived at Pisa (December 10) he received a splendid welcome from its people, he lost no time, but invited the great men of Genoa to come to him. They came at his summons, and, through the persuasive eloquence of the Pope, and “reverence for the pontificate”, “the work of peace was advancing by his religious labours, and the inveterate hostilities of those warlike peoples were abating”, when he was seized with a fever.

“In a very few days he bade adieu to this world, in order”, says our historian, William of Newburgh, “to associate, as we may well believe of so good a man, with the good pastors in heaven” (December 17). The remains of this single-minded pontiff were honourably laid to rest in a great sarcophagus of white marble which was placed at the right of the main doorway (Porta Regia) of the cathedral. Unfortunately, this monument perished in the fire of 1600. But in 1658 a painted memorial was set up to keep the remembrance of this zealous Pope fresh until such times as a new and fitting cenotaph could be erected, while at the same time a new inscription was composed.

“This venerable pontiff”, according to a contemporary’s assertion which we suppose none would now venture to call in question, “was a man really conspicuous for his wisdom and for the sincerity of his life. He was zealous in all things for the glory of God according to knowledge. He, moreover, sharply reprehended certain superstitious customs which without warrant of Holy Scripture the multitude had adopted through the rustic simplicity of certain persons in the Church. For this reason some thoughtless people imagined that his mind was deranged by his excessive abstinence, and thought him insane”.

CLEMENT III**A.D. 1187-1191****EMPERORS OF THE ROMANS.**

Frederick I Barbarossa, 1152-1190

Henry VI, 1190-1197

EASTERN EMPERORS.

Isaac II Angelus, 1185-1195

ENGLAND.

Henry II, 1154-1189

Richard I, 1189-1199

FRANCE.

Philip II Augustus, 1180-1223

JERUSALEM.

Guy of Lusignan, 1186-1194.

WITH Saladin in possession of Jerusalem, and all the peoples of Europe waiting for the successor of St. Peter to unite them in a mighty effort to recover it, there could be no delay in electing a new Pope. Accordingly, on the second day, or, according to Roman reckoning, on the third day after the death of Gregory, the cardinals met together in the cathedral and chose as his successor the Cluniac Theobald, bishop of Ostia. But he declined the preferred honour, and the cardinals fell back upon the bishop of Palestrina, Paul Scolari, whom, as we have seen, Henry of Albano had formerly declared to be too weak to bear the burden of the Papacy. It is true he was very weak, being troubled with heart disease; but he was a Roman, and, as there had not been a Roman Pope for some years, it was no doubt hoped that the election of one at this crisis might smooth the difficulties with the Roman Republic. Perhaps also the Roman consul Leo de Monumento who, we read, was present at the election, may have been able to exert some influence in securing the choice of a Roman. At any rate a Roman, the son

of John Scolari and Mary, was chosen to the satisfaction of even the monks of Canterbury. They would no doubt have preferred to see the throne of the Fisherman occupied by their patron Theobald, but still they have left it on record that Paul Scolari, who was given the name of Clement III, was believed to be “a steady and just man”, and that though he was “a Roman he was above a bribe”.

The new Pope, so we are told by the contemporary Roman annalists, was a native of the region then known as that of the Pinea. It was and still is the old ninth region of Augustus, the region of the Circus Flaminius, which included the Campus Martius, and of which the Pantheon was one of the principal buildings. The pine-cone, indeed, which may have given its name to the district, and which, according to the *Mirabilia*, was once, “with a roof of gilded brass, the covering over the statue of Cybele, mother of the gods, in the opening of the Pantheon”, is said by some to be now in the Giardino della Pigna at the Vatican. But that, when Paul Scolari was born, there was a *pinea* between the Pantheon and the Church of St. Mark, is certain. Special mention is made of the *pinea* in the contemporary *ordo* of Canon Benedict, and it must have been one of the early recollections of Paul Scolari. In due course he became archpriest of St. Mary Major, and cardinal-bishop of Palestrina. To this latter high position he was raised whilst yet young by Alexander III about the close of the year 1180, as his name as bishop appears on papal bulls from January 13, 1181. Elected Pope on December 19, he was crowned on the following day.

The new Pope lost no time in notifying his accession to the bishops of the Catholic world; but the only specimen of the letters despatched on this occasion which has come down to us is the letter addressed to the bishops of our own country. Clement begins by bewailing the short reign of his predecessor, “a good and prudent father”, and proceeds to express the profoundest astonishment at the ways of God in his regard. “On the third day after the death of our predecessor, when all the prescribed regulations had been duly performed, our brethren turned to our insufficiency, and by the will of God placed the burden of the Apostolate on our shoulders”. But he hopes that through the prayers of the good God will give him all the necessary strength and knowledge. He concludes by urging the English bishops to show themselves, as usual, devoted to their mother the holy Roman Church, and to induce their people to show it due reverence.

This preliminary accomplished, Clement devoted himself in person and by his legates to promote the sacred cause of peace, especially in the interests of the wished-for Crusade. His predecessor had come to Pisa to effect a treaty between that city and Genoa. Clement pursued the work he had begun, and pushed the peace negotiations so far forward that by means of his legates the two cities were reconciled in the July of 1188. Meanwhile, he earnestly exhorted the Pisans to labour for the recovery of Jerusalem, and with his own hands presented “the standard of St. Peter to their archbishop Ubaldus, in order that he might be the standard-bearer of the Christian host and the representative (legatus) to it of the Apostolic See”.

But the peace which Clement had most at heart was naturally peace with his people of Rome. Fortunately, they were as anxious for the return of the Pope as he was to go back to them. Not quite half a century had yet elapsed since they had proclaimed a Republic, but the strife and discord, combined with the enforced prolonged absences of

the Popes, which had ensued, had well-nigh ruined the city. Negotiations opened no doubt between Leo de Monumento and the Pope, were continued by the latter's sending envoys to Rome. The Romans proclaimed that they, "even more than their lord and father", desired peace and concord; but they declared that they must insist that, if they could not themselves compel Tusculum to acknowledge their overlordship, and to pay them an annual tribute, then the Pope, at his own expense, must help them. Although, as the sequel will show, Clement did not wish to take any steps against Tusculum, he came to the conclusion that it was a less evil that the walls of Tusculum should be destroyed, *i.e.* that it should become an open town, than that the Popes should be kept out of Rome. Accordingly, on the understanding that in any event the people of Tusculum were not to be removed from Clement's control, the following conditions of peace were agreed to, though they were not formally signed till after Clement's return to Rome in February 1188.

In the first place, the overlordship of the Pope is fully recognised. He is to have the nomination of the Senate, the supreme power in the city, and the right of coining money. The churches and other ecclesiastical buildings put in pledge by the Senate during the war are to be returned to the Pope on the understanding that the Senate be allowed to keep a third part of their revenues until such time as the mortgages should be paid off. The regalian rights held by the Senate, whether within or without the Senate, were to be surrendered, except the tolls derived from the Ponte Lucano, which bridge the Senate was to keep in its own possession. The reason of this exception is made clear by a later clause. The strongly fortified Ponte Lucano crossed the Anio less than a mile from Tivoli (Tibur), and hence commanded its district. Now it was stipulated that if the Romans wished to make war on Tivoli the Pope was not to hinder them, and they retained their control over the bridge that they might be free to harass their weaker neighbour when the opportunity offered.

The lands and people of Tusculum were to remain in the possession of the Roman Church; but the Pope was to permit the Romans to destroy its fortifications; and, if they had not come into their power by the first of January (1189), Clement was to excommunicate its people and, with his vassals, to help the Romans to take the place.

The Pope was to continue his customary payments and largesses to the senators, to the judges, to the notaries appointed by the Roman pontiffs, and to the functionaries of the Senate; he was also, according to the agreements which both parties were to observe, to make good the losses which certain individuals had sustained at the hands of the papal party, and he was to give yearly a hundred pounds towards the upkeep of the walls of the city. The Romans, on their side, were to respond to the Pope's call upon them to defend the Patrimony of St. Peter, but they were to receive the usual pay.

On these conditions the Senate agreed that their body should regularly swear fealty to the Popes, and that the Pope and his curia and all having business with it should enjoy peace and security.

A number of the citizens from every quarter (*contrada*) of Rome were to swear to the observance of this treaty, which was dated the forty-fourth year of the Senate (May 31, 1188), and signed by the fifty-six senators. It has been noted that this charter of 1188 was the last of the important concordats made between the Papacy and the

Commune of Rome, and, though often violated, it regulated without substantial alteration the relations between the two parties for a considerable period; for, as it left “the Pope free in a free Rome”, it was always found necessary to revert to it.

Content with the substantial recognition of his rights secured by this agreement, Clement set out for Rome Rome, along with his whole court (*curia*) and with Leo de Monumento, and was welcomed with the greatest joy and with the usual acclamations (*laudibus*) by all the Romans, great and small, clergy and laity, and conclude the Roman annals, even by the Jews (February 1188).

Before leaving Pisa, he would appear to have initiated certain reforms in the management of the Lateran palace. In this he was helped by his careful Camerarius, Cencius, who was anxious to secure a more devoted body of officials for the immediate service of the Pope. Of the details of his work, however, we only know that he ordered the *ostiarii* (doorkeepers) or custodians of the palace to perform their duties in regular weekly turns, entrusting their work to their unoccupied companions should any just excuse prevent any of them from performing their appointed task. All of them were, moreover, to present themselves at the palace on the feasts of the Assumption of Our Lady, Christmas day, Holy Thursday, and Easter, and whenever they were duly summoned by the Camerarius. New members of their body were only to be enrolled by order of the Camerarius, and only those who had taken the oath were to be entrusted with the care of the keys of the basilica of St. Lawrence or of the palace. The oath these custodians were required to take is an indication not merely that they were disposed to steal, but that literary articles (including lead for the seals of the charters) were as much objects of their pilfering ringers as gold, silver, and precious stones. The Prior of the *ostiarii* and his associates swore to be faithful to the Pope, to guard the palace during his life and on his death, and not to steal or allow to be stolen relics, gold, silver, precious stones, ornaments, books, paper (*de cartulis*, lead, bronze, etc).

Besides thus taking special care of the property of the Holy See, which came directly and constantly under his eye, Clement also kept watchful guard over that which was more remote. During the reign of his predecessor Urban, a certain Lanterius, a Milanese knight and nephew of that Pope, had been appointed by him as his “bailiff” (*ballivus*) throughout the whole of the Campagna. Lanterius kept in his own hands Castrum and Rocca di Lariano in the neighbourhood of Velletri on the Appian Way. On the death of his uncle, he contemplated returning to Milan, but apparently had no thought of returning the abovementioned places to the Pope. Accordingly, with a view to preventing loss to the *curia*, so at least we are told by the annals of Ceccano, Jordan, the abbot of Fossa Nova, not merely bought the territories from Lanterius, but handed them over intact to Pope Clement, who, for this act of thoughtfulness and generosity, made him cardinal-priest of St. Pudenziana and sent him on an embassy to Germany.

For the same reasons that moved his immediate predecessor, Clement treated the Emperor Frederick with great consideration, so that the latter is said to have restored to the Church the property belonging to it which had been seized by his son in the quarrel with Urban III. About to start on a Crusade for the recovery of Christ’s sepulchre, the old emperor could not set out on his expedition troubled by the thought that he whom he

regarded as his Lord's Vicar had a real grievance against him, nor would he be outdone in generosity by the Pope.

Besides thus improving the Patrimony of St. Peter outside Rome, Clement did not neglect its needs in and about the city. Taking his share in the Roman artistic development of the twelfth century, he constructed the large cloister of the basilica of St. Lawrence outside-the-walls. Frothingham assures us that this cloister shows an architectural advance on its predecessors of the same century. "One sign of progress", he writes, "is the use of coupled in place of single shafts to flank the central arches or doorways in each bay of the four galleries. The walls are still of plain brickwork, the arches still merely varied by plain projecting archivolt, the capitals still plain plinths, and the baseless shafts still rest directly on the continuous basement. The shape of the cloister is oblong, the longer sides having three groups of arcades divided by piers, the shorter sides only two. Part of the second story, with brickwork and windows in the same style as the lower story, is still preserved. This is particularly valuable; practically a unique case in Rome, where the question of the second story is one of controversy".

Clement also continued the work of several of his predecessors in this age on the Lateran palace. He is credited with both raising a portion of it, and with decorating it with frescoes. When he was cardinal-bishop of Palestrina he had built, for the use of the bishops of his see, a palace, to the left of St. Mary Major's, to the left, *i.e.*, as you look at its facade. On becoming Pope he gave it to the canons attached to the basilica. This we know from a bull of his successor, Celestine III, January 4, 1192. As some of Clement's predecessors occasionally abode in the neighbourhood of St Mary Major's, it has been supposed that he merely rebuilt an old papal palace. At any rate, the successors of Clement not infrequently resided in the palace which he had built; and some of them in turn reconstructed it. This was done by Nicholas IV, and, on a splendid scale, like the rest of his undertakings, by Nicholas V. Remains of the elegant loggia built by the last-named Pope may still be seen; and the bulls of later Popes issued from the Quirinal palace, but dated "apud S. Mariam Majorem", kept fresh the memory of the old papal residence by that basilica.⁴

He also "caused a well to be made before the bronze horse". This bronze horse is the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius which in 1538 was set up in the square of the Capitol, where it may still be seen, but which in the days of Clement III was "the hors of bras and the rider that stant at laterane", as an English pilgrim to Rome, the Augustinian, John Capgrave, described it in 1450. Whilst it stood in front of the Lateran palace it was known as the horse of Constantine, and as such is mentioned in most of the medieval guides to Rome.

But the principal work of Clement was in connection with the Crusade. His letters and legates urging the princes of Europe to make peace with one another and to take up the cross penetrated everywhere. He exhorted the bishops of England, for instance, to exert themselves lest "the unspeakable progeny of Ishmael" should grow more insolent, and still more fiercely attack the Christian. He bade them send help themselves to the Holy Land, and tell the people of the indulgences that might be gained by such as took the cross, if they were truly penitent. Further, he required them to compel the clergy to contribute money to the cause of the cross, and to send round prudent clerks to collect

the subsidy. Especially did he order them to have prayers said for the success of the Crusade, and to promote peace.

The zealous cries of Gregory and Clement did not fall upon deaf ears. So great was the ardour of this new pilgrimage, that it was no longer a question who should take the cross, but who had not yet taken it. Several persons sent a present of a distaff and wool to one another, as a significant hint that whosoever declined the campaign would degrade himself as much as if he did the duties of a woman: wives urged their husbands, mothers their sons, to devote themselves to this noble contest. Many migrated from the cloister to the camp, and, exchanging the cowl for the cuirass, and the library for the study of arms, showed themselves truly Christ's soldiers. It was also agreed both among nobles and bishops, by common consent, that in order to maintain the pilgrims who were poor, those who remained at home should pay tithes of their property. Popular enthusiasm was still further enkindled by ballads and poems that were every where sung or recited.

At length, moved especially by the zeal of Henry of Albano, whom Gregory VIII had sent to him, the Emperor Frederick took the cross, and urged his people, in accordance with the mandates of the Pope and the decision of all the princes of the Empire, to march to the rescue of the Christians of the East.

Splendidly did the Germans rally to the call of their emperor and the papal legates, and in the month of May the aged Frederick, after leaving the Empire in charge of his son Henry, set out through Hungary towards Constantinople.

Meanwhile, the papal envoys, particularly that "servant of the cross", Henry of Albano, had also approached the kings of England and France, had made peace between them near Gisors (January 1188), and had induced them to take the cross, after the example of Henry's son, Richard Coeur de Lion, duke of Aquitaine. When they had fixed the time of their departure for the East, they drew up a proclamation which was to be issued to their respective peoples. It set forth that when the sad news from the East had reached the Church of Rome and the whole of Christendom, the Pope, wishing to relieve the general depression caused by it, had "with the wonted clemency of the Apostolic See instituted the best remedy for all who should take the cross, viz., that from the day anyone should assume the cross he was to be released from every penance enjoined upon him for his sins, provided that he were sorry for them and had confessed them". The decree then laid down that all, clergy and laity, who did not take the cross should pay the Saladin tithe, *i.e.*, a tenth of their rents and movables; and, besides making various regulations for the benefit of debtors anxious to join the Crusade, it forbade luxury in dress or diet.

But Richard and Henry, and especially Philip of France, were more intent on their own interests than on those of Christendom, and not one of them had the singleness of purpose of Barbarossa. Richard took sides with Philip against his father, and war broke out between the two kings (August 1188). Very much grieved at this serious hindrance to the success of the war against the Moslem, Clement sent a fresh legate to negotiate a lasting peace between the combatants, for Henry of Albano had died in July. The new envoy, John of Anagni, cardinalpriest of St. Mark, was at first partially successful in his mediation, and it was agreed by the kings that, "in virtue of the authority of the Pope",

anyone should be excommunicated who should do anything to hinder the conclusion of peace (January 1189). But when Henry and Philip met the legate in June at La Ferté Bernard to settle the question of peace or war, the French king, who had no intention of coming to terms, made fresh demands. The legate thereupon threatened to lay France under an interdict; but Philip declared that it did not belong to the Roman Church to punish France if its king chose to punish rebels, and insultingly added that the legate had “smelt” English gold. And while the French king sneered, the blustering Richard of the Lion Heart could scarcely be prevented from cutting down the cardinal where he stood. But though the assembled magnates expressed their conviction that John was only “anxious for the cause of the cross and the honour of Christendom”, the conference came to naught, and fighting began again.

The fortune of war, however, went against Henry, and in the following month (July) he had to submit to Philip’s terms. But no sooner had he signed the treaty of peace, and learned that his favourite son John had taken part with Richard against him, than he died, it is said, of a broken heart (July 6, 1189).

There was now nothing to prevent the English and French from setting out on the Crusade. Richard, the new king of England, met Philip at Vezelay (July 1190); both received “the scrip and staff” (*peram et baculum*) of the pilgrim and started for the Holy Land by different routes.

Both, however, again met in Sicily, where troubles soon arose between the Crusaders and the islanders and between Richard and King Tancred. Unfortunately the Norman king of Sicily, William II, one of the bulwarks of Christendom against the Moslem, and by Pope Clement accounted the most beloved of kings, had died at the close of the year before the French and English reached Messina (November 18, 1189). As he died without issue, his throne ought to have gone to his aunt Constance, the wife of the German king Henry VI. But the Germans were unpopular; and so, taking advantage of this, a strong party in the state secured the election of Tancred, count of Lecce, a natural son of Duke Roger, the son of King Roger II. It is said, moreover, that the consent of Pope Clement was sought and obtained; for he was naturally not anxious that Henry should hold Germany and the Sicilies. Tancred, the last Norman king, was accordingly crowned at Palermo in January 1190.

The English had not been long in the island before hostilities broke out between Richard and Tancred. Our king had demanded the release of his sister Johanna, the widow of William II, whom Tancred had kept in prison, the return of her dowry, and the legacy which his deceased brother-in-law had left to Henry II. The king of Sicily only partially satisfied the claims of Richard, whose vexation was increased by the insulting treatment meted out to his men by the natives’ treatment which, however, the unrestrained conduct of the Crusaders had no doubt done something to deserve.

The English flew to arms, and soon captured Messina. But as most of the leading men of the expedition had really at heart the success of their main undertaking, they brought about peace between Richard and the Sicilian sovereign. Concessions were made on both sides. Tancred was to give the English king a large sum of money to satisfy his just claims, and Richard was to give in marriage his nephew and heir-presumptive, Arthur of Brittany, to Tancred’s daughter when she became marriageable.

“Or if it shall please your Highness that she shall be married before she arrives at marriageable years, our said nephew shall do so in accordance with your good pleasure, if the Supreme Pontiff will grant a dispensation. Moreover we give our lord the Pope and the Church of Rome as sureties, to the end that if the said peace should be violated by us, the Church of Rome shall have power to coerce both ourselves and our territories”.

At the same time that he signed the articles of peace, Richard wrote to the Pope to beg him to accept that position of guardian of the treaty which he had assigned to him. “To his most reverend lord and most holy father Clement, by the grace of God, Supreme Pontiff of the holy Apostolic See, Richard by the same grace, king of England, duke of Normandy and Aquitaine and earl of Anjou, health and sincere dutifulness in the Lord. The actions of princes are blessed with more prosperous results”, began the letter of Richard, “when they receive strength and favour from the Apostolic See, and are directed by communication with the Church of Rome”. The king then proceeds to tell the Pope of the treaty he has made with Tancred, and concludes: “We do earnestly entreat your Holiness and the holy Church of Rome, that the holy Apostolic See will undertake to be surety in our behalf to our lord the King Tancred and his heirs for our constant observance of the peace thus established between us. ... Your Holiness well knows how to have regard to the honour of both of us; so that, if, through the mediation of the Roman Church, the peace and the intended marriage have a happy issue, many benefits will ensue therefrom for the future”.

The reception of a letter so full of a large confidence in the Holy See will assuredly have removed from the mind of the Pope any little soreness he may have felt from the slight which Richard would appear to have put upon him shortly before. When coasting along from Marseilles to Sicily, the English king had arrived in due course at the mouth of the Tiber. There he had been met by Octavian, cardinal-bishop of Ostia, and other envoys of the Pope. But, so far from complying with the Pope’s request that he should visit Rome, he took occasion to charge the Romans with simony, because, among other counts, it had cost fifteen hundred marks to secure the legatine authority in England for William, bishop of Ely, Richard’s chancellor.

According to the author of the *Gesta Ricardi* the English king had a personal dislike for Clement; and he gives us this piece of gossip no doubt in illustration of his assertion. Once, when the famous Abbot Joachim of Fiore was unfolding to Richard his views on Antichrist, and had assured him that he was already born, and would one day possess the Roman See, the king exclaimed: “If that is the case, the present Pope Clement must be Antichrist”.

Richard left Sicily on April 10, 1191, and sailed for the Holy Land. Perhaps before either the French or English left the island, the aged Clement had breathed his last (March? 1191), and thus was saved the pain of learning the comparative failure of the best-arranged expeditions that had hitherto left the West. Of the accidental death of Barbarossa in the Calycadnus (Gueuk Su), on the borders of Armenia (June 10, 1190), he will have heard with regret. But of the melting away of his army, of the selfish abandonment of the Crusaders by Philip of France, and of the enforced return even of him of the Lion Heart without recapturing Jerusalem, he would know nothing. During

all his brief pontificate he was able to work with the hope of seeing the Holy City once again in Christian hands. Not content with directly exhorting the nations, even the most northern,¹ to take up the cross, he strove to forward the cause of the Crusades by unceasing efforts to promote peace, by furthering the interests of the Knights Templars and Hospitallers in every country, and by forbidding all trading with the Saracens during time of war.

He essayed even more difficult tasks. He tried to induce the Greeks and the Armenians to be, if not zealous in the cause of the Crusade, at any rate not false and treacherous to the Crusaders. He wrote to the Byzantine emperor Isaac Angelus (c. December 1188) pointing out to him how at his exhortation the princes of the West had roused themselves against Saladin. The chief among them, he said, were “the other Emperor Frederick, Philip, king of the French, Richard, king of England, and Otho (sic), duke of Burgundy. William, king of Sicily, he continued, had cleared the sea of pirates and had furnished the intending Crusaders with corn from Sicily and Apulia. The Frisians and the Danes had fitted out fifty war-vessels, and the men of Flanders twelve. These bearing down on the coasts of Mauritania and Africa had greatly harassed the Saracens. Moreover (Bela), king of Hungary, had made peace with the Venetians. He concluded by imploring the emperor to advance the success of the undertaking in every way he could. How far Clement was successful in this appeal may be inferred from the fact that Sibyl, once queen of Jerusalem, had to inform Barbarossa in the summer of 1189 that Isaac had made an impious treaty with Saladin, and that the Greek’s envoys were not to be trusted. By their treachery the Byzantines were rapidly filling up the measure of their iniquities, and, before twenty years have elapsed, we shall see an angry Western host storming the city of Constantinople, driving thence in ignominy the successors of the great Constantine, and placing on the throne of the Cesars Latins whom those Cesars prevented from occupying the throne of Jerusalem.

Clement also put himself in communication with the Armenians, who at this period seem to have been disposed to favour Saladin.

When first we had occasion to mention Armenia in the days of St. Gregory I, the name referred to the high tableland south of the Caucasus and west of the Caspian Sea, stretching to the south as far as the mountains of Kurdistan and to the west as far as Asia Minor. This country, even in the days of Gregory partly subject to the Byzantine Empire, became at length wholly dependent upon it or upon the Moslems. At the time of the pontificate of Clement III it was for the most part under the dominion of the infidels, but the Greeks still held the north-west portion between Ani and the Caucasus, though Ani itself had been captured in 1064 by the Seljukian Turks. However, about the time when the last two of the native dynasties succumbed to the Greeks or the Moslems (c. 1080), Roupen, a relative of the last king (Kakig II) of the Pagratid dynasty, fled to the fastnesses of the Taurus in Cilicia. Step by step his descendants increased their possessions till they founded the kingdom of Lesser Armenia, between the Taurus range and the sea, became the close allies of the Crusaders, and, with the kings of Cyprus, the last bulwark of Christianity in the East. Their rule was brought to an end by the Mamelukes of Egypt, who in 1375 captured their last king, Leo (or Ghevond VI).

Residing at Rom-cla, the modern Rum Kalah, situated at the most northerly extremity of the great western bend of the Euphrates, the Armenian Catholicus, Gregory IV (Dgha or Tela, the Child, 1173-93), would appear to have been, nominally at least, subject to the Byzantine Empire. Hence perhaps it is no proof that he was playing a double game if, following the lead of Isaac, he wrote (*c.* July 1190) to Saladin informing him of the doings of the German army, of the drowning of Frederick, and of the miserable state to which his army had been reduced.

However this may be, he had, like some of his more immediate predecessors, long been in communication with Rome. According to his contemporary, the Armenian historian Vartan of Partzepert, he turned to the Pope, and as those of old were wont to do, he sent to ask his help and his blessing. He accordingly despatched Gregory, bishop of Philippolis, to Pope Lucius III, whom he found at Verona (1184). In the letter which the envoy bore to the Pope, his master professed his filial submission to the Roman pontiff, begged him to intercede with the Byzantine emperor in behalf of the persecuted Armenians, explained to him the injustice of some of the charges made by the Greeks against the faith of the Armenians, and requested him to furnish him with an instruction on the discipline of the Roman Church.

The reply of the Pope, sent off at the end of the year 1184 (December 3), is most paternal, and the pallium and mitre which he himself had worn and which accompanied the letter were additional proofs of his affectionate regard for the Catholicus. Lucius praises the Armenians for their love of unity with Rome, and begs them to pray God that they may become one with Him, “and with that rock, that corner-stone, which joins the two walls together, and from them makes one dwelling”. Moreover, “since their faith is orthodox”, he begs them to amend certain matters of liturgical practice; as, for instance, he exhorts them to mingle a little water with the wine at the Holy Sacrifice, and to consecrate the holy oils on Holy Thursday, *etc.* Finally, to help them in carrying out these directions, he sent them copies of the Roman Ritual and Pontifical.

The correspondence with Armenia begun by Pope Lucius was continued by Pope Clement. He told Gregory of the Crusaders whom he had roused to go to rescue the Holy Land from the Saracens, and begged him to aid the expedition and to share in the indulgences offered to it. Following the example of Pope Lucius, he also sent him a Roman ritual. He furthermore made the same request of Leo II, prince of (Lesser) Armenia, whom he styles “the Mountaineer”, as he had made of the patriarch. These letters were not in vain. The Armenians proved true friends of the soldiers of the cross, and we shall see “the Mountaineer” appealing to Clement’s successor for a crown.

The action of the Armenians at this period, it may be noted, made no little sensation in the West. Not unnaturally, one of those specially influenced was the impressionable Joachim of Fiore, who was looking for the end of the world, which he supposed to be rapidly approaching. The saintly abbot speaks of the Armenians, “whom we ourselves saw at Jerusalem, instant in fasting and prayer, and more devoted to the faith of Rome than all the other churches of those parts which are not subject to the Latin kingdom”. He also tells of “their lately coming to the Roman pontiff and asking to say Mass with unleavened bread, and to conform to the rite of the holy Roman Church”.

One of the results of the third Crusade which Clement lived long enough to see, *viz.*, the death of the Emperor Frederick, filled him not merely with regret, but also with alarm. If Barbarossa had at times scourged Italy and the Papacy with whips, his son Henry had given every indication that he was prepared to scourge them with scorpions. Besides, Henry had personal grievances against the Papacy. When, in order to fix the imperial crown in his family, Frederick had requested Lucius III to bestow it upon his son even before he had himself vacated it by resignation or death, the Pope had properly refused the request. Frederick was not, however, inclined to let the matter drop, and, as Clement had in the affair of Volmar of Trier shown himself well disposed towards him, he renewed his petition very strongly before he set out for the East. Clement promised to accede to the emperor's desires; but, being a master in the art of diplomatic procrastination, he contrived to delay the fulfilment of his promise, so that Frederick departed for the Holy Land and died without seeing the accomplishment of one of the dearest wishes of his heart.

Whilst the disappointment incident on continued failure to obtain the imperial crown was still rankling in Henry's breast, there reached him the news of the death of William II of Sicily (November 1189), and, at least, a report that the election of his rival Tancred had been approved by the Pope. Whether Clement did or did not give his assent to the Sicilians choice of Tancred as their king, there is certainly no evidence that he took any steps to secure for Henry the rights which he claimed through his wife Constance.

Furious at what he regarded as the usurpation of Tancred, but unable, through difficulties at home, to take the field himself, Henry sent troops into Apulia in the spring of the year 1190. They had, however, to withdraw in the summer (August) without effecting anything of importance.

With his temper still further exasperated at this failure, Henry received about the month of November the news of his father's death (June 10, 1190). He at once sent envoys to Rome to demand the imperial crown from the Pope and from the senators. This he could do with the greater assurance because he had made peace with his principal domestic foe, Henry the Lion, of Saxony, apparently in the month of July. When in their master's name his ambassadors had promised that the future emperor would not molest the freedom of the Pope and the city, but would observe the old laws and customs, Clement assured them that he and the Romans would acknowledge him as emperor, and that he would crown him in the following Easter (1191).

Accordingly, in the early part of the year 1191, no doubt as soon as the passes of the Alps were open, Henry with his wife entered Italy with a powerful army, and marched towards Rome.

How great was the anxiety of Pope Clement at this juncture we may conjecture from a letter which he wrote some time before to Cardinal John of Anagni, whom he had sent into England as his legate to end the dispute between the archbishop and monks of Canterbury. The death of William of Sicily, "of illustrious memory", and the death of many of the cardinals at the very time when great difficulties had arisen had put, he said, him in the direst need of trusty counsellors. Hence, as soon as ever his

business in England was accomplished, John must come to him without a moment's delay.

Clement's last days were also embittered by the importunities of the Romans clamouring to him to assist them to take Tusculum as he had promised. He had continually put them off, but their patience was almost at an end.

Unable to bear the pressure of the Romans urging him to do a deed he loathed, and overwhelmed with anxiety as to Henry's feelings towards him on account of the Sicilian succession, Clement had no strength to resist the advance of death. He departed this life in March, but on what day cannot be stated with certainty. He was buried in the Lateran basilica, before the choir of the canon, *i.e.*, about the middle of the central nave, as the choir used formerly to be in front of the high altar.

Concerning the more strictly local dealings of Clement, some have already been discussed, and, with regard to the others, we can scarcely do more than, in accordance with our plan, briefly delineate some of his relations with England.

More than once before in these pages it has been told that Clement III definitely freed the Church of Scotland from all dependence on the Church of England, making it immediately subject to the Apostolic See, establishing therein the sees of St. Andrews, Glasgow, Dunkeld, Dunblane, Brechin, Aberdeen, Moray, Ross, and Caithness, and declaring that it was unlawful for anyone but the Roman pontiff or his legate *a latere* to pronounce sentence of interdict or excommunication against the kingdom of Scotland.

Richard I, of the Lion Heart, soon after his succession, wrote to Clement expressing his profound grief at the loss of Jerusalem and his fear "lest (which God avert) with the standard of the Faith, the Faith itself also be trodden under foot". He then strongly appealed to the Pope in behalf of Archbishop Baldwin against the monks of Canterbury, and, as was his wont, threatened violence if no heed were paid to his wishes. "We will", he wrote, "more resolutely lay on them the hands of our royal severity, unless the wisdom of the Apostolic See stand in the gap, to crush the haughtiness of these monks, and by its equitable decision restore peace and his rights to the archbishop, a man of simplicity, piety, and discretion". How far Clement's equitable decision was in accordance with the wishes of Richard and Archbishop Baldwin, the reader will find by referring back to the biography of Urban III.

On account of the spirit of independence oft displayed by monastic chapters, a spirit which by its cleansing and bracing properties is from time to time of as much use in the Church and in the State as is a strong gale to a city or a country, several bishops in England and Ireland were about this time endeavouring to replace chapters of monks by chapters of secular canons. But as the struggle of Archbishop Baldwin with the monks of Canterbury has already been unfolded at some length, there is no need to set forth here the dispute between Hugh de Nonant, bishop of Chester or Coventry, with the monks of the chapter of Coventry. Their expulsion by Hugh and their restoration by the legate Hubert Walter, archbishop of Canterbury, are told by Roger of Hoveden. It remains, then, to speak of Clement's intercourse with some of our more distinguished countrymen who, for one cause or another, came into contact with him. We may limit our notices to Geoffrey, a natural son of Henry II, and to William Lonchamp, chancellor and bishop of Ely.

By the commanding influence of his father, Geoffrey, who proved himself to be at least a dutiful son, and possessed of undoubted courage, was elected to the see of Lincoln (1173) at a very early age, perhaps when he was no more than fourteen years old. But though Pope Alexander III confirmed the election, still, finding that the youth showed no signs of taking orders, he at length in 1181 insisted that he must either be ordained or lose his see. Although three more years grace were obtained from Rome, Geoffrey resigned his see, and became chancellor of England.

On the death of Henry, Richard, in filling up the vacant sees of England, nominated Hubert Walter, dean of York, to the see of Salisbury, William Lonchamp, the royal chancellor, to that of Ely, and, in accordance with the dying wish of his father, Geoffrey to the see of York. He is also said to have sent letters to the chapter of the church of York bidding them under threats to elect his brother. Although some important members of their body were absent, the canons duly elected Geoffrey. The absentees at once appealed to Rome, and, though the archbishop elect attempted to establish himself by force, they were able, with the assistance of the queen-mother Eleanor, who hated Geoffrey with a stepmother's hate, to obtain a mandate from Richard that the status of the see should revert to the condition in which it had been in his father's lifetime. In virtue of this decision, Hubert Walter took charge of the spiritual concerns of the diocese, and the old officials again took possession of its temporalities. To this Geoffrey retorted by refusing to instal several clerics to whom Richard had granted certain offices in the archdiocese, on the ground that until he had received the pallium, or had received confirmation of his election from the Pope, he could not act as archbishop.

Furious at this opposition, the king seized his brother's property both in England and on the Continent, and prevented his envoys from setting out for Rome to obtain the pallium (October 1189). Moreover, when the papal legate John of Anagni landed in England (December), every effort was made to induce him to declare Geoffrey's election null. But in the Pope's name John decided that it was valid, and confirmed it by a formal document which was afterwards approved by the Pope. Convinced, however, that it was hopeless to kick against the goad, Geoffrey purchased the king's good-will with a large sum of money, and still further satisfied him by duly installing his nominees.

But neither brother could long endure the pride of the other, and when in 1190 Geoffrey had to appear before the king in Normandy without the money he had promised him (March 1190), Richard's anger against him revived, and he endeavoured to obtain from Rome a decree annulling his brother's election. But he was too late. Geoffrey's envoys had already arrived in Rome, and, as we have seen, had secured Clement's sanction of the action of his legate (March). They were met by the king's messengers as they were on the way with the pallium for the new archbishop. Richard then exacted an oath from him not to return to England before three years were over; but, before he left France, he appears to have revoked his prohibition.

Geoffrey's difficulties were, however, far from being over. Archbishop Baldwin, before he set out for the Crusade, had forbidden him to receive ordination or consecration from any hands but his, and had endeavoured to obtain the sanction of the

Pope for this prohibition. Canterbury was again endeavouring to assert its supremacy over York. Moreover, though Geoffrey had obtained from Clement permission to be consecrated by any archbishop, Richard, who was always jealous of his brother, had in parting from him secretly forbidden any bishop in his dominions to consecrate him. Besides this, other enemies whom he had made at home in his diocese made such a case against him at Rome that Clement suspended his confirmation of Geoffrey's election. But unexpected forces were now at work for Geoffrey. It would appear that Richard had begun to fear the ambition of his chancellor, William, bishop of Ely, and of the northern justiciar, Hugh de Puiset. To counteract their influence, he bade his mother Eleanor use her influence with the Pope to secure the confirmation of Geoffrey as archbishop. She had come to visit him in Sicily (March 30, 1191), bringing with her his future wife, Berengaria. Four days after her arrival, she began her return journey to England, with the intention of passing through Rome to treat of the affair of Geoffrey; "for through her the king of England sent word to the Supreme Pontiff, and humbly entreated him to confirm the election of the said Geoffrey and consecrate him archbishop of York, or else to allow him to be consecrated by someone else".

When Queen Eleanor reached Rome, it would seem that Clement had passed to his reward. In any case, even if it was Clement who acceded to her request, it was Celestine III who instructed the archbishop of Tours to consecrate him at once: all things to the contrary notwithstanding. Accordingly, on August 18, Geoffrey was consecrated at St. Martin's, Tours, with no little pomp. The abbot of St. Martin (Marmoutier -lez-Tours, Majus Monasterium) brought him the pallium. In receiving it, Geoffrey took the usual oath to receive with due respect the legates of the Roman Church, not to interfere with appeals, and to pay his visit *ad limina* every third year either in person or by deputy.

The chancellor William Lonchamp, who had done every thing he could to prevent Geoffrey's consecration, now forbade him to come to England, on the ground that he had promised the king not to enter the land for three years. The new archbishop naturally paid no heed to this prohibition, but was soon on English soil at Dover. The satellites of the chancellor, however, at once seized him, and inflicted the greatest indignities upon him. This, however, was the regent's last act of tyranny. The clergy, nobility, and people were indignant at this outrage offered to an archbishop, and a king's son. William was compelled to release Geoffrey, and to fly from the arms and anger of his enemies first to the Tower of London, and then abroad.

We do not intend to follow the turbulent career of Geoffrey, archbishop of York, any further. His gross want of tact, begotten of a proud, irascible nature, was perpetually involving him in strife with Hugh of Durham, who endeavoured to induce Celestine to recall his mandate requiring his offering canonical obedience to Geoffrey; with his own canons of York; with the intriguer Prince John; with King Richard on his return to England from the Crusade; and with King John on the death of his brother of the Lion Heart. King John was too strong for Geoffrey. He had to flee from England in 1207, and never returned to it (*d.* 1212). These broils involved both Celestine III and Innocent III, who, if they had at times even to punish Geoffrey, were also naturally bound to do all they could for an archbishop in trouble. Like so many other prelates of this age who were called to rule the Church of God, not on account of the possession of suitable

qualities, but because they were the favourites of kings, Geoffrey was wholly unfit for the mitre. By taste and education he was a soldier and a hunter, but not a priest.

This much have we told of his life to give a fuller idea of the activities of Clement III. But, if anyone should feel disposed to follow the wild course of such a typical Plantagenet as Geoffrey, the references in the note appended to this paragraph will enable him to do so to the best advantage.

Even as much of the story of Geoffrey of York as we have just given will have familiarised the reader with the name of William Lonchamp, whose physical and moral deformities are painted in the strongest colours by Giraldus Cambrensis. That lively author was never wont to present his readers with a hazy picture, and, as William was a strong opponent of one of the Welshman's heroes, a personality purporting to be that of the bishop of Ely is put prominently before us in bold but lurid outlines. Giraldus depicts in William Lonchamp a man low in birth and in stature, and deformed in body and in moral character, and yet a man who, because he was a Norman, regarded himself as of a superior race, and despised the English. Ignorant of the English language, and not understanding the ways of the English people, he was at no pains to conciliate them. But, if he domineered over those whom he despised, he was haughty towards those who would naturally be accounted his equals. Against all this, however, has to be set his loyalty to his master Richard, both before and after he became king, and his political sagacity.

When Richard succeeded to the throne of his father, he made William his chancellor, procured his election to the see of Ely, and, as Baldwin, the archbishop of Canterbury, had taken the cross, he induced the Pope to make his trusted minister legate of all England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland"; "in order that", says Richard of Devizes, "triple-titled, and triple-headed, he might use both hands instead of the right alone, and that the sword of Peter might aid the sword of the general". However, from the actual bull of Pope Clement, it appears that there is no mention of Scotland at all, and with regard to Ireland, William is only made legate of those parts over which Prince John "had jurisdiction and dominion" (June 5, 1190).

When Richard set out for the Holy Land, he left the bishop regent of the kingdom. It appears to be the general consent of his contemporaries that he executed his charge so arbitrarily and haughtily as to have alienated the sympathy of his friends, and to have supplied his enemies and the enemies of King Richard with excuses in plenty for acting against him. "The laity felt him to be a king, and more than a king . . . the clergy, a Pope and more than a Pope; and, indeed, both of them an intolerable tyrant". But, as we have seen, his last high-handed act was his arrest and violent treatment of Geoffrey Plantagenet.

Though, in consequence of this, he had to fly the country, he was not the kind of man to acquiesce even in a serious reverse. He at once turned to the new Pope Celestine, who in the first place renewed his legatine powers which had expired with the death of Clement, and then wrote to the bishops of England (December 2, 1191) reminding them that, when King Richard took the cross, he placed his kingdom under the protection of the Holy See. Hence, as he has heard that Prince John and others have conspired against William, bishop of Ely, legate of the Apostolic See, to whom the king had entrusted the

care of the kingdom in his absence, they must excommunicate those who have outraged William, if his allegations are true. But, no doubt on the ground that William's contentions were to all practical purposes false, "for they did not account him either legate or the king's chancellor", not a single bishop made any effort to execute the Pope's mandate; nor is there any evidence that the Pope made any effort to enforce his commands. He must in the meantime have heard more of the doings of William, bishop of Ely.

Once or twice his own devices enabled the bishop to return again to England, but only for a brief space on each occasion. The people would have none of him, and even King Richard, on his return from the Holy Land and his German captivity, does not appear to have made any effort to re-establish him in England, though he continued to bestow his confidence upon him and to employ him regularly till his death (January 1197).

Although we are unable now to follow the traces of Clement in Norway, Livonia, Spain, or Ragusa, a word or two may be said on his efforts to ameliorate the condition of one class or other of the more dependent sections of the community. In the interests of the poorer students in the University of Bologna, he confirmed an already existing legatine ordinance forbidding masters or scholars to offer a landlord a higher rent for a house already occupied by scholars; and, to ensure the observance of his decree, commanded it to be read every year by the bishop of the city "in the presence of the masters and the scholars".

To show that he was really a pontiff, we find him granting an indulgence of thirty days to all the faithful of the kingdom of Sicily, of Tuscany, and of Genoa who helped to build a bridge.

In conclusion, we may contemplate him patronising work for the redemption of captives, and, true to the traditions of the Popes, protecting the Jews from the savage violence of their neighbours.

CELESTINE III**A.D. 1191-1198**

WESTERN EMPERORS.

Henry VI, 1190-1197

Otto IV, 1197-1212

Philip II., 1197-1208

KING OF ENGLAND.

Richard I, 1189-1199.

KING OF FRANCE.

Philip II Augustus, 1180-1223

EASTERN EMPERORS.

Isaac II Angelus, 1185-1195

Alexius III Angelus, 1195-1203

THE weak heart of Clement III had proved unable to stand the strain of the worry caused him by the importunate demands of the Romans for the destruction of Tusculum, and by the advance on Rome of Henry VI, whose approach he had every reason to dread. He died in March, possibly on March 28; and, if that were the correct date, then the election of his successor took place on the canonical third day after Clement's demise (March 30).

The choice of the cardinals fell upon another of the veterans trained by Alexander III, upon the learned Hyacinth Bobo, cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Cosmedin, the first of the deacons of the Roman Church. Chiefly, no doubt, on account of his great age, Hyacinth endeavoured to avoid the burden which his fellow-cardinals wished to place upon his shoulders; and it was only when it was made clear to him that the proximity of Henry might cause any delay in electing a Pope to result in a schism that he gave his consent.

The new Pope, a Roman of illustrious birth, was the son of Peter Bobo, and belonged to the region then known as Arenula or Cacabariorum, the modern seventh Rione della Regola. It was the quarter by the Tiber anciently known as that of the Circus Flaminius, stretching between the theatre of Marcellus and the Ponte Sisto or the Pons

Antoninus as it was called in the Middle Ages. It was in this quarter that, as we have seen, the Pierleoni had their strongholds, and here also were the towers of another famous Roman family which now makes its appearance in history for the first time, *viz.*, the Orsini a family which, like the other great papal families, has brought at one time honour, and at another dishonour on the Papacy.

The author of the *Gesta* of Pope Innocent III tells us of the doings of certain sons of Ursus, nephews of Pope Celestine III. As Hyacinth, then, was the brother of Ursus, the founder of the Orsini family, he may be fairly described as the first Orsini Pope. Other members of his family are often mentioned in the documents of the twelfth century, and one of his fellow-cardinals, Bobo, first cardinal-deacon of St. Angelo (1182), and then cardinal-bishop of Porto (1189), the friend of Archbishop Baldwin, is said to have been his brother. He himself became cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Cosmedin as early as December 1 1144; but he began his public career as the prior of the subdeacons of the Lateran basilica as early as the year 1126. Hence he was in the habit of saying that he had been a levite for sixty-five years (1126-1191). When he became Pope he cannot have been less than eighty-five years of age. We may take it then that he was born in 1105.

Between the years 1138-1140 Hyacinth appears to have been in France, where he seems to have conceived an admiration for Abelard. At any rate he took up his defence very vigorously, associating himself in this matter even with Arnold of Brescia. He spoke for him at the Council of Sens (1140), and attacked St. Bernard so warmly that the holy abbot complained of his conduct both to Innocent II and to his chancellor, Cardinal Haimeric, and declared that, in the vehemence of his partisanship, he spared neither the Pope nor the Curia. "Hyacinth", he wrote, "has shown me much ill-will, but has done me no harm, simply because he was unable".

During his long career as cardinal the most important work on which he was engaged outside of Rome and the immediate service of the Pope was in connection with the Church in Spain. We find him in that country as papal legate on at least three separate occasions. He was despatched thither in the first instance by Pope Anastasius IV, apparently in the spring of the year 1154, with the object among other things of enforcing obedience to the archbishop of Toledo as primate. In virtue of this commission the cardinal held a council in Valladolid (*c.* Jan. 5, 1154); but what he did there, except settle certain diocesan boundaries, does not appear to be known.

Before he left Spain, however, he took steps to enforce the submission of the archbishop of Braga to Toledo, and, in response to a general request, preached a Crusade. His preaching is supposed to have had a good result and to have helped the success of Alfonso VII in 1155.

The cardinal was again in Spain in 1173, holding councils in Leon and in Salamanca, but not always meeting with that obedience from the bishops which he regarded as his due. Finally, in 1187 a mission of reform took him to Spain once more; and, after degrading a number of abbots, he proceeded to Portugal. When, however, he proposed to degrade the bishop of Coimbra, Alfonso I, according to Roger of Hoveden, whom we are quoting, would not allow him to carry out his intention, but threatened to cut off one of his feet unless he left his kingdom forthwith. But, as Alfonso died in

1185, it must have been his fierce, self-willed son Sancho who issued this barbarous order. At any rate, the aged cardinal returned to Rome, and the bishop retained his see.

We have already seen how Hadrian IV employed him to soothe the anger of Barbarossa, which had been roused by the words and bearing of Cardinal Roland. As he supported Roland (Alexander III) all through his election troubles, he was much trusted by that Pontiff also, and was often employed by him in the many difficult situations in which he found himself in his exile in France; and till the day of his own election his incorruptible services were used by one Pope after another.

A man of the long and varied experience of Cardinal Hyacinth naturally acquired great influence at the papal court, and hence we see the monks of Canterbury anxious to win him over to their side in their dispute with the archbishop. When he was elected Pope, they made haste to congratulate him as their friend, and as the friend of St. Thomas Becket. "When we heard of your Holiness election", wrote the monks to him, "we rejoiced more than others, because you of your natural goodness have mercifully come to the help of our misery. We recognise the hand of God in your election. For He has called to the chief priesthood one who is no acceptor of persons, but who regards truth and innocence, and who with all his might has up to this cherished and loved the Church of God".

Celestine, however, stood in far greater need of commiseration than of congratulation. His position was desperate. Without the city was Henry, king of the Romans, angry with the Papacy for favouring the pretensions of Tancred in Sicily. Inside the city were the Romans, equally angry with it for refusing to help them to obtain possession of Tusculum. When Clement died, Henry, who had had an unopposed march through Lombardy, was entering Tuscany. He was now, with a powerful army, beneath the walls of Rome, disposed to take all the advantage he could of the difficulties which everywhere beset the Pope.

But, old as he was, Celestine could not easily be broken. He turned a deaf ear to the importunate clamours of the Romans for the destruction of Tusculum, and, says Arnold, "seeing the boastfulness of the king", he resolved to defer his own consecration in order to put off that of Henry. The Romans, however, forced the Pope's hand. They approached the king, and, in their eagerness to destroy Tusculum, agreed to support his application for the imperial crown if he would acknowledge their commune, withdraw his garrison from Tusculum, and hand the place over to them, as Pope Clement had promised to do. To these conditions Henry agreed. Concealing the concessions they had wrung from the king, the Romans again betook themselves to Celestine. They pointed out to him how the huge army of the king was destroying their corn, their olives, and their grapes, and they begged him to consecrate Henry at once lest everything should be destroyed. They finally assured him that the king's intentions were peaceful, and included the honouring of their city and the offering of due obedience to himself.

Perceiving readily enough the understanding between the king and the Romans, Celestine allowed himself to be persuaded, and that too the more easily because Henry in his anxiety to act against Tancred had agreed to restore much that his predecessors had taken from the Church. He therefore caused himself to be ordained priest on Holy Saturday. On the following day (Easter Sunday) he was consecrated (April 14), and, out

of the abundance of his generosity, as the senators themselves put on record, granted to all the members of the Senate, which at that period counted more than the legal number of senators, the sum he was only bound to give to the prescribed fifty-six.

There was nothing now to prevent the crowning of Henry. As early as April 2, when he had advanced no further than Anguillara, on the lake of Bracciano, he had solemnly ratified the oath of security which in his presence the princes of the Empire had taken to the Pope and cardinals regarding their property and that of the Romans during the period of the imperial coronation.

On Easter Monday morning (April 15), Henry and his wife Constance, descending the slopes of Monte Mario (Mons Gaudii), came to the little bridge over the stream which flows down the Valle dell Inferno between Monte Mario and the Vatican. Here the future emperor swore to observe the “good customs of the Romans”, an oath which he renewed at the Porta Collina (or Gate of St. Peter or Porta Castelli, in front of the castle of St. Angelo), and on the steps of St. Peter’s.

Entering the Leonine city by the said Porta Collina, the king and queen made their way to the Church of S. Maria Transpontina, *i.e.*, the Church of the deaconry of St. Mary by the bridge and castle of St. Angelo, which is close to the Terebinth of Nero, another mausoleum on the border of the Via Triumphalis of the same style as that of Hadrian. There Henry was formally received by the prefect of the city and the count of the Lateran Palace, and his wife by a *Judex dativus*, and by the *arcarius* (treasurer). Thence they were escorted along the portico by the clergy in their sacred vestments, swinging censers and chanting: “Behold, I will send my Angel”.

On a platform at the top of the steps before the bronze gates of the oratory of our Lady *in Turri*, situated on the left of the entrance of the atrium of St. Peter’s, was seated the Pope surrounded by his cardinals. After Henry and Constance and their suite had kissed the Pope’s feet, the queen withdrew a little while the king took an oath of loyalty to the Pope and his canonical successors, promising to defend the Roman Church and the person of the Pope, and to be a help to them as far as he could.

Then, giving the orb into the hands of the papal chamberlain, the emperor-elect thrice replied in the affirmative to the Pope’s queries as to whether he wished to have peace with the Church. “I therefore give you Peace”, said Celestine, “as the Lord gave it to His disciples”; and he thereupon kissed the imperial candidate on his forehead, chin, both cheeks, and mouth. Next, rising from his throne, the Pope three times asked Henry if he wished to be a son of the Church, and, when he had thrice replied that such was his wish, Celestine added : “And I accept you as the son of the Church”, and covered him with his mantle. Kissing the Pope’s breast, Henry took hold of his right hand, and his chancellor of the left.

After this the archdeacon took the elect by the right hand and led him across the atrium to the Porta Argentea of the basilica itself, whilst the papal choir sang the Benedictus. There for a moment the Pope left him kneeling in prayer, whilst he entered the basilica, and the king was joined by his consort. When he had finished praying, he arose, and the bishop of Albano said the first prayer over him, calling upon God to make the elect a wise ruler who might please Him, and excel all others. Meanwhile the Pope had entered the basilica whilst the choir sang the antiphon: “Peter, lovest thou

me?"; had blessed the singers; and had taken his seat to the right of the great porphyry disc. When the bishop of Albano had finished his prayer, the archpriest and the archdeacon led Henry to a seat on the disc, and took their places near him to suggest to him the proper answers to make to the questions which the Pope was about to put to him.

During the *scrutinium* there sat on the right hand of Celestine the seven bishops of the Latern palace, *i.e.*, the seven suburbicarian bishops, and on the right of Henry the German bishops. At some length the Pope then questioned the emperor-elect as to whether it was his intention to serve God, to restrain his passions, and to protect the poor. Having received suitable replies to these queries, Celestine next inquired into Henry's orthodoxy. After Henry had professed his belief in the different articles of the Creed, and had anathematised all heresies that raised themselves up against the Holy Catholic Church, the Pope retired to the sacristy to put on his ecclesiastical vestments, whilst the bishop of Porto, taking his stand in the middle of the centre disc, pronounced the second prayer over the imperial candidate.

When this prayer was finished, the elect went to the chapel of St. Gregory at the end of the left aisle near the sacristy, escorted by the cardinal, archpriest, and archdeacon. They first robed him with amice, alb, and girdle, and then led him to the Pope in the sacristy. There he was made a cleric (by receiving the tonsure), and then clothed with tunic, dalmatic, cope (*pluvialis*), mitre, buskins (*caligae*), and sandals.

Meanwhile, the bishop of Ostia returned to the Porta Argentea, where the queen was waiting with her attendants, and prayed God, who chooses the weak things of the world to confound the strong, to strengthen, after the manner of Judith, the queen whom they had elected, and to make her the happy mother of children for the glory of the realm.

Constance was in her turn then escorted to the altar of St. Gregory, and thence walked behind her husband as he followed the Pope, wearing chasuble, pallium, and mitre, to the Confession of St. Peter, where the king and queen prostrated themselves in prayer. Whilst the *schola cantorum* sang the Introit and the Kyrie eleison, the Pope went to the altar, and, after saying the Confiteor, gave the kiss of peace to the deacons, and incensed the altar.

When the archdeacon had recited the Litany, the bishop of Ostia, laying aside his cope, anointed Henry on the right arm and between the shoulders, calling upon God to pour forth His grace upon the emperor-elect that he might prove a worthy ruler.

After the queen had also been anointed, she and the king followed the pontiff to the altar of St. Maurice at the top of the left inner aisle. Henry took up his position on a marble disc immediately in front of the Pope, whilst his wife stood on his right hand, and six of the suburbicarian bishops grouped themselves round them. The seventh assisted the Pope. When the first and second *oblationarius* had brought the imperial crowns from the altar of St. Peter, and had placed them on the altar of St. Maurice, Celestine placed a ring on Henry's finger with the words: "Receive this ring as a sign of the holy faith and the solidity of your kingdom, by which you may learn to be ever linked with the Catholic faith". Then he girded on the sword, praying that he might have strength to overcome his enemies and those of the Church.

Then, taking the crown from the hands of the archdeacon, the Pope placed it on Henry's head, saying: "Receive this glorious symbol in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in order that, despising the assaults of the Evil One, you may so love justice and mercy as to receive from our Lord Jesus Christ the crown of the eternal kingdom in the company of the saints".

When Celestine next placed a crown on the head of the empress, the seven bishops imposed their hands over her, whilst the Pope bade her: "Receive the crown of royal excellence, which is imposed upon your head by unworthy but still by episcopal hands. It is decorated with gold and gems that you may learn so to adorn your soul that, with the wise virgins, you may enter the kingdom of heaven".

In giving Henry the sceptre, Celestine bade him receive the rod of power by which he might rule himself and all those committed to his care.

Then the Pope with his attendants returned to the altar of St. Peter, while the emperor was escorted thither by the prefect and by the Primicerius of the judges, and the empress by the Admiral of the fleet and the Secundicerius of the judges. After the *Gloria in excelsis Deo* had been sung, and the Pope had intoned the Prayer, *Deus regnorum omnium*, the archdeacon and the other palatine deacons, along with the Primicerius and the subdeacons, chanted the laudes. Then followed the Epistle, gradual, and alleluia. Before the Gospel, the emperor and empress took off their crowns. When it had been sung, the emperor laid aside his sword and, along with the empress, went up to the Pope and offered him bread and wine for the sacrifice, and gold and wax candles. At the Preface, the emperor put off the cope (*pluviale*) and assumed a special mantle. Clad in this he went up with the empress at the *Pax Domini* to receive Holy Communion.

After Mass the count of the palace took off the emperor's sandals and buskins and put on him the imperial greaves and the spurs of St. Maurice, and then the emperor and the empress followed the Pope to the atrium of St. Peter's to ride through the city to the Lateran palace. At the steps of the basilica, the emperor held the stirrup of the Pope's horse and assisted him to mount it. Both the emperor and empress, wearing their crowns, joined in the procession. The city was beautifully decorated, the bells rang forth, and at duly appointed places the clerics of the city and the Jews sang the laudes. Imperial chamberlains preceded and followed the procession scattering money among the people in order that the cavalcade might not be impeded by the crowd. Special laudes greeted the procession when it reached the Lateran. Laying aside his crown, Henry assisted the Pope to dismount, and with him went to the triclinium of Leo III, whilst the empress went to the great hall known as the *camera Julie*, there to dine with the bishops and with her own vassals. Whilst, sitting at his right hand, the emperor was dining with the Pope, his chamberlains along with those of the Pope were engaged in distributing largess to all the members of the Sacred Palace. At the close of the banquet, after the reading of a lesson, the singing of songs, and the giving of the blessing, Celestine retired to his apartments, and the emperor to the hall of Julia.

The price of this ceremony, at once so splendid and so peaceful, was paid almost immediately after by the unhappy people of Tusculum. No sooner was his coronation over, than the emperor ordered his garrison at Tusculum to hand over the unsuspecting city into the hands of the Romans. The order was at once obeyed, and the Romans, false

to the engagements which they had made at least to Pope Clement, not merely completely destroyed the walls of Tusculum, but killed or horribly mutilated most of its wretched inhabitants. "For this", concludes the historian Burchard, "the emperor was severely blamed by many".

Such is the account regarding the destruction of Tusculum which is given to us by the best-informed contemporary German and Italian historians. Certain English authors, however, equally coeval, say that the emperor first handed over the unfortunate town to the Pope, who was himself anxious to pacify the Romans, and that he then surrendered it to the people of Rome. Their authority, however, writing as they did at such a distance from the scene of action, cannot compare with that of the Germans and Italians whose works are cited in the note.

Whether the Pope or the emperor or both were responsible for the surrender of Tusculum to the Romans, it would appear that, if they broke the treaty they had made with Pope Clement by treating its inhabitants so barbarously, they stood so far by it at least that they handed over its property to Pope Celestine. This cruel destruction of their hated rival would seem for the time to have sated the Romans; for an historian records that Celestine ruled "Rome in peace".

Scarcely was his coronation over than, despite the opposition of the Pope, the suzerain of the country, Henry marched south to establish his claim through his wife to of Sicily, the kingdom of the two Sicilies. At first all went well with him. One fortified place after another fell into his hands. Becoming master of Salerno, he left his wife there and laid siege to Naples. But his good fortune now deserted him. Plague seized upon his army. Most of the princes fell victims to it, and when, at death's door himself, he had to hurry north (September), the people of Salerno, emboldened by his misfortunes, seized his wife and sent her over to Tancred in Sicily.

Deeply humiliated by the loss of his wife, Henry turned to the Pope and urged him to use his influence with Tancred in order that she might be restored to him. Influenced possibly by the more or less treacherous release of manner in which she had been seized, Celestine, in this particular, magnanimously took up the emperor's cause. But it was not till he had had recourse to interdict and excommunication, or to threats of them, that he obtained her release. Two cardinals were sent to bring her from captivity, and they were instructed to conduct her to Rome; for Celestine hoped through her to effect an advantageous peace (*c.* May, 1192). But whilst on the way to Rome, the queen fell in with a body of troops whom the emperor had sent into Italy, and to the Pope's chagrin refused to enter Rome, and went north with them.

This unexpected denouement was a bitter disappointment both to Tancred and the Pope. The former had lost an invaluable hostage, and the second what he had hoped would prove a sufficiently powerful lever to move the emperor to acquiesce in the loss of the kingdom of Sicily. Celestine's policy had been to support Tancred, and as the price of that support to obtain from him the surrender of the excessive ecclesiastical privileges claimed by the kings of Sicily. At the same time, to make his support as valuable as possible to Tancred, he had striven to induce the emperor to make peace.

Accordingly, in the interests of the Sicilian king, he had excommunicated the monks of Monte Cassino for their vigorous defence of the imperial cause; he had shown

favour to Henry the Lion and his sons, opponents of the emperor, by granting them the privilege of being free from liability to excommunication except by the special action of the Holy See; and he had made a strong, if futile, attempt to persuade Henry to come to terms with Tancred.

It was evident to the Sicilian king that he could not dispense with such an ally as Celestine. Hence his surrender, however reluctant, of Constance (c. May 1192), and his readiness at Gravina in Apulia to yield many of the privileges conceded by Hadrian IV to William I. By the concordat of Gravina there was to be freedom of appeal to Rome; the Pope was to have the right, if he wished to use it, of sending a legate into Sicily every five years or oftener if need be; councils might be held in any city of the kingdom; and episcopal elections were to be free. The thousand *schifati*, as already agreed upon in the time of Hadrian IV, were to be paid annually by the king and his heirs for Apulia, Capua, and Marsia, and the usual oath of fidelity was to be taken by him to Celestine. On these conditions Tancred was duly invested with the kingdom of Sicily, and was promised the assistance of the Pope.

Whilst these events were in progress, and whilst Henry VI was striving to break the power of the Guelphs (of Henry the Lion and his son Henry of Brunswick), to which his failure in south Italy had given a fresh impetus, Rome was a prey to internal disorders. Its citizens could not agree among themselves as to the constitution of their commune.

According to Robert of Auxerre, who alone gives us any details of the incident, a certain Benedict Carushomo, a man of great experience in public affairs and born to rule, distressed at the bad government of the fifty-six senators, gradually formed a faction by means of which he was able to seize the supreme power (1191). Acting with dictatorial power, he put down with equal impartiality both malefactors and those who were opposed to his way of thinking, with the result that the law was respected both within and without the city. During the early days of his power, he acted quite independently of the Pope; deprived him of all authority in the Maritima and the Sabina; and on his own authority created the various officials. However, as time went on, his position was recognised by the Pope, and Innocent III upheld the legitimacy of his acts.

Those, however, whom he had dispossessed of authority, and whom he would appear to have irritated by an unnecessary display of pomp, rose up against him, besieged him in the Capitol, took him prisoner, and kept him in confinement for a long time. Benedict was followed by another single senator, who was in turn replaced by the fifty-six senators (1194); and when Celestine died, one of the Papani (Scottus Papani) was the sole senator (1197 to January 27, 1198). After this all municipal authority rapidly fell into the hands of one or two of the aristocracy, into the hands, *i.e.*, of the Pierleoni, Papani, Anibaldi, Frangipani, Colonna, etc., who were as a rule under the influence of the Popes, who thus again resumed control of the city.

Meanwhile, in Germany the emperor was so encompassed with difficulties that he could not prosecute his claims on the kingdom of Sicily with any vigour. Some of these troubles were made for him by others, and some of them by himself. The enmity of Henry the Lion of Saxony and of his son Henry of Brunswick was simply the enmity of the Guelph for the Hohenstaufen.

Other difficulties, however, against which he had to contend, were the result of his own despotic and cruel character. Among these latter was the affair of the bishopric of Liège. Henry had been successful in filling, without serious opposition, a number of bishoprics which fell vacant about this time; but he was not so fortunate with regard to the bishopric of Liege. Its incumbent, like the occupiers of many other sees, had died in the Holy Land (1191), and the majority of the chapter of Liege, influenced, it is said, by the duke of Brabant, chose his brother Albert, whilst the minority, thinking to please the emperor, elected another Albert, Albert of Retest (Réthel). Henry, however, bribed by three thousand marks, set aside, in open violation of the Concordat of Worms, both the candidates chosen by the chapter, and gave the see to Lothaire of Hochstaden. Albert of Brabant at once appealed to the Apostolic See, and, although the emperor caused all the ordinary routes to be watched, he succeeded in reaching Rome by travelling through Provence to Montpellier, and then, after crossing the Maritime Alps, by making his way disguised as a servant through Genoa and Pisa. Arrived in Rome, he presented himself to the Pope just as he was, “all bronzed by the sun, with his face covered with dust and sweat, wearing a large black linen hat, big coarse boots half worn out, a mean and wretched tunic, and a poor and clumsy belt from which hung a big knife in a dirty, greasy sheath, so that one would take him not for a nobleman, and a bishop-elect, but for a hired servant straight from the kitchen”.

As soon as Celestine learnt who the extraordinary apparition was, he embraced him and promised to confirm his election if it should prove to be just. The justice of his cause was soon apparent, and, though some cardinals were afraid to pronounce in his favour through fear of the emperor’s anger, the majority declared for him, as did also the Roman princes and senators. His election was accordingly formally approved by the Pope (May 1192), who despatched letters to the archbishops of Cologne and of Rheims, and to the people of Liege and others. The archbishop of Cologne was ordered to consecrate Albert, and, if fear of the emperor should prevent him from obeying the Pope’s orders, the archbishop of Rheims was commissioned to perform the function. The people of Liege were commanded to acknowledge Albert of Brabant as their bishop. To ensure these documents reaching their destination, Celestine issued them in duplicate, and sternly forbade any member of the curia to take any money for any service rendered to one who had had to suffer so much for the sake of the liberty of the Church.

After many adventures, crossing Hannibal’s Alps (Mont Cenis), he at length reached Germany. Afraid of the emperor, the archbishop of Cologne feigned sickness, and begged the archbishop of Rheims to fulfil the papal mandate, and to consecrate Albert. This he did on September 20, 1192.

Henry in a fury at once made his way to Liege, cruelly persecuted Albert’s adherents, and forbade him to enter his kingdom. Before the close of the year, the newly consecrated archbishop was treacherously and barbarously murdered by three German knights with the connivance of the same Henry.

The news of the murder of the bishop roused the greatest indignation all over Europe; and, when it was found that the emperor accorded his patronage to the murderers, he was execrated by every right-minded man.

As soon as Pope Celestine heard of the tragedy, he immediately excommunicated all the assassins, and in particular excommunicated by name Lothaire, the emperor's candidate, and assigned to others his various benefices. Unable to endure the excommunication, Lothaire made haste to Rome, and endeavoured to procure a mitigation of the papal sentence. The Pope, however, was inexorable, and only consented to remove the excommunication on condition that he resigned all his benefices, save the provostship of Coblenz, and gave up all thought of any further promotion.

The murder of Albert was just what was needed to put fresh vigour into the opposition against Henry. The relations of Albert joined with Henry, duke of Saxony, and in a brief space half the princes of the Empire, along with the duke of Bohemia, were in league against him. It is, moreover, said that they secured the approval of the Pope. This formidable confederation might have crushed the emperor had not blind fortune thrown as a hostage into his hands none other than Richard the Lion-hearted, the friend of the house of Guelph, and the ally of Tancred of Sicily (March 1193).

The selfish departure of Philip Augustus from the Holy Land had seriously crippled the numerical resources of the Crusaders, and so Richard, seeing that in addition both money and health were failing him, and alarmed at the rumours he had heard of the expulsion of his chancellor from England and of the designs of his brother John and the French king on his throne and kingdom, made a truce with Saladin, and left Palestine for England. As is so well known, shipwreck and mischance caused him to fall into the hands of Leopold, duke of Austria, whom his pride had outraged in Palestine (December 1192). Realising how useful such a prisoner would be to him, Henry bought him from his partisan (March 1193), and, in contempt of the papal decrees which declared the persons of Crusaders inviolate, *i.e.*, in contempt of the international law of the period, he kept him in captivity.

Knowing that the news of Richard's seizure would give - the greatest pleasure to Philip of France, the emperor sent an account of it to that subtle monarch. It was through this letter that the English heard of the captivity of their king, whose warlike exploits had endeared him to their hearts. The Pope was at once urged to vindicate the rights of a Crusader. Foremost in this work was Hubert Walter, bishop of Salisbury, who had himself fought side by side with Richard in the Holy Land. The bishops of Normandy are also credited with begging Celestine to draw the sword of Blessed Peter to avenge a deed which all laws, both new and old, execrate. There are, moreover, extant three passionate letters which Queen Eleanor is generally supposed to have addressed to the Pope with the same object. They show her as the woman in the Gospel who by her importunity forced the unjust judge to do her justice. In all the letters the theme is the same an appeal to the Pope's pity, his pride, his interest, and his gratitude, to induce him to intervene on behalf of the captive Crusader king. In all the queen takes a tone of mingled pathos and menace. The first of the three letters is addressed : "To the revered Father, the lord Celestine, by the grace of God supreme Pontiff, Eleanor, by the grace of God queen of the English, duchess of Normandy, and countess of Anjou, in the hope that he may show himself a father to a wretched mother".

She is afraid to speak, she begins, lest in her grief she should say what she ought not to say; for grief is but little different from madness, which knows no masters. But a suffering people, desolate provinces, nay, the whole Church of the West, sorrowfully turn to the Pope whom God has set in power above nations and kingdoms. And should he not hear their cry, “the whole tragedy of this fell deed will fall back upon him”, as he is the sole comfort of the afflicted. “For our king is in straits, beset on all sides. Behold the condition or rather the ruin of his kingdom, the malice of the times, the cruelty of the tyrant who out of the furnace of his avarice is ever forging weapons against the king whom he seized when on Crusade under the protection of the God of Heaven and the tutelage of the Roman Church, and whom he now holds in chains”. Where is the zeal of Elias against Achab, “where the zeal of Alexander III, who, as we have heard and seen, with dread solemnity cut off from the communion of the faithful, with the full authority of the Apostolic See, Frederick, the father of this emperor. If, then, you are not ready to avenge the injury done to you and to the Roman Church, you cannot be indifferent to the insult offered to Peter and to Christ”.

The Pope must not fear man. If the enemies of the cross of Christ “trust in their own strength and glory in the multitude of their riches”, “the maw of insatiable avarice swallows up whatever is taken from the needs of the Church and of the poor”.

The queen goes on to complain that whereas important embassies are often sent from Rome for trifles, Celestine has on the important matter of Richard’s captivity not despatched even a subdeacon. It would appear that even if gain regulated the sending of legates, the Pope should ask himself what gain could be comparable to the exaltation of the pontificate by his effecting the liberation of Richard. He should also be mindful of the good which Richard’s father Henry did to the Roman Church by throwing his influence in the scale in favour of Alexander. Celestine must, therefore, not be ungrateful, and not cause the Roman Church to blush for being so slow to help “so noble a son who is in such serious straits”.

This letter, which we suppose to have been sent off early in March, was quickly followed by two others to the same effect. Celestine, however, did not really require all the urging which Eleanor seems to have imagined necessary. He had already shown himself true to Richard. When, after his base desertion of the sacred cause, Philip, king of France, had visited Rome on his way back to his country (October 1191), and had endeavoured to obtain permission from the Pope to invade Normandy in order to compensate himself for the wrongs which he alleged had been inflicted on him by Richard, Celestine had sternly forbidden him under pain of excommunication to lay a hand either on Richard or on his territory.

Accordingly, whether moved by the representations from England or influenced by a desire to punish an outrage committed on a Crusader, Celestine threatened to excommunicate even the emperor himself if he did not quickly release the English king from captivity; and he also gave Philip of France to understand that a like penalty would be inflicted upon him if he persisted in harrying the territories of Richard whilst he was a prisoner (c. April, 1193).

This vigorous action was not without its effect. As early as March 1193 Richard had promised the emperor one hundred thousand marks for his freedom; but it was not

till after the threats of Celestine, and the indignant remonstrances of many leading men in Germany and Italy, that the emperor came to an agreement with Richard. From a letter of Richard himself to his mother and the justiciaries of England (April 19, 1193), it appears that the two sovereigns agreed to aid one another against all men, and that Richard “had to prolong his stay with the emperor till he had paid him seventy thousand marks of silver”, so euphemistically under the circumstances had he to express himself. Richard had also to agree to give hostages to the emperor till the rest of the ransom should have been paid.

But, in order to wring more and more concessions from his prisoner, the avaricious and faithless emperor kept putting off the hour of his liberation, even after a large portion of the king’s ransom had been paid over to him. At length, however, the indignation of his nobles compelled him to fulfil his promises, and Richard was at last released (February 4, 1194).

No sooner was Richard at liberty than he turned his attention to punishing his enemies. Though the nobles of France would not act with Philip against the English King’s domains whilst he was “on God’s service”, their crafty ruler had no difficulty in persuading them to assist him in the invasion of Normandy when Richard was a captive in Germany. Accordingly, the English sovereign lost no time in showing Philip that sometimes at least the sword was mightier than craft, and that the strength and courage of the soldier was more effective than the subtle art of the politician.

Inasmuch as, by the diplomatic grant to Richard of the kingdom of Arles or Provence, over which he had no effective control, Henry had made our king his liegeman, Richard could not well turn on him, but against his first captor, the duke of Austria, he promptly took steps with the aid of the Pope. His envoys put strongly before Celestine how their master had been seized by the duke, though as a Crusader he was under papal protection; how he had afterwards been sold to the emperor by Leopold “as though he were a bull or an ass”; and how “the two of them consumed the substance of his kingdom by demanding an intolerable sum for his ransom”. The envoys, therefore, begged the Pope to compel the duke to liberate the English hostages he was holding as security for the payment of the rest of Richard’s ransom; to restore the money which the English monarch had already been forced to pay to him; and to make fitting atonement for the injury inflicted on their master.

Celestine, who had in Rome for half a year been protecting Richard’s wife Berengaria, and who had then sent her under the escort of Cardinal Melior to Poitiers, listened favourably to the complaints of the envoys. When they had completed their charges against the duke, “our lord the Pope then rose with all his cardinals, and excommunicated the duke himself by name, and laid the whole of his territory under an interdict” till he should comply with the demands of Richard, and undertake never to perpetrate such deeds again. Adelard, cardinal-priest of the title of St. Marcellus, and bishop of Verona, was commissioned to publish the sentence of excommunication throughout the whole duchy of Austria on every Sunday and feast day.

At first Leopold paid no heed to this sentence, and men attributed to his contumacy the floods, famine, and pestilence which then devastated his duchy. However, being soon after at the point of dying a painful death (December 31, 1194), he

undertook to obey the Pope's orders; but it required the intervention with his son of many of his magnates, and even of Innocent III, before they were all fulfilled.

We must now retrace our steps a little, and return to Henry VI, face to face with a formidable coalition, from which it was said that the captivity of Richard saved him. The possession of the person of the king of England not only assured to the emperor the acquisition of a large sum of money, but put at his disposal both the money and the arms of Philip of France and of Prince John, Richard's contemptible brother. The conspirators now realised that they must come to terms with the emperor. Accordingly, after Henry had caused a number of bishops and barons "to swear on his own soul that he had neither ordered nor wished that the bishop of Liege should be put to death", and had restored to the conspirators the castles which he or his father had taken from them, they all submitted with the exception of the duke of Saxony.

Henry was now in a good position to pursue his ideas of world-rule by proceeding against Tancred of Sicily. By making Richard king of Arles or Provence, he expected ultimately, to obtain a more practical control over that kingdom, and he had succeeded in becoming suzerain of England. More than all, Richard's ransom had supplied him with the sinews of war; and, as if fortune were bent on granting him every favour, Tancred died (February 20, 1194) soon after his son Roger. He had now in Sicily only to face a woman and a child, Sibyl, Tancred's widow, and her son William III. Moreover, the treaty of Vercelli which he brought about between the warring Lombard communes (January 1194) gave him every ground to hope that he would not be hindered, nor the Pope or Sibyl helped by the Lombard League. Accordingly, preceded by a fleet which by delusive promises he had obtained from Genoa and Pisa, he entered Campania in August. All opposition to him collapsed at once. Taking a fearful vengeance on Salerno for its treatment of Constance, he crossed over to Messina in October. In the following month he was master of the capital of Sicily (Palermo), and was there crowned king of the two Sicilies on December 25, 1194. Then, taking advantage of a real or pretended plot against him, he seized the royal family of Sicily, and their chief supporters, and sent them as prisoners into Germany.

The Norman dynasty was at an end, and Henry was not only emperor, but king of the two Sicilies; and when, after keeping the Easter (April 2) of 1195 with his wife at Bari, he returned to Germany, he could reflect with satisfaction that he had at length no little real hold of a very considerable portion of Italy. Large tracts of it were directly ruled by Germans. He had invested Conrad of Urslingen with Spoleto; his trusty general, the Marquis Markwald of Anweiler, with Romagna and the Marches; and his brother Philip with the duchy of Tuscany and the estates of Matilda.

It will be seen that in making his dispositions for the ruling of Italy Henry paid no regard to the sovereign rights of the Papacy. Nor, in his subjugation of Apulia, *i.e.*, of that portion of the kingdom of Sicily which was in Italy, did he respect its private ownership rights. He made no scruple of confiscating papal property in Apulia.

For some little time there had been no communication between Celestine and Henry. The Pope had made a vain effort to come to some agreement with the emperor, no doubt with the view of preventing him from prosecuting his claims on the kingdom of Sicily. But when he saw the ruthless way in which Henry not only fought for his own

rights in the kingdom of Sicily, but also seized therein the property of the Church,⁴ he abruptly broke off all relations with him.

But it was now Henry's turn to wish to open friendly negotiations with the Pope. On December 26, 1194, his wife had given him a son and heir, and he at once took up his father's ideas of making the imperial crown hereditary in his family. This he well understood could not be done without the co-operation of the Pope. Consecration by "the universal Pope" was the sheet-anchor of the claims of the Western Roman emperors to the imperial title as against those of the Eastern Roman emperors.

Celestine must, therefore, be placated. Not only did he secretly take the cross himself, and openly encourage others to take it, but he sent envoys to Rome with letters to the Pope pointing out that for the liberation of the Holy Land, for the uprooting of heresy, and for the good of Christendom generally, nothing was so important as peace between the Empire and the Church. Hence, for his part, he was determined to work to bring about a peace which should not be broken by the trifles which had broken it in the past. In conclusion, he exhorted the Pope to draw the sword of Peter against the heretics.

To these overtures the Pope replied that he had not written to the emperor for some time, on account of the excesses of the emperor's agents, which seemed to have his sanction. However, he has now learnt that the emperor is anxious for the general good, and is ready to make satisfaction for the wrongs wrought by his followers. Urging him, therefore, to remember that it profiteth a man nothing to gain the whole world if he suffers the loss of his own soul, he tells him that he is sending him two legates, both excellent men, who are ever striving for the good of the Church and of the Empire.

While thus striving to win the good-will of the Pope, Henry had succeeded, if not by bullying, at any rate by diplomacy, in inducing the magnates of the Empire to recognise the baby Frederick as emperor along with his father (1196).

Had long life been granted to Henry, it is hard to say to what a height of power his able, bold, and unscrupulous policy might not have carried him. But he was called to his death by trouble in his new Sicilian dominions. His immediate object, however, in entering Italy in the summer of 1196 was to arrange for the departure to the Holy Land of the Germans who had taken the cross in large numbers and with great enthusiasm, and especially to procure the infant Frederick's consecration as emperor by the Pope.

But he found it harder to circumvent Celestine than it was to prevail over the princes of the Empire. Envoys passed backwards and forwards between the two in rapid succession. The Pope could not but be distrustful of him. He paid no heed to Celestine's complaints about the oppressions of Philip of Hohenstaufen, duke of Tuscany, and so Celestine would not listen to his request for the anointing of his son. Finding that the Pope was as impervious to gold as to persuasion, he left Tivoli, where he had halted for three weeks (November 1196), and pursued his way to Sicily in high dudgeon.

Practically depriving the Pope of all power outside the walls of Rome, and passing severe sentences on misdemeanours in Apulia, he crossed over into Sicily, where his tyranny was soon faced by another plot (May 1197). It is said that it was organised by the empress herself, and that Pope Celestine was privy to it. The

conspirators had plotted to murder Henry, but their design was betrayed, and the rebellion was crushed with the most barbarous cruelty. Even those who had taken part in the former conspiracy, and were in custody in Germany, were cruelly tortured. These latter barbarities of the emperor, if not his former ones, are said to have completely alienated from him the affections of his wife Constance, who took up the defence of her countrymen. The estrangement between them soon became generally talked about, and Salimbene, that gossiping Italian Matthew Paris, assures us that the wits of the time used to say that “if anyone cried check to the king, the queen would not defend him”.

Henry was now freer to devote his attention to accelerating the departure from Italy of the great host of German Crusaders, through whom alone he had been able to effect anything against his enemies in Italy. But it is agreed that in this he was working not from any disinterested zeal for the recovery of the Holy Land, but with a view to speedily subduing the Greek empire. But his Napoleonic schemes of world-wide dominion were cut short by death. A fever struck him down when he was only thirty-two (September 28, 1197). His daring dreams were dissipated, and the world was relieved from one of the most barbaric despots who ever sat upon a throne.

Concerning the relations between Celestine and Henry just before the death of the latter, and between Celestine and Constance just after it, our fullest, but unfortunately unsupported, authority is Roger of Hoveden. Before he died, Henry became reconciled to his wife, whom his cruelties had estranged from him; committed his infant son to the guardianship of the Holy See; and sent his relative Savaric, bishop of Bath, to offer to restore to Richard the ransom he had exacted from him. During the absence of Savaric, Henry breathed his last, excommunicated, according to Roger, by the Pope. Whether or not he regarded himself, or was generally regarded, as included in the excommunication with which Celestine struck those concerned in Richard's capture, is uncertain; but it appears that Celestine accounted him as excommunicated, and for some time would not allow his body to be buried.

Accordingly, the archbishop of Messina, Berard, lost no time in waiting upon the Pope to beg him to allow Henry's body to be buried; to cause the Romans to cease besieging Markwald, the chief justiciary of the late emperor in “the March of Guarnero”; and to allow the coronation of Frederick as king of Sicily. To this the Pope replied that the first of his requests depended upon the consent of King Richard, the second upon the consent of the Roman people, and the third on the consent of the cardinals. Ultimately, however, moved, as it would appear from Roger, by a large sum of money, Celestine agreed to the interment of Henry's body, and to the coronation of his son. It might perhaps be safer to conclude that Celestine was really induced to yield on these points because great part of Tuscany, which the said emperor and his predecessors had taken from the Roman pontiffs, was restored to him, as was also Sicily, Calabria, Apulia, and all the territories which had belonged to the king of Sicily, as being the proper patrimony of St. Peter, over which he made Frederick king.

Shortly before Christmas (1197) his great burden of years began to press very heavily on Celestine, and, feeling that his end was drawing near, he recommended the cardinals to take thought for the election of his successor, at the same time endeavouring to induce them to choose John of St. Paul, cardinal-priest of St Prisca, in

whose wisdom, sanctity, and justice he placed great confidence. He had, indeed, already appointed him his vicar to act for him in everything except the consecration of bishops, which belonged to the office of the cardinal-bishop of Ostia. Seeing, however, that the cardinals were not prepared to follow his lead, so self-willed was he, that he offered to resign the Papacy if they would elect John. But they declared that it was quite without precedent that the Supreme Pontiff should abdicate; and then, instead of forwarding the interests of John, they each and all, according to Roger, strove to secure votes for themselves. In the midst of this contention, Celestine died at the patriarchal age of ninety-two (January 8, 1198), and was honourably buried in the Lateran basilica towards the bottom of the outer northern aisle, near the chapel of our Lady de Reposo.

The portion of his epitaph which has been preserved sets forth that his fame will be bright for ever, and that, descended from an illustrious Roman family, he was first known as Hyacinth (Jacintus), as though the world's gem. As a member of the race of Romulus Celestine could not but be interested in the improvement of the city of his birth, and we find him showing his interest in it by continuing the work of Eugenius III on that new Vatican palace which, with its treasures of literature and art, has become one of the wonders of the modern world.

ENGLAND.

Readers of the foregoing pages will have already often seen Celestine III issuing his mandates to England in connection with the great dispute between the monks of Canterbury and its archbishop; with Geoffrey Plantagenet, archbishop of York, and with William Lonchamp, bishop of Ely and sometime regent of England.

He had also dealings with the bishops of the country generally in connection with the Order of Sempringham, which, as we have noted, was confirmed by Eugenius III. Despite this confirmation, complaints of episcopal interference with the new Order reached Celestine. He accordingly sent a bull to the archbishops and all bishops throughout England: "It has come to us, that there are some among you who, by occasion of words, saving the canonical justice of the bishop of the diocese, are trying to infringe and diminish the liberties and immunities granted by the Apostolic See to our beloved children the canons and nuns of the Order of Sempringham at their own will. Since it is but little to grant privileges and indulgences, unless we will protect them, we must not endure that anything be done by way of fraud, or that they be violated in any way by the presumption of any one. Wherefore by the writings of the Apostolic See we order and command you that ye be content with your own right, and suffer the canons and nuns to hold their chapters and to have their liberties and immunities untouched, without let or hindrance".

Other Popes followed the example of Celestine III in protecting and in granting privileges to the English Order of Gilbertines. In 1220 Honorius III granted the Master and brothers of the Order of Sempringham permission to elect a new Master on the death of the head of the Order, and decreed that on his election he should take the same oath which Roger took to observe the Institutes of the Order drawn up by the Blessed

Gilbert. Gregory IX, Innocent IV, and many other Pontiffs granted the Order one privilege after another. But, despite the fact that it had been exempted from episcopal jurisdiction at an early date, the bishops made constant efforts to assert their authority over different houses. Hence as late as 1345 we find Queen Philippa, Henry, earl of Lancaster and Leicester, Steward of England, and other great nobles pointing out to Clement VI “that although the Master, prior, brethren and sisters of the Order of Sempringham, being immediately subject to the Roman Church, are exempt from ordinary or even from legatine authority, nevertheless certain ordinaries endeavour to enforce jurisdiction over them. The aforesaid persons, therefore, pray the Pope to confirm the said privilege and exemption, and to declare the said Order to be free from all ordinary jurisdiction for ever”.

With this petition Clement duly complied, and the Order led the peaceful life of those who have little or no history, until with the reluctant consent of Convocation (1531), and by virtue of an Act of Parliament (1534), England had in Henry VIII a lay Pope. Then, that this lustful tyrant might have money for his mistresses, not content with a tithe of the property of the Order like the Popes of Rome for their needs, he seized all their property, and brought to an abrupt end an Order that, despite faults of human weakness, gave honour to God, and support and encouragement to man.

Soon after it became known in this country that Archbishop Baldwin had died in the Holy Land bewailing the sins of Crusaders, the monks of Canterbury, anticipating by a *ruse de guerre* any interference by the bishops, elected as his successor Reginald, bishop of Bath (November 1191). Both the monks and the newly elected archbishop then straightway appealed to the Apostolic See to approve of what had been done, and envoys were at once sent for the pallium. But before he could have learnt that Celestine had confirmed his election, Reginald had died (December 26), and the see of Canterbury was again vacant. After Richard had heard of this fresh vacancy, he took the first opportunity of writing to his mother from his place of captivity (Spires) urging her to secure the election of his companion in the Crusade, Hubert Walter, bishop of Salisbury (March 30, 1193). Accordingly, on May 30, 1193, the monks announced to the bishops that they had already elected Hubert Walter (May 29). The bishops could not but consent, and due notice of the election was immediately forwarded to the Pope. At the same time envoys from the archbishop-elect, from the monks, and from the king went to Rome to ask for the pallium and the plenitude of power.

In due course the pallium, which reached England in October, was presented to Hubert on November 7, 1193, when he took the usual oath of fealty and obedience to the Pope. It was not, however, till much later (March 18, 1195) that Celestine made him papal legate for the whole kingdom of England, seeing that the loyalty and faith of the Anglican Church towards the Holy Roman Church flourished in him.

Passing over Celestine’s further relations with Archbishop Walter, we will but mention one more instance of the intercourse between him and this country. It will constitute a further proof of his sympathy with Richard for his captivity. During the latter’s wars with Philip of France after his release from his German prison, he captured in arms Philip, bishop of Beauvais, whom he regarded as the cause of his ill-treatment during his detention by Henry. The bishop was at once loaded with chains, more rudely

than beseeemed his office, but more leniently than he deserved, says one of our historians. Philip thereupon appealed to the Pope, but Celestine received the appeal very coldly, and, reminding the bishop that he had been captured wearing a coat of mail and a helmet instead of a chasuble and a mitre, refused to command that he should be set at liberty, but promised, at a fitting opportunity, to intercede for him as a friend. When, however, he fulfilled his promise, Richard sent him the bishop's coat of mail, with a request to look: "if this be the coat of thy son or not". "It is the coat of no son of mine or of the Church" replied Celestine. He must be ransomed at the will of the king, for he is a son of Mars and not of Christ".

JOACHIM OF FIORE, ETC.

Postponing the narration of Celestine's endeavours in connection with the second marriage of Richard's enemy, Philip of France, till we come to treat of the intervention of Innocent III in regard to it, we will here briefly enumerate some other spheres of action in which he was engaged. His exertions in behalf of the Holy Land had most magnificent results as far as he was concerned. It is asserted that a greater number of efficient troops set out for Palestine during his pontificate than marched thither under the conduct of Barbarossa. If they effected but little, it was due chiefly to the death of the emperor, Henry VI. As the Pope favoured the Crusade, it was natural that he should encourage the military orders which were the mainstay of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem.

His influence was, moreover, felt in Hungary, Livonia, Sweden, Denmark, Spain, and Sardinia. He stretched forth his hand to protect the Jews, and also a new hospice in the Alps, for which he himself appealed for funds. And he strove to extend the protection of the Church to the shipwrecked and to merchants; but he allowed punishment, without benefit of appeal, to be inflicted both on the heretics of the south of France and on the free companies which devastated it.

An interesting decree of his shows the survival of Greeks and the Greek rite in Calabria, to which attention has already been more than once called. Celestine had heard that Greeks were ordained by Latins and Latins by Greeks, and therefore decided that the respective rites and customs of the two churches were not to be confounded together.

Celestine was also brought into touch with the Greek rite elsewhere. In 1191 Richard of the Lion's Heart, on his way to the Holy Land, took the Isle of Cyprus from the Greeks, and afterwards (1192) gave it to Guy of Lusignan (1194), who had lost his kingdom of Jerusalem. The establishment of a Latin dynasty in Cyprus naturally led to the establishment of the Latin rite. During the course of the year 1195-6, King Amaury, Guy's successor, informed the Pope that he had been making great efforts to bring the island back to the bosom of the Roman Church, and begged him to establish a Latin hierarchy in the island. Celestine listened to the request, and, in virtue of the supreme power of governing the Church which had been committed by God to St. Peter and his successors, he established an archbishop at Nicosia and bishops in three other sees. The

bishops of the Greek rite were not disturbed, but, as may easily be imagined, dissensions soon arose when in the same areas there was a Latin archbishop and a Greek archbishop, and Latin bishops and Greek bishops. At length in 1260 (July 3) Alexander IV decided that, on the death of Germanus, the then Greek archbishop, there should not be another Greek archbishop, and, while forbidding the Latin bishops to interfere with the election of the Greek bishops, made the latter in many ways dependent on the former.

Even this bare enumeration of some of the gleanings of Celestine's lost register will not be without value if it enable the imagination of the reader to do for Celestine what the existing register of Innocent III compels his intelligence to do for that great Pope, viz., to realise the world-wide influence of even that feeble old pontiff.

As Celestine III confirmed the rule of Joachim of Fiore, it would not be desirable to close his biography without a reference to that remarkable mystic, whose words and prophecies so profoundly affected the whole of the thirteenth century. Joachim was born of a good family, perhaps as early as the year 1130, at Celico, near Cosenza in Calabria. His early inclinations towards a contemplative life developed after a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and for some years he led in secret the life of a hermit among the mountains of Calabria. When his identity and whereabouts came to be generally known, he became a Cistercian lay brother, and soon gained a great reputation as a preacher. In 1168 he was made a priest, and about ten years later became abbot of Corazzo. But the charge of a monastery was distasteful to him, the more so when he recognised that the brethren had, to a considerable extent, lost the spirit of their order, and had become distinctly worldly. He accordingly laid down his office (before 1192), retired into the desert of Pietralata, and devoted himself to the composition of his commentaries on the Scriptures. He did not, however, finally bury himself in solitude. He often went from monastery to monastery preaching reform, and everywhere predicting trouble to come, and the approaching end of the world, i.e., of the carnal world as then constituted. It was to be followed by the advent of the reign of the Holy Spirit, because, as he explained in his writings, the reign of the Father, corresponding with the sway of the laid or *conjugati*, had closed with Zacharias, and that of the Son, coextensive with the sway of the *clerici*, was only to last till the year 1260. Then was to begin the reign of the Holy Ghost, when the *conjugati* and the *clerici* would be supplanted, and the sway of the superior *contemplantes* or monks in conjunction with the Pope would begin. "For, the Church of Peter, which is the throne of Christ, will not fail but, made more glorious, will endure for ever".

A crowd of disciples soon gathered round him. The Popes themselves were impressed by the intense earnestness of the hermit, and, as we have seen, encouraged him to preach and write.

For those who flocked to him at Fiore, a remote and wild spot on the high plateau of the Sila Mountains near the banks of the upper Neto, he drew up a rule of life, which, like everything else he took in hand, he submitted to the Pope. He went to Rome to offer his rule in person to Celestine III, who solemnly confirmed his Constitutions, which, he declared, had been drawn up "with much fore sight"

But the new congregation, with its regulations stricter than those of Citeaux, did not spread beyond Calabria, and, as its founder is said to have predicted, did not last long. In the beginning of the sixteenth century it was reunited to the order of Citeaux, from which it had sprung. Joachim became even more famous after his death than he had been in life. He had been a prophet, and many of his prophecies had been verified by the event. Consequently, many assertions which knaves or fools wished to have accepted were palmed off on the unwary as prophecies of the abbot of Fiore. In his writings his zeal for orthodoxy, not always according to knowledge, had led him into putting forth heretical opinions on the Blessed Trinity; and his development of his Utopian age of liberty, which the Holy Spirit was soon to inaugurate, had caused him to minimise the position of the hierarchy in this rapidly approaching era of the Eternal Gospel.

The use which, naturally enough, was soon made of the abbot's works to push heretical opinions and bogus prophecies under cover of his saintly name caused them to be carefully scrutinised by ecclesiastical authority. But because in life he had been invariably attached to the Apostolic See, and because in death he had declared that he accepted what the Pope accepted, the adverse sentence which Rome decreed against some of his statements never passed to their author. In proof of his attachment to Rome, we may turn to the commencement of his *Concordia*. It opens with a letter of Pope Clement to Joachim in which it is pointed out that he had begun his commentary on the Apocalypse by order of Pope Lucius, and had continued it by order of Pope Urban. Clement bade him finish the work, and submit it to the judgment of the Holy See. The letter is dated from the Lateran, in the first year of Clement's pontificate, June 8. The Pope's letter is immediately followed by a declaration on the part of Joachim himself. After enumerating his works, he added that the times had prevented him from submitting any of them except the *Liber concordiae* to the correction of the Holy See: "apostolico culmini ut ab eo corrigeretur". He then proceeded to lay down that, if he should die without having had an opportunity of presenting them to the Apostolic See, they were to be submitted "to him to whom the whole teaching authority has been given". He commanded all his co-abbots and priors to submit to the Apostolic See for correction all that he had written or might write to the day of his death. They were, finally, to explain to the Holy See his devotion to it, and to state that he was prepared to observe what it had decreed or should decree. The document closed with the declaration that Joachim wrote and signed it in the year 1200.

Joachim, then, might have erred, but he had not been contumacious. Hence, though Innocent III. found it necessary to condemn one of Joachim's works at the Lateran Council (1215), both he and his successor, Honorius III, forbade his order to be calumniated on that account, and the latter emphatically declared that Joachim was a Catholic. Dante, then, was only voicing the mind of the Holy See when he placed in Paradise :

"The monk Calabrian, with prophets soul endowed".

INNOCENT III.

A.D. 1198-1216

It was stated on a previous page of this work that, with the approach of the thirteenth century, the amount of material available for the history of the Popes becomes so great that it is impossible to treat, within reasonable limits, of their relations with all the different countries with which they came in contact. It was, therefore, further stated that, apart from special circumstances, attention would in the future have, for the most part, to be confined to the unfolding of papal intercourse with the Empire and with the British Isles.

An exception has, however, been made in the case of Innocent III, in order to try to bring out, by the example of perhaps its most distinguished member, what was the position of the Papacy in mediaeval Christendom. By the development of his biography at some length it is hoped to show that, whilst the government of Europe rested on feudal principles, it was upheld, "in theory at least", by "a supreme regulating force in the authority of the Head of the Church". During that period, the Papacy, as Innocent expressed it, was "the foundation of the whole of Christendom"; and it is indeed the fact that "the administrative all-controlling monarchy of Gregory VII, Innocent III, and Boniface VIII was a necessary and inevitable consequence of the conditions of the times".

PART I.
INNOCENT HIMSELF; ROME; ITALY AND SICILY.

CHAPTER I
INNOCENT'S FAMILY AND EARLY CAREER. HIS ELECTION. HIS
AIMS, VIEWS, AND WRITINGS.

Of the manner of man who succeeded the aged Celestine, another great man, a contemporary sovereign, shall tell. James I of Aragon, the Conqueror, or in Catalan, the language in which he loved to write, *En Jacme lo Conqueridor* (1213-1270), wrote the *Chronicles of Aragon*. In them he tells us that “that apostolic Pope Innocent was the best of Popes. For a hundred years before the time that I am writing this book, there had not been so good a Pope in all the Church of Rome; for he was a good clerk in that sound learning that a Pope should have; and he had a good natural sense, and a great knowledge of the things of this world”.

This best of Popes, this man who, according to the Aragonese monarch, had both the simplicity of the dove and the wisdom of the serpent, was the son of a Latin noble, Trasimund of Segni, and of a Roman mother, Claricia (Clarissa). On his father's side he belonged to the distinguished family afterwards known as the *Conti*, generally accounted “one of the four oldest and noblest families of Italy”, sharing the honour with the Colonna, Orsini, and Gaetani. From Innocent III to Innocent XIII, the last Pope of the Conti family, this family has given to the Church no less than thirteen Popes. It has, moreover, produced “three antipopes, forty cardinals, a queen of Antioch and Tripoli (Luciana Conti, wife of Boemond V), seven prefects of Rome, five senators, and thirteen leaders of armies, all valiant and worthy chevaliers, like the Torquato Conti and his son Innocenzo, who so distinguished himself in the defence of Prague against the Swedes”. And, what is especially to our purpose at present, it must be noted that, out of the thirteen Conti Popes, three of them (Innocent III, Gregory IX, and Alexander IV) in the course of about sixty years took up the struggle against the Hohenstaufen.

On his mother's side Innocent was descended from the noble Roman family of the Scotti, who had their towers in the Arenula quarter, gave their name to the adjoining church of S. Benedetto in Arenula (now Trinità del Pellegrini), and during the twelfth century at least gave distinguished men to their city.

Lothaire or Lothario Conti (Innocent III), who was born in 1160 or 1161 at castrum Gavignano, was not an only child. He had at least two brothers—Richard,

whom he made count of Sora, and John, cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Cosmedin—and a sister. John of Anagni, dei Conti di Segni, cardinal-priest of St. Mark, in whom, considering his nationality, the monks of Canterbury were pleased to state that they had confidence, is credited with being Lothaire's uncle, and we find our King Richard anxious to honour his nephew, who was, perchance, Lothaire himself. Besides his brother-in-law (*sororius*), Peter Anibaldi, Innocent in his correspondence names Stephen, a certain B..., and Leonard as his nephews, and we know from another source that the great Pope Gregory IX was his grand-nephew. Quite a number of others are referred to in the *Gesta* or in Innocent's letters as the Pope's cousins or relatives generally. Among the former appear John Oddo, Transmond, Lando of Montelongo, James the Marshal, Octavian and Oddo of Palombara, and among the latter Benedict and Romanus Carzoli. Furthermore, as a certain Theobald, of whom we shall again have occasion to speak, was the son-in-law of Romanus de Scotta, from whom Innocent was descended through his mother, we may presume that he was in some way akin to the Pope. Through the Scotti, Innocent was also connected with the Paparoni.

As many of these men owed their advancement to Innocent, their rise in the world caused the charge of nepotism to be urged against their benefactor. But, if there was some ground for the accusation, it is generally agreed that the men upon whom the Pope thus bestowed his favour were men of ability, and it was necessary for him to surround himself with trusty adherents, in view of the rival families ever ready to contest his authority. We shall see later the practical reply which Innocent himself made to this accusation.

Innocent's family was, however, not merely locally well connected. It was allied with some of the reigning families in Europe. Philip Augustus of France calls himself a blood-relation of the Pope; and, what is decidedly curious, Voukan (or Velican), whom the papal chancellery designates as Vulcanus, the second son of Stephen I, Nemanya, the founder of the kingdom of Servia, declares that, of his distinguished connections, he is most proud of his kinship with Innocent.

All we know of the youth of Lothaire is that it was passed in study at Rome and then at Paris, which was now acquiring the greatest fame as a centre of studies, and finally at Bologna; and we are assured that his abilities and application enabled him to outstrip his companions both in philosophy and in theology.

For his old masters and schools Innocent always retained the respect of a true scholar. Peter Hismael, abbot of St. Andrew, who taught him in Rome, was named by him bishop of Sutri; and Peter of Corbeil, under whom he sat at Paris, obtained through him first the bishopric of Cambrai and then the archbishopric of Sens. Unfortunately, the ancient professor continued to be more a man of the pen than of the sword, and, showing himself weak against strong offenders, brought down upon himself before he died some bitter reproofs from his dauntless pupil. And when the archbishop, cut to the quick, told the Pope how very bitter his words were to his soul, though Innocent declared that he was glad he had written them, not indeed simply because Peter was grieved by them, but because he was grieved to repentance, he took care to add words that must have brought balm to his old master's wounded heart: "Throughout the whole realm of France it is well known that it is you I specially love among all its bishops, and

that it is of your honour that I am most concerned. By the aforesaid letter, then, it is the negligence of others that I have blamed, for they will realise that, if I have not spared you, I would certainly not spare them under similar circumstances". He does not, however, fail again to insist that Peter must do his duty. "Though", he concludes, "I have sent you this letter to console you, lest too great sadness should consume thy soul, I would not have you forget the former one". Had it not been for the interfering hand of death, Innocent might even have had to punish the archbishop for not having at once accepted the excommunication which he published against Philip of France, when Prince Louis invaded England.

If the men who had taught him ever remained dear to Innocent, so also did the places wherein his mind had received its training. Especially dear to him was Paris, which the enthusiasts among the scholars at the time styled "the fortunate city wherein the sacred codices are unrolled with so much eagerness, and their deep mysteries solved by the aid of the learning there instilled; wherein is such zeal on the part of the scholars, such knowledge of the Scriptures, that the place deserves to be called 'Cariath Sepher', the city of letters".

More critical observers, however, were not slow to point out to the Pope that all was not well at Paris, and that some professors were more eager for novelty than for truth, with the result that the "Indivisible Trinity is torn asunder even by the roadside, so that there are as many errors as doctors, as many scandals as audiences, and as many blasphemies as streets". Confusion, too, is carried into the studies of canon law by forged letters of the Popes, and mere striplings "who have not yet learnt to be scholars, aspire to be appointed professors" of the liberal arts. "All these evils", concluded a critic, "call for apostolic correction, in order that papal authority may reduce to order the present chaos in teaching, learning, and discussion".

Moreover, the masters and scholars complained that they were unduly hampered by the tyranny and exactions of the local ecclesiastical authorities, who were anxious not to lose their full control over the growing educational establishment in their midst. The Pope was informed that the chancellor of the cathedral, who, before the rise of the University was an ecclesiastical judge and head of the schools, wished to exact an oath of obedience from the masters, and also at times money as well, and had even imprisoned some of the members of the University. Innocent was indignant. When he was studying at Paris, he said, he had never witnessed such conduct. He accordingly took steps to remedy the evils which had been pointed out to him. In deference to the representations of Stephen of Tournai and others, Innocent decreed that, under normal circumstances, there were not to be more than eight professors; and, in response to the complaints of the masters and "his beloved scholars", it was decided in consequence of his mandate that the chancellor was not to exact any oath of obedience or any money for granting a licence to teach, and that the oaths he had extorted were to be annulled. Nor was the chancellor to refuse a master a license to teach theology, law, science, or art, if the majority of the professors declared he was a suitable person. Innocent also, at the request of the students, confirmed their right to state their case, as occasion might arise, by a proctor.

But he did not stop here. His heart was with the University. Whatever learning he possessed, so he declared, was the result of his stay at Paris. He therefore sent to Paris one of his most trusted counsellors, the Englishman Cardinal Robert de Courçon, in order to examine into the whole condition of the University, and to legislate accordingly. The regulations issued by Robert (August 1215) do not concern us, but we may note with the learned author of the *Universities of Europe* that “the University gained in the end ... by every appeal to the Roman Court; ... for the Papacy, with that unerring instinct which marks its earlier history, sided with the power of the future, the University of masters, and against the efforts of a local hierarchy to keep education in leading-strings”. But, needless to say, the local hierarchy did not give way at once. They made desperate efforts to control “the university of masters and scholars” as they had controlled their cathedral school. But as Popes Honorius III and Gregory IX followed in the footsteps of Innocent, the University was enabled to free itself by their aid.

Before the young Lothaire left Paris, he made a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Thomas at Canterbury, where, no doubt, his ideas of working for the liberty and exaltation of the Church were strengthened. From Paris the earnest student made his way to Bologna to study law. Both civil and canon law were indeed taught at Paris, but it was at Bologna that its most distinguished professors were to be found. Under them he attained a remarkable proficiency in the intricacies of law, and was subsequently accounted one of the most authoritative of papal legislators. When he became Pope, Innocent ceased not to keep in touch with his former professors or fellow-students. We find him in correspondence with Uguccio of Pisa, afterwards bishop of Ferrara, whom he speaks of as especially learned in canon law. On Peter Collivacino, whom he met at Bologna, and who collected the *Decretals* which he dedicated to the University of Bologna (1210), he conferred the cardinalate. Here also he is supposed to have come in contact with the Englishman, Geoffrey of Vinsauf, who, at any rate, afterwards dedicated to him his *Art of Poetry* (*Poetria Nova*), and took delight in speaking of him in very flowery language: “Thou art neither God nor man, but as though between the two, one whom God chooses to be His ally. As such, with thee, He rules the world. But He wished not all things for Himself alone. So He willed earth to thee, and Heaven to Himself. What could He do better? To whom better than thee could He give it”

It was probably not long before the year 1187 that Lothaire returned to Rome with a knowledge of law which was to manifest itself in his every action for the rest of his life, and with a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures that astounded his distinguished modern biographer. He was also credited with being able to read Greek, and to write verse. In addition he was, according to his biographer, “a man of clear mind and tenacious memory; eloquent both in the language of the people and in that of the learned, and skilled in music and singing. He was of middle height, and pleasing face. Although as a rule he was not prodigal, and still less avaricious, he was, however, profuse in alms-deeds, and sparing in other matters, except in cases of necessity. Against the rebellious and the contumacious he was severe, but was gracious towards the lowly and the dutiful. Grave and steadfast, magnanimous and far-seeing, he was a defender of the faith and a destroyer of heresy. In matters of justice he was inflexible, though ever prone to mercy. Humble in prosperity, patient in adversity, and ready to forgive, he was nevertheless of a naturally fiery temperament”.

Such a man could not long be left in the background. He was soon made a canon of St. Peter's, whose church he took care to benefit when he became Pope. Pope Gregory VIII ordained him subdeacon in 1187, and he was even then a man of such influence in Rome that the monks of Canterbury, in their protracted dispute with their archbishops at this period, advised their Roman agents to try to gain the goodwill of "the lord Lothaire and his friend the lord Pillius". In 1190, Clement III, said to have been his uncle, made him, when he was only twenty-nine, cardinal-deacon of SS. Sergius and Bacchus, the little church which till sometime in the sixteenth century was to be seen in the Forum between the arch of Septimius Severus and the Capitol.

One of the first cares of the new cardinal was to restore at his own expense his titular church, which, according to his biographer, was so much out of repair as to resemble a crypt rather than a basilica. He thoroughly renewed it both inside and out, and, as soon as he became Pope, built a portico in front of it, made it many valuable presents, and confirmed its possessions, which included among other things the greater part of the arch of Septimius Severus itself, with the tower built on part of it, and a tower "in casale Barbariana".

Whilst cardinal, or, as he was afterwards in the habit of alluding to himself at this period, "whilst I was in a less important position", Lothaire was kept busily employed by Popes Clement III and Celestine III, and his name is found regularly affixed to their bulls.

But, busy as he was in dealing with ecclesiastical disputes of all kinds, he found time enough for some literary work. Of the books which he composed, the following were written before he became Pope, viz.: *De contemptu mundi*, *De sacrificio missae*, and *De quadripartita specie nuptiarum*. Whatever may be thought of the literary value of these small treatises, they give us an insight into Innocent's character which could not easily be obtained from his famous *Regesta*. This proclaims him the statesman, the judge, the lawgiver, the man of business, the conscious guide of the destinies of men; this shows him the Head of the Universal Church, ever watchful over her interests and welfare, and ever assertive of his own rights; the temporal ruler, anxious for the prosperity of his domains, and resolved to restore them to their pristine extent; the Head of Christendom ruling, guiding, and directing all things great and small. But if, occasionally, his letters reveal to us that, though in the world, he was not of it, and that, though plunged deeply in the work of the world, it did not absorb but wearied him, still it was reserved for his *opuscula* to lay bare the mystical side of his nature, and to make known to us how little hold the world and the things of the world really had upon him, and how intensely he despised its vanities and had his heart centred upon God, and upon the things of God.

His *De contemptu mundi* has been translated into many languages, and the title of the earliest English version furnishes a summary of its contents: "The Mirror of Man's life: plainly describing what weak mould we are made of. Englished by H. K(erton) from the treatise 'De contemptu mundi' by Pope Innocent III", London, 1576. With the object of lowering man's pride, "Lothaire the unworthy deacon" set forth in three books the miseries of human nature, physical and moral, both here and hereafter also, in the case of the wicked. The treatise consists of little more than quotations from

the Scriptures, and, if its compilation reveals a character that had already shaken itself free from the attractions of this world, it equally shows that in this species of composition he was not in advance of the average writer of his age. It must certainly be borne in mind that it was simply composed in order that even the little leisure of his busy life might not be altogether unproductive, and that it was rather a scholastic exercise than the deliberate expression of a man of experience. For the sake even of the quaint old English version we append one or two characteristic passages:

“Perhaps this one thing he may perfectly learn and know, that there is nothing absolutely known unto men, notwithstanding his great and forcible arguments grounded upon probable reasons”. In the fifteenth chapter of the same book he shows “the misery of the married and unmarried man”. ... “So deeply rooted is lecherous lust in the flesh of man, that if it be possible for fire not to burn, it is possible for man not to lust”. The married man “is careful for those things which belong to his wife and family, and is divided in himself”. ... “His wife desires to have precious ornaments and rich Jewells, she craves divers sites of gorgeous and sumptuous apparel, and sundry parcels of household stuff, yea and oftentimes the wives furniture doth exceed the revenue of her husband’s lands. But if she be denied what she demands she does mourn and sigh ... she chats . . . with grievous complaints of her husband’s ingratitude etc. ... If she be fair, she is soon beloved of others; if she be foul she is not hastily desired. But it is a hard matter to keep that which is beloved of many, and it is a grief to possess that which no man esteems”.

“What is more vain than to adorn the table with fine and imbrothered clothes, with ivory trenchers, with long carpets, with flagons of silver and gold, and a number of precious and gorgeous ornaments? or what avails it a man to paint his chamber, to gild the posts of his bed, etc.”.

The curious treatise “On the four kinds of marriage” is also described as written under difficulties, and is dedicated to one who shared those difficulties with the deacon, to the priest Benedict, whom he addresses as his “beloved brother in the Lord”—no doubt because he had frequently worked in his company. The work is attributed to Benedict’s wishes, and is published with the full knowledge that the result is not proportionate to the wealth of material, nor the building to its foundation. The four kinds of marriage treated of are the legitimate union of man and woman, that between Christ and His Church, that between God and the soul of the just man, and finally that between the Word and human nature. The deacon’s treatise aims at bringing out the analogies between these different kinds of marriage; and to an age that delighted in symbolism it cannot have failed to be attractive.

Though Lothaire’s treatise on the Mass is also treated very largely from a symbolical point of view, it is distinctly the most valuable of the three works which he composed whilst deacon of SS. Sergius and Bacchus. From it much useful information can be gathered concerning the ceremonies and rites of the Roman Church in the twelfth century. The deacon sets out to explain the Mass, “that banquet of the Church in which the father kills the fatted calf for the son who returns to him, setting out the bread of life (John VI) and the wine mingled by wisdom (Prov. IX. 2)”. He proposes, moreover, to treat of the persons, actions, words, and materials which are connected with it; and

when he comes to do so, he gives to each of them a symbolical or allegorical explanation. He treats at length in the fourth book of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, neatly noting that what was bread when our Lord took it into His hands was His body when He distributed it. Moreover, in this treatise he displays a distinctly critical spirit. On the one hand he extracts an argument that the Canon of the Mass was not composed by one man at one time, but was gradually built up by different men at different times, from the threefold repetition of the names of the saints therein found. On the other hand, he ventures, with all due humility, to suggest that the order of the prayers in it might easily be improved. He concludes his work by modestly exhorting his readers not to suppose that, when they have perused his book, they have read a full and complete account of the great sacrifice of the Mass. He has been hampered, he declares, not only by the vastness of the subject, but by the limited time at his disposal, and he begs his reader both to correct his book and to pray for him.

To one who reviews these early works of Innocent with the ideals of our age in front of him, they will scarcely appeal at all; but their symbolism was a delight to the men of the thirteenth century, and there is scarcely an author of that epoch who mentions Innocent who does not praise his writings. In any case, they assuredly do not show him that energetic, firm, and enlightened ruler of men which his deeds and his letters subsequently proved him to have been. For there was in truth much more of the man of action than of the mystic in Innocent III; and if for once we may give credence to the gossip of Friar Salimbene, his choice of the active state in preference to the contemplative was deliberate; and he knew how to justify his choice. Speaking to one who wished to decline a bishopric, he said: "Do not imagine that, because Mary chose the better part which shall not be taken away from her, Martha therefore chose a bad part in busying herself about many things. If the contemplative state is safer, the active is the more fruitful; and if the former is sweeter, the latter is more profitable. In fertility of offspring the bleary-eyed Leah excelled the comely Rachel".

After the interment of Celestine III the cardinals, including the deacon Lothaire, who had assisted at it, betook themselves immediately to the Septizonium of Severus to join the rest of their brethren who had already assembled in this ancient ruin, long before turned into a fortress. It had been decided to hold the election in that stronghold in order that it might be entirely free. After the Mass of the Holy Ghost had been said, the cardinals humbly prostrated themselves, and gave each other the kiss of peace. When they had been duly exhorted to vote conscientiously, *scrutators* were appointed according to custom to record the votes and report thereon to the others. Before the death of Celestine, satirists proclaimed that all the cardinals were aiming at the Papacy; but when it came to the actual election of his successor only three names were put forward. Of these John of Salerno, cardinal-priest of S. Stefano Rotondo, received ten votes, and Lothaire the great majority; and although some at first thought that the latter, being only thirty-seven, was too young, still, considerations of his strong character, his virtue, his learning, and perhaps of his freedom from party attachments, speedily carried the day. The other candidates resigned their pretensions, and, as the votes of all centred on Innocent, the Roman proverb, that he who enters the conclave a Pope leaves it a cardinal, was for once proved false. Lothaire, whom the majority of the Romans had already thought of as Celestine's successor, was, on the very day of that pontiff's death,

officially declared Head of the Universal Church by the unanimous vote of the cardinals. Hoping, no doubt, as Innocent has himself suggested, that “they would find the silver cup in the sack of Benjamin”, they would not listen to Lothaire’s tearful objections to the honour which they wished to bestow upon him; but, placing the pontifical mantle on his shoulders, and giving him the name of Innocent, they intoned the Te Deum, and led him to the assembled people who were awaiting without the result of the election.

In connection with this election the author of the *Gesta* has a pretty story to tell us. After Innocent had been duly elected, and had taken his seat to receive the homage of the cardinals, the whitest of three doves which had been flying about the hall came towards him and settled at his right hand. He also states that in a vision Innocent had been assured that he should become the spouse of his mother, *i.e.*, the Roman Church, and that many good men had seen visions concerning him, which, as the new Pope did not like to have discussed, he would not mention.

After his election he was escorted by the people first to the basilica of Constantine and then to the adjoining Lateran palace with the solemn ceremonies which we have already partly described in the case of Paschal II. When he first reached the Lateran basilica, Innocent was placed by the cardinals in the marble seat, known as the *sedes stercoraria*, verifying the words of the Psalmist: “Raising up the needy from the earth, and lifting up the poor out of the dunghill (*de stercore*) that he may place him with princes (and that he may hold the throne of glory)”. Then rising from his seat the Pope took from the *camerarius* (chamberlain, at this period the papal treasurer) three handfuls of denarii and scattered them among the people, crying out, “Gold and silver are not mine for my pleasure; what I have, that do I give to you”. The prior of the canons of the basilica and one of the cardinals thereupon led the Pope into the church to the great staircase which ascended to the oratory of St. Sylvester in the Lateran palace, whilst the chant was raised: “St. Peter has chosen Innocent Pope”.

At the top of the staircase the Pope was met by the judges, who conducted him through the palace to the oratory, the entrance of which consisted of an arch supported by two porphyry columns. Above the arch was an image of our Saviour which had once been struck by a Jew on the face, and which, as may be seen at this day, adds Cencius, thereupon gave forth blood. To the right of the arch was a *porphyry* chair. When Innocent had taken his seat upon it, the prior of the canons presented him with a baton (*ferula*), the symbol of rule and correction, with the keys of the Lateran palace and basilica, because especially to Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, was given the power of opening and shutting, binding and loosing, and through that apostle to all the Roman Pontiffs. Still holding the baton and keys, Innocent betook himself to another *porphyry* chair on the left of the arch, and there, after giving up the baton and the keys, was girded by the prior with a red silken girdle from which depended a purple purse containing musk and twelve seals made of precious stones. Moreover, the Pope-elect was instructed so to place himself on the two chairs as to seem to be reclining on them, in order to represent himself as recumbent between the primacy of St. Peter and the preaching of St. Paul, the doctor of the Gentiles. The *Ordo* also notes that the girdle typifies chastity, and the purse the treasury whence the poor are supported; the twelve

seals denote the power of the twelve apostles, and the musk suggests, in the words of the apostle, that we are “the good odour of Christ unto God”.

Whilst still in this second seat the Pope gave the kiss of peace to the officials of the palace after they had kissed his feet, and, before rising, thrice scattered more denarii among the people, saying: “He hath distributed, he hath given to the poor, his justice remaineth for ever and ever” (Ps. CXI. 9).

From the oratory of St. Sylvester Innocent was led to that of St. Lawrence (the *Sancta Sanctorum*), passing beneath the statues (*yconas*) of the apostles, “which came by sea to Rome by themselves”, and after making a long prayer before the altar, specially reserved for the Pope’s use, he adjourned first to his private apartments and then to the banqueting hall.

As the Saturday of Ember week, one of the usual days for conferring of holy orders, was approaching, Innocent’s ordination to the priesthood was put off until that day (February 21), and his consecration as bishop was fixed for the following Sunday.

In the early morning a splendid procession left the Lateran palace. First, clad like all the others in silk, went the youngest of the subdeacons of the Lateran, carrying the cross. After him was led a spare horse fully caparisoned for the Pope. Next marched twelve *draconarii* carrying the standards of the twelve regions of the city, and followed by two admirals of the fleet clad in copes (*pluvialibus*). Then came such foreign bishops and archbishops as chanced to be in the city, to the number of four of the latter and some twenty of the former, followed in order by ten abbots of the various Roman monasteries, the cardinal-bishops, and six cardinal-priests. These were succeeded by the advocates of the Curia (the *advocati* or *defensores*) and the notaries, a Greek deacon and a Greek subdeacon, who had to chant the gospel and the epistle in their language. The *schola cantorum* came after the notaries, and they were followed by the regionary subdeacons, the subdeacons of the Lateran, and the prior of the subdeacons with a baton. After them walked eight cardinal-deacons two by two, followed by their prior also carrying a baton. After him, mounted on a horse with scarlet trappings, rode the Pope clad in a white chasuble (*planeta alba*). Close to him walked a subdeacon with a towel (*toalea* or *tagolia*). The procession was closed by the prefect and the seven Palatine judges in copes, and was kept in order by the archdeacon and the prior of the Lateran basilica, who were instructed often to leave their places, in front of the Pope and the cardinal-deacons respectively, in order to see to the regularity of the procession.

This attractive cortège crossed the open space (*campus*) in front of the Lateran palace and, passing by the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, moved along the Via Major (now known as Santi Quattro), which led to the Colosseum. This gigantic monument, like most of the great ruins of antiquity, was then of living interest to the men who gazed upon it, for it was a fortress in the hands of a family, friendly or hostile to them as the case might be. Near this mighty stronghold the procession turned to the left, and by a route which corresponded more or less to the present Via del Colosseo, passed by the Arcus Aure, which stood near the existing little church of S. Andrea de Portugallo, and then went, possibly *through*, but probably in front of, the entrance of the Forum of Nerva (the Forum Transitorium), which lay between the Forum of Augustus and that of the Forum *Pacis* (or of Vespasian), to the church of St. Basil *de Arca Noe* in

the Forum of Augustus. By a street corresponding to the modern “Via del Grillo”, the procession next approached the Militiae Tiberianae, the site of which is marked by the Torre delle Milizie. Thence it descended by the church of S. Abbaciro *de Militiis*, now destroyed, to the SS. Apostoli, where it turned to the left, and, after following the Corso for some distance, turned off by the Via Quirinalis to the church of S. Maria in Aquiro. Thence it proceeded to the Arch of Piety, and, leaving on the left the church of St. Trypho *in Posterula*, now destroyed, went along the bank of the river to the bridge of St. Angelo. Crossing the bridge, it made its way to St. Peter’s after entering the covered portico near the pyramid known as the sepulchre of Romulus.

On entering the basilica, Innocent was at once escorted to the chapel of St. Gregory, in the near left-hand corner of the church, to be robed in the pontifical vestments. These were put upon him in order: the sandals and buskins, the amice, the alb, the girdle with its *subcinctorium*, the pectoral cross, the fanon or orale, the stole, the tunic and the dalmatic, then gloves, and the chasuble, and finally the mitre.

Thus arrayed, Innocent, beneath a canopy carried by the Mapularii, was escorted to the high altar by the prelates, preceded by seven torch-bearers and by a thurifer. When all had taken their places in front of the altar, the consecration of the Bishop of Rome elect was performed with much the same ceremonies and prayers as are used in consecrating a bishop today. There will be found to be in both cases the same prayers; the litanies; the imposition of the open book of the Gospels on the head of the elect with the words: “Receive the Holy Ghost”; the anointings; and the presentation of the ring (placed upon the ring-finger of the right hand), and of the book of the Gospels.

But the older prayers are fuller. God in His care for the *universal* Church was implored to bestow “His grace on His servant whom He had given as prelate of the Apostolic See, as primate of all the bishops of the world, and as teacher of the universal Church; and whom he had chosen for the office of chief Bishop (et ad summi sacerdotii ministerium elegisti)”.

The giving of the pallium is the only part of the ceremony specially noted by Cencius. When the bishop of Ostia had completed the actual consecration, the prior of St. Lawrence, *i.e.* the Sancta Sanctorum of the Lateran, placed upon the altar the pallium which he had himself prepared with his own hand. Taken from the altar by the archdeacon and the second deacon, it was placed by them in Innocent’s hands, whilst the archdeacon said: “Receive the pallium, to wit, the plentitude of the pontifical office, to the glory of Almighty God, of the most glorious Virgin His Mother, of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and of the Holy Roman Church”. The archdeacon and the prior then fixed it on Innocent’s shoulders by means of three golden pins, with jacinth heads, placing one in each of the lapels and one on the part which rested on the left shoulder.

After the reception of the pallium, the Pope incensed the altar, and said the *Gloria in Excelsis* and the Collects; but, before the reading of the epistle, there took place the solemn chanting of the *laudes*. The cardinal-archdeacon, baton in hand, marshalled, in two equal groups before Innocent, the deacons, subdeacons, judges, and notaries, and, raising his voice, sang in recitative: “Hear us, O Christ”. To this in the same tone the judges and notaries replied: “To our lord the Pope, by God’s decrees chief bishop and universal Pope, long life!”. Thrice was this repeated; and thrice did the

archdeacon call on the “Saviour of the World”, and thrice on “Holy Mary”, and to each invocation the notaries and judges responded, “Do you help him!”. And when the archdeacon invoked in turn St. Gabriel, St. Raphael, St. John Baptist, St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Andrew, St. Stephen, St. Leo, St. Gregory, St. Benedict, St. Basil, St. Sabas, St. Agnes, St. Cecily, St. Lucy, the judges and notaries continued their response: “Do you help him!”. To the thrice-repeated *Kyrie eleison* of the archdeacon, thrice was returned the same invocation; and the *laudes* came to an end by all chanting *Kyrie eleison* in unison. The epistle and gospel were next read first in Latin and afterwards in Greek, and then the rest of the Mass was said with the customary ceremonies.

But before the Mass was over, Innocent himself preached the sermon which custom required on such occasions. A full analysis of it is here given, as it shows clearly what was Innocent’s own conception of his position and of the duties it involved.

“Who thinkest thou is a faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath appointed over his family, to give them meat in season?” (St. Matt. XXIV. 45)

To this question propounded in the Word of God, Innocent proceeded to give an answer drawn from the same source. The faithful servant is the Holy See, which God has Himself set over His family; for He Himself said: “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it” (St. Matt. XVI. 18). God Himself laid the foundation of the church, nay, He is Himself its foundation. Hence is the Holy See not depressed when adversities overtake her, for she knows that she is strengthened by them: “When I was in distress, thou hast enlarged me” (Ps. IV. 1); and she is consoled because her Founder is with her “all days even to the consummation of the world” (St. Matt, XXVIII. 20). As then the Apostolic See comes from God, in vain does the heretic strive to destroy it; for, as Gamaliel said: If it be of God, you cannot overthrow it” (Acts v. 39).

“I then am that servant whom the Lord has placed over His family. May I be found faithful and prudent. I confess myself the servant, not the Lord of all, speaking in the spirit of my first and greatest predecessor when he said: Not as lording it over the clergy, but being made a pattern of the flock from the heart” (1 Pet. v. 3).

“To be set over the household is to be given a position, if very honourable, certainly very onerous; for I am become a debtor to all. Hence must I have faith for all. But I rely on Him who said: I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted confirm thy brethren (St. Luke XXII. 32). Hence the faith of the Apostolic See has never failed in any emergency, but has ever remained whole and undefiled, that the privilege of Peter may endure unshaken”.

“I must, too, be prudent, very prudent, to be able to solve the knotty questions that are brought before the Pope, to clear away doubts, to discover the merits of cases, to observe the due course of justice, to expound the Scriptures, to preach to the people, to correct evildoers, to strengthen the weak, to confound heretics, and to confirm Catholics”.

“But, in choosing me for this work, God has shown that all that is to be done will be done through Him; for “who am I that I should sit above kings and occupy the throne of glory? for to me is it said : ‘Lo! I have set thee this day over the nations and

kingdoms, to root up, to pull down, and to waste and to destroy, and to build and to plant” (Jer. I. 10). To me also is it said: “To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven” (St. Matt. XVI. 19)

Then, apparently confusing the Syriac word Cephaz with the Greek word *Kefali*, he quotes: “Thou shalt be called Cephaz” (St. John I. 42), and says that the Pope is called the head because he has the plenitude of power. “You see then”, he continued, “who is the servant whom the Lord has set over His household, to wit, the vicar of Jesus Christ, the successor of Peter, the Christ of the Lord, the God of Pharaoh, one set as an intermediary between God and man, ... less than God, more than man, who has to judge all, but is himself judged by no man; for the apostle has declared, ‘He that judgeth me is the Lord’ (1 Cor. IV. 4).

“But let the duty of being the servant of all keep in humility the man whom so sublime a dignity exalts, so that the dignity may be lowly, and the humility sublime”.

“If it be the fact that to whom more is given from him more will be required, what account will he have to give to whom all are entrusted? Now all who are of the household (*de familia*) of the Lord have been placed under his care; for the Lord spoke not of different families, but of one family, in order that there might be “one fold and one shepherd” (St. John x. 16).

“But he has been set over the family that he may give it food in season. The Primacy of Peter was thrice constituted by our Lord Jesus Christ; viz., before, during, and after His passion. Before His passion when He said: “Thou art Peter”, etc. (St. Matt. XVI. 18); during His passion when He prayed for Peter’s faith (St. Luke XXII. 32); and after His passion when He thrice commanded St. Peter to feed His sheep (St. John XXI. 15). In the first passage there is expressed the grandeur of his power, in the second the constancy of his faith, in the third the feeding of the flock. Now he must feed the flock by the example of his life, by his teaching, and by the bread of life”.

Innocent concludes his discourse by reminding his hearers that he has set before them the food of the Word, and begs them to pray God that his weak shoulders may support the intolerable burden put upon them “to the glory of His name, to the salvation of my soul, to the advancement of the Universal Church, and to the advantage of the whole Christian People”.

When at length all the impressive ceremonies connected with the consecration were over, Innocent and his suite betook themselves to the outer steps of the basilica. There in sight of all the people, chanting the *laudes*, his investiture was completed by the cardinal-archdeacon’s placing on his head “the crown which is called the regnum”. He was now both Priest and King.

Then, to enable the cavalcade to make its way back to the Lateran, the seneschal scattered money among the people.

The pressure was at once relaxed, and the procession, crossing the Tiber, passing under the arch of the emperors Theodosius, Valentinian, and Gratian, of which there are remains near the church of St. Celsus, made its way to the palace of Chromatius. Here it

made its first halt, whilst the Jews came forward to acclaim the Pope, and to offer him the roll of the Law for him to do it reverence.

Another scattering of money from the top of the tower of Stephen Serpetri enabled the cortège to push on through the Parione quarter to the *Pinea* and to the palace of Cencius “Musca Impunga” on the Via de Papa. Again took place a distribution of money, and the procession reached the church of St. Mark, where a further bestowal of largess enabled it to get to the church of St. Hadrian near the arch of Septimius Severus. For the last time were denarii flung to the people from the palace of St. Martina, and the cavalcade, riding along the Forum, passed the palace of Pope John VII, rode under the arch of Titus and under triumphal arches erected by the Frangipani, and then, skirting the Meta Sudans and the arch of Constantine, turned to the left by the Colosseum and thus returned to the Lateran.

Mention has been made of the triumphal arches of the Frangipani “de Cartularia”, but the fact was that the whole papal Via Triumphalis was green throughout its whole extent with arcles of shrubs, and with branches of trees spread on the ground. From that by the steps of St. Peter, erected “by the masters of St. Peter”, to those between S. Clemente and the Lateran, decorative arches, erected by different *scolae* or guilds, by the clergy, by private families, or by groups of persons, adorned the whole route. And if every part of this Triumphal Way was gay to look upon, it was also odoriferous. Thurifers from some three hundred and eleven churches and monasteries grouped themselves together at suitable places and caused the whole route of the papal procession to be fragrant from clouds of incense which they continued to waft into the air. They came not only from the great churches of St. Peter, St. Mary Major, and the like, but from the smaller ones, from Innocent’s late church of SS. Sergius and Bacchus, from the Irish Church (S. Trinitas Scottorum), from the church of Our Lady *in Savia*, which once belonged to the *Schola Anglorum*, from St. Sebastian *de Via pape*, from many churches *de Pinea*, from churches we have recently mentioned, such as from St. Andrew *Arcus Aure*, and from small chapels to which no clergy were regularly attached (e.g., from the chapel of St. Cesarius Grecarum).

On the return procession Innocent was accompanied by the prefect and the senator and by the nobility of the city, as well as by many representatives of the various cities of the League and of the States of the Church.

Arrived once more at the Lateran, one of Innocent’s first tasks was to distribute the regulation gratuities to those who had taken part in the ceremony of the day. In these gratuities all shared, both the highest and the lowest, both the clergy and laity. Seated on a faldstool with a mantle thrown over his shoulders, Innocent with his own hand distributed the largess to the principal members of the clergy and nobility. Those who had erected the arches were remunerated, as were the clergy who had acted as thurifers. The Jews, who in presenting the Old Testament to the Pope had offered him three and a half pounds of pepper and two and a half pounds of cinnamon, received a specially large donative. All the *scolae* of the palace also received a fixed sum, but other officials of the Curia were dependent upon the goodwill of the *camerarius* for the donative which was awarded to them. Even the great *scolae* or guilds of the city each received a gratuity. Such were the *Adextratores*, who guarded the papal crown; the *Ostiarrii*, who guarded

the palace; the *Majorentes*, a sort of mounted police for the papal processions; the *Masons* and the rest. But, as the *Camerarius* is careful to note, seeing that these donatives were given to the guilds in view of services rendered to the Curia, it is quite possible that not all of them were granted gratuities on this occasion.

Some of the more important functionaries were granted donatives in kind as well as in money. The chief seneschal received not only a silver dish to the value of three and a half marks, but also a dinner of fifteen covers which he had to eat with his friends “in panettaria” before the Pope returned from St. Peter’s. He was also entitled to receive from the head butler (or cupbearer—*pincerna*) an agnaricia of spiced wine or hippocrass (*claretum*), and one of wine; and to have sent to his own house six boars’ heads ready for use, a measure of lard, and half the skins of all the beasts slaughtered for the feast. The head butler (*magister pincerna*) was to be supplied with a silver cup of the value of three and a half marks, while he in turn had to give to each of his assistants a silken girdle. His other perquisites were the same as those of the chief seneschal. At the official banquet with the Pope each senator was allowed a half sauma of wine and a similar quantity of hippocrass, and he was further supplied with a dinner for forty covers. The prefect, besides being furnished with a dinner for fifteen friends, was given an iron-hooped barrel of hippocrass and one of wine.

When the Pope had finished distributing the regulation donatives, he adjourned to the great triclinium of Pope Leo III for the official banquet, which was a very representative gathering. Besides the magnates of the clergy and the laity there sat down with the Pope a certain number of the members of the various guilds. All the *Adextratores*, the *Mapularii* and *Cubicularii*, all the *Majorentes*, the *Vastararii*, the *Fiolarii*, the ironworkers (*Ferrarii*), and all the standard-bearers, and four of the *Ostiararii* had the right to “dine with the Lord Pope on the day of his coronation”.

But with the customary presents the Romans were not content. Following the just criticisms of the authors of this age, those of St. Bernard, John of Salisbury, and Gerhoh of Reichersburg, Hurter notes that “at this epoch the people of Rome combined in their character all the faults of their pagan ancestors with those of the barbarians who had transformed Italy”. Particularly had they preserved the avarice which had been the disgrace of their pagan predecessors. Accordingly, no sooner had Innocent been elected than they clamoured to be allowed to take the oath of fealty to him at once, so that they might receive forthwith the presents customary on that occasion. But, no doubt lest he might seem to be paying a price for his election, he refused to entertain their request till after his consecration. When that ceremony was over, the Romans renewed their request in a still more turbulent fashion. But even then Innocent would not straightway satisfy their demands. He looked first into the finances of the Holy See, and then took steps to prevent the greedy Romans from receiving more than was their strict due. A very little examination revealed the fact that these finances were in a deplorable condition (*pessimus*). Papal sovereign and private rights had been usurped by the Germans and by the Senate. Carushomo, who had made himself sole senator from 1191 to 1193, had taken from the Holy See the Maritima and the Sabina, and Henry VI “had taken possession of the whole kingdom of Sicily and the whole patrimony of the Church up to the gates of the city except Campania, and even in it he was more obeyed than the Pope himself”. Despite, however, the unsatisfactory state of the papal exchequer, Innocent, in

order to avoid exciting immediate unpopularity, decided to give the largess to the citizens after he had made secret careful inquiries into the number and status of the people in each region.

But though he made this concession to the times, Innocent proceeded without a moment's delay to improve his position as temporal ruler of Rome and the Patrimony. On the very day after his consecration, he insisted on Peter, the prefect of the city, taking an oath of fealty to him, and acknowledging that he received his powers from him; for, from the time of the struggle between Barbarossa and Alexander III, the emperor had occasionally been able to institute the prefect himself. Innocent in person invested Peter of Vico with a mantle, and, sending envoys throughout the whole Patrimony, compelled all the barons to take an oath of fealty to him. Then, expelling the justiciaries who had been appointed by Carushomo and other senators, he not only nominated his own justiciaries, but caused the election of a senator devoted to him, and began to recover the patrimonies which had been lost, both within and without the city.

Now more assured of his position at home, the young Pope notified to the Christian world that he had obtained "the most glorious possession to be found among men, the throne of Peter". France was one of the first countries to be informed of his election, and he earnestly exhorted Philip Augustus, whose disregard for law would, he felt, soon cause a rupture between them, to follow, as the special son of the Church, the reverential footsteps of his father. Similar letters are extant to the bishops of France and England, and to the patriarch of Jerusalem, in which he excuses his youth, and earnestly begs for prayers, while at the same time he assures these prelates of his intention of giving them due honour and of helping them in their difficulties.

The Christian world now knew that for once its chief was a young man; and it was soon to learn, if it knew it not already, that its chief was a man of remarkable energy, of broad views, of lofty aims, and of uncompromising character.

The feebleness that necessarily accompanied Celestine's extreme old age had resulted in a considerable accumulation of work in the papal chancellery. That, however, despite his age, the late Pope got through a very large amount of work is clear even from Innocent's correspondence, which at every turn refers to documents "of our predecessor Celestine of blessed (or happy) memory". Still, Celestine left many questions undecided, many letters unanswered.

Without waiting to be consecrated, Innocent at once applied himself to the task of clearing off the arrears of communications; and correspondents in various parts of Europe, especially no doubt the poorer ones, were astonished at receiving letters from him with only a half leaden bulla attached to them.

Many were unaware that a custom was growing up in virtue of which a Pope-elect was wont to employ only imperfect or unfinished leaden bulla before his consecration. Hence it was that Innocent found it necessary to notify the prelates of the Christian world, and through them those whom it might concern, that bulls issued before his consecration, furnished with a half bulla, were as authentic as those subsequently despatched with an entire bulla appended to them. Light may be thrown on this passage by another from a letter of an unknown Pope to a king. "Wonder not", is the conclusion of the letter, "that a bulla not stamped with our name is appended to this

document which is being despatched before the solemnity of our consecration or benediction, because the Roman pontiffs are wont to observe this method of sealing their letters (*in bullandis litteris*) before their consecration”.

Had we no words of Innocent himself on the subject, his Register, which everywhere bears the impression of his own hand, is proof enough of his remarkable energy. But he has often described the enormous amount of work which he was called upon to perform, work as much in the temporal as in the spiritual order, and which, little as he liked it, he could not avoid. “Since our Lord”, he wrote, “in the person of Blessed Peter (whose successor He has made us though unworthy) has set the Church over all spiritual concerns, and has, even in temporal matters, given it a large interest, it is proper that we should strive to do something at least for the said Blessed Peter in the persons of you his canons, or rather for Christ in him who has done all for us. ... It is then right that whilst we, overwhelmed by pressure of business, strive to reform relaxed religion, to give justice to the oppressed, to reply to consultations, to reconcile those at enmity, to send legates *a latere* for the various needs of churches and provinces, and to take thought for the succour of the East—it is then right that, as we cannot (for these reasons) frequent the basilica of St. Peter’s as we ought, we should at least honour it with presents”.

To cope with the work here outlined by himself, Innocent had in truth need of the greatest energy. But his very zeal for work, and the manner in which he carried it through, did but increase it for him. His capacity for business, his quick grasp of difficult problems, and above all his burning passion for justice, caused ever more and more cases to be submitted to him.

His consuming energy and his knowledge of the weaknesses of some of his agents made him desirous of proceeding himself to the different countries of Europe to remedy abuses, and to promote the cause of God. He wished to imitate the apostles or his great predecessor St. Leo IX, and he told our King Richard the Lion-hearted, that, although he had innumerable calls upon his time, he hoped in due course to pay a visit to his country, so that they might discuss what would be for the profit of the whole of Christendom. He regretted that he could not fly to the different countries “in the twinkling of an eye”, and do everything himself.

Being uniformly just, says his biographer, “innumerable cases were laid before him, and in his pontificate he decided many more important questions than had been decided in many previous pontificates”. To settle the affairs that were brought to his court, Innocent revived the custom which had fallen into desuetude of holding a public consistory thrice every week. When he had heard the various causes, he handed over the less important ones to be dealt with by others. But the more important ones he examined himself; and he handled them with such skill as to excite general admiration. Men learned in the law flocked to Rome just to hear him, and Innocent himself tells of a lawyer who was so struck with his judicial fairness that he threw himself at his feet, crying out in the words of the Psalmist : “Thou art just, O Lord; and thy judgment is right”. Others declared that they learnt more in his consistories than in the schools, especially when they listened to him passing sentence. So admirably did he sum up the two sides, that it was said that each party felt sure of success when they heard him

present their arguments. Nor, we are told, was there any advocate who came before him who was so clever as not greatly to dread his searching questions (*oppositiones*).

Another reason why so many causes were brought before Innocent's tribunal was his readiness to deal with the interests of the poor. We have already seen how he began to investigate their demands and complaints as soon as ever he was elected to the Papacy, and after he became Pope he listened to their troubles first. His court was also popular because, as a rule, he used despatch in dealing with the cases which came before it; he abridged the law's delays. But no doubt his absolute integrity was the chief reason why his tribunal was so thronged. He was no acceptor of persons, nor were his hands ever soiled by a bribe.

He was, moreover, extremely anxious to prevent those under him from making the administration of justice a matter for bargaining. In his anxiety to cleanse the Roman Church from the charge of venality, he had scarcely become Pope ere he issued a decree forbidding any official of the Curia to exact any remuneration for his services, except those who had to register and despatch the papal bulls, *i.e.*, the *scriptores* and the *bullarii*. But at the same time he fixed a definite charge which these latter might not exceed, and he removed the doorkeepers from the offices of the notaries that all might have ready access to them.

There was within the precincts of the Lateran palace itself a kind of exchange and mart, of which we have already spoken, where jewellers and money-changers daily plied their trade. With the zeal of Him who overturned the tables of the money-changers, says his biographer, Innocent ordered this mart to be entirely removed from the palace.

Moreover, that he might be the freer to denounce the luxury of the great, especially of the higher clergy, he set an example of modest and frugal living in his own person. Vessels of gold and silver were replaced by those of wood and glass; expensive furs by the skins of lambs. Except on special occasions no more than three different kinds of dishes were served at his table, and no more than two at the tables of his chaplains; and he was waited upon by ecclesiastics, the service of nobles being reserved for state occasions. But although the young sons of the nobility who had hitherto attended on the Pope were thus banished from the papal court, Innocent provided handsomely for them, so that in due course they might become knights.

Whatever immediate good results followed Innocent's efforts against bribery and corruption, it is not to be supposed that he succeeded in rooting the national vice of avarice out of the Romans, or in silencing malicious tongues ever ready, in season and out of season, to throw up the charge of greed of gold against the Roman Curia. Unfortunately for Innocent, it happened that the greatest of the Minnesingers, Walter von der Vogelweide, espoused the cause of Philip of Swabia against Otho in the struggle for the Empire which we shall presently have to relate. Accordingly, when in the course of the struggle Innocent sided with the latter, Walter did not hesitate to allow political zeal to get the better of sober judgment. With a supposed hermit he cried to God :

“Alas! the Pope is far too young;
In mercy help thy Christendom!”

Nor does he shrink from comparing Innocent even to Judas:

“We all make moan, yet know not what it is that grieves,
That ‘tis the Pope himself, our father who deceives us.
Oh! in how fatherly a way he now precedes us!
We follow in his steps whitherso’er he leads us.
Now, all the world, to what I blame in this give heed:
If he be greedy, all men ape his greed:
If he tells lies, his lies they all repeat:
If he deceive, they join in his deceit.
Mark well, whoever thinks my words ameeet
In this wise this new Judas will as the old one speed”.

In no more measured language did another of Philip’s partisans, the German chronicler, Burchard of Ursberg, gibe at the alleged venality of Rome. “Rejoice”, he jeered in mockery, “rejoice, O thou our mother Rome, that the cataracts of earth’s treasures are opened, and that rivers of gold flow abundantly into thy bosom... It is not devotion and a pure conscience that draws men to thee, but the perpetration of countless crimes, and the decision of legal cases bought with gold”.

If Innocent’s manly efforts to suppress an abuse could not close the mouths of loud-voiced partisans, neither could they prevent the parsimonious gossip, Matthew Paris, from propagating exaggerated statements, not to say lies, regarding his endeavours to procure money from the prelates who attended the Lateran Council of 1215. To the monk of St. Albans, “who loved not Rome”, the possessions of his abbey were as the apple of his eye, and anyone who made any demand upon them for any purpose whatsoever was sure of being cordially denounced by him. This prejudiced and unreliable monk stands alone in asserting that, before Innocent would allow the prelates who had come to Rome for the Lateran Council to return to their homes, he exacted a large sum of money from them.

But if he could not sweeten the bitter tongue of the monk of St. Albans, Innocent could show both by word and by example how desirous he was of putting down bribery and corruption, and of preventing the very shadow of simony from attaching itself to his name. Writing to Abbot Stephen of Bologna, and to Gregory, a doctor of laws of the same place, to whom he had entrusted the examination of a case connected with the bishop of Alessandria, he says: “We invoke the testimony of Him who is our faithful

witness in heaven ... that we endeavour to settle the questions which are brought before the Apostolic See with all fairness and disinterestedness, ... as those can testify who on various business affairs are in the habit of coming to the Roman Church". He proceeds to note that the examination of the bishop's case had proved that "he thought that the Pope could be induced to grant ecclesiastical property for money". The commissioners were accordingly ordered "to suspend the bishop publicly, so that what had befallen him might make others afraid of imitating his conduct".

Innocent's determination not to allow life or death or the favour of any one whomsoever to separate him from the observance of strict justice, and his regret that he could not be everywhere at once and do everything himself, sprang from this conviction that it was his to reform the world through the paramount power of the Church. His was unceasing care for all the churches, because the "Apostolic See is the mother and mistress of all the churches"; he was set over "peoples and kingdoms", because he was the Feather of all Christians, and because kings and princes were his spiritual sons. Hence he felt that he had a father's right and power to correct wrong-doing in his family, if that wrong were done even by the most distinguished of his sons. But if he believed that the "paterna potestas" over kings and peoples was his natural and acknowledged right, he wished to exercise his parental authority rationally, and in accordance with the dictates not merely of justice but of mercy. He was, therefore, most careful not to exercise his repressive powers without real reason, and to forbid his subordinates to exercise the power of excommunication without good and sufficient cause.

Greatly did he bewail the evils of the times. There was a time, he sighed, when justice and peace kissed; now they are in exile, and violence and sedition, joining their perjured hands, boast that they have taken their place. The Church and the poor are robbed, and the weak are oppressed. Injustice has usurped the place of right, and law is made not by right reason but by arbitrary will, so that some seem to imagine that all that pleases them is right.

But it is his duty "to plant religion in the churches of God, and to cultivate it where it has already been planted"; and it is "the desire of his heart that in his time the Christian religion may everywhere make more substantial progress". The care of all the faithful of Christ has been committed to him, and he will work that they may all obtain justice, and its first-fruit, peace. It is the special duty of the father and guardian of the great Christian family to provide for the peace of his children; for, however unworthy, he occupies the place "of the supreme Mediator" on earth, and he will not only take his seat in judging with the princes of the land, but, if need be, will also judge those princes themselves.

There was, moreover, every need that Innocent should exert himself to reform the world. All the world looked to the Pope; and if he slumbered, everything slept the deadly sleep of sin. If the Pope is not vigilant, continues a contemporary Roman or Italian poet, the divine law perishes, and the whole machine of the world is thrown out of gear. But whilst he watches, all is alive. The law of God is vigorous, and world's machinery all runs true.

In the assertion of his position, Innocent also made use of language which was still stronger though it was not new. It had been employed by Gregory VII. "Just as God", he wrote, "has set two great lights in the firmament of heaven, a greater light to rule the day and a lesser light to rule the night, so in the firmament of the Universal Church has He set two great dignities, the greater to rule the day, *i.e.*, the souls of men, the lesser to rule the night, *i.e.*, their bodies. These two dignities are the pontifical authority and the regal power. Moreover, as the moon derives its light from the sun, and is in fact less than the sun in every way, so the regal power derives the splendour of its dignity from the pontifical authority, and the more exactly it remains in its orbit, with the more lustre will it shine ... Both powers have their seat in Italy, which by divine dispensation has the chief power in the world ... in which is the foundation of the Christian religion, and in which, through the primacy of the Apostolic See, there is specially manifest the supreme power of Church and State".

But though Innocent was pleased to describe the Church as a more noble constellation than the State he did not mean to imply that the State had not its proper functions in the exercise of which the Church had not right of direct interference. He knew that the moon was the independent mistress of the realms of night. And, as there will be occasion to point out more at length when speaking of his relations with the Empire, Innocent uses many other images which show that he held the doctrine of his predecessors. The machinery of the world was not kept in motion by one power on which lesser powers were dependent, but by two powers. There were two cherubim over the ark; there were two splendid columns by the door of the temple, and there were two swords.

We have, therefore, right to conclude with a modern author that it is only imperfect acquaintance with the state of Europe in his age that could excuse the oft-repeated assertion that Innocent exercised a usurped and unjust dominion over it. Where Innocent had political rights", says the writer we are quoting, "he acted like any feudal lord; where he had ecclesiastical rights he acted according to canon law, and the practice of the papal chancery. And all the canons directly or by logical inference depend upon the Bible; and we shall not understand ecclesiastical pretensions, whether in law or diplomacy, unless we regard them, as the great churchmen did, as corollaries from the very words of God".

A man then who, regarding himself and seeing himself acknowledged as the father of the great Christian family, as the apex of the feudal government of Europe, and as the rock of the Christian faith, had the thought of reforming and elevating all things in Christ; a man who was believed by his contemporaries to be far-seeing and courageous enough to effect the end he had in view, such a man could not be narrow.

Nothing so well establishes his breadth of view as the answers he gave to the questions on points of morality which were sent for his solution from every country in Europe. These replies reveal a mind of very different calibre to those of most of his interrogators. They permit us to see on the one hand men likely to mutilate justice from inability to distinguish between the leading fact in a case and its unimportant accessories, and on the other a clear understanding brushing aside irrelevant detail, bringing out the real point of the case into distinct view, and giving to it a solution at

once lucid and just, and expressed in moderate language. Especially does his moderation stand out in his treatment of the matrimonial problems which were brought to his notice. He would not, for instance, allow marriage contracts which had been made against the law, but in good faith, to be broken without very grave reason; and he even permitted converted Moslems to keep the wives they had legitimately married in accordance with their law before their conversion. At the same time his decisions were not arbitrary, but, wherever possible, were based on the decrees of his predecessors.

These points cannot be further elaborated here, but we would refer those interested in them to Luchaire, who gives in some detail a number of trials conducted by Innocent and his Curia which display the good and bad sides of Roman legal procedure, and who also gives a number of Innocent's decisions which show his sound common sense. We may, however, usefully close our notice of Innocent's character as a judge in the words regarding him with which the author just cited concludes his first volume: "In the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the Middle Ages it is often necessary to mount to the summit in order to find that superior wisdom which knows how to oppose the spirit to the letter, to take practical necessities into account, and in the proper way to relax the severity of principles. How often do we see the Popes repressing the excessive zeal of their agents, disavowing sectaries and fanatics, and giving to legates and bishops alike lessons of moderation and justice. This instinct of the opportune and the possible has put them in the first rank of statesmen in an epoch which counted but few of them. And it is precisely, as we have seen, this spirit of tolerance and equity which characterises the decisions of Innocent III. In the normal and daily exercise of his judicial capacity, he exhibited sound sense and broad views; and he must be congratulated on having formulated a maxim which certain modern reformers of justice would do well to take as a device: Mercy is above justice. 'Misericordia super exaltatur iudicio'."

Although well-nigh crushed beneath the work thrust upon him both by his office and by "the malice of the times", still, trusting in God and in the prayers of good men which he ever sought with great earnestness, Innocent not only contrived for many years to keep abreast of his duties, but even to snatch a few brief hours for literary work. As he professed that he was anxious ever to give the preference, when possible, to spiritual concerns, no one would expect to find any profane work labelled as his. Nor indeed will he. Passing over his letters, in many respects the most magnificent literary monument of his age, because it is to be hoped they will speak for themselves in these pages, we will briefly mention in the first place his sermons, which he addressed to the clergy and people now in the language of literature, and now in that of the populace, but which he dictated seemingly only in the former style. He preached them lest the pressure of temporal affairs should cause him to neglect the affairs of the soul altogether, and he published them at the request of a Cistercian abbot. Some eighty in number, they may be praised for their high moral tone, for their good and clear Latin, for the knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures therein displayed, and, some of them at least, for their inspiring notes.

The gossip Salimbene tells us that Innocent sometimes preached with an open book in front of him, and, on being asked by his chaplain why he did this, seeing that he was so learned, he replied: "I do it for your sakes, seeing that you are so ignorant, and yet are ashamed to learn".

Possibly in the year 1203, after he had been very ill at Anagni, he may have written his *Commentary on the Seven Penitential Psalms of David* to lessen the tedium of convalescence. Like the rest of his writings, it evinces in its author a deep knowledge of the text of holy writ, a love of symbolism, and no little personal holiness. He dilates at some length on prayer and sacramental confession, and concludes by begging his reader to attribute any good in his book to divine grace, and any imperfection in it to his want of ability, and not to forget to pray for its author.

Innocent was also the author of a few other little treatises, some of which (*e.g.*, *A Dialogue between God and the Sinner*) will be found in Migne's edition of his works, while others seem only to be known by name. His *Decretals* show that he was not only learned in the law, but that he was also a lawgiver. He is further credited with having reformed the liturgy, and with being the author of the rule of the great hospital of S. Maria in Saxia which he himself founded.

But even Innocent, with his gigantic appetite for work, this Pope, "most holy, and most powerful, the hammer of the guilty and the consoler of the innocent", the man who, though he liked not the heat, often deprived himself of his summer visit to the hill country that he might work in stifling Rome, the man who made the Papacy the centre of European policy,—even such a man could not work and be serious always.

Not far to the south of the Lateran palace, in the midst of a pleasant meadow, was the Fons Virginum. This fountain, beautifully constructed of Parian marble, poured forth an abundant supply of clear cool water, which in a sparkling stream went brightly dancing away through the flowery field. To this sweet spot Innocent was in the habit of repairing, and when the tolling of the palace bell and the sound of prancing palfreys proclaimed that he had gone thither, there followed him on one occasion the lively Welshman whose name has often figured in these pages, Giraldus Cambrensis. When the Pope had taken his seat by the refreshing waters with a few chosen companions in a secluded spot, he summoned Giraldus to take a seat by him, and after a little serious conversation in which he assured him that the equity of the Roman Curia, which was guided not by personal considerations but by the justice of the case, would in the end shine forth clearly, he begged Giraldus to give him some instances of the bad grammar and theology of the illiterate archbishop of Canterbury, Hubert Walter.

We may suppose that it was here too that Scatutius, a wit from the March of Ancona, once offered "Pope Innocent, the teacher of all nations", this salutation in rhyming couplets and in bad grammar :

Papa Innocentium,
 Doctoris omnis gentium,
 Salutat te Scatutius
 Et habet te pro dominus.

When asked by the Pope whence he came, the wit replied in the same style that he was a native of Recanato :

De castro Recanato

Et ibi fui nato.

Whereupon, to match his humour, Innocent replied in the same vein that he had better come to Rome, where he would fare well :

Si veneris Romam,

Habebis multam bonam.

And thus amusing himself with the Welshman's mimicry or the rhymes of Scatutius, Innocent pleasantly passed a few light moments. For this man, who got through so much work that two or three generations later an historian declared that, had he lived ten years longer he would have subdued the earth and brought it to the "one Faith"—this man who was above all things anxious to be genuine and thoroughly consistent in word and deed, this man knew well that "desipere in loco", occasionally to play the fool wisely, was a help to labour, and anything but injurious to character.

CHAPTER II

THE CITY OF ROME

When Lothaire or Lothario Conti was first reckoned among the successors of St. Peter, Rome was, as usual at this period, in a most unsatisfactory condition. It was a city which law and order had abandoned, and in which anarchy had found congenial quarters. The authority of the Pope, if of some weight in the Leonine city and in the Trastevere, did not count for much in the city proper, and the voice of the Senate or of the single senator, as the case might be, if listened to in the immediate neighbourhood of the Capitol, was not much heeded anywhere else. Paupers, mechanics, and tradesmen grouped in guilds, usurious bankers who traded on the necessities of litigants and pilgrims, and turbulent nobles made up the bulk of its population. All of them, after the manner of dependants in the Middle Ages, looked to the Pope for largess, and were divided into fierce factions. Inflated with memories of the past, they dreamed and babbled of universal dominion, when they had neither power nor sagacity enough to subdue their immediate neighbours nor to rule themselves. Their poorer classes either could not or would not do anything but beg, and their upper classes would do nothing but fight among themselves. Long ago had they turned the city into a nest of fortresses, making strongholds of the great ruins of ancient Rome, of the mausoleum of Augustus, of the great arches in and near the Forum, of the theatre of Marcellus, of the Colosseum, and of the Septizonium. And now, for purposes of attack and defence, they were

studding it with lofty towers, so that to one who gazed upon it across the Campagna, it will have presented the same appearance, though on a very much larger scale, as does today the turreted town of San Gimignano to one who looks upon it across the Tuscan hills.

To introduce the reign of law and order among the turbulent Romans, by making them submissive to his rule was the first aim of Innocent; and, although he began his task as soon as ever he was consecrated, it took him no less than ten years (1198-1208) to accomplish it. For he cannot be accounted Rome's unquestioned sovereign till the day in November 1208 when all classes of its community begged him to return from Ferentino and rule over them. Meanwhile, the witty Welshman, Gerald Barry, was having his fun out of the situation, and pointing out in verse how strange it was that the Pope's censure which in Rome could not move trifles, was elsewhere making the sceptres of kings tremble; and that he to whom in Rome a poorly kept garden would not yield, was striving to bend kingdoms to his nod.

On his accession the restored Senate, which had never been much more than a little shadow of a great name, was represented by a single senator, Scottus Papparone, who had taken part in the ceremonies of the new Pope's investiture. One of Innocent's first acts was to depose the senator; and then, content with this manifestation of sovereign power, he did not himself name a new one but nominated a third party to perform that function for him. He next turned his attention to the prefect, who had become an imperial instead of a papal official, and, as we have seen, on the day after his consecration made Peter of Vico take the oath of fealty to him. Civil and criminal power in the city were once more in papal hands, and for the nonce there was peace.

But the tranquillity was not of long duration. Two men, John Capocci and John Pierleone Rainerii, who had in turn held the office of sole senator, whether from disinterested zeal for the commune which they had represented, or because they hoped, by creating discord between the people and the Pope, thus to be able to fish in troubled waters and to wring more money from the Pope, at any rate, began to stir up the people. They pointed out to them that, by taking away from them control over the Sabina and the Maritima, the Pope had stripped them of their rights as a hawk does a bird of its feathers, that he had got control over the Senate, and caused the election of successive senators who were favourable to himself, and opposed to the people.

According to Innocent's biographer, these specious arguments were not accepted by the people, and failed to draw money from the Pope. Chance, however, came to the aid of the demagogues. The then strong and powerful city of Viterbo, a commune which owned the suzerainty of the Pope, possessed with the same passion for subjugating its less powerful neighbours that at this period animated all the larger communes, laid siege to Viterclano (Vitorchiano), some five miles away, on a steep hill near Montefiascone. In their distress the people of Vitorchiano begged the aid of the Pope and the Romans. The Romans, who had desired to subject Vitorchiano themselves, and who on the other hand wished to take vengeance on Viterbo because its people had sided with Barbarossa and had carried off the bronze gates of St. Peter's, received the request with pleasure. The civic adversaries of Innocent were especially delighted. If he refused the help, his

influence in Rome would be ruined; if he granted it, he would lose the allegiance of Viterbo.

The affair was complicated by an appeal for help by Viterbo to the Tuscan League, which was promptly accorded. Innocent made every effort to avert hostilities. He reminded the *rectors* of the League that it had been called into being for the advantage of the Church, and persuaded them to withdraw their troops. But, though he sent embassy after embassy to Viterbo, he could not induce its people to suspend hostilities against Vitorchiano. He accordingly declared them excommunicated, and commanded all his subjects to help the Romans against them.

In the desultory campaign which ensued the Romans were at length successful, as the money which the senator received from Innocent's brother Richard enabled them to hire mercenaries as the people of Viterbo had done. On January 6, 1200, they completely defeated their enemy, killing and capturing many of them. Some of their prisoners they treated very badly, incarcerating distinguished men in the pestiferous dungeon known as the Canaparia.

Realising how conduct of this sort would militate against his efforts for peace, Innocent contrived to get them removed first to the Lateran, and then for greater safety to the stronghold of Lariano near Velletri. The escape of one of the principal prisoners from this fortress was assigned by the Roman malcontents to the connivance of the Pope, and materially increased his difficulty in bringing about a settlement. At length, however, he triumphed over all obstacles, and brought about a peace which won for him the thanks of the great mass of the Romans, and did not alienate from him the loyalty of the people of Viterbo. By the terms of the peace the Romans liberated their prisoners, while their opponents had to abandon Vitorchiano, to demolish a fortified place in front of their city, to take an oath of fealty to the Romans (saving in all things the fidelity they owed to the Pope), and to restore the bronze gates of St. Peter's which they had carried off in the days of the Emperor Frederick I (1167).

Some of the Romans, however, affected not to be satisfied with the peace. The Orsini, nephews of Celestine III, "who had been enriched with the property of the Roman Church², and who were at enmity with the Scotti, Innocent's maternal relations, were especially loud in declaring that he had made the peace simply in his own interests. They further showed their hostility to the Pope by taking advantage of his absence at Velletri during the months of September and October of the year 1202 to fall upon the Scotti and drive them and their wives from their homes. Innocent promptly returned to Rome, and exacted an oath from the Orsini that they would be obedient in future, and keep the peace.

But the senator, Pandulf of the Suburra, who was a devoted adherent of the Pope, and did not think these measures sufficiently drastic, forced the contending parties to surrender their towers into his hands, and to dwell outside the city—the Orsini by St. Peter's and the Scotti by St. Paul's. He then proceeded to demolish one of the Orsini towers as a punishment for their outrage.

Not content with this advantage which they had gained, the Scotti brought fresh trouble upon themselves. A certain Theobald, who was a cousin "of the sons of Ursus", and yet a son-in-law of Romanus de Scotta, was in the habit of going over to St. Paul's

to meet his father-in-law. The Scotti, however, regarding him as the cause of their trouble, assassinated him on the occasion of one of these visits.

Wild with rage, the Orsini rushed into the city, roused the just indignation of the people, seized the towers of their enemies which were in the hands of the senator, levelled them and their adjoining houses with the ground, and were with difficulty prevented from carrying the dead body of their kinsman before the palaces of Richard and of his brother the Pope.

Then, taking up the ideas of the vendetta, they included the Pope in their hatred of his relations, and sought every means of injuring him "at least in his relations and friends". They had not long to wait before they were able to gratify their hatred. They took up the cause of the Poli, and helped them to drive Innocent from the city.

A certain Odo de Polo, an extravagant son of extravagant ancestors, inherited heavily encumbered estates which were held of the Roman Church. With a view to improving his financial position, he endeavoured to bring about a marriage between his daughter and the son of the Pope's brother Richard. His proposals were entertained, and as a result of the negotiations regarding the lady's dowry, Odo saw his ancestral estates cleared of debt. He thereupon wished to withdraw from his engagements, and accused Richard of sharp practice. But, though the latter expressed his willingness to have the affair examined before any tribunal, and Innocent himself had even offered to advance his adversary the money necessary to have the case tried, Odo refused to appear before any recognised judge. Instead, he endeavoured to excite public opinion against not only Richard but the Pope also. He and his brothers used to rush into the churches half naked with crosses in their hands, proclaiming aloud how they had been robbed by the Pope and his brother. On Easter Monday, when Innocent was saying Mass in St. Peter's, they managed to raise a disturbance in the basilica, and when, after Mass, he was returning to the Lateran in solemn procession, as was customary on that day, he was grievously outraged.

Their next move was to pretend to make over to the Roman people their fief which belonged to the Pope. But Innocent, through some of his cardinals, proved his right to the lands before the people, and ordered his brother to take forcible possession of them. Foiled again, the Poli, with the help of the Orsini and other enemies of the Pope, worked up the people by lies against his brother, and attacked his tower. Richard himself managed to escape, but his tower fell into the hands of his enemies.

It was, *perhaps*, on account of this very tower that the Poli and the Orsini managed to raise the people against Richard. Later writers assert that in this year (1203) Innocent, with the monies of the Church, built or completed for his brother the highest tower in the city of Rome, and that, when upbraided for such a use of ecclesiastical revenues, he founded the hospital of S. Spirito in Sassia in expiation of his misdeed.

Whenever and by whatever funds built, the Torre dei Conti still stands at the corner of the Via Cavour, but not as it did when Petrarch could speak of it as unique in the world. It now boasts only a third of its original height, and is divided into a number of poor shops. Its battlemented summit was destroyed by the terrible earthquake of 1348, and for safety's sake the tower had to be reduced to its present height by Urban VIII and Alexander VII (1655).

Whether Innocent built the Torre dei Conti or not, or whether its menacing height helped the Poli and the Orsini to rouse the people, certain it is that Innocent found it advisable to bow to the storm which they had raised. He left the city in May (1203), and the same month saw him in Ferentino, where he left a beautiful memorial of his visit in the shape of a glorious fountain which is still flowing. In September he went to Anagni, and there his health, never very robust, gave way. He became so ill that his death was frequently reported.

Meanwhile in Rome the time (November) came round for the re-election of the Senate whilst Innocent was still lying ill. His enemies, who, in order to get some power into their hands, had in the interval persuaded the people to have once more fifty-six senators instead of one, procured the selection of twelve *mediani* (intermediaries) by those who were acting for the Pope. Most of these men they contrived to capture, and, confining them in the house of one of their supporters, John de Stacio, situated among the ruins of the Circus Flaminius, near the existing church of S. Catarina dei Funari, they compelled each of them to swear to elect at least two senators hostile to Innocent.

But the triumph of the opposition was not so near as it imagined. The retiring sole senator Pandulf, whose loyalty to the Pope had been conspicuous, would only admit into the Capitol those of the new senators who were favourable to the Pope. The others made their headquarters in the monastery so called “of the lady Rose” (*Dominae Rosae*), which was attached to the church of S. Maria *dominae Rosae* (S. Catarina dei Funari).

While these two fragments of municipal authority were quarrelling about their abstract right to the estates of the Poli, the whole city was given over to lawlessness. Deputation after deputation begged Innocent to return to his convulsed capital. At length, when he had completely recovered from his illness, Innocent yielded to the people’s solicitations and returned to Rome, where he was received “with immense honour”, March 1204.

To put an end to the civic trouble, Innocent, in front of the assembled people, boldly named as *medianus* (intermediary) to chose a single senator, one who had even acted against him, John Capocci. This impartial choice met with general approval, and John selected Gregory Pierleone to be sole senator. Unfortunately, Gregory, though well disposed, was weak, and the state of the city went from bad to worse.

Pretending that the Pope had abused his privileges, the senators in the monastic foundation “of the lady Rose” elected fresh senators, calling themselves “good men of the commune”. And as “everybody did what seemed right in his own eyes”, John decided to build a tower by the side of his house. Whereupon the late senator Pandulf and others bade him desist. Seeing that he took not the slightest notice of his behests, Pandulf and his party prepared for a fight. On Easter Sunday, however, Capocci anticipated them, and took the field with loud boastings. There was fighting all over the city, but Capocci’s faction were generally worsted. Helped by the money of Richard Conti, Pandulf’s party began everywhere to erect towers, of stone if possible, if not of wood, to dig trenches, and to raise mounds. They turned the ruins of the ancient baths into forts, and made castles of the churches.

Fighting went on day and night. Horse and foot encountered each other in the streets, and serving men hurled down stones from the lofty towers. Mangonels too and balistas were mounted on the walls of the turrets, and skilled artillerymen hired to work them.

Meanwhile, Capocci continued to make progress with his tower. Pandulf, however, at length erected on an old monument a wooden fort which dominated the rising tower, and his sharpshooters soon rendered work on it impossible. At the same time Peter Anibaldi, the brother-in-law of the Pope, erected a tower to keep in check Capocci's allies, the Frangipani, who, as we know, were all-powerful in the neighbourhood of the Colosseum.

At length, after an interval of success, in which he once more showed that he knew not how to be moderate. Capocci with his party was everywhere defeated; worsted, as was said, by the Pope's money. Many now advised Innocent to allow his enemies to be entirely crushed. But, says his biographer, he was unwilling that they should be treated as they deserved, but proposed that for that year, without prejudice to his claims, four respectable citizens should be chosen who should decide, in view of the pact of 1188, on the respective rights of the people and the Pope with regard to the Senate. At first Capocci and his party would not listen to this proposal. In the childishly bombastic language which the civic magnates of Rome so often used during the Middle Ages, and which still comes readily to their lips: "The city", they said, "has not been accustomed to yield in any dispute into which it has entered against the Church, nor has it been its wont to conquer by forms of law but by force".

However, a little more of the pressure of war made the truculent John and his party eager to fall in with the Pope's proposal. The four arbitrators were chosen, and they promptly decided that it was the right of the Pope to create the Senate (October 1204). They, however, advised the Pope again to permit fifty-six senators to be elected, as it was impossible to find a single one who would be acceptable to all. Although Innocent felt and said that there would never be order with so many, he accepted their suggestions, and the fifty-six were chosen.

But it turned out as he had declared that it would turn out. Disorder still continued rife, so that at last, at the request of the people themselves, Innocent named a strong single senator, "who brought back peace and justice into the city" (1205). "No one", continues the author of the *Gesta*, "dared to murmur against him, so much was the Pope's authority feared". The good men of the commune were practically subdued.

In 1208 Innocent once more left the city in consequence of some fresh disturbance. The whole Roman nobility went out to Perentino to beg him to return, undertaking that the senator, who was in opposition to him, should resign his office, and that he might appoint whomsoever of the nobility he chose to take his place. The worthy abbot of Andres, who is our authority for this incident, was astounded at the splendid procession that came out from Rome to meet the Pope on his return. "I saw", he said, "coming out to meet him companies of soldiers and nobles, all clad in purple, in fine linen and in silk, and mounted on splendid horses superbly caparisoned, and Jews and Christians from all the guilds of Rome, each *schola* acclaiming him in its own way" (November 1208).

During all these years whilst Innocent was being buffeted about by the turbulent section of the Roman people, and whilst his own immediate dependants were defiantly building towers before the Lateran itself, he was being looked up to as the arbiter of the Christian commonwealth and the guide of its destinies. And now at last he was in Rome what he was in Christendom, its apex; now was he free to help it in distress or to urge it along the path of prosperity. We find him, at enormous cost, feeding its people in time of famine, extending his protection to the Roman money-lenders or bankers who, if generally usurious, were sometimes imposed upon and in need of his assistance, and, greatest of all his works of charity, founding the hospital of S. Maria or S. Spirito in Saxia.

During the latter half of the twelfth century the number of pilgrims to Rome, especially of English pilgrims, fell off very considerably. To this had contributed the turmoil in which the city had been kept by those who wished to turn Rome into a free commune; the prohibitions against pilgrimages to Rome occasionally issued by the Popes themselves to punish the rebellious city; and the attempts made from time to time by the emperors and the kings of England to interrupt communication with Rome.

One result of these causes was the dissolution of the *Schola Anglorum*.

To the remnant of its revenues Innocent added money which he collected from various parts of the world, even from our King John, and contributed from his own resources, and founded a great hospital on the site of the *Schola Anglorum*. He established it on the model of one which had been established in Montpellier “by our beloved son Brother Guido”, where, says the Pope, “the hungry are fed, the poor are clothed, and the sick are supplied with all necessaries, and where those receive the greatest help who are in the greatest need”.

We have seen that certain late authors have set forth that Innocent founded his hospital of the Holy Ghost out of remorse for building Richard Conti’s tower with Church money. But for this there is no contemporary evidence. Such a motive is unknown to the author of the *Gesta*, and is not mentioned by Innocent in any of the numerous letters in which he refers to the hospital of S. Maria or S. Spirito in Saxia. The tradition of the place itself has another story to tell of its origin. At the close of the sixteenth century Rome was visited by a certain Arnold von Buchell of Utrecht. His *Iter Italicum* is still extant. When in Rome he saw “the most famous and rich hospital” of S. Spirito; and in the portico of that part of the hospital where foundlings were deposited he saw a fresco depicting fishermen taking to the Pope in their nets the bodies of infants they had fished out of the water. This, says von Buchell, is regarded as the origin of a foundation where provision is made for infants exposed by night, so that they might not be killed by the inhuman cruelty of pitiless mothers.

All during his pontificate Innocent took the greatest interest in this hospital. After a brief space he placed it under the management of a confraternity which had been founded some twenty years before his accession by Guido or Guy of Montpellier in the city of his name for the care of the sick. He allowed the brothers to collect for their hospital in Italy, Sicily, England, and Hungary, and was constantly giving them money and presents, as we have already seen. Then, in order to sustain interest in his favourite foundation, Innocent ordered a solemn *station* to be held at the hospital on the Sunday

after the octave of the Epiphany. To ensure a large attendance, the famous relic of the “sudarium Salvatoris” (the veil of Veronica) was brought to the hospital in solemn procession that it might be seen and venerated by the people; and, as further inducements for them to attend, it was arranged that the Pope himself should preach a sermon on the works of mercy, and should grant indulgences to those who should put the said works in practice.

Innocent fulfilled his own regulations; and not only carried “the image of the Lord’s countenance” himself, but composed “an elegant prayer” to be used on the occasion, and attached “an indulgence of ten days” to its recital.

As Guy’s confraternity was known as that of the Holy Ghost (fratres S. Spiritus), the old name of the church of the *Schola Anglorum*, viz., S. Maria in Saxia, gradually gave place to that of S. Spiritus, and all knowledge of the connection between the hospital and the old *Schola Anglorum* would seem to have been gradually lost. For we find such a well-informed Englishman as John Capgrave, in the year 1450, speaking of “the hospitall of the Holy Ghost” without note or comment.

As time went on “the hospital of the Holy Ghost” increased in importance and usefulness, and, if it cannot now be called the largest hospital in the world, especially since the recent demolition of part of it to afford an approach to a new bridge across the Tiber, it was, even in the days of Hurter, the most magnificent institution of its kind in the world.

“It was understood”, writes Doctor Walsh, “that the ailing picked up in the streets should be brought to the hospital, and that all the wounded and injured would be welcomed there. Besides, certain of the attendants of the hospital went out every day to look for any patients who might be neglected or be without sufficient care, especially in the poorer quarters of the city, and these were also transported to the hospital. This old Santo-Spirito hospital then was exactly the model of our modern city hospitals”.

“Pope Innocent’s idea, however, was not to establish a hospital at Rome alone, but his fatherly solicitude went out to every city in Christendom.. By official papal encouragement he succeeded in having during his own pontificate a number of hospitals established in all parts of the then civilised world on the model of this hospital of the Holy Ghost at Rome. The initiative thus given proved lasting, and even after the Pontiff’s death hospitals of the Holy Ghost continued to multiply in various parts of Europe, until scarcely a city of any importance was without one”.

But Innocent was not only the father of the people throughout his dominions in that he strove to provide for all their physical wants; he was also, for their sakes, a glorious patron of art, in order that they might behold the divine service everywhere celebrated with becoming splendour. The large sums he expended on the repairing and beautifying of churches both in and out of Rome, and on sacred vestments and utensils, must have done much to foster that revival of art in Rome which, begun in the second half of the twelfth century, showed “increased vitality in the thirteenth”.

We have already seen what Innocent did for the churches of SS. Sergius and Bacchus, and of St. Peter. He is, moreover, credited with rebuilding the churches of S. Sisto *in Piscina* (or Vecchio), and Silvestro *in Capite*. He also completed that rebuilding

and decorating of *S. Maria in Trastevere* which has left it perhaps the very finest example of the art of the second half of the twelfth century. For mosaics for the basilica of St. Paul he gave a hundred pounds seventeen ounces of gold, and other large sums for the repair of the churches of St. Pantaleon, which had been burnt, St. Mary Major, St. Agnes, the charming round church of St. Constantia, and of the Lateran baptistery, known as *St. John ad Fontes*.

Hundreds of Roman churches benefited by his donations of sacred vessels or vestments. As a result of an inquiry as to how many churches in the city were without silver chalices, he distributed a hundred and thirty-three such chalices, worth a hundred marks of silver, —one to each of the needy churches, “out of reverence for the holy mystery of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ”.

It would take too much space to enumerate all the churches which received gifts of plate or vestments from the Pope. For one reason or another we may, however, mention the church of *St. Thomas de Hispanis*, then the national church of the Spaniards, but now known as the church of *SS. Petronio e Giovanni de' Bolognesi*, which stands behind the Farnese palace; *St. Stephen de Schola Cantorum* and especially the church of *S. Maria in Saxia* which figures repeatedly as a recipient of the Pope's presents. Many of the vestments which Innocent gave to the churches were made of that rich heavy silk stuff, shot with gold or silver threads, known as samite. It was originally made in the Isles of Greece, where it was called *examiton*, but later on at Acre, Alexandria, and other places.

Besides adding various rooms, among others “a summer room”, to the Lateran palace, and strengthening it in various parts by buttresses, helping to make it one of the most wonderful piles of buildings in Europe, he thought it not only right and proper but also useful that the Supreme Pontiff should have a fitting palace by St. Peter's. He accordingly reconstructed the Vatican palace, and added to it a series of buildings for domestic as well as for more elevated purposes, surrounding the whole of it with a wall, and protecting its main gateway with two towers.

For the history of the medical profession it is also noteworthy that he bought a house which was situated within his new enclosure, and handed it over to his physician. This was no doubt John Castellomata, one of the signatories of the will of Mary Queen of Aragon (April 20, 1213), who would appear to have succeeded Romuald of the University of Salerno, to whom Giles of Corbeil, physician of Philip Augustus, dedicated his highly praised poem: “*De compositorum medicaminum virtutibus*”.

Of the Pope's physicians generally, if not of these two in particular, it has been asserted that they “were as a rule the most scientific medical men of their time”; that “the prestige of their appointment as papal physicians helped to raise up in the eyes of the people the dignity of the medical profession which they represented”; and that “there is no list of physicians to any European court, nor indeed any list of names of medical men connected together by any bond in history—no list, for instance, of any faculty of a university—which can be compared for prestige in scientific medicine with the papal physicians”.

Throughout the whole of the Middle Ages the Popes treated the medical faculty in the most broad-minded manner. The doctors were left free to practise and to teach as

they thought best. Even if they were Jews, no obstacle was placed in their way, and they were frequently honoured with papal patronage.

Innocent III, in particular, advanced the cause of medicine indirectly as well as directly. He increased the prestige of the medical profession by providing, as stated, a house for his physician in the grounds of the Vatican; and, by denouncing monks for usurping the province of doctors, he directly benefited the faculty. During the days of storm and stress in the early Middle Ages medicine, like every other peaceful art, was driven to take refuge in the monasteries. But with better times it again left the cloister, and Innocent was determined that monks should not leave their enclosures even to pursue so noble a quarry as medicine.

What Innocent did for the embellishment of the churches of Rome he did for churches in various cities of the Patrimony. He sent large sums to Viterbo, Civit  Castellana, Corneto, Fossanova, and Casamari for the building or repairing of churches or monasteries, and presents of all kinds for ecclesiastical purposes to Anagni, Segni, and Ferentino, where his family had special influence, as well as to Orte, Reate, Spoleto, and other places. With all his lavish generosity, Innocent was nevertheless prudent, and his biographer tells us that he put aside a sum of money only to be used in case of some dire necessity suddenly arising.

It would seem more than likely that for some of his artistic undertakings in Rome and out of it Innocent employed the *Cosmati*, one of those family groups of artists who called themselves *Marmorarii* or marble-cutters, but who were in reality sculptors, mosaic-makers, painters, and architects all combined. These *Marmorarii* came into prominence in the second half of the twelfth century. Thenceforward for three centuries, *i.e.*, till towards the middle of the fourteenth century, when the absence of the Popes from Rome killed art there, they did most excellent work, especially in that style of art which took its name from Cosmas, one of the distinguished members of their guild. If the Roman *Marmorarii* did not invent they at least perfected that geometrical arrangement of coloured marbles, either on a large or small scale, which is known as Cosmati work or "parcel mosaic", and which in their hands lent itself so admirably for the making of beautiful floors or for decorating pillars, pulpits, paschal candlesticks, and the like. The names of two members of the Cosmati family are to be found in inscriptions which bear dates that fall within the pontificate of Innocent III. An epigraph over the door of S. Saba on the Aventine sets forth that the mosaic work there was executed by Master James (Magister Jacopus) in the seventh year of the pontificate of Innocent III, and an inscription on an arch at Civit  Castellana proclaims work done by Magister Jacopus and his son Cosmas in 1210. It is true that Innocent's name does not appear to be connected with either of these places as a benefactor, but it does in connection with the church of St. Thomas *in Formis* and its adjoining monastery (now in ruins) on the Celian. The marble doorway of the monastery still stands at the entrance of the Villa Mattei, and above it may be seen a mosaic showing our Lord with a black slave on one side of Him and a white one on the other, freed from their chains. On the arch of the door is an epigraph which belongs to the time of Innocent, and which states that Magister Jacopus and his son Cosmas accomplished this work.

Equally at the Pope's disposal was another distinguished family of artists, that of the Vassalecti or Bassalecti, one of whose names—Petrus Bassalectus—appears on the magnificent paschal candlestick of St. Paul's outside-the-walls, to which Innocent gave gifts in abundance.

In concluding the story of Innocent's relations with Rome, we may note with interest that he shared in the simple amusements of its people, as well as in their strenuous life. In days gone by his predecessors had shared more largely in them, but increased care had lessened the power of the Popes to take part in them. However, from the *Liber Politicus* of Canon Benedict, printed with the *Liber Censuum*, we may perhaps conclude that the carnival festival at the Monte Testaccio, the potsherd hill, still survived in the days of Innocent III. On Quinquagesima Sunday the knights and "trained bands" (*pedites*) of Rome met together after breakfast, and, after sharing a friendly glass, the trained bands laid aside their shields and went off to the Monte, whilst the knights went to the Lateran for the Pope. With them and the prefect the Pope rode to the hill "in order that, as the city took its rise there, so there on that day the pampering of our bodies might be brought to an end". The games were held in the Pope's presence, so that no disturbance might arise. Among other things there were killed a bear to typify the slaying of the devil, the tempter of our flesh; a young ox to denote the slaughter of the pride of life; and a cock to show forth "the destruction of our impurities in order that henceforth in struggle of mind we may live chastely and soberly, so that at Easter we may deserve to receive worthily the Body of the Lord".

In course of time, perhaps owing to the long residence of the Popes at Avignon, they ceased to be present at the games on Monte Testaccio. Whether in consequence of this or not, these festivities gradually lost all religious signification, and by the year 1402, when the Welshman Adam of Usk visited Rome, they had sadly degenerated. Adam, who has left us a description of the games as they were carried on in his time, says that "in these games too the Romans run riot like brute beasts in drunkenness (the feast of misery), with unbridled extravagance, like to the sons of Belial and Belphegor".

CHAPTER III.

ITALY. THE PATRIMONY OF ST. PETER, BOTH IN ITS RESTRICTED AND IN ITS GENERAL SENSE. THE TUSCAN AND LOMBARD LEAGUES. SARDINIA.

In the last chapter we saw Innocent, after a struggle of ten years' duration, lord of the city of Rome, and its royal benefactor in the domains both of art and of philanthropy. And inasmuch as, according to the phrase of an old Icelandic historian, "he was born to rule, and was naturally of a generous disposition", we shall in this

chapter see him occupying much the same position with regard to the rest of the Patrimony of St. Peter.

Whilst he was struggling to have his authority recognised in Rome, he was also striving to introduce the reign of law and order into the *Patrimonium Petri*, and to recover therein the lost rights of the Papacy. When in May 1198 he told our King Richard that he intended to visit his dominions when he had arranged the affairs of the city and of the kingdom of Sicily and the rest of the Patrimony of the Church, he had probably no idea that it would prove such an arduous undertaking as it did to settle those affairs. It took him almost as long to enforce recognition of his authority in the Patrimony of St. Peter as in the city of Rome. But he persevered in his task when once he had taken it up, for he looked upon the care of the Patrimony as one of his most important duties.

What was then specially known as the *Patrimonium Petri* was the country stretching from Radicofani to Ceprano and Terracina, and from the Sabine mountains to the sea. It corresponded practically to the modern province of Roma, and was divided by Rome itself into two nearly equal portions, of which the northern half was called the *Patrimonium Petri* in the most restricted sense.

Innocent states very plainly the reason of his anxiety to recover control over the Patrimony of the Church. "The liberty of the Church", he wrote, "is best provided for where the Church of Rome has full power in temporals as well as in spirituals. For, since the Apostolic See is the Mother and Mistress of all the churches in proportion as it more firmly restrains those subject to its temporal power from injuring churches and ecclesiastics, the more does it redound to its prejudice and to that of all the churches if it preserve not the churches in its own Patrimony in their proper condition of liberty".

He accordingly made it generally known from the very beginning of his pontificate that he intended to be effective master of all the territory that had ever been recognised as belonging to the Church of Rome, including the Tuscan donation of the Countess Matilda. Some of the barons sent in their submission to him at once. Among these was the powerful Hildebrand, lord of Montalto, which with its castle, founded on the ruins of the classical Forum Amelii, still overlooks the Aurelian road. Oddo of Palombara and Oddo of Monticelli took the oath of fidelity to him on the very day of his consecration. Both the places (about three miles apart), of which these two Oddos were the lords, were situated on advance eminences of Monte Genaro, and their castles, of which remains exist to this day, dominated the Campagna. By granting his cousin, John Oddonis, Montorio (Romano) and Caminara (presumably Cameria, now Le Pedicate), also in the neighbourhood of Monte Genaro, the Pope got a firmer grip of that district; and still further to retain his hold on the Sabina he kept in his own hands the stronghold of Rocca Anticoli, on the left bank of the Anio near Subiaco.

South of Rome, possession of the huge castle of Lariano in the neighbourhood of Velletri, with which it was often at war, helped to give Innocent control of the Alban hills. It was in this castle that he afterwards imprisoned Adenulf, abbot of Monte Cassino, for daring to fortify certain castles in opposition to the Pope. Innocent's castellans also held in the same neighbourhood "Sarianum and Castrum", *i.e.*, perhaps Soranum (or Suranum) in the territory of Albano, and Castrum Vetus, now Le Castella,

in the neighbourhood of Velletri. In the extreme south of the Patrimony he compelled the consuls and people of Terracina, who were at enmity with the Frangipani, to submit to him, and to yield up to him “Rocca Circe”, the key of the Maremma, and other fortresses round their city. He had already, it should be noted, had to buy back the “Rocca” from a noble to whom the Frangipani had granted it in fief although they themselves were only the custodians of it for the Holy See.

The valley of the Sacco, between the Apennines on the east and the Lepini on the west, which was one of the main thoroughfares in the southern half of the Patrimony, was also well in his power. His brother Richard, as heir of the Poli, held the entrance to the valley as lord of Valmontone and Piombinara, the ruined walls and towers of both of which may still be seen high up above the level of the valley. Possession of the fortress of Monte Fumone, and his family influence in Anagni, Segni, and Ferentino rendered his power in the valley further south quite effectual.

The other great avenue of communication in the southern portion of the Patrimony was between the Lepini Mountains and the sea. Through this ran the Appian Way, which was completely dominated by Cora (Cori). This strong mountain city Innocent, at the request of its people, committed to the care of his brother-in-law, Peter Anibaldi, his seneschal, and in the plain below he placed his cousin and marshal, James, in command of Ninfa, in return for his services against the enemies of the Holy See, and of the young Frederick of Sicily

In the northern half of the Patrimony, known as *Roman* Tuscany, Innocent kept in his own hands the important positions of Radicofani, with its grim hill fortress commanding the road from Tuscany, Montefiascone, occupying the centre of the basin of Lake Bolsena, and the heights of Orte, on its abrupt and lofty cliff lording it over the Tiber, the Nera, and the Via Ameria. At Radicofani he caused the old walls to be increased in height, built new ones, and further protected the place by a deep moat.

Of all the fortresses which belonged to the Roman Church, Innocent thought most of that of Montefiascone. We find him, accordingly, building a chapel in connection with its palace, clearing away houses behind the palace, and connecting it by means of walls with the city ramparts, in which he made a special gateway. Furthermore, to ensure the safe keeping of the palace, he entrusted it to one of his relations, Romanus Carzoli, in whom he had supreme confidence. He had had no little difficulty in recovering possession of Montefiascone. It had been strongly held by the German troops of Philip of Suabia, and, as Innocent complained, its people had been almost the last to return to the obedience of the Holy See. Even after the town had returned to its allegiance, there remained a party in it who favoured the Germans, and put forth as an excuse the oaths they had taken to them. Innocent accordingly turned to the young king of Sicily, who, as one of the candidates for the Empire and son of Henry VI, had naturally great influence with many of the imperialists. Frederick, in compliance with the Pope’s wishes, thereupon wrote as “king of Sicily, of the duchy of Apulia, and of the principality of Capua” to the men of Montefiascone who were loyal to him. Feeling how much he was indebted, he said, to his father in Christ, the lord Innocent, and to the Roman Church, he wished to show his gratitude by fulfilling his desires “royally and devotedly”. He therefore proceeded to tell them plainly that he was

pleased that they had returned to their allegiance to the Supreme Pontiff, and to bid them hold of no account any oaths they were said to have taken to him.

Nor was it without trouble and expense that Innocent recovered Toscanella (the ancient Tuscania), which dominates the valley of the Marta, and the little picturesque mountain city of Acquapendente, which he had to free from the harassing attacks of lordly Orvieto, and concerning which he declared emphatically that no one should be its “rector” or podestà unless he was a native of the place and a vassal of the Holy See.

This appointing by cities of their governors without any reference to the Pope was one of the anomalies which Innocent was at pains to suppress, though occasionally he allowed a town to choose its own consuls “during the Pontiff’s pleasure”.

Among the serious troubles which Innocent, in his efforts to recover this part of the Patrimony, had to master was the flagrant lawlessness of two bandit nobles, whose castle was apparently in the neighbourhood of Vetralla, situated on one of the northern slopes of wooded Cimino, and kept guard over the old Via Cassia, one of the principal roads to Rome. These men had long been wont to live by plundering the pilgrims who were on their way to the Eternal City. As they paid no heed to the admonitions of the Pope, he ordered the “rectors” of the Patrimony to bring them to their duty by force. It was only after their lands had been ravaged and their last stronghold was about to be stormed that the robber lords made an unconditional surrender. Travellers were no longer to be molested; the robber lords had to promise to make satisfaction for their wrongdoings, take the usual oath of fealty to the Pope, and as a guarantee of better conduct for the future, they had to deposit a thousand pounds of the money of Siena.

From the story of Pietro Parenzi which we are about to relate, it may perhaps be inferred that, if the robber lords of castrum Rispampini were not heretics themselves, they were certainly not averse to protecting heretics if it suited their purpose.

The efforts of Innocent to subject to his control the cities of the Patrimony were complicated by the appearance of heresy in some of them, particularly in Orvieto and Viterbo. Before his accession there had appeared in the former town a certain Florentine, by name Diotesalvi, a man, says Master John, canon of the church of Orvieto, of venerable appearance, who was the first to spread successfully “the heresy of the Manichaeans”. He denied the efficacy of the sacraments, declared that all the Popes from Blessed Sylvester I. were in hell, and taught that every good man was equal to St. Peter, and every bad one to Judas, and that every visible thing had been created by the devil and was subject to him. After he had been expelled from the city by the bishop, two women took up the secret propaganda of these doctrines. When their doings were brought to light, the bishop, acting on the advice of the clergy and the principal laity, began a fierce persecution of the sectaries, whom he pursued in some cases even to death.

But the dispute between Innocent and the city relative to Acquapendente, of which mention has already been made, prevented these measures from achieving their end. The dissension led to the bishop’s being detained in Rome by the Pope.

Taking advantage of the absence of the bishop, a Manichaean teacher came from Viterbo, and was so successful in his mission that he thought his party was strong

enough to attempt to drive the Catholics out of the town and to take possession of it for themselves. His idea was that the strong city of Orvieto might be made a powerful centre for the Cathari “from all parts of the world”. But the Catholics, seeing their danger, banded together, and sent to Rome for a “rector”, that they might thus win Innocent’s favour.

The “rector” (podestà) selected for them by the Romans with the Pope’s approval was Pietro Parenzi, a man “young in years but old in sense”, eloquent, firm, public-spirited, and very charitable. On his taking leave of Rome, Innocent bade him extirpate the heresy, and assured him that, “if on that account he were to incur death, he would secure the everlasting reward of the kingdom of Heaven”. Pietro was received most enthusiastically by the people, at least by the Catholic party, in February 1199.

Soon after his arrival he proclaimed that all the heretics who returned to the Church by a certain date should be pardoned, but that those who refused to submit should be punished in accordance “with civil and canon law”. Those, therefore, who would not submit were punished by imprisonments, whippings, exile, and the destruction of their houses.

During the course of this persecution, Parenzi returned to Rome, and presented himself before Innocent when he was returning from St. Peter’s to the Lateran. He met the Pope “at the basilica of St. Daniel”, *i.e.*, no doubt at the church of S. Daniele *de Forma*, in the neighbourhood of the Lateran, a church frequently mentioned in the bulls of Honorius III. In reply to Innocent’s question as to his treatment of the heretics, the podestà replied that they had fared so hardly at his hands that they had threatened him with death. The Pope, however, bade him persevere fearlessly, and assured him that, “if he were killed by the heretics”, he absolved him “from all bonds of sin”.

Not long after his return to Orvieto, Parenzi was betrayed into their hands by one of his servants, who had been bribed by the heretics (May 1199). Some of them wished to convey him at once to a certain *arcem Ruspampanum*, an abode of the vilest men. The others, however, anxious for more summary proceedings, told him that, if he would save his life, he must engage not only to cease to persecute the Patarines, as the Cathari were often called in Italy at this time, but even to show them favour. Death and mutilation promptly followed his refusal to comply with their demands. It would appear that, in murdering Parenzi, the Cathari killed their cause. At any rate, for the time, we read no more of heresy at Orvieto, though, as we have seen already, its people continued to have occasional difficulties with the Pope on the question of municipal independence.

More populous than Orvieto, if not so impregnable, was the city of Viterbo. It was from this place that the Patarines of the former town had received teachers and support. Innocent accordingly found it necessary to resist not only its heretical tendencies, but its attempts at complete political autonomy, which were often the cause of the former. How the Pope dealt with the Tuscan League, to which, without his permission, Viterbo dared to affiliate itself, and how he dealt with the heresy in its midst, will be recounted hereafter. Meanwhile, let it suffice to note here that to settle Roman Tuscany generally he resolved to make a tour through it himself, as he had done through the duchy of Spoleto in 1198. He had already sent several cardinal legates to different cities of the Patrimony, but at length, in the tenth year of his pontificate, after

he had celebrated the feast of the Ascension (June 4, 1207), Innocent left the city, went to Viterbo, and was received by its people with the greatest joy and honour. His first care was to wipe out the corruption of the Patarines, with which the city of Viterbo was deeply tainted. This he did lest the Roman Church should be reproached with suffering heretical depravity to exist under its eyes in its own Patrimony, and should not be free to call others to account on this matter of heretics, lest it should hear: "Physician, heal thyself" (St. Luke IV. 23), or "Cast first the beam out of thy own eye, and then thou shalt see clearly to take out the mote from thy brother's eye" (St. Luke VI. 42). The Patarines, however, fled on the news of the Pope's approach. But he, calling together the bishops and clergy of the city, ordered a careful inquiry to be made regarding the heretics and their aiders and abettors, and a full list of them all to be drawn up. Then he commissioned the podestà and the consuls to cause all the people to swear and to give pledges that they would obey his commands. Then he ordered the houses in which the Patarines had been received to be razed to the ground, and issued a series of statutes against them.

Innocent remained some months at Viterbo, and, before he left it, held a great assembly of the bishops and abbots, counts and barons, podestàs and consuls of the *Patrimonium Petri*, the duchy of Spoleto, and the March (Sept.). On the first day he laid down what were the territorial rights of the Roman Church, and received oaths of obedience from the laity; on the second day he listened to grievances, and on the third issued regulations by his spiritual and temporal authority for the well-being of the clergy and for the peace of the cities. Especially did he forbid anyone but the rector of the Patrimony to execute justice.

Knowing the importance of seeing for himself, Innocent did not return directly to Rome, but resolved to visit on his way back some of the chief towns of the *Patrimonium*. Crossing a beautiful, well-watered and fertile country, he first visited Toscanella on the Marta, and thence made his way to Corneto, which, powerfully perched on a volcanic eminence, close to the same river not far from its mouth, guards the Via Aurelia, the coast-road to Rome, and watches the surrounding plain. From Corneto he journeyed by Rovertello to ancient, ravine-protected Sutri, and thence by the Lago di Bracciano to Rome. Innocent was at length master of the Patrimony, and had taught the citizen in the crowded town and the baron in his grim castle that his authority was not to be flouted with impunity. The cities learnt too that submission to Innocent and especially a visit from him brought them prosperity. The people of Toscanella had their ancient privileges confirmed, those of Corneto saw a papal palace rise in their midst, and those of Sutri witnessed the solemn dedication of their cathedral. A visit of the Pope transformed for the time each little town into a Rome, as the abbot of Andres said of Viterbo during Innocent's sojourn in it this year. Every day for a month, so we are assured by the good monk, there were more than forty thousand strangers in Viterbo, among others many monks from Canterbury, and "their countryman the venerable lord cardinal Stephen (Langton), a man eminent for virtue and learning".

When Innocent assumed the papal crown, he did not propose to himself to be content to be the sovereign of Rome and of the *Patrimonium Petri* strictly so called. He resolved to recover all the territorial rights of the Papacy, and to be recognised as suzerain in the duchy of Spoleto, the march of Ancona, and the duchy of Ravenna and

Romaniola, as well as in the Tuscan lands of Matilda—then for the most part in the hands of the German followers of Henry VI. In his anxiety not to allow temporal affairs to occupy his time and attention to the detriment of his spiritual duties, he felt sometimes that the care of the Apostolic Patrimony did withdraw him from due solicitude for all the churches. Still, as he said, “the Patrimony of Blessed Peter was his portion, his desirable and magnificent inheritance”, and the due care of it, he declared, was no small part of his duty. He realised that he was bound to intervene in its government, because many in it “were abusing the patience of the Apostolic See, disturbing the peace, violating justice, and destroying the security of the highways and the country to our great disparagement”.

On the death of the Emperor Henry VI a general rising took place against his lieutenants in Italy. With great difficulty his brother Philip of Swabia escaped to Germany, and many towns at once threw off the German yoke. Among others who found that many of his cities had revolted from him was the duke of Spoleto, Conrad of Urslingen, not to be confused with Conrad of Lützelhard (*d.* 1197), known as “Bee-in-bonnet” (*musca in cerebro*). When he saw that numbers of his subjects “were returning to the dominion of the Roman Church”, that the division of the Empire gave him no hope of help from Germany, and that there was on the throne of Peter one who was a match even for a united Empire, he endeavoured to come to terms with Innocent. He offered to give him ten thousand pounds at once, to pay an annual tribute of a hundred pounds of silver, and to furnish two hundred men for service in the Patrimony “from Radicofani to Ceprano”. Not unnaturally Innocent felt disposed to entertain the duke’s offer. But he was soon told that if he listened to Conrad he would be thought to wish to encourage the stay in Italy of those Germans whose cruel tyranny had reduced the people to the most degrading bondage. He accordingly made it known to his critics that he intended to keep the Patrimony of the Church in his own hands, for the benefit of the Church and the good of Italy, and informed the duke that agreements were out of the question.

Finding that his position was untenable, Conrad consented to an unconditional surrender. Innocent therefore despatched to Narni cardinals Octavian and Gerard of the title of St. Hadrian, and, in presence of a large assembly of bishops, barons, and people, he swore on the Gospels, relics, and the cross to submit to the Pope. Conrad then absolved his vassals from their oaths of allegiance to him, bade them all return to the service of the Roman Church, and, in earnest of the sincerity of his intentions, straightway yielded up two of his strongholds, Rocca Gualdo and Rocca Cesi. He also gave orders for the surrender of the citadel of Assisi into the hands of the Pope. But the people of that city, who were at the time laying siege to it, either because they had some special grudge against it, or because they were not anxious to be coerced either by Pope or Emperor, only gave it up after they had reduced it to a heap of ruins.

Although Conrad had thus abandoned his claim to the duchy of Spoleto, he did not at first leave it, hoping no doubt to take advantage of any opportunity to recover it. By Innocent’s orders, however, he was compelled to quit Italy. As far, then, as the Germans were concerned, the Pope was master of the duchy of Spoleto, and received through his agents oaths of allegiance from its citizens and from its greater and lesser nobility. To give proof of his intention to be master in his newly recovered duchy, he

ordered the destruction of the fortress of St. Mary's Mount in revenge for its having been the prison of Cardinal Octavian on his return from France in the days of his predecessor.

For the purpose of confirming the loyalty of the people of the duchy to his person, Innocent left Rome just after the feast of SS. Peter and Paul (June 29), and made a royal progress through it. As he went from city to city we read of him performing spiritual acts in one place and temporal in another. Now he is consecrating an altar, now confirming the privileges of the cities, now nominating rectors, and everywhere offering gifts to the churches. It is not, however, to be supposed that the Pope was henceforth the peaceable ruler of the duchy of Spoleto. His letters show the difficulties he had in keeping many of the cities sufficiently submissive to his authority, and at peace with one another, or with themselves. Civit  Castellana, for instance, gave him no little trouble. Not content with the oaths of allegiance tendered by its consuls, Innocent insisted that each and all of its inhabitants should take an oath of fealty to him. Nevertheless, though we find them paying tribute to him, Innocent had to lay their city under an interdict before they would make amends for nominating a rector without his knowledge. He had to do the same with Assisi, and had to take Arezzo severely to task for attempting to rebuild the fortress of St. Mary's Mount. The podest  and people of Spoleto were informed that the acts of their judges and notaries were of no legal value, inasmuch as they had dared to appoint them without reference to him.

As an illustration of the difficulties he had in keeping the cities at peace with one another we may take the case of Narni and Otricoli. Although Innocent threatened the former town with interdict and a fine of a thousand pounds if they did not cease harassing the smaller place, the people of Narni set his prohibition at naught, and seized and destroyed Otricoli. But Innocent, "just and firm", says his biographer, assembled an army, punished them severely, exacted the fine of which mention has just been made, and devoted part of it to the rebuilding of the walls of Otricoli. Later on the insubordinate spirit of the people of Narni broke out again, so that Innocent was compelled to lay upon them the interdict with which he had already threatened them, and to add the further threat of depriving them of their rank as an episcopal city. In a similar predicament to that of Conrad of Urslingen was Markwald of Anweiler, who is set down as "seneschal of the Empire, duke of Ravenna and Romaniola, and marquis of Ancona and Molise" in southern Italy. Innocent's biographer describes him as a man of talent and craft, who had acquired a large fortune in Sicily under Henry VI, whose prime favourite he was, and of whose will he was the executor. It may be added that his cruelty made him a fitting first lieutenant of Henry. At the time of the death of his master he was in Sicily (September 1197); but, when the empress promptly expelled the Germans from the kingdom, he was compelled to swear that he would never again enter it without her permission. Accordingly, says the southern Italian chronicler we are quoting, the marquis betook himself to Ancona, where, no doubt in his efforts to put down opposition to his authority, "he and his followers committed every outrage".

"Immediately after his election" Innocent despatched two cardinals into the March to receive the allegiance of the revolted cities. Thereupon Markwald sent an embassy to the Pope asking for a safe-conduct, as he wished to make his submission to him. At the same time he declared that, if the Pope would receive him into favour, he

would do more for the Roman Church than anyone else had done since the days of Constantine, since the late emperor's will (of which he proclaimed himself the executor and guardian) would redound greatly to its honour and glory. Meanwhile, however, he begged that the cardinals might be ordered not to receive the pledges of fidelity to the Church.

But Innocent would only grant that in the meantime the cardinals should make no attempt to compel obedience to their authority. They were, nevertheless, to continue to receive the submission of those who came to them of their own accord. Markwald, whose only object had been to gain time, at once refused the safe-conduct which Innocent had sent him, and endeavoured by money and force to retain his hold on the March. But all in vain, the cardinals excommunicated him for his excesses, and he found that his power was waning rapidly. He then offered the Pope a large sum of money and an annual tribute if he would leave him lord of the March. As Innocent, who mistrusted him, refused, Markwald found it necessary to quit the March, and, despite the prohibition of the empress, re-entered the kingdom of Sicily.

“The whole of the March except Ascoli”, says Innocent's biographer, “was therefore brought back to the dominion of the Roman Church, *i.e.*, Ancona, Fermo, Osimo, Camerino, Fano, Jesi, Sinigaglia, Pesaro, and all their dioceses”. But the submission of the March to the Pope did not in fact take place so readily and rapidly as the words of the biographer would seem to imply. In the month of March 1199 we see Innocent writing thus to the consuls and people of Jesi : “Whereas the spiritual jurisdiction of the Apostolic See is not confined within any limits, but has received power over peoples and kingdoms, it has even, by God's grace, received considerable temporal jurisdiction”. He goes on to say that much of this temporal power which had been taken from the Church is now returning to it, that the duchy of Spoleto, and a large portion of Tuscany (Roman Tuscany) have already returned to it, and that, by the mercy of God and their zeal, *almost all* the March has come back to its old allegiance. In the following year (1200) there were further troubles, apparently regarding taxation, and certainly regarding the question of internal peace among the different towns. Delegates from some of the cities made known to Innocent that they were dissatisfied with certain regulations of his cardinal legates. In response to their complaints, the Pope at once despatched plenipotentiaries to the March to effect the necessary reforms. But he insisted that the cities should meanwhile keep the peace with one another, that all who had not yet taken the oath of fealty to him should do so without further delay, that they should render up all properties that belonged to the Holy See, and that they should pay the taxes agreed upon. He was, however, careful to add that, despite any regulations to the contrary, he only wished that moderate taxes should be imposed, “in order that the March might rejoice that it had returned to the dominion of the Church”. That his envoys might be received more favourably, he ordered them, under proper securities, to release all the political prisoners. Letters setting forth these points almost in the same terms were sent to Fermo, Ancona, and other towns.

However the taxation question fared, it was not easy for the Pope to prevent private wars. But, by letter after letter addressed to the different towns, he made it plain to them that peace he would have. The state of things, he declared to them, was worse now that they were enjoying the delights of freedom than when they were in the bonds

of servitude. If, however, they were not content with the sweets of peace, he would let them taste of the bitterness of war, and they might impute to themselves the consequences of their conduct.

Innocent's representations must have produced their effect. With the exception of a letter or two about recovering some small possessions of the Holy See, and one to the people of Ancona urging them to resist the pretensions of one who claimed to exercise authority over them in the name of the emperor; with these exceptions the papal registers appear to be silent about the March till towards the close of his reign, when his troubles with the new emperor Otho began. In his letter to the people of Ancona just noticed, he said that the envoy whom he was sending to them would explain to them a clause of the will of Henry VI, which would remove any scruples they might have as to the justice of their position. Furthermore, "there were two parties in the Empire, each of them anxious to obtain his favour. Hence they would leave the March in peace, as neither party could obtain the imperial crown without his adhesion".

But the case was very different when death removed one of the rival emperors, and Otho, crowned by Innocent himself (October 1209), proved false to his engagements, and revived the pretensions of the Hohenstaufen House in Italy. He was soon acknowledged as suzerain by the greater part of the March. To be able to offer a more effectual resistance to him, Innocent decided to give the March as a fief to some powerful noble. He quickly fixed on Azzo, marquis of Este, as the proper person for his purpose, and already in June 1211 bade the archbishop of Ravenna entrust to him what he could not guard himself. On May 10, 1212, he formally made over the March to Azzo as a fief, "because of the sincerity of his devotion to us and to the Roman Church", on condition that he should every year pay to the Apostolic See the sum of a hundred pounds of the money of Provins, should every year serve at his own expense for a month with a hundred soldiers in the Patrimony, and should at the Pope's bidding hold the March against all men. On the death of Azzo, Innocent granted the fief to his son Aldebrandino, and Honorius III to Azolino after him.

If the Pope's power in the March, especially during the last few years of his pontificate, was not very effective, it was still less so in the duchy of Ravenna. There he had to face not only the same elements of opposition as in the March, but also the archbishop of Ravenna, who claimed to rule it in virtue of papal concessions. In the first year of his pontificate he sent a letter to the archbishop and his suffragans exhorting them to help his legate Carsendinus in his efforts to bring back to the allegiance of the Roman Church "the exarchate of Ravenna and the county of Bertinoro" (in the southern portion of the duchy). At the same time he pointed out to them that increased temporal power of the Holy See in that locality would be followed by greater freedom for them. But although the power and authority, and consequently the resources, of the archbishops had fallen so low that Innocent had even to send one of them vestments, they had not lost the traditional love of independent authority which had always distinguished their predecessors. Archbishop William (1190-1201) accordingly maintained that the exarchate had long ago been committed to the care of the archbishops of Ravenna, produced papal privileges, and declared that as late as the year 1177, Alexander III, when in Venice, had confirmed to his predecessor the county of Bertinoro. For the time being Innocent thought it advisable not to press his claims, but

“saving the rights of the Apostolic See”, permitted the archbishop to recover and to hold the county of Bertinoro.

He did not, however, cease to endeavour to reclaim certain territories which were more or less independent of the duchy of Ravenna and Romaniola—as, for instance, the county of Ferrara. He reminded its people of the vain efforts that were made to induce Pope Lucius III, when at Verona, to consent to its alienation, and of the way in which, in contempt of him, they had submitted to the yoke of another. He exhorted them, on pain of his deep displeasure, to return to the obedience of the Roman Church.

In all probability the words of the Pope produced little effect. At length, however, Ferrara fell into the power of his lieutenant, the marquis of Este, and then Innocent was able to act as its lord. Hence his Register shows him ordering his legate, the bishop-elect of Albano, to provide the city with a bishop, and to decide whether it was advisable to agree to the request of the marquis that he might be allowed to build a citadel in Ferrara in order the easier to keep it for the Church.

Nor in fine did Innocent cease to make the Ravenese archbishop act as his legate. He insisted upon his going personally to Modena in order to force its authorities to stop their oppression of the Church, and he commanded him to guard the city of Argenta.

South of the line from Luna to Bercetum and thence to Mons Silicis, *i.e.*, south of the northern boundary line of the Donation of Pippin, there still remained Tuscany proper, the lands of the Countess Matilda. These also Innocent attempted to recover from the cities which held them. But the cities would only surrender them on their own terms, and as these did not suit the Pope, he allowed the matter to drop for the time. He had too many other affairs on hand to engage in a quarrel with the cities of Tuscany, which, moreover, as we shall see presently, were strong in their newly formed League. Later on, however, after Otho’s promise to restore Matilda’s lands to the Pope, Innocent granted a large portion of them in the province of Emilia to the powerful Salin guerra of Ferrara. As Salin guerra agreed to hold his portion of the lands “of the Countess Matilda of illustrious memory” only from the Roman Church, to pay it every year “as a tax” forty marks of silver, and to serve for a month each year with from a hundred to twenty-five soldiers according to the distance of the district from Ferrara in which he was called upon to serve, the Pope hoped to reap some advantage from the contested property.

It would greatly help us to estimate the amount of real hold that Innocent had over the States of the Church if we knew the revenue he derived from them. Unfortunately, the documents are wanting which might enable us to find out this fact, interesting, moreover, in itself. The *Liber Censuum* has, however, preserved one or two documents which are worth attention. One of these, unfortunately not dated, but which no doubt represents the state of things under Innocent, deals with the broad and fertile vale of Umbria, along which, almost to its very end, the traveller looks with rapturous admiration from the heights of Perugia. The document in question deals with some thirty localities in the *Vallis Spoletana* (as the Umbrian vale is here called), both with towns such as Assisi, Foligno, Spello, Terni, etc., and with villages. From this vale the taxes amounted in cash from feudal dues to one thousand three hundred and forty-one pounds, sixteen solidi. Besides this, from twenty-three of the localities, the papal Curia

received sometimes one-third, sometimes two-thirds, and sometimes the whole of the local fines, taxes, and tolls; and from some ten localities varying quantities of corn; and from Collestates, on the Nera to the east of Terni, a chicken from every house.

We know that the same state of things obtained in other parts of the duchy of Spoleto in Innocent's reign, as for instance at Reate (*Rieti*), and that, at times, some powerful noble seized the revenues which ought to have come to the Pope.

With regard to the March of Ancona and the territories of the Countess Matilda, we can only say that it is asserted that Innocent maintained the regalian charges almost at the same moderate figure as had been fixed by the emperors.

On the death of Henry VI, Florence, Lucca, Siena, other cities of Tuscany, the bishop of Volterra, and other Tuscan notables, listening to words of the envoys of Celestine III, formed a League, in order to prevent a recurrence of the tyranny to which they had had to submit during that emperor's reign.

The written constitution of the League—a very long document—opens thus: “In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. May the grace of the Holy Spirit come down upon us! To the honour of God and of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of all the Saints, and of the Roman Church, and to the honour and safety of all who are or shall be in this League—we swear on the Holy Gospels of God henceforth to the end of our lives to maintain true peace and concord among all the persons of this society ... And if any person, prince or king, wishes to make war on any member of this League, we will not only not assist him in any way, but will, in accordance with the direction of the rectors of this League, help the member which is attacked. Nor will we receive any emperor or any representative of his without the assent and special order of the Roman Church”. The members of the League also undertook, when called upon so to do, to help to recover such property of the Holy See as had not been for some considerable time in the hands of any member of the League. These provisions were sworn to in the presence of cardinals Pandulf of the basilica of the Twelve Apostles, and of Bernard of the title of St. Peter *ad vincula* (legati Tuscie), in the church of St. Christopher in the Borgo San Genesio.

The leagues of the great Lombard plain were now matched by a league of the hill-cities of Tuscany. There can be no doubt that one object of the Tuscan League was “to secure to the cities the complete possession of their respective territories”, *i.e.*, of those which they were then holding. It will then be readily understood that Innocent could not give an unmixed approval to its constitution. According to him some of the clauses of the act of incorporation were neither useful nor honourable. He had himself read the *Donation* of Matilda and the other privileges of the Holy See, and from these it was clear to him that “the duchy of Tuscany belonged to the sovereignty of the Roman Church”. The legates Pandulf of the basilica of the Twelve Apostles, and Bernard of St. Peter *ad vincula*, were instructed to inform the rectors of the League that they had no right to form a League, except saving in all things the rights and authority of the Holy Roman See. While the Pope was prepared to go all lengths in defence of those who were loyal to the Holy See, he made it known that he would endeavour to force the recalcitrant Pisans to join the League, of which he approved in principle, if its *rectors* would agree to his terms.

In some way or other unknown to us, the heads of the League would seem to have satisfied Innocent, whose demands, in view of the strength and utility of the League, may have moderated. At any rate, in the October of the first year of his pontificate he wrote to the *prior* and the other *rectors* of the League that he was resolved to afford them his patronage against their foes so that it might prosper more and more. Furthermore, to show his zeal for the welfare of the League, he urged the ecclesiastical and civil rulers of Pisa to do all in their power to induce the people to throw in their lot with the other Tuscan cities.

That Innocent had real influence with the League is proved by the fact that, at his bidding, it finally refrained from helping Viterbo against Rome. But at this period no authority whatever except that of might was wholly respected by the Italian communes. So that if Innocent finally approved of the amended constitution of the Tuscan League, it was, as he said, because he could not find anything in it which was opposed either to natural justice or to the written canon law, and not because it was designed to be a source of much direct advantage to the Roman Church. And if he had but little trouble with the League as a whole, he had not unfrequently to take to task several of its members, especially the haughty Florentines who were its mainstay.

The Tuscan city which gave the greatest anxiety to Innocent was maritime Pisa, the powerful rival of Genoa and Venice for the trade of the East. During the greater part of the twelfth century it had been true to the Popes. Gelasius II, Innocent II, and Gregory VIII had found an asylum within its proud walls, and it had been greatly favoured by the Popes. But, towards the close of the century, it had learnt that it was more to its interests to stand for the emperor. It had therefore placed its fleets at his disposal; for it was desirous of having a free hand in Sardinia, which the Papacy claimed as its own, and which Innocent was striving to reform. Hence whilst he was appointing one of his own trusted assistants, the notary Blasius, to the archiepiscopal see of Torres in order that he might work for reform, the ecclesiastical and civil authorities of Pisa were endeavouring to increase their hold on the island. Innocent found it necessary to impress upon the archbishop of Torres that the primatial authority of the archbishop of Pisa over his diocese was, under ordinary circumstances, in no way exceptional, and that he could only exercise special jurisdiction over it when, “with our authority, he exercises for definite periods legatine power in Sardinia”. And, with regard to civil encroachments, he had to urge one of the *judges* of the island to resist the usurious demands of the Pisans; to remind both the Pisan and Sardinian rulers that the latter were feudally subject to the Apostolic See; and to insist that the oaths of fealty should be taken to him, and not to any of the Pisan rulers.

In the midst of his struggle to maintain his authority in Sardinia an event happened which Innocent endeavoured to use as a means of greatly strengthening that authority. In 1203 the *Judge* of Gallura died, and left as his heir his only daughter Helen, whom he committed to the care of the Pope. Innocent saw his opportunity, and as guardian of the maid resolved to wed her to his cousin Transmund of Segni. Helen herself, her mother, and other responsible persons in Sardinia were told that the Pope would provide a suitable husband for his ward. Although Innocent strictly forbade any interference with his rights as suzerain, it was some time before the difficulties in the way were overcome. At length, however, the lady gave her consent, and in May 1206

Innocent was able to announce to Helen that his cousin was on his way to her. He assured her that he had instructed him to love her as himself, and to rule her subjects with justice, and at the same time he begged her to receive his cousin honourably, and in turn to try to please him, that she might be loved and honoured by him with sincere devotion.

But whether the lady's affections had all the time really been placed elsewhere, or whether the Pisans had been able to persuade her that their interests were hers, when Transmund reached the island his affianced bride would not accept him. The Pope was much annoyed, and promptly wrote to the bishops of the island bidding them insist that she should keep her matrimonial engagements. "If the lady of Gallura is great and noble", wrote the indignant Pontiff, "still, with all due respect to her be it stated, her lineage is not more splendid than ours, nor has it ever touched the sublime dignity of the Apostolic See. Nor must she forget that, owing to the dependence of Sardinia on the Apostolic See, she is our ward, and hence, by feudal custom, cannot marry without our consent". Innocent cannot understand the frivolous excuses by which she is endeavouring to put off a marriage which was rather of her seeking than his. Does she imagine that we ought to have waited for the approval of Pisa? Or does she despise Transmund because he did not come with greater pomp? "She ought to have known that hardly anyone in the world could have sent him in greater splendour than we; but we bade him be content with a small following, as we were given to understand that such an arrangement would be for the greater good of all Sardinia". And it was this good which it was hoped this marriage would further.

If the lady of Gallura did not fulfil her contract, he would let her see, as her spiritual and temporal superior, "how rash and foolish it was to have wished to treat us with contumely".

Despite the Pontiff's threats, however, Pisan influence prevailed, and the lady of Gallura married the Pisan Lamberto Visconti. Innocent was very indignant. The newly wedded couple were declared excommunicated, Gallura was laid under an interdict, and efforts were made to stir up the Genoese still further against the Pisans. The latter were alarmed, and offered Innocent terms of peace which he accepted, though he declared that they were not altogether satisfactory. Pisa was to compel Lamberto to go to Rome in person or to send some responsible representative, and to submit absolutely to the Pope's sentence for having taken possession of the kingdom of Gallura, and for having married Helen without his permission. He was also to be made to offer complete satisfaction to Transmund for the losses he had suffered. Should Lamberto fail to fulfil either of these stipulations, the Pisan podestà was to place all his property which was under the control of Pisa at the disposal of the Pope.

In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we may presume that due satisfaction was made to the Pope, and that for the time the Pisans ceased to push their claims in Sardinia. But a few years later, when Otho IV, after having been crowned emperor at Rome (October 1209), broke his oaths and proceeded against the young Frederick of Sicily, the Pisans espoused his cause, invaded Sardinia, and incurred papal excommunication. The "peace and quiet", which had descended on Sardinia under

Innocent's influence, departed, and were again being succeeded by the ravages of war when he died.

The increase of the power of Henry VI had alarmed the slippery Lombards, as Salimbene calls them, and eleven cities, headed by Milan and Verona, had on July 20, 1195, renewed the League to defend the rights granted them by the council of Constance. But, although the death of Henry and the subsequent dissensions in Germany had relieved them from any fear from that quarter, Innocent is said to have induced seven of the eleven to associate themselves together once more (April 1198). This he did no doubt in the hope that peace could be more easily preserved among the members of a league; for no sooner was external pressure removed from the populous cities of Lombardy than they began to turn their exhaustless energy against one another, or against themselves. Faction fights and wars between groups of cities were being waged with fierce cruelty, and without cessation. The local annals of Piacenza, Cremona, Parma, etc., are full of such notices as the following: The men of this place took out their *Carroccio* (war-standard) against the men of that, destroyed and burnt innumerable places, and depopulated the district. Innocent was, therefore, perpetually occupied with endeavours to promote peace, as his was the only authority that was in any way recognised in Lombardy.

Sometimes too the cities, in want of money for their perpetual wars, would try openly to wring it from the clergy; sometimes they would connive at their being robbed by the nobility. Thus we see the people of Cremona excommunicated for oppressing their bishop, the historian Siccard, and his clergy with excessive taxation, and Parma and Piacenza getting into trouble on account of the Palavicini and some citizens of Piacenza, who had robbed the papal legate, Peter of Capua, on his return from Poland. As the lands of this noble family were situated in the neighbourhood of these communes, they were ordered by the Pope to force the *banditti* to restore their plunder. The people of Piacenza were especially warned that, if they did not force the robbers to make full satisfaction in a month's time, he would "give orders, under threat of excommunication, to the various provinces of the world that no one should trade with them, and that the goods of their merchants should be everywhere seized. He would subject their church to that of Ravenna, and if that was not enough to make them do their duty, he would deprive their city of a bishop, and both spiritually and temporally would lay a heavy hand on them. He meanwhile ratified the sentence of interdict which the cardinal had laid on Piacenza and its diocese, and the sentences of excommunication with which he had struck the Palavicini and their associates, and ordered them to be observed inviolably until complete satisfaction had been made".... He ordered the consuls of the past year to be excommunicated, because, though frequently appealed to, they had not punished the crime; and the consuls of the present year, the Privy Council of the city (the *Credenza*, *totani credentiani*) and the consuls of the merchants, he would also cause to be treated in like manner, and he would forbid their being admitted to the counsels of the Lombard League ... He had also written, he concluded, "to the rectors of the League, bidding them force the criminals themselves and the people of Piacenza to make satisfaction for such a great crime, if they did not wish the whole of Lombardy to be laid under an interdict". Parma was the first to yield to this strong language and action. The people of Piacenza seem to have soon followed the example of those of

Parma, and last of all the representative of the house of Palavicini submitted to be scourged, and gave a fief to the Pope in token of his penitence.

It was not long, however, before the people of Piacenza were again giving trouble to the Pope. He had to blame them for the fierce war they were waging with Parma, which was embroiling the whole of Lombardy, but still more for allowing themselves to be seduced “by heretical fallacies” and driving their bishop and clergy into exile. For this he threatens to remove the episcopal see from their city, “if city it can be called, after it has been deprived of its episcopal dignity”. At length, however, through the mediation of the Roman merchant-bankers, the consuls of Piacenza expressed their desire to comply with the commands of the Pope, and Innocent with joy informed them that he had ordered “the visitors of Lombardy” to bring the case to a satisfactory conclusion. They had to agree to pay some thousands of pounds down, and to make compensation for the damage done to the property of the clergy and of the Church.

It is impossible here to deal with all the negotiations which war, heresy, or what Innocent considered the unjust taxation of the clergy, caused him to enter into with the various cities of north Italy. But, from what the reader has now seen of Innocent’s policy, he will be in a position to conjecture how he successfully combated the undue taxation of the clergy in Bergamo, Verona, and Modena; how he proposed to make Novara a byword among the nations for driving its bishop into exile; how he strove to make peace between Acqui and Alessandria, to which he annexed the see of Acqui, and to which he sent a banner of St. Peter; how for six months he toiled hard to quell the long-standing feud between Milan and Pavia; and how he had the pain somewhat later of seeing Alessandria and Milan espouse the cause of Otho against him.

CHAPTER IV THE KINGDOM OF THE TWO SICILIES

Of all his worldly cares Innocent regarded that which concerned the kingdom of Sicily “as the most important importance since”, so he wrote, “besides the ordinary debt of pastoral solicitude which we owed it, its direction concerns us in a special manner, both as its suzerain and as its appointed guardian”.

That the care of the kingdom of Sicily and of its young king had been left to Innocent by the will of its last sovereign, the Empress Constance, is certain. Innocent frequently proclaimed the fact in public documents, and it is so stated by well-informed historians.

Moreover, there is some reason to believe that the will of supreme direction of the kingdom was left to the Pope by the Emperor Henry VI himself, as well as by his

wife, “to whom”, says a contemporary with the strictest truth, “the kingdom belonged more than to her husband”. As we shall see presently, Markwald of Anweiler, in the course of his struggle to seize, if not the kingdom itself, at least the first place in the kingdom, pretended that its management had been left to him by the late emperor’s will, of which he had been made the executor. Of this will Markwald kept possession, and, as we have seen, simply told the Pope that it had been drawn up largely in the interest of the Roman Church. After his defeat in Sicily (July 1200), the will of the late emperor, sealed with a golden bull, is said to have been found among his baggage. By this will it was laid down that the empress should do homage to the Roman Church for Sicily, which was to revert to the Church if Frederick were to die without an heir. On condition that the Pope confirmed Frederick in the Empire, the lands of the Countess Matilda were to be restored to him, except Medisina (some ten miles south-east of Bologna) and Argelata. Markwald himself was to do homage to the Pope for these two places, as well as for the duchy of Ravenna and the March of Ancona, which territories were to remain subject to the Roman Church in the event of Markwald’s dying without issue.

Innocent himself more than once alludes to this will; part of it is given verbatim by the author of the *Gesta*; and Markwald himself is said to have asserted that it was a document highly favourable to the Roman Church. Owing, however, to the fact of its contents being long kept concealed, some modern authors do not regard it as authentic. Whether they are right or wrong affects the matter very little. The undoubted last will of the empress, and Innocent’s rights as suzerain, are quite enough to justify his interference in the politics of Sicily.

On the death of her husband (September 1197), the first care of the empress was to expel Markwald, “of cursed memory”, and all the Germans from her domains, to bring her son from Italy, and to have him crowned king at Palermo, May 17, 1198.

The Pope on his side though, as we shall see, he would not support Frederick’s candidature for the Empire, nevertheless complied with the request of the empress, and confirmed to her and to her son the kingdom of the two Sicilies. But before he consented to do so he insisted on the empress’s renouncing the exceptional ecclesiastical privileges which Hadrian IV had been compelled to concede. Innocent justly maintained that they were inconsistent with proper ecclesiastical freedom. Despite all her efforts, for the great Norman lady was very loath to lose any of the privileges enjoyed by her predecessors, Constance was compelled to yield. Freedom of episcopal election was once more restored to Sicily, and the Pope resumed his right to send legates there at his pleasure.

Whilst engaged in the negotiations which terminated in the recognition of Constance and her son as rulers of the two Sicilies, Innocent exerted himself in obtaining the release of the Sicilian supporters of the dynasty which Henry VI had ousted. They had been treated by him with the utmost barbarity, and had been imprisoned in various parts of the Empire. Soon after his accession he sent envoys into Germany to urge the bishops to insist, under threat of ecclesiastical punishments, upon the immediate release of the captives. At the same time he assured the princes of the Empire that he would lay the whole of Germany under an interdict if they did not exert themselves for the same object. The legates were also instructed to approach Philip of

Swabia, and to offer to release him from the excommunication under which he had been placed by Celestine III for his devastation of the Patrimony, if he would obtain the release of the archbishop of Salerno, and make satisfaction with regard to the matters for which he had been excommunicated. To this Philip, who had been meanwhile elected king by one section of the German nobles, readily agreed, and at once procured the release of the archbishop and his brothers. Although Innocent was convinced that their effeminacy had been the cause of the troubles of the Sicilian captives, he did not rest till they had been released from their German prisons, and the empress had restored their property to them.

Innocent had now done much towards assuring a peaceful reign for Constance and the young Frederick; but there were many elements of discord still uneradicated. There was Markwald in arms in south Italy, striving to seize Monte Cassino, which commanded the road to Naples and the approach to the kingdom; and there were many intriguers in the Sicilian court itself. The empress at once forbade all her subjects to lend any support to Markwald, and was disposed to dismiss from his office Walter Palear, bishop of Troya, chancellor of the kingdom, as his brothers had shown themselves partisans of Markwald. However, at the earnest intercession of the Pope, she not only restored him to favour, but by will named him one of the regents of the kingdom.

Unfortunately, the affairs of the Sicilian kingdom were complicated by the death of Constance (November 27, 1198).

Markwald, who, as we have seen, after having been forced to abandon the March of Ancona, and to retire to his possessions in south Italy, had turned his arms against the empress, now prepared to invade Sicily itself, asserting that the late emperor had named him its regent. Meanwhile, however, he tried to gain over Innocent, who had taken the most vigorous measures to ensure his own recognition as warden of the kingdom, and to stir up active resistance against the pretender.

Markwald himself had been declared excommunicated; the bishops and clergy, and the nobles and people of Sicily, Apulia, and Calabria had been urged to be loyal to Frederick and to resist Markwald; and cardinal legates had been sent both into Sicily to take charge of the young king, and into Apulia to lead the opposition against the rebel.

In January (1199) he had written to the council of regency at Palermo to send him some money in view of the expenses which he had already incurred against Markwald; for, by the will of the late empress, he was to receive during his wardenship thirty thousand *tarins* every year, and recompense for all monies which he might expend in the defence of the kingdom. He had, he said, not spared his own treasury, and had had to borrow money in addition, and impressed upon his correspondents that it was in the end more economical to expend money freely at first than to dole out successive small sums. He also reminded them that they knew not merely by hearsay, but also by experience, of the tyranny, cunning, perjury, avarice, and lust of Markwald.

The Pope had also written to console the little Frederick for the loss of his father and mother, assuring him that in the Pope he would find another father, and that the Roman Church would be to him as a second mother.

Despite all this, Markwald did not despair. He knew there were many points in his favour. Walter of Palear, aiming at ruling Sicily in his own interests, was jealous of papal interference, and so could be relied upon not to give too hearty a support to Innocent; the Pisans could also be counted on to lend him their cooperation, and the German party in south Italy, headed by Conrad of Marlenheim, the castellan of Sora or Sorella, the fiercest of them all, and by Dipold of Vohburg, count of Acerra, was his to a man.

He accordingly made it known to Innocent that, if he would leave him a free hand, he would give him enormous sums of money, would hold the kingdom of Sicily from him, and would greatly enlarge the privileges which the Roman Pontiffs had in it. He further assured the Pope that he need have no scruple in abandoning Frederick, as he was in a position to prove that he was not Henry's son at all. Finding, however, that Innocent was proof against his promises and his lies, he feigned submission, and, after gaining much time by prolonging negotiations, at length secured his absolution from excommunication.

No sooner was he absolved, than he sent word in every direction that Innocent had granted him the regency of the kingdom. And when he was reminded that he was false to his oaths, he declared that neither God nor man should make him submit to the Pope's orders, and, leaving Dipold and others to hold south Italy, he crossed over to Sicily towards the close of the year 1199.

But he had to deal with a man as energetic as himself. Innocent at once denounced him as a perjurer, and, in response to an appeal for help from Sicily, sent thither soldiers under his cousin, the marshal James. He also wrote to the people of Sicily to urge them to resist Markwald, and warned the Saracens still on the island who had sided with Markwald that, if they were not loyal to Frederick, he would turn the arms of the Crusaders against them.

The allied troops of the Pope and the Sicilian regency inflicted a severe defeat on Markwald and his German, Saracen, and Pisan supporters (July 20, 1200). But the chancellor Walter of Palear was not to be trusted. He was simply working for his own ends. Despite the exhortations of Innocent to the nobles and people of Sicily to give pecuniary assistance, no money was forthcoming for the troops of the victorious marshal, who was compelled to return to Italy.

The situation both in Sicily and on the mainland was now very serious for the Pope and his ward. Walter of Palear was assuming more and more power, and although Innocent would not permit his succeeding to the archbishopric of Palermo, he acted as though he were the sole regent, in fact as though he were the king of the island. Furthermore, despite the prohibition of the Pope, he opened negotiations with Markwald, and came to such an understanding with him that that indefatigable warrior was able to pay a flying visit to the peninsula to concert measures of resistance with his party who were still holding their own in south Italy (c. November 1200). Indeed, Innocent's biographer assures us that the two agreed to divide the kingdom between them. Walter was to have the island, and Markwald the mainland.

But they were too ambitious to trust one another. Markwald declared everywhere that the chancellor was working to place his brother Gentile on the throne, and Walter

proclaimed that Markwald was striving to become king himself. War was again resumed, and Walter, leaving the young Frederick in the care of his brother, sailed over to south Italy to raise money, which he did by the most shameless plundering of the churches. He, moreover, never lost an opportunity of denouncing the Pope for calling in Walter of Brienne to oppose Markwald and his adherents. Innocent retorted by declaring Walter excommunicated, and deposed even from the see of Troya; by writing to the young king Frederick to inspire him with trust in his new ally; and by exhorting the great ones of Apulia to annul the chancellor's doings in their districts.

The absence of Walter of Palear from the island was fortunate for Markwald. He obtained possession of Palermo, and of the person of the king. But he was cut off in the midst of his successes, dying in the greatest agony under an operation for stone (c. September 1202). Writing soon after to Frederick's council of regency. Innocent declared that "by a just judgment Markwald had come to an evil end", and exhorted them, now that the great obstacle was removed, to work "for the honour of the Apostolic See, the safety of the king's person, and the good of the whole kingdom".

It is time now to retrace our steps, and, crossing over to the mainland, see how Innocent's efforts to preserve his kingdom for the young Frederick fared against Markwald's associates in that quarter.

After Sibyl, the widow of Tancred, and mother of William III, the last Norman king of Sicily, whom the Emperor Henry VI displaced, escaped with her daughters from her German prison, she gave her eldest daughter in marriage to Walter of Brienne, a noble of Champagne, and the brother of that John of Brienne who became emperor of Constantinople and king of Jerusalem. On the deposition of William III, he had been promised the principality of Tarento and the county of Lecce. But Henry was careful to forget his promise, and the deposed family were incapable of enforcing their claims. But the times were now changed. The empire was divided, a child was king of Sicily, and the rights of the fallen Norman house were in the keeping of a powerful noble of France. As representative of the claims of his wife, Walter, with a splendid company, appeared before Innocent, and urged his title to the fiefs of Tarento and Lecce (1200).

Innocent was greatly embarrassed. To favour Walter seemed to be tantamount to opposing Frederick; and yet, on the other hand, if he resisted his reasonable demands, he might drive him into the arms of Dipold and Markwald. Accordingly, after most careful consideration and consultation, he resolved to recognise Walter's claims. To avoid, however, the slightest appearance of acting against his ward, he insisted on his swearing, in presence of a very large number of people, that, if his demands were granted, he would in no way seek to diminish the rights of Frederick, but would, on the contrary, oppose his enemies. Moreover, Innocent assured Frederick's counsellors that the final decision in the matter rested with them, though at the same time he admonished them of the needs of the kingdom, and of the great use that Walter could be to it. It is to be presumed that, although the chancellor, Walter of Troya, opposed Innocent's alliance with his namesake, the majority of the council of regency approved of his action. At any rate, the Pope resolved to use the Frenchman to break the German power in south Italy, and Walter returned to France to raise troops.

Some modern authors believe that the initiative in this matter was taken, not by Brienne, but by Innocent himself. The narrative, however, of the Pope's biographer is consistent as well with itself as with the known character of Walter. Such a soldier was not likely to remain idle when he had a right to a principality.

Walter soon returned from France with a body of bold cavaliers, and at Innocent's behest, and with his gold and letters, at once proceeded against Dipold, whom he defeated at Capua and again at Cannae (June and October). The latter battle quite broke for the time being the German power in south Italy. But Innocent's satisfaction was soon spoilt by the news of the success of Markwald in Sicily, of his capture of Palermo and the young king (October 1201). It was clearly necessary to act vigorously in Sicily or all would be lost, and so he began to urge the victorious Walter of Brienne to sail to Sicily against Markwald.

But the armed master of the island was also a master of diplomacy, and he tried every means to induce the count, whom he feared, to abandon his enterprise, and to leave the kingdom. But although he had no intention of retiring from the kingdom altogether, Walter was not anxious to risk the hold he had on south Italy, and showed himself very slow to entertain the idea of the invasion of Sicily itself. The Pope, however, continued to urge him by threats and by promises to set out against Markwald. In the first half of September (1202), letter after letter reached the count from the Pope. Innocent had hitherto, so he said, accepted his excuses, but he must now sail for Sicily without offering any more of them. To encourage him to start, the Pope not merely wrote to his own relatives urging them to assist the count, but offered to raise a large sum of money for him in any way he should find most convenient. He would even borrow money for him at usurious interest, or raise it by selling even at a loss the revenues due to his treasury from Apulia or the Terra di Lavoro.

It was at this juncture that news reached the Pope of the death of Markwald. Not without reason was he then full of hope that the days of storm and stress were over, when he heard that a new foe had arisen in Sicily. William of Capparone had seized Palermo and the young king, and had styled himself guardian of the king and captain-general of Sicily. Although in many ways confusion now became worse confounded in the island, the position of the young king was not so perilous. Though factions multiplied, and disorders more or less serious consequently increased, no other Markwald arose capable of depriving Frederick of his kingdom altogether.

On the mainland the position of the Pope as supreme guardian of the kingdom steadily improved. He was able to inform the archbishop of Cologne before the end of this eventful year (November 20, 1202) that Conrad of Urslingen, who had returned to Italy to take the place of Markwald, was dead, as was also Otto of Barenste, the murderer of the bishop of Liège, and that he was now for the most part free from anxiety as far as the kingdom of the two Sicilies was concerned. Next Walter of Palear, who before the battle of Cannae had declared that he would rather go to hell than not oppose his namesake of Brienne, now sought and obtained Innocent's forgiveness, and returned to Sicily to resist Capparone (1203).

Unfortunately, Innocent was taken so ill this year at Anagni that a report of his death was freely circulated, and many cities in consequence threw off the allegiance

of Walter of Brienne. On the Pope's recovery, James the marshal and Walter of Brienne, whom he had named "Masters and Justiciaries of Apulia and Terra di Lavoro", set themselves to subdue the revolted cities, and the Pope wrote to exhort them to return to their allegiance.

So successful was Walter against the Germans that, with true Gallic brag, he boasted that even when armed they were afraid of unarmed Frenchmen. With the stupidity bred of arrogance, he neglected the ordinary military precautions, was surprised by Dipold, and died of the wounds he then received (June 1205). He left a son who bore his own name, and was destined to be an object of jealousy to Frederick II, as he was the grandson of Tancred, king of Sicily. The death of his champion might have proved very disastrous to Innocent had not Dipold thought fit to make his submission to him (1206).

In the following year that warrior sailed for Sicily to strive with Capparone for the control of the young king. His departure, and the subsequent displacement from his stronghold by force and by gold of Conrad of Sora or Sorella in favour of Innocent's brother Richard, gave peace to south Italy (February 1208). Arrived in Sicily, Dipold leagued himself with the papal legate and with the chancellor Walter against Capparone. This combination proved too strong for Capparone, and the guardianship of Frederick was wrested from him. Walter and Dipold, however, distrusted each other. The latter was seized and imprisoned, but contrived to escape to Italy, where he again later turned against the Pope in favour of Otho IV. Unfortunately, however, the dissensions between Walter and Capparone still kept the unhappy country in a state of turmoil, and the Saracens, taking advantage of the situation, broke out into rebellion, and seized a fortress.

It seemed, however, to Innocent that the time had now come when he might definitely pacify the two Sicilies. Knowing how much his presence in the duchy of Spoleto (1198) and in the Patrimony (1207) had helped towards the peace of those territories, he proceeded in the May of this year (1208) from Anagni to San Germano in the kingdom of Sicily. Particulars of his journey are furnished by the *Annales of Ceccano*. Outside Anagni the Pope found John of Ceccano with fifty picked and splendidly accoutred soldiers ready to escort him for some distance, and to amuse him by a display of their skill in arms. At Castrogiuliano he was received by Albert, bishop of Ferentino, and by the clergy "of all the territory of John of Ceccano", singing the antiphon *Tua est potentia*. After they had received the apostolic blessing, the clergy were entertained to a splendid banquet, at which, besides the ordinary viands of veal, pork, birds, etc., they were treated to pepper, cinnamon, and saffron. Then for several hours John and his soldiers entertained the Pope and the assembled multitude to military sports (June 16). It was when Innocent reached the famous monastery of Fossa Nova that his brother Richard was solemnly proclaimed count of Sora.

Arrived at San Germano, he there held, towards the close of June, a great diet of the counts, barons, and *rectors* of the cities of the kingdom, and caused them to promise on oath to stand by his regulations for the peace of the kingdom, and for the assistance of the young Frederick. Two hundred soldiers were to be despatched at once to the help of the king, and all the faithful subjects of the kingdom in Apulia were exhorted to assist

in carrying out the measures which the Pope assured them had in the making caused him largely to put to one side the affairs of the rest of the world. And all this he did though, as his biographer assures us, “the time of his wardenship had now expired”.

The further intervention of the Pope in Frederick’s behalf was urgently called for. Of what he had already done for his ward, Innocent reminded him in eloquent language: “In defending your interests oft have we passed sleepless nights; and in devising measures for the peace of your realm it has oft been supper-time when we have taken our dinner. How often have the crowds of our messengers met each other when going to and returning from different parts of the world with the letters we have written in your behalf! How often have the documents we have issued concerning the tranquillity of your kingdom wearied the pens of our notaries, and dried the ink-wells of our scribes! How often have men coming from all parts of the world had to grieve that their business was delayed because we were wrapped up in your affairs! What shall we say of the immense expense in which the many needs of your kingdom have involved us? Nor have we spared our brethren and our kinsmen, whose toil though great was, we rejoice to say, not always without fruit”.

Unceasingly, indeed, had Innocent worked in Frederick’s interests against Walter of Plear, and against Markwald, supported as he had been by Philip of Swabia, by Saracens, by pirates, and by the Pisans. He had striven to save his treasury, and had put pressure in his behalf on the monks of the famous monastery of Monreale, who were supporting his captor William of Capparone, and giving his wife the very plate and vestments of the Church.

He rejoiced with him over his liberation by Dipold, but saw that complete peace was not yet assured. Hence to strengthen the young king’s position he hurried on a marriage which he had negotiated long before, and, as we have seen, arranged at the diet of San Germane that help should be sent to him from the mainland. As early as 1202 Innocent had decided that the wife for his ward was Constance, the sister of the promising sovereign Pedro II of Aragon, and widow of Emeric, king of Hungary; for Pedro had promised to send armed assistance for the young king. Though the two were solemnly affianced in the same year, several years elapsed before Innocent’s diplomacy was able to bring about the actual marriage. It was not till the year 1209 that Constance, escorted by a splendid company of nobles from Provence and Catalonia, reached Sicily, and was married to Frederick.

The assembly of San Germane and the Aragonese marriage may be said to mark the establishment of peace in the two sections of Frederick’s Sicilian kingdom. But Innocent’s care of his ward did not finish in the year 1209. As will be seen when the affairs of the Empire are treated, he intervened to save his kingdom from the ambitious grasp of Otho IV, and encouraged him to fight for the Empire. Fortunately for him, he did not live long enough to taste of his pupil’s ingratitude, though he had on one or two occasions to rebuke him. In the very year of his marriage, for instance, he had to blame him very strongly for interference in an episcopal election; and in the following year for dismissing from his court Walter of Troya, then bishop of Catania.

In the midst of all his political anxieties for his young charge Innocent did not forget his education. As long as lasted the hard tutelage of Markwald, and of the others

who used the child-king for their own ends, the Pope could do little for either his moral or intellectual training. Still he did not lose sight of his education, received reports about it, and expressed his pleasure when he heard “that he was from day to day increasing in wisdom and in virtue as well as in age”. His legates were instructed to see to his good as well as to that of the kingdom; nor did he fail in beautiful language to urge Frederick to follow their instructions, whilst he himself oft showed the youth the path in which he should tread. “As the farmer rejoices”, he wrote, “when his land is white to harvest ... so are we even more glad in the bowels of the mercy of Christ when we hear that you, brought up in the bosom of the Apostolic See, have now almost reached the years of puberty—you whom almost from infancy till now we have had such difficulty in guarding. And since you are said so to have clung to the breast of the Apostolic See—which like a most tender nurse has hitherto suckled your infancy—that by the power of the most High, anticipating maturer years by your virtues, you are advancing before God and man in prudence and age, we pray Him by whom kings reign to multiply in you the gifts of His grace ... by which to the honour of His holy name you may soon be able to rule your kingdom, and we may be able to rest from our great anxiety ... We therefore earnestly bid and exhort you to turn your thoughts to God ... and to beg Him to grant you strength to rule your kingdom and yourself”. In like manner did he urge upon the young King’s councillors the need of training him in the ways of the Lord.

Details, however, of his education are wanting. “We know only”, says Huillard-Breholles, “that he had for governors Nicholas, archbishop of Taranto, and the notary John of Tragetto. He himself, in two letters in which he recommends them to Pope Honorius, speaks of them as those to whom he owed his upbringing. This would seem to imply that they had directed his education under the eyes of the cardinal legates, and consequently more in accordance with Christian ideals than is commonly supposed”.

However this may be, it is certain that Frederick regarded Innocent as the great friend of his youth, and spoke of him as his “protector and benefactor ... by whose kindness, zeal, and guardianship I was brought up, protected and destined for great things

PART II.
INNOCENT AND THE EMPIRE

CHAPTER I
THE IMPERIAL SCHISM TO THE DEATH OF PHILIP OF SWABIA
(1208).

When the news of the premature death of Henry VI (September 1197) reached Germany, the minds of thoughtful men were filled with dread. Nor were their fears vain. The evil which they foresaw came upon them, and for over ten years Germany was lacerated with civil war. Henry's death was "to the Teutonic race and to all the peoples of Germany a cause of eternal regret".

But "to all the peoples" of Italy his demise was a cause of deep joy. It was followed immediately by risings against his lieutenants, and so it was with the greatest difficulty that his brother, Philip of Swabia, made his way back in safety to Germany. He had been summoned into Italy by Henry to escort the young Frederick to Germany, in order that, as the princes had elected him king, he might be solemnly anointed by the archbishop of Cologne. But on Henry's death Philip thought only of returning to Germany as soon as possible. There the princes, both those who had the good of the Empire at heart (if such there were) and those who had no other concern but their own interests, were agreed at least on one point. Though they had all taken the oath of allegiance to Frederick, they all averred that it was out of the question that a child should be emperor. The disinterested knew that the rule of a child-king was ruin to the state, the interested realised that their time had come. A few of the more powerful had hopes that the Empire might fall to them — "The coronets are grown too vain", sings der Vogelweide—, and the rest were determined to wring gold or privileges from the imperial candidates.

The chief candidates were Berthold, duke of Zahringen, the Guelf Otho of Brunswick, the son of Henry the Lion, and the Ghibelline Philip of Swabia, who, it is said, at first did all he could to secure the confirmation of the election of the young Frederick. If he ever had really at heart the cause of his nephew, he must have been soon convinced that it was hopeless. Even the least selfish of the princes were glad of the opportunity of opposing the hereditary principle which Henry had succeeded in forcing upon them.

Berthold, Otho, and Philip now began to pour out money like water. Berthold soon retired from the contest, but Otho and Philip were resolved to go to extremes. The former was substantially supported by Richard of England, and the latter was the possessor of the treasure which his brother had extorted from his Sicilian kingdom.

Seeing that his opponent was winning the support of the majority of the princes, Otho precipitated matters. Although his election (June 9, 1198) took place after that of Philip (May 8), he had himself crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle by Adolf of Altena, the archbishop of Cologne, who had been the last of the great princes to submit to Henry's scheme to make the Empire hereditary. His coronation then (July 12) was anterior to that of Philip (September 8), and was more legal in form, as he was enthroned in the proper place, and by the proper person. But Philip was in possession of the imperial regalia, and had the support of much the greater number of the important princes. He was, however, only crowned by the archbishop of Tarentaise, and the sole bishop present at his coronation who ventured to wear his pontifical robes was the bishop of Sutri. As the latter was then representing the Pope, who had sent him to Philip to negotiate the release of the Sicilian prisoners, Innocent promptly degraded him on his return for having thus ventured to commit his master to one party, and for not having strictly fulfilled the Pope's instructions regarding the absolution of Philip.

The rival kings were both under twenty-five years of age. One of them, Otho, is said to have been tall, very handsome in appearance, generous in disposition, skilled in arms, but not too truthful, nor moderate in prosperity. Philip, on the other hand, though also possessing good features, was rather small and frail of body. But his panegyrists Burchard and Conrad add that he was gentle and affable, prudent and generous, a man of literary tastes and fond of taking part in the services of the Church; while certain Greeks declared that he was actually a cleric.

The double election, says the same Burchard, caused "all the ills of earth to be multiplied". Treachery, robbery, devastation of property, and fighting became so general that no one could safely go from one house to another. "Violence", moaned Walter, the Minnersinger, "is supreme on the highroads; peace and justice are sick unto death". Especial sufferers were the defenceless clergy and their churches; and later on, when Innocent declared in favour of Otho, and showed favour to the bishops who supported him and enmity to those who opposed him, many bishops, says the annalist Gerlac, abbot of Mülhausen, "fell between the two kings as between two stools".

Innocent was now master of the situation; and he took care to inform "all the princes of Germany, both ecclesiastical and secular", that, in the first place, it was allowed that the ultimate authoritative settlement of the difficulty appertained to him. He then blamed them, both for their original act in electing two kings, and for not having attempted to remedy the mischief which they had caused by prompt recourse to him. At the same time, as well to them as to others, he explained his views on the *regnum* and the *sacerdotium* (the Empire and the Papacy), his belief that loss to the Empire meant evil to the Church, and his earnest wish to act for the best interests of the Empire.

The Empire, he said, was transferred from the Greeks by the Roman Church for its own defence; and so he himself, far from "giving his mind, as certain pestilent fellows contended, to the destruction of the Empire, was rather anxious to provide for its preservation". As "the pestilent fellows" continued to assert that the Pope's aim was the degradation of the Empire, Innocent ceased not to proclaim that his one object was its exaltation. The Empire and the Papacy, he urged, are the two great powers in the

world, and ought to be in harmony. “They are the two cherubim who are described as facing each other with wings conjoined over the mercy-seat. They are the two wonderfully beautiful columns placed near the door in the vestibule of the temple... They are the two great lights which God set in the firmament of heaven, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser one to rule the night. And they are the two swords of which the Apostles spoke when they said, ‘Behold, here are two swords’ (St. Luke XXII. 38)”.

“The rule of the world”, he said to Otho after he had been recognised as the sole imperial candidate, “has been entrusted chiefly to us two; and, as the imperial crown has to be granted by the Roman Pontiff, it behoves him to strive for the greater glory of the Empire”. It was vain for anyone to pretend that the Papacy was anxious to destroy the Empire. The Church, he declared, cannot be without an emperor, and has no wish to be without one; for, just as when the moon is eclipsed, darkness becomes darker still, so, through the want of an emperor, the wild violence of heretics and pagans cruelty increases to the great detriment of the faithful. He could write without exaggeration: “When we heard that the votes of the princes regarding the election of an emperor were divided, we were so much the more troubled that, for the reasons just assigned, the good estate of the Empire particularly concerns us, and because for the many great needs of the Christian people, not only does the Church desire to have a devoted defender, but the whole Empire is known to stand in need of a suitable guardian”.

In another letter to the princes of the Empire Innocent depicts with eloquent force the burning need of Christendom for a united Empire. “The evils of the hour show what loss is resulting from the division of the Empire, not only to us and to you, but to the whole Christian people. Heretics are prevailing against Catholics; the boundaries of the Christian faith are contracting, and the pagans are boasting in the ears of the faithful about the capture of the land of the Saviour’s birth. Peace and justice, which once were embracing each other, now mourn their mutual separation; while violence and sedition have joined hands and cry aloud that they have taken their place. The violent have laid their sacrilegious hands on the goods of the churches, the powerful have planted their feet on the necks of the weak, and the scanty purses of the poor are made to engender in the coffers of the rich a needy abundance or an abundant neediness ... so that there is now fulfilled to the letter the saying that ‘from him that hath not, that also which he seemeth to have shall be taken away’ (St. Matt. xxv. 29). To sum up all in a few words, injustice has usurped the place of right, and will, not reason, makes the laws, so that some imagine that they may do that which pleases them”. As the princes have failed to take steps to remedy these evils, it is for the Pope to do so, seeing that he has at heart “the exaltation, not the depression of the Empire”, and has no wish by his silence to seem to foment the discord.

Now that at some length and in his own words the ideas of Innocent concerning the Papacy and the Empire have been stated, the narrative of the chief events of the imperial schism may be resumed. As it was clear both to Otho and to Philip that the last word on their respective claims would rest with Innocent, both candidates turned to him almost immediately, and each boasted that he had received the Pope’s support. To gain his favour Otho had, on the very day of his election, sworn to preserve the rights of the Roman Church and the other churches, to restore what the emperors had unjustly taken

from the churches or the princes, and to give up the evil custom of annexing the property of deceased ecclesiastical princes. Writing himself to the Pope, Otho pointed out what his father Henry the Lion had suffered in the cause of the Church. He declared that he would preserve intact the possessions and rights of the Roman Church and all the churches, and that he would renounce the *jus spoli*; and he begged Innocent, mindful on the one hand of the devotion of his father and of his uncle. King Richard of England, to the Roman Church, and mindful on the other hand of the evils inflicted on it by Philip himself and by his father and brother, to summon him to receive the imperial consecration, to make known the excommunication of Philip throughout the whole Empire, and to compel all the princes, ecclesiastical and civil, to render him due obedience.

Richard of England and others of Otho's partisans made the same requests in his behalf. Richard declares that among all Christian princes there were not any more devoted to the Roman Church than was Otho himself, and he declares in his nephew's name that, under the Pope's direction, he will endeavour "to eliminate all the abuses of the secular power".

As we have already seen, Innocent entered into communication with Philip concerning the release of the Sicilian prisoners soon after his accession to the papal throne. He had employed the bishop of Sutri, a German by birth, to convey his message to the duke of Swabia. The bishop, who found that Philip had meanwhile been elected king, absolved him from the excommunication under which he had been placed by Celestine III, without insisting on Innocent's conditions. The new king then, using the bishop as his agent, sent him to the Pope to secure his interest in his behalf (c. September 1198). About the same time also Philip of France wrote "to his most dear relative", the lord Innocent, in behalf of his namesake, assuring the Pope that the king of Germany was willing to give way concerning the matters in dispute between the Church and the Empire, and, in order to obtain the Pope's favour, was prepared to make pecuniary sacrifices.

But Innocent was not anxious to interfere in the dispute. He, however, made it known that no final agreement with Philip was possible until he had made over to him the fortress of Montefiascone. And when, writing a little later to the princes of Germany to urge them to end the schism which was causing "the robbing of churches and the oppression of the poor, loss of life and the ruin of souls", he gave them to understand that he would have to step in to end a schism which was ruining the dignity of the Empire, and he exhorted them to accept his decision (May 3, 1199). Besides, whatever may have been his private feeling in Otho's behalf, it was not till May 20, 1199, that he even sent answers to the letters of his partisans, and in them he simply said that he would see to his honour and interests as far as his duty to God would allow him.

The great mass of the princes, however, including most of the officials of the Empire, who had elected Philip, were not disposed either to submit "to the few princes who resisted the claims of justice", or to invoke papal arbitration. They accordingly informed the Pope of their election of Philip "as emperor of the Roman throne", and of the resolution which they had just formed to establish his position by an overwhelming display of force. "Therefore", they wrote, "do we earnestly beg the apostolic clemency

to listen to the request of those who love the good estate of the Roman Church, and not to make any injurious attack on the rights of the Empire, just as we for our part are resolved that the rights of the Church shall not be infringed by any one. Hence do you extend your favour and goodwill to our most excellent lord, and, wherever you can, so efficaciously promote his honour and advantage that iniquity may not prevail over justice, and that falsehood may yield to truth. Moreover, we beg and implore you to grant your support to the beloved friend and faithful servant of our lord King Philip, *i.e.* to Markwald, marquis of Ancona, duke of Ravenna, procurator of the kingdom of Sicily, and seneschal of the Empire. And we equally urge you not to help those who would oppose him when he is on the king's business ... Know too that with all the force we can master we shall, with the blessing of God, in a short time come to Rome with our lord to obtain for him the sublime dignity of the imperial coronation" (May 28, 1199). This strong letter was backed with the names of the archbishops of Magdeburg, Trier, and Besançon, of many bishops and abbots, of the king of Bohemia, of the dukes of Saxony, Bavaria, Austria, and of other dukes and marquises. About the same time Philip himself accredited by letter certain envoys to the Pope "on the affairs of the Empire".

To the former document Innocent replied that he was grieved as a father over the discord which had arisen in Germany, that he was solicitous not for the depression but for the exaltation of the Empire, and that he only wished that others were as anxious to respect the rights of the Church as he was wishful that those of the Empire should be preserved intact. "We are indeed anxious to recover and to preserve our rights, but we have no wish to interfere with the rights of others. But since the imperial crown is to be given by the Roman Pontiff to the candidate who has previously been properly and lawfully elected and crowned king, we shall, in accordance with old and approved custom, willingly call such a candidate to receive the imperial crown, and solemnly confer it on him, after the usual matters which precede the coronation have been settled". What the princes had to say about Markwald he did not deem worthy of comment. If they had known more about him they would have written not for but against him. He knew *for certain* that the marquis was aiming at being king of Sicily, which belonged to the Roman Church, and that he had hence been proclaimed by the Empress Constance, and excommunicated by the Church.

Innocent concludes his dignified reply by urging the princes to remain true sons of the Church, and not to believe those who say what is untrue about her.

In his answer to the envoys of Philip, Innocent declared that though there ought to be concord between the Church and the Empire, still the former was superior to the latter. Both priests and kings were anointed, but kings were anointed by priests, and not priests by kings. To princes is given power on earth, to priests in heaven; the former have jurisdiction over men's bodies, the latter over men's souls. The power of princes is local, that of Peter and his successors universal. Among the chosen people the priesthood was instituted by God, but kingly power only in consequence of human discontent. In this matter, therefore, of the divided election, recourse should have been made to the Apostolic See at once, because it is allowed that this affair belongs to it both primarily and ultimately—primarily, because the Apostolic See transferred the Empire from the East to the West, and ultimately, because it granted the imperial crown.

Civil war and negotiations with Rome and between the belligerents continued, and the disorder was increased by each of the kings appointing one of their own party to any bishopric that might become vacant. Otho especially, whose party was the weaker, kept turning to Rome, and, profuse in his promises, earnestly implored the Pope's open support. Meanwhile, Conrad, archbishop of Mainz and cardinal-bishop of Sabina, whose exile in the cause of Rome had given him great influence, was working hard for peace. In accordance with Innocent's wishes, it had been arranged that the dispute should be referred to a board of arbitration consisting of six clerical and lay nobles from each side under the presidency of the archbishop of Mainz. Although Otho professed to have full confidence that the arbitrators would give their verdict in his favour, he wrote to beg the Pope to compel them to accept him as their king.

By way of a reply to this request Innocent sent a letter to the princes in which he told them that he had been asked by many to make a careful study of the dispute so that he might know to whom he should give his support. Having then stated the arguments which were alleged on both sides, he proceeded to say that he had not hitherto taken any decisive steps in the matter in the hope that they would themselves settle the dispute, and that he was delighted to hear that at last they had listened to his suggestions, and were going to deliberate on the means of bringing peace to the Empire. But at the same time he exhorted them to study the arguments of the two candidates which he had enumerated (and which, it must be confessed, he had set out rather in Otho's favour), and to choose a strong man whom he could and ought to crown, inasmuch as the Empire needed such a one, and the Church could no longer do without a strong defender. They were not, however, to choose one whose obvious defects would prevent him from being accepted by the Church. "This have we said to you, not because we wish to interfere with your freedom and dignity, but to remove any cause of dissension and scandal".

About the same date he despatched a number of other letters in which, without making any direct appeal in Otho's behalf, he showed towards which candidate his own feelings were inclined. He told the duke of Brabant that he would grant a dispensation so that his daughter might without delay be married to Otho, to whom she was related in a rather remote degree. The archbishop of Trier had, on receipt of a sum of money from Adolf of Cologne, promised to recognise the king accepted by him, and had then repudiated his engagement and kept the money. The Pope required him to refund the latter, and to answer to him for his broken oath. Otho had complained to Innocent that, like so many others, the landgrave of Thuringia had taken his money in return for his allegiance, and had then denied him both. The Pope required the archbishop of Mainz to see to it that the landgrave at least returned the money. Our own King John was also told that he must pay over to Otho the legacies left him by King Richard; and Octavian, bishop of Ostia, was instructed to arrange, in the course of his efforts to bring about peace between the same King John and Philip of France, that no condition should be agreed to which would interfere with loyalty to the Apostolic See, "especially in the matter of the negotiations now in progress for the settlement of the Roman empire".

Whether the arbitrators would have followed Innocent's obvious lead must remain mere matter for conjecture. Their award was never given. Conrad of Mainz, the only man capable of holding them together, unfortunately died on October 27, 1200; and though a meeting was held, it accomplished nothing.

Convinced that the German princes themselves were unable or unwilling to heal the schism, Innocent at length resolved to intervene directly himself. Accordingly, towards the close of the year (1200), he drew up his famous *deliberation*, in which he unfolded the reasons for and against each of the three candidates—the youthful Frederick, Philip, and Otho. The document opened with a statement of the Pope's reason for interfering, beginning, like many other official documents of the period, with the words, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost". "It concerns the Apostolic See", the document continued, "prudently to provide for the good of the Roman Empire, since it is recognised that in the first and last instance, the Empire pertains to that see. In the first instance, seeing that the Empire was transferred from Greece by it and for its own advantage—by its act of translation, and for its better defence. In the last instance, because the emperor receives from the Supreme Pontiff the last step of his promotion when he is consecrated, and crowned by him, and is invested with the Empire by him. This Henry thoroughly understood; for, after he had received the crown from our predecessor Celestine III of blessed memory ... he asked to be invested by him with the Empire by means of the golden palla".

With regard to Frederick, it is true, he pointed out, that the princes elected him and took the oath of fealty to him in the lifetime of his father. But they chose a wholly unfit person—to wit, a child of two years old, not then baptized. Unlawful and rash oaths of that kind are not to be kept. In Phihp's case it may be said that he was elected by the majority of the electors and the more dignified ones. He was, however, elected when under excommunication, and he is still under it because the bishop of Sutri did not fulfil the papal mandate in absolving him. Besides, as the chief ally of Markwald, he has shared in the excommunication pronounced against him and his aiders and abettors. Moreover, he has shown himself a persecutor and usurper of ecclesiastical property, and he is of a family which has greatly persecuted the Church.

Coming lastly to Otho, the Pope as usual stated the case against him. "It was not right to favour him, because he was elected by the minority; it was not proper, because in supporting him he would seem to be acting rather from hatred of another than from any merits of his; and it was not expedient, because his party was the weaker. But, since as many (if not the majority) of those to whom the chief share in electing the emperor belongs are known to have sided with Otho, as sided with his opponent; since the suitability of the person elected is in such cases more to be considered than the number of the electors; since in the electors themselves wisdom is of more importance than numbers", and since Otho, owing to his family connections devoted to the Church, is more fit to rule than Philip, it must be accounted lawful, proper, and expedient for the Apostolic See to favour Otho. If, therefore, the princes will not agree on a suitable candidate, nor refer the matter to the decision of the Holy See, then Otho must be accepted as king, and summoned to receive the imperial crown.

By letters and through the agency of Guido, cardinal-bishop of Praeneste, Otho and all the interested parties were informed of Innocent's decision. Then, as the princes neither themselves agreed on a suitable candidate nor referred the dispute to the Pope, "on July 3, 1201, in the church of St Peter (at Cologne), Guido of Praeneste, cardinal-bishop and legate of the Apostolic See, by the authority of the Supreme Pontiff Innocent III, confirmed the election of Otho, and, having consecrated him, excommunicated all

his adversaries". This definite papal pronouncement was made not an hour too soon, for, as Guido soon after reported to Innocent, had it not been made then, some of the princes would, "in hatred of the Roman Church", have put forward a third candidate.

It is not astonishing that Innocent should have thus favoured Otho, seeing that that prince had made more advances to him than Philip, and the oath he had taken at Neuss, near Dusseldorf (June 8, 1201), before the Pope's envoys publicly accepted him, must have been regarded at Rome as most satisfactory. Among other items Otho swore to recognise as belonging to the Roman Church "all the country between Radicofani and Ceprano, the Exarchate of Ravenna, the March of Pentapolis, the land of the Countess Matilda, and the county of Bertinoro, with the other adjacent territories enumerated in various imperial privileges from the time of the emperor Louis (the Pious)". He also recognised the right of the Roman Church to the kingdom of Sicily; and he engaged to follow the Pope's lead in his relations with the Roman people and with the Tuscan and Lombard Leagues, and in the matter of peace between Philip of France and himself. But, as so often happened, Innocent and his successors were to find that Otho and Frederick II, for whom they had done most, were to prove the most ungrateful.

Whilst Innocent supported the efforts of his envoys on Otho's behalf, Philip's partisans were not idle, and in the beginning of the year 1202 they addressed a vigorous letter of protest to the Pope. Who could believe, they asked with indignation, that confusion would spring from the fount of order, and injustice from the home of right? Hence they cannot believe that the action of Cardinal Guido of Praineste has the authority of the Pope behind it. It has never been known that cardinals have interfered with the election of the King of the Romans, nor can it be maintained that, apart from the princes themselves, there is any superior who can step in and remedy a schismatical imperial election. In their conclusion, however, the princes so far descended from their lofty stand as to assure Innocent that their candidate would never cease to pay his due obedience to him and to the Roman Church, and they begged him not to refuse to anoint Philip when the proper time arrived.

Philip of France wrote to the Pope in even less measured terms. He was astonished that the Pope should think of placing the imperial crown on the head of an enemy of France. The hard things (no doubt he is here alluding to the affair of his divorce) which the Pope had said and done against his own person he could bear, but he could not endure what threatened the honour of his realm. "If then you wish to persevere in your undertaking, we shall take such steps with regard to it as opportunity and time shall suggest". He, too, adopting milder language at the close of his letter, again offered to go bail for Philip's conduct towards the Church.

To these militant missives Innocent replied at length. The princes were reminded that their right of election was fully recognised, and had not been interfered with; but they were also asked to remember that to the Pope belonged the right to examine the candidate for empire. If the princes agreed to elect an excommunicated person, or a tyrant or a fool, the Pope could not be expected to crown such a one. Then, after repeating the arguments in Otho's favour and against Philip which have already been noted, he warned the princes that the accession of Philip would strengthen the

hereditary principle of succession to the Empire, and tend to destroy their rights and privileges.

Next Philip of France was assured that he need have no fear of Otho, and that, if need be, the Roman Church would ever keep him and his kingdom from suffering any harm from Otho. On the contrary, he would be in danger from Philip, who, besides having once behaved treacherously to him on his return from the Holy Land, would be too powerful for him if he obtained the Empire, and succeeded in the endeavours he was already making to attach Sicily to it. “If you, then, consider it unbearable that the Roman Pontiff should favour any one, and especially an emperor, against the kingdom of the Franks, so it would be very vexatious to us if the king of the Franks were to show favour to any one against the Roman Church, especially in this matter of the Roman Empire”.

Innocent’s interference, however, in Otho’s behalf quite failed to put an end to the imperial schism; and, later on gave occasion to his enemies to attribute to him the great evils of the schism, which they said were largely due to his having first favoured and then condemned Otho. Hence, says the old story-teller, Caesar of Heisterbach, once when Innocent was preaching to the people his enemy, John Capocci, who favoured Otho, interrupted his discourse by shouting out: “Your words are the words of God, but your deeds are those of the devil”. Still he was not discouraged, but for years, by hundreds of letters, and by every means in his power, did he labour to secure Otho’s ultimate triumph. On Otho himself he urged trust in God and in the Roman Church, and the necessity on the one hand of avoiding rash exposure of his person in battle, and on the other of cultivating the goodwill of Philip of France, the Senate and people of Rome, the rectors of the Lombard and Tuscan Leagues, and the bishops. John of England was exhorted to give to Otho not only what was due to him by Richard’s will, but substantial help in addition. The archbishop of Trier was instructed to take steps against the archbishop of Tarentaise if he did not repent of having crowned Philip—an act of presumption of which none of the archbishops of Germany were guilty. Milan and all the rulers of Lombardy were called upon to help the heir of Henry the Lion, and they were reminded that the one aim of the Pope was to bring about the triumph of one “who will cultivate the peace of the Church and of the Empire, who will safeguard the privileges of the city, and preserve the freedom of all Italy, and especially of Lombardy”. Nor does Innocent forget to ask Otho’s relative, the king of Denmark, to support him vigorously, so that he may soon obtain “the monarchy of empire”.

Premysl Ottokar I, duke of Bohemia, 1197-1230, was also one of Innocent’s correspondents in this connection. “Before your accession”, wrote the Pope to him in a most interesting historical letter, “though many of your predecessors in Bohemia wore the regal crown, they were never able to induce our predecessors, the Pontiffs of Rome, to style them kings in their letters. We too, following in their footsteps, and carefully considering that you caused yourself to be crowned king by his excellency Philip, duke of Swabia, who, as he was not legitimately crowned king himself, could not make you or any one else a king—we have, therefore, hitherto decided that you must not be entitled king. But since, in view of our exhortations, you have wisely gone over to our most dear son in Christ, the illustrious King Otho, Roman emperor-elect, and since he has recognised you as king, it is our will, in virtue of his request and your devotion, to

account you as king, and so to address you". The letter closed with an entreaty to the new king to be grateful, and to get himself crowned by Otho as soon as possible.

After Innocent's open recognition of Otho's claims the cause of that prince prospered for some time, and he was able to report to the Pope that he had gained the support of the king of Bohemia, the landgrave of Thuringia, and the marquis of Moravia. But Philip's party was not idle in the meantime. Their leader gave out that the sole reason of Innocent's opposition to him was his wishing to rule (*imperare*) without papal permission, and that liberty had come to an end, as no one could be king (*imperare*) without the consent of the Roman Pontiff. As the struggle went on, he caused it to be spread abroad that the Pope had sent an envoy to him to offer him the imperial crown; and when in the autumn of 1203 the Pope fell ill, Philip's party announced everywhere that Innocent had died, and had been succeeded by a Pope Clement, in whose supposed name they forged letters, as they had already done in the name of Innocent himself.

Above all things, Philip fought with money, of which, especially since the death of Richard of England, his opponent had been in want. The shameful way in which the German princes allowed themselves to be bought and sold aroused the indignation even of that staunch upholder of Philip, Burchard, abbot of Ursberg. They had, he wrote, "no scruple about breaking their oaths, violating their faith, and confounding every principle of right, deserting now Philip for Otho, and now Otho for Philip". With soul equally indignant sang Walter von der Vogelweide:

These threadbare kinglets press thee sore:
Crown Philip with the Kaisers crown
And bid them vex thy peace no more.

Among others who allowed themselves to be won over by money or promises was even Adolf of Cologne, the one whose right it was to crown the German kings (close of 1204). He at once completed Philip's claim to universal recognition by crowning him in the proper place, *i.e.*, at Aix-la-Chapelle (January 6, 1205). Philip's partisans were overjoyed, and his poetical client, the Minnesinger Walter, broke out into song to celebrate his patron's success:

The crown is older than King Philip! Lies
Not here a miracle before our eyes?
The smith has done so well his duty,
The crown fits the imperial head so true
That no good man would separate the two;
And the one sets off the other's beauty.

Each strengthens each in sooth,
 The noble jewel and the noble youth.
 In ecstasy the Princes are!
 Let him who here and there for Kaiser turns.
 Behold upon whose head the *Orphan* burns :
 The stone is all the Princes' polar star!

Innocent's indignation, however, at the treason of Adolf may be easily imagined. It was unendurable, he wrote, that, at a time when Greeks, Wallachians, Bulgarians, and Armenians were returning to obedience, he should be disobeyed by his venerable brother the archbishop of Cologne.

Adolf was promptly cited to Rome, and, in consequence of his failure to obey, was excommunicated and deposed. Bruno, the provost of Cologne, was consecrated in his stead by Sigfried of Mainz, assisted by two English bishops who had been ordered by the Pope to betake themselves to Germany for the purpose (June 6, 1206).

This treachery of Adolf proved a fatal blow to the success of Otho. Some years before, Cardinal Guido, Innocent's legate to Otho, had assured his master that if only the ecclesiastical princes would adhere to his candidate, his cause would soon be won. Evidently also the converse of the proposition was true. Even Innocent could not prevent the mass of the ecclesiastical princes from favouring Philip. He made, however, heroic but useless efforts to check the general abandonment of Otho's cause which now ensued—an abandonment shared in even by Otho's own brother Henry, Count Palatine of the Rhine. On March 18, 1205, the Pope addressed a circular letter to all the ecclesiastical and secular supporters of Otho. "He", wrote Innocent, "is not a friend of a man but of his fortune who, shaken by adverse fortune like a reed by the wind, deserts in adversity the one upon whom he smiled in prosperity. Various are the fortunes of war, and what is ever on the move cannot always remain in the same state. Steady men, therefore, must not fluctuate with every change of inconstant events, but must rather stand fast, realizing that it is the final accomplishment, not a single battle, which puts the crown upon an undertaking ... We are, accordingly, no little astonished and moved that some of the princes who, of their own free will, did homage to our most dear son in Christ, the illustrious King Otho, Roman emperor-elect, and who, without compulsion, took the oath of fealty to him,—now that the cause of the noble duke of Swabia seems to be prospering somewhat, should violate their honour and their oaths, and should abandon him to whom they had once adhered, and should go over to his adversary". Innocent concluded by noting that the more traitors are contemptible, the more estimable are the loyal. But it was all to no purpose. Otho's was now a lost cause which it was worse than useless to attempt any longer to uphold.

It only remained for Innocent to try to obtain the best terms for Otho. To this end all his policy was directed right up to the death of Philip (June 1208); and this end he was to find of very difficult accomplishment, as the man in whose interests he was working was much more distinguished for daring rashness than for common sense.

Philip, who had never ceased to maintain diplomatic relations with Rome and to make splendid promises to the Pope, if only in order that he might be able to give out from time to time that the Pope had ceased to support Otho, now resumed negotiations with Innocent with renewed vigour. He sent him a long account of his election, as well as of the counter-election of Otho. He assured the Pope that he recognised the Roman Church “as the mother and mistress of all churches, and that it was his will to revere and honour it as his catholic and apostolic mother, and to defend it to the best of his ability, and to labour for its exaltation”. He denied that he was ever excommunicated by Celestine, and concluded his apologia by asserting that when the Pope knew the whole truth, and realised his devotion to him, he would give him a full share of his love.

Innocent expressed himself pleased with the tone of Philip’s letter, and endeavoured to bring about a truce, in the hope that some peaceful settlement might be arrived at. This was the more necessary in Otho’s interests after his severe defeat by Philip at Wassenberg on the Roer (July 27, 1206); for, despite all the efforts that were made to detach the Pope from Otho, Innocent still remained true to him.

But Otho’s affairs were rapidly becoming desperate. Even Cologne, the very centre of his strength, was compelled to negotiate with Philip; and towards the close of the year (1206) he found it necessary to abandon it, and to retreat to Brunswick. A few months later Philip captured the envoys whom the authorities at Cologne had sent off to Rome to negotiate about peace, and in April (1207) made his triumphal entry into the city.

Otho meanwhile had sailed to England (1207), and he returned with five thousand marks of silver which he contrived to extract from King John. Such a sum was not, however, sufficient to enable him materially to improve his position. Besides, the nobles generally were tired of the years of war, and resolved to work for peace. An important embassy, consisting of Wolfger, patriarch of Aquileia, with a number of Philip’s officials, was sent to Rome in his behalf. It would appear that they made a favourable impression on the Pope, and it is even said that they agreed to a marriage between Philip’s daughter and Innocent’s brother Richard. At any rate, the Pope sent to Germany, in order to negotiate a general peace, his great-nephew Ugolino, now cardinal-bishop of Ostia and Velletri, and Cardinal Leo (1207)—men who are described as remarkable for their industry, ability, and religion. In a very eloquent letter their mission was commended by Innocent to all the princes of Germany. He pointed out the public and private calamities which had resulted from the imperial schism, especially its unhappy effect on the cause of the Crusades, on the growth of heresy, and on the poor. He therefore begged them to give heed to the words of the envoys whom he had sent “in order to restore harmony in the Empire, and to establish true peace between it and the Church”.

On August 15 the papal legates succeeded in bringing the two kings together at Northusin (Nordhausen), on the confines of Thuringia and Saxony. Though not much was effected at this meeting, much more was done at subsequent meetings—at Ouedlinburg, and especially at Augsburg (November 30). Philip, who had been absolved from excommunication in August after having promised to submit to the decision of the Pope regarding the matters on account of which he had been

excommunicated, agreed to release Bruno, archbishop of Cologne, whom he had taken prisoner, that he might go to Rome to arrange his claims against Adolf. He also consented to abandon Leopold of Mainz, to recognise Sigfried, and to disband the large army he had collected against Otho. Finally, although the legates were unable to arrange definite terms of peace between the rival kings, they succeeded in having a truce proclaimed between them for a year.

Unfortunately, no official document has survived to let us know exactly what terms of peace were put forward by the legates as a basis of a settlement of the rival claims of the two kings. Otto of St. Blaise, however, says that they proposed that Otho should give up the title of king, and recognise Philip as his sovereign. In return, he was to receive Philip's daughter as his wife, and with her the duchy of Alamannia (Swabia) and other possessions; and, considering that Philip had no male heir, this alliance might mean much to Otho in the future. But, says the historian—and this is a point to be insisted upon—though his position was hopeless he declared with obstinate courage that he would die rather than give up his regal title, and proceeded to offer Philip still more advantageous terms if he would yield to him. The legates were only too pleased to secure the year's truce.

All through these negotiations, although the desperate state of Otho's affairs compelled Innocent to yield somewhat to Philip in the hope of arriving at a settlement not wholly unfavourable to his ally, he never abandoned the cause of Otho. To the hour of Philip's death that prince never received any other title from Innocent than "duke of Swabia", whereas Otho was always to him "illustrious king, emperor-elect". So straightforward was his conduct that, when some of his private instructions to his legates were lost, he bade them not be distressed even if they found that they had fallen into Philip's hands. For, said he, "it will be clear from them that we have acted not with duplicity but with straightforward singleness, not deviating to the right nor to the left".

Before returning to their master, the papal legates Ugolino and Leo, in accordance with their instructions from Innocent, exhorted both the kings to send envoys to him in their company. Philip at once notified his intention to comply with the Pope's wishes, and sent Wolfger, the patriarch of Aquileia, and others, "with full power and authority to make peace between the Church and the Empire, and between you and us, and also to heal the schism so fatal to the Empire and the Church". After a special letter from Innocent himself to Otho in which he urged him also to send envoys, so that his cause might not be left undefended, and in which he suggested to him that the bishop of Cambrai should be one of them, that obstinate prince likewise complied with the Pope's wishes, and sent his envoys with the others.

What was the result of the special pleading of the rival groups of plenipotentiaries who appeared before Innocent is not known. All that is known for certain about the Pope's decision is contained in a few words of general import which he addressed to Otho. He informed him that the legates and envoys were returning to Germany with news of the decisions arrived at, and that he might await their coming with feelings of contentment.

Innocent, who was very pleased with the manner in which Ugolino and Leo had carried out their difficult task, sent them back to Germany to complete their work. But,

when in June they reached north Italy, they heard rumours that Philip was dead. The rumours proved to be well founded. On June 21, 1208, Philip had been murdered at Bamberg by Otho of Wittlesbach, count palatine of Bavaria, whose feelings he had outraged by promising him his daughter in marriage, and then giving her to another.

CHAPTER II

OTHO IV AND FREDERICK II

The first result of the base murder of Philip, which wrung a general expression of sorrow from all parties, was an alarming increase in the already widespread disorder. The poor and the merchants were robbed with increased effrontery. The next was an attempt of Henry I, duke of Brabant, to be elected king in Philip's stead. To this he was urged by Philip of France. But the mass of the greater princes had had enough of anarchy, and the Pope, of course, now exerted himself in his usual energetic style in Otho's behalf. His letters on the prevention of the election of any fresh imperial candidate were soon all over Germany, and the bishops were ordered to excommunicate anyone who should dare to anoint or crown another king.

He also made a strenuous effort to secure for Otho the goodwill of Philip of France, impressing upon him that Otho had sent to Rome a letter under his golden bull to the effect that he would follow the papal directions in the matter of peace with France.

In writing to Otho, Innocent reminded him that, when even his relations had deserted him, he had never ceased to watch his interests, doing for him "what seemed to be for his advantage at the time, watching for him when perchance he was sleeping himself, and suffering for him much which he forbore to tell him when he was oppressed by adversity". He assured him that he was working hard in his interests, and urged him to show himself gracious to all; to be neither too stingy nor too liberal with his promises; to offer abundant guarantees of his favour to the leaders of the opposite party; to take care of his person; to throw off torpor; to see to things himself; and, if he thinks desirable, to marry Philip's daughter Beatrice.

Innocent's hope that in his time both the Church and the Empire would benefit each other was destined to be fulfilled, but, as we shall see, for the briefest space.

After a few months spent in winning over the princes, Otho was re-elected king by a great diet at Frankfort (November 11, 1208), and on the same occasion it was decided that he should, with papal dispensation, marry Philip's daughter.

This news naturally gave great satisfaction to Innocent; nor did he fail often to share his satisfaction with Otho. "We have", he wrote, "been credibly informed that

with the increase of temporal power which has come to you, an increase of spiritual power has also been wonderfully added unto you, so that we may, in your regard, congratulate ourselves, in the words of God, that we have found a man after our own heart. Our soul, most beloved son, is so united to yours, and your heart so welded to ours, that it is believed that our thoughts and wishes on all points are the same, as though we had but one heart and one soul. What great advantages are expected to follow from this union the pen cannot set down, nor the tongue narrate, nor even the mind imagine. For to us two has the rule of the world been chiefly committed; and if we remain united in good, then indeed, as the prophet said, will the sun and moon remain fixed in their orbits, then will the crooked paths be made straight and the rough ways plain, since, with the blessing of God, nothing will be able to oppose us, inasmuch as we shall hold the two swords". He concludes by most earnestly exhorting Otho to preserve at all costs the existing concord between the Church and the Empire, and by informing him that he is again sending to him Cardinals Ugolino and Leo.

Even after Otho's final election Innocent did not cease his efforts in his behalf. For instance, at the request of Otho's legate in Italy, Wolfger of Aquileia, he wrote in February to the cities of Lombardy and Tuscany urging them to offer due submission "to the illustrious King Otho, Roman emperor-elect". And when Otho himself expressed his fear to him that Frederick of Sicily was scheming against him, and begged him not to help the youth, seeing that "the peace of the Empire ... as heretofore rested with him", Innocent assured him that he was fast fixed in his good graces, and that he must not doubt of him.

Meanwhile Otho was taking steps to receive the imperial crown. At a great diet of the Empire which he held in Lent at Hagenau, notice was given to the princes to prepare for the "Rome-journey".

Then a little later, at Spire (March 22), he took a solemn oath regarding his intentions towards the Holy See. In gratitude to God who had raised him to be king, he wished, so he declared, to show great honour to Him, to His vicar, and to His spouse the Church. Then after offering "all the obedience" which his predecessors had paid to those of the Pope, he proceeded to guarantee freedom of ecclesiastical elections, and the right of ecclesiastical appeals to Rome; to give up the *jus spoli*, and all interference in spiritual matters, so that what was Caesar's might be rendered to Caesar, and what was God's might be rendered to God. He also undertook to help to root out heresy, and to see that the possessions of the Roman Church, including "the territory of the Countess Matilda" and the kingdom of Sicily, were secured to it. This oath was a solemn ratification of the promises he had made at Neuss, and which Frederick II was to make at Egra (1213).

On May 24, a still more important assembly was held at Würzburg in presence of Innocent's legates, Cardinals Ugolino and Leo. At this gathering, at which were present nearly all the spiritual and temporal magnates of the Empire, after the transaction of the business of the State, Otho addressed the assembly, "especially the cardinals who were present by the authority of the Apostolic Lord", on the subject of his marriage with Beatrice, who was related to him within the forbidden degrees of kindred. He wished to know whether he might lawfully take her to wife. "For if", he declared, "I were to live

six thousand years, I would rather lead a celibate life all that time than marry at the peril of my soul. Let then none of you think of the glory or nobility of birth, or riches, or lands of this maid, for all these things cannot be compared with the salvation of the soul". After due deliberation the answer of the magnates was made known to Otho by Leopold, duke of Austria, a man remarkable for his eloquence. He assured the king that this assembly of "cardinals, who bring the authority of the lord Pope", and of great prelates and princes were decidedly of opinion that the peace of "the Roman world" required that he should marry Beatrice, and recommended him, in view of the dispensation, to found two great monasteries. The king at once accepted the decision, and the maiden was asked whether she would take Otho as her husband. Thereupon, "blushing deeply", says the historian, "she modestly replied that she was very happy to give her consent". Then was she solemnly espoused to him "by the sign of a kiss in public, and the exchange of rings"; and when Otho had seated her between the two cardinals whose throne was opposite to his, he proclaimed aloud to the whole company: "You have a Queen: pay to her becoming honour". The solemn espousals were over; but the marriage was not to be celebrated till Otho's return from Italy.

As very usual on such occasions, the feudatories assembled at Augsburg for the "Rome-journey". The crossing of the Alps by the Brenner Pass was begun about the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin (August 15), and by September Otho was in the neighbourhood of Bologna. Whilst, "with a terrible army", he was marching south, envoys were constantly passing backwards and forwards between himself and the Pope, in order to settle the final details of the coronation.

Although even the presence of Otho did not cause the cities of north Italy to cease altogether from their cruel and bitter strife, still his powerful army caused them at least not to attempt to molest him. "At his terrible approach", says a monk of Padua, "Italy shook with fear".

It was in the hill town of Viterbo, strong with its towers and beautiful with its palaces, that Otho looked upon the Pope's face which he had so long desired to see, and that Innocent greeted (September) the man for whom he had done so much with the words: "My most beloved son, in thee does my heart find its delight". Elaborate fêtes were held in honour of the king, and we read of a body of youths forming themselves into "the Company of Joy", and celebrating the festival of the tree of fortune in the Piazza of St. Sylvester.

After Otho had on this occasion also renewed his promises to the Pope, the latter made his way to Rome to prepare for the coronation. The king followed with his army, now reinforced with a large number of Lombards, and encamped on Monte Mario (October 2). Thence he issued the usual safe-conduct guaranteeing security of life and limb to all attending the coronation ceremony. But neither he nor the Pope could guarantee the Romans, who, perhaps because they had not been consulted in any way regarding the imperial coronation, showed themselves very hostile to Otho and his followers. Just before the coronation a number of Germans, some of them men of position, ventured into the city proper to see its sights. A quarrel soon ensued between them and the citizens, which resulted in the death of many high officials of the diocese of Augsburg.

The great day to which Otho had been looking forward for so many years arrived at last (Sunday, October 4), and he entered the Leonine city at the head of a most imposing host. A body of Milanese was straightway despatched to hold the bridge of St. Angelo so that there would be no danger of an armed interruption of the ceremony by the Romans. Meanwhile, by a constant scattering of money to the right and left, and by a free use of their pikes by the accompanying soldiers, the royal procession was able to make its way through the dense crowd to the old basilica. Arrived immediately in front of it, Otho took the usual oath to be the protector of the Church and the poor, and was then duly crowned with the solemn ceremonies which have been described elsewhere. When the function was over, the new emperor helped the Pope to mount his horse, and the two rode in great state to the adjoining Vatican palace, where, through the munificence of the emperor, rich and poor alike were well provided for.

The day, however, was not to be allowed to close in peace, but was, as usual on these occasions, to end in bloodshed. Whether it was because the Germans wantonly insulted the Romans, or because the emperor would not give them largess, or for both these and other reasons, at any rate the Romans fell upon the imperialists when they were leaving the Leonine city and a furious fight ensued. The imperialists suffered heavily, losing, besides a number of men, some eleven hundred horses and baggage as well.

It was the contemplation of scenes such as this that made Otho's marshal, Gervase of Tilbury, say bitter things about the Romans. Contrasting the Rome that once held the world in check with the one that in his time could not defend the small circuit of its own walls, he rails at it for being hostile to none more than to its own emperor, and, while wishing to have two lords, the Pope and the emperor, shutting out the one and despising the other.

Although Innocent had much to arrange with the emperor, nevertheless, to prevent further bloodshed, he begged him to leave the neighbourhood of Rome at once. This, after the action of the Romans, he was not in the least disposed to do; but from his camp on Monte Mario he demanded reparation from the citizens. As this was not forthcoming, want of provisions forced him to withdraw towards Tuscany.

Soon after leaving Rome, perhaps from Isola Farnese, a medieval town, off the Via Cassia, some ten miles north-west of Rome, which he had certainly reached by October 7, Otto wrote to the Pope, "the vicar of God". He thanked him for conferring the imperial crown upon him, and begged him to grant him an interview in order that they might complete the discussions they had held on the affairs of the Empire. Moreover, he assured the Pope that, if necessary, he was ready to risk his life, and to seek an audience with him in the city itself. But the Pope, fearful no doubt that, if he left Rome or if the emperor came again to it, there would be an upheaval, replied that for the present their business had better be conducted by intermediaries, and that, "regarding the land", *i.e.*, regarding the territories of Matilda, it was for both of them to try and devise some settlement which both parties could accept with honour.

Otho, however, showed himself not a skilful diplomatist, but what one of his adverse critics said he was, "a proud fool", or, as an English historian described him, "a man who would promise everything and hardly perform anything". He made no further

attempt in conjunction with Innocent to unravel the Gordian knot of the Matilda inheritance, but drew his sword and essayed to cut it in his own interests. But for a month or two there was no overt quarrel between the two potentates, and Innocent wrote friendly letters to the emperor, begging him not to suffer the attempt of Waldemar II of Denmark to convert the heathens to be interfered with (October 13), and to help Simon de Montfort to subdue the Albigensians.

It would seem, however, that very soon after Otho left Rome, and as he marched through Tuscany, the duchy of Spoleto, the march of Ancona and Romaniola, he began to act as though he were the immediate suzerain of those districts. His ambition was fired by men such as Dipold of Acerra, who, in order to improve his position, again changed sides, abandoned the cause of the Pope and the young Frederick, and joined the standard of Otho. At any rate, on January 20, at Chiusi, the emperor invested his relative Azzo of Este with the March of Ancona on the same terms as it had been held by Markwald. Moreover, what was much worse, he received about the same time a number of traitors from Apulia, headed by Dipold and Peter, count of Celano, who came to urge him to seize the kingdom of Sicily, and he resolved to act upon their suggestions. Then, to soothe his conscience, he turned like Barbarossa to the men of law, and from them he received comfort. The advice they gave him amounted to this: He was to neutralise the oaths he had taken to Innocent by the oath he had taken when made emperor to preserve the dignity of the Empire, and to maintain its rights. Accordingly, when Innocent began to upbraid him for his perjury, and, by the agency of the archbishop of Pisa and others, to urge him to respect the rights of the Church, he said in fact, if not in words: "If the Supreme Pontiff desires to possess unjustly the rights of the Empire, let him release me from the oath which he insisted on my taking when he consecrated me to the imperial dignity, the oath, that is, which I took to recover the alienated rights of the Empire, and to maintain those which I possessed".

It was in vain that our countryman Gervase of Tilbury, whom Otho had made the marshal of the kingdom of Arles, urged him to behave in a straightforward manner towards "his consecrator", and implored him to yield something to the one who had given him "the whole Empire", even if he believed that there was a desire somewhat to lessen his imperial rights. "Moreover", added the marshal, "the Empire is not yours, it is Christ's; not yours, but Peter's". If, he impressed upon him in conclusion, "you do what is right", you will prevail in the end, even "by the just decision" of Peter himself. But Otho would listen neither to the counsels of moderation nor to the dictates of justice. He began to make preparations for war.

At Otho's perfidy, which is condemned practically by all his contemporaries of whatever shade of opinion, the great heart of Innocent was filled with bitterness. In writing (March 4, 1210) to the archbishop of Ravenna and his suffragans of the ingratitude and perjury of Otho, he quoted as appropriate the words of God with regard to man in general: "it repented him that he had made (the) man" (Gen. VI. 6).

Resolved now to stop at nothing, Otho in the early summer called upon the cities of Lombardy to lend him armed assistance; and then, descending upon the *Patrimonium Petri*, began to lay hands on its cities and castles.

Meanwhile the unfortunate youth Frederick of Sicily felt that fresh trouble was in store for him, and accordingly sent envoys to Otho offering to give up his claim to the German crown, which had been bestowed upon him in his father's lifetime, and to pay the emperor a large sum of money, if he would leave him his Sicilian crown in peace. But the emperor, following, as the chroniclers often note, the evil advice of Dipold and Peter of Celano, entered the kingdom by way of Sora in the month of November, and rewarded the zeal of Dipold by naming him duke of Spoleto.

Hitherto Innocent had confined himself to protesting against Otho's conduct, and to making vain efforts to induce him to stop his ambitious career. But when the emperor ventured to invade the kingdom of Sicily, and the Pope had reason to fear that he would be overwhelmed by the German if he were able to add the Sicilian to the imperial crown, he solemnly excommunicated him (November 18). Then, seeing that Otho paid no heed whatever to his sentence. Innocent sent letters in different directions forbidding assistance to be given to the ungrateful monarch. Otho retorted by endeavouring to cut off the Pope from intercourse with the outside world.

Throughout the winter of 1210-11, whilst Otho was residing at Capua, Innocent ceased not endeavouring to bring him to a sense of his duty; and the historian Burchard assures us that he met at Rome about this time (1211) the virtuous abbot of Morimond (in the diocese of Langres), who told him that, in accordance with the orders of the Pope, he had already passed five times between Rome and Capua in order to effect an understanding between the two. One of the letters written by Innocent to the emperor just before his excommunication has come down to us, though not in the papal registers. The Pope upbraided Otho for his ingratitude; bade him be content with the territories he had inherited from his ancestors, lest the fate of Barbarossa, of Henry, and of Philip should overtake him also; and urged him, under threat of excommunication, not to interfere with the rights of the Holy See, but to keep the oaths he had sworn to him.

A letter written apparently about this same time by Innocent to the king of France shows how much he had been disappointed in his estimate of Otho's character, and what efforts he had made to avoid pronouncing sentence of excommunication. He began his letter by expressing a regret that he had not been as good a judge of Otho's character as Philip, and proceeded to point out how ungrateful the emperor had proved himself in attacking first his mother the Roman Church, and then her ward the orphan Frederick. Threats of excommunication had had no effect upon him. He had paid no heed to the Pope's declaration that he was preventing the prosecution of the war against the infidel. He was solely occupied with the idea of securing the goods of others, and of subjecting all the kings of the earth to his sway. The Pope had to acknowledge to his shame that the king of France had warned him of all this, and could only console himself with the thought that God Himself had regretted that He had made Saul king. He had, however, definitely forbidden him, under penalty of excommunication, to carry further forward his schemes of aggrandisement, and excommunication would mean the loss of the allegiance of his subjects. But when he had been exhorted to cease his opposition to France, he had replied that he could not do so whilst France held any portion of his uncle's territories. In conclusion, the Pope assured Philip that he had made it plain to the emperor that he at any rate would never abandon France.

But all the Pope's efforts were useless, even though he had expressed his readiness to endure any injuries the emperor might inflict on the territories of the Roman Church, if he would abandon the Sicilian expedition. Otho was resolved "to expel Frederick from Sicily, and to take vengeance on Philip of France", who had opposed him all along, and was at enmity with his uncle King John.

Finding that Otho was obstinate, and, now master of the mainland, was making active preparations to invade Sicily itself, Innocent, "inasmuch as he was a man of spirit, and had great trust in God", devoted his whole energy to procuring the deposition of his ungrateful ally. Among other steps which he took with this intent was to cause the solemn proclamation throughout Germany of the emperor's excommunication (March 31). He also wrote for help to Otho's constant enemy, Philip of France, exhorting him to stir up the princes of the Empire against their excommunicated sovereign.

But still all went well with Otho. Even to the extremity of Calabria was his authority acknowledged, and the young King Frederick had a galley ready moored by his palace at Palermo to convey him to the Saracens if Otho should cross the straits (August 1211).

But the energy of Innocent kept pace with that of Otho. He lost no opportunity of encouraging the emperor's enemies and of weakening his friends. On the one hand, he threatened the Bolognese, among other penalties, with the removal of their famous schools to some other centre, if they continued to favour Otho, and, under threat of deposition, he forced such prelates as Archbishop Albert of Magdeburg to publish the emperor's excommunication; and, on the other hand, he fostered the opposition which was growing against him in Germany.

When Otho had been under the ban of the Church for a twelvemonth, as he had made no effort to be absolved from the censure he was treated in accordance with the recognised customs of the Empire. He was declared a heretic, his deposition from the imperial throne was proclaimed, and his subjects were absolved from their allegiance. A strong letter, pointing out Otho's ingratitude, made this action of Innocent known to all the German princes. "Hence", he wrote, "have we absolved all Otho's subjects from their allegiance to him, or rather we have decided that they are already absolved from it". He called upon the princes to lose no time in providing a successor to the imperial throne, and, under the figure of Saul being replaced by the youthful David, no doubt suggested the substitution of Frederick for Otho.

Innocent's invitation to the princes was not made in vain. After some preliminary meetings, an important diet was held at Nuremberg, at which were present the king of Bohemia, the dukes of Austria and Bavaria, and many others. The thoughts of the electors immediately turned to the youthful Frederick of Sicily, whether because, as Burchard says, they had already sworn allegiance to him, or because he was supposed to be the papal candidate, and had the support of Philip of France. By these nobles also Otho was proclaimed "a heretic", and they chose Frederick as the one who was "to be consecrated emperor". The assembled princes at once despatched envoys to secure the adhesion of the Lombards, of Innocent, and of Frederick himself to their proposals. There was not much difficulty in winning over a number of the Lombard communes, and, despite the opposition of his wife Constance, who had just borne him a son and

heir, Frederick accepted the invitation of the princes, and declared his intention of at once proceeding to Germany. The Pope, however, according to a contemporary French historian, did not allow himself to be easily persuaded to recognise a Hohenstaufen. “Although”, writes William the Breton, “Innocent had really wanted Frederick’s election, still he dissembled his satisfaction; for the Roman Church is ever wont to proceed with gravity, and not to make new concessions except with difficulty and deliberately. Moreover, he thoroughly disliked the stock from which Frederick was descended”.

Civil war now broke out all over the Empire, especially in Germany, and Otho’s friends urged him to return to that country instead of attacking Sicily. After a belated attempt to negotiate with the Pope, Otho hurried to the north, crossed the Alps in March 1212, and, “a burden to the Italians, still more so to the Germans, and ungrateful to his friends”—received but a poor welcome in Germany.

But Otho’s Italian partisans were furious with Innocent. The author of the *Carmen de Ottone*, which we have already quoted more than once, proclaims the Pope not *innocent*, but *nocent* (injurious), calls him not “the Apostolic”, but “the Apostate”; and, what is most interesting, anticipates the cry of later ages, and appeals to a “General Council against Frederick, against you and against the enemies of the Roman name”. The poem concludes by the assertion of the “Council” thus invoked that it is not in its power to depose the Pope, but that it is just that it should depose Frederick, and restore Otho.

Soon after Otho had left Italy, the young Frederick arrived in Rome (April). He was splendidly received both by the Pope and by the Roman people.

One of the first acts of Frederick was to renew to the Pope in person the homage he had already paid to his deputy for the kingdom of Sicily, Innocent, charmed with the youth’s courage and docility, espoused his cause with vigour. By letter he called upon the communes of north Italy and the people of Germany to cast in their lot with Frederick; he poured money into the youth’s purse, procured for him a Genoese fleet to conduct him to their city, and sent a cardinal-legate with him to win for him greater obedience.

Innocent has been severely blamed by many authors for his support of Frederick. His action, they say, brought about the disastrous struggle between the Empire and the Papacy, the intrusion of the house of Anjou into the affairs of Italy, the Sicilian vespers, and the “captivity” of Avignon. It is quite possible that none of these unhappy events would have happened had Innocent not taken up the cause of Frederick; but it must be allowed also that, if the Pope was justified in opposing the perjured Otho, there was no other prince who had more right to succeed him than Frederick, nor was there any other who could have had any hope of taking his place except Frederick, and Innocent could scarcely have foreseen that Frederick would be guilty of the monstrous ingratitude that he afterwards displayed.

From Genoa, where he had been splendidly entertained, Frederick made his way across the Lombard plain escorted by Azzo, marquis of Este, and other nobles devoted to his cause. His journey was hazardous, because Milan and other communes, though usually devoted to the Church, had suffered too much from Barbarossa to tolerate

another Hohenstaufen. Fortune, however, favoured Frederick. The “boy from Sicily” escaped the snares of his enemies in Italy, contrived by dangerous paths to cross the Alps and to avoid the troops of Otho, and finally reached Constance in safety (September). After this successful beginning, difficulties melted away before the enterprising Sicilian youth. Otho had to fall back on his Saxon fief, and to watch Frederick making an alliance offensive and defensive with Philip of France, and binding fast to himself the venal princes of Germany with money which he received from the French monarch.

On December 5, at Frankfort, Frederick was proclaimed emperor-elect by a very large number of princes in presence of the envoys of the Pope and of the king of France and some five thousand knights. Four days after he was crowned at Mainz by its archbishop.

Through the efforts of Innocent especially, the position of Otho grew daily worse, and he was soon compelled to retire to Brunswick. In 1214 he made a desperate attempt to retrieve his fortunes by allying himself with our miserable King John, and in conjunction with a number of English and Flemings attacking Philip of France. His defeat at Bouvines (July 27, 1214) put an end to the remnant of his power.

If we are not relying merely on Gallic imagination, both Philip and Otho made much use of the name of the Pope before this important battle. According to William the Breton, Philip thus addressed his soldier: “Our whole trust is in God. Otho and his soldiers have been excommunicated by the lord Pope, for they are enemies of the Church, on whose possessions they are living. But we are Christians in communion with the Church, whose liberties we will defend to the best of our power”. Otho, on the other hand, is declared to have spoken to his men to this effect: “It is only the king of France who prevents us from subduing the whole world. It is through his protection of the clergy that the Pope dares to anathematise us, and has dethroned King John, who has been so liberal to us. The king of France therefore must we kill first ... and afterwards we must kill or exile the clergy and monks whom he protects. Then shall the soldiers have their property”.

The battle of Bouvines was fatal to Otho; for, says an historian, “all the princes of Germany who had hitherto adhered to him, regarding his cause as desperate, joined themselves to Frederick”.

Next year Otho saw his rival crowned a second time at Aachen (Aix-la-Chapelle) in 1215, and then, soon afterwards, beheld him master of Cologne. He failed to get his excommunication removed by the great council of Lateran held in the same year, and continued to drag out an inglorious existence in Brunswick, after the claims of “the emperor of the priests” had been recognised by the synod and by the world at large.

Before he died, however, he several times sent envoys to Rome to effect a reconciliation with the Church, but, as he would not comply with the conditions laid down for his absolution, he remained under the ban of the Church almost till the day of his death. But when, after the Easter of 1218, he felt that his last hour was come, he sent for the bishop of Hildesheim and consulted him as to how he was to obtain absolution. In accordance with the instructions of the bishop, he swore to abide by the decisions of the Pope, and was then absolved. “Then”, says a chronicler of Cologne,

“having made his will and confessed his sins, he received Holy Communion and Extreme Unction, and with great contrition of heart died in his castle of Harzburg (May 19). His body, clad in the imperial robes, was translated to Brunswick and buried near those of his father and mother in the church of St. Blaise”. Otho IV was nothing but a warrior, who understood neither his own limitations nor the strength of the forces opposed to him. The old Cistercian chronicler summed up his life’s work very well when he said of him that “in not regarding as enough for him, he lost his ears also like the little ass in the fable.”

It remains for us now to examine the relations between his great rival, the youthful Frederick, and Pope Innocent after his entry into Germany, to the latter’s death in 1216. During the period whilst he was still faced with Otho, he was ever striving to render himself acceptable to the Pope. Knowing how Innocent was devoted to the Crusaders, he unexpectedly took the Cross on the occasion of his coronation at Aachen (1215), and encouraged others to do the same. Before that, as early as July 12, 1213, at Egra in Bohemia, he had made a series of declarations which must have been most satisfactory to Innocent. In a document in which he acknowledged the many great blessings he had received from God and from “his most dear lord and most reverend father and protector the lord Innocent”, he announced that he wished to give to his special mother the Roman Church all “the obedience, honour, and reverence” which his predecessors had ever given to it, and even more. He granted freedom of ecclesiastical elections and appeals; gave up the custom of seizing the goods of deceased prelates; promised help against heretics to the Roman Church, and resigned to it the property which had been usurped by his predecessors, and which she had recovered; engaged himself to restore what she had not recovered, and to defend for the Roman Church Sicily, Corsica, Sardinia, and the other rights recognised to be hers. These concessions were made, as the document proclaimed, in order that, all cause of misunderstandings being removed, “there might ensue for all time firm peace and complete agreement between the Church and the Empire”. This bull was signed by all the great magnates of the Empire, both ecclesiastical and civil. Nor was it merely signed by them, it was confirmed by special documents issued by each of them.

A few days before Innocent’s death, Frederick issued another golden bull of the utmost importance (July 1, 1216), concerning which there had doubtless been many negotiations with the Pope from the time when Frederick was first called to the Empire. By this bull, addressed to his “father and lord” by Frederick, “by the grace of God and the Pope king of the Romans, ever Augustus and king of Sicily”, the latter engaged, when he should have received the imperial crown, to hand over Sicily to his son Henry, “whom at your behest we caused to be crowned king”. This he did, so the bull declared, in order “that at no time might any suspicion of a union between the kingdom and the Empire arise ... by which any harm might come to the Apostolic See and to our heirs”. Had Frederick only been true to his word, what trouble would he have saved the Church and himself, and what misfortunes would he have averted from his heirs!

It is doubtful whether Innocent ever saw this gratifying proof of the success of his efforts to prevent evil from arising from his advocacy of Frederick’s claims to the Empire. He died within a few days after the issue of the bull, which Frederick confirmed (February 10), in the very year (1220) in which he caused his son to be

elected king of the Romans (c. April 23). He certainly did not live to see, probably not even to suspect, that the ward for whom he had done so much would prove the most merciless foe of the Papacy, and would for thirty years wage the most relentless war on the Church of Christ.

PART III.

THE CRUSADES. THE CHURCH AND THE LATIN KINGDOM OF CONSTANTINOPLE

CHAPTER I.

THE CRUSADES. THE FOURTH CRUSADE. SUBSEQUENT EFFORTS FOR A NEW CRUSADE. ORGANISATION OF THE CHURCH AND STATE IN THE NEW LATIN KINGDOMS AND PRINCIPALITIES FORMED AS A RESULT OF THE FOURTH CRUSADE.

A TYPICAL man of his age, Innocent could not fail to be profoundly interested in the Holy Land, and in the Crusaders' conquests in its vicinity, all of which, with the exception of Tyre and Tripoli, Acre and Antioch, were now in the hands of Saladin. The men of his day could not bear to think that the land in which their Saviour had lived and died should be under the dominion of the Moslem. The thought was the more unendurable inasmuch as it was but a comparatively brief period since their forefathers had plucked that beloved country from the unbeliever's hand. The capture of Jerusalem by Saladin (1187), and his subsequent capture of nearly all Palestine and Syria, was a barb in their hearts which rent them at every motion. If, in addition to being men of

faith, they were like Innocent possessed “of a great knowledge of the things of this world—if they were, that is, endowed with any political insight—they perceived, moreover, that the power of the Crescent was a menace to their faith and to their freedom.

In devoting himself, then, throughout the whole of his pontificate to the cause of the Crusades, Innocent was animated by lively faith and the example of his predecessors, as well as by sound political instincts. He was not blind to the difficulties in his way either in the East or in the West. He took pains to inform himself about the status of the enemies of the Cross, and was soon taught by his own dealings with the Christians themselves in the Holy Land how their ecclesiastical and civil dissensions were undermining their power of coping with their relentless foes. He was aware that the bitter animosity between Philip Augustus and Richard of England would prevent either of those sovereigns from taking a lead against the common enemy of Christendom, and he knew that the rivalry between Otho of Brunswick and Philip of Swabia gave him no hope of an emperor marshalling the hosts of Europe against the dreaded Turk. Nevertheless, undaunted by the vision of well-nigh superhuman difficulties, Innocent girded himself for the work with his wonted vigour, and, as we shall see, ceased not, in spite of one failure after another, to push forward the interests of the Crusades to the end of his life.

A few extracts from some of Innocent’s letters will, better than anything else perhaps, enable the reader to understand some of the difficulties which he had to face, arising from the perversity of the ecclesiastical and civil authorities in the Holy Land itself. Writing to Aimaro Monaco, the patriarch of Jerusalem, he has to blame him for blackening the reputation of the archbishop of Tyre, and for his rash conduct in first condemning the marriage of Amaury (Amalric) II, king of Cyprus, with Isabella, heiress of the kingdom of Jerusalem, and then suddenly crowning them king and queen of that realm. “We are penetrated”, said the Pope, “even to the marrow of our bones with the deepest sorrow when we learn that the subjects of the kingdom, both clerical and lay, and even you yourself, are continually provoking the anger of God on yourselves and your country,—aye, and even on the whole Christian people, by your hatreds, your jealousies, and your perpetual detractions; whereas you ought, to the best of your ability, to have been endeavouring to win His mercy by prayer, fasting, and other good works. We are so much the more grieved that you ought to have been leading the people subject to you along the way of righteousness, by exhortation and example, instead of conducting them by words and deeds along the path of perdition”. The same unsatisfactory prelate, who was constantly interfering with the rights of others, had shortly after this to be warned by the Pope not to meddle with the privileges of the Hospitallers granted them by the good-will of the Holy See and the assent of his predecessors.

Later on (January 9, 1213), we find him impressing on John de Brienne, the titular king of Jerusalem (1210-1225), that the misfortunes of his kingdom have sprung from the dissensions of kings and princes, and exhorting him not to allow himself by any injuries or by any ambition to be drawn into a war with a Christian people, but, with his mind fixed on the kingdom to come, to devote all his powers to the defence of the Holy Land, to that sacred cause for which he left his sweet native land.

Many other letters of Innocent bear out this contention of his. Prelates, princes, and the two great military orders of the Templars and Hospitallers were for ever adding to the difficulty of the Christians holding the Holy Land by their selfish pursuit of their own interests, or, considering the circumstances, by their unreasonable efforts to maintain their real or supposed rights.

One of the most prolific sources of internal trouble in the Latin Orient during Innocent's reign was the dynastic succession of the principality of Antioch. As a condition of peace with Leo (or Livon) II, the Great, king of Lesser Armenia, Bohemond III, prince of Antioch, had agreed to marry his eldest son, Raymond, to the niece of his powerful neighbour. It had been further agreed later on that Rupen, the fruit of this marriage, should inherit both Antioch and Armenia. But on the death of Bohemond III (1201), his second son, Bohemond, count of Tripoli (*d.* 1234), seized Antioch, and held it against Leo, with varying success, till long after the death of Leo himself (*d.* 1219) and of his grand-nephew Rupen (*d.* 1222). The result of this dynastic dispute was to divide the forces of the Latins and to introduce the infidel as an ally of a Christian ruler. The Templars and the Moslems of Aleppo were found fighting for Bohemond; and the Hospitallers, in conjunction with Leo and his Armenians, for Rupen.

Already in 1199 Innocent had occasion to write to the Armenian king (Leo) begging him not to turn his sword against "the household of the faith, but against the enemies of the Cross", and not to retain any longer a castle which belonged to the Templars.

A few months before he had to exhort the Hospitallers to settle their differences with the Templars by an appeal to law and not to arms. "The controversy", he wrote, "which has arisen between you and our beloved sons, the soldiers of the Temple, concerning certain possessions, has, in its power of doing harm, exceeded almost all the other disputes of our time. It is harmful to the whole of Christendom, injurious to us, fatal to the Latin kingdom (*mortifera partibus*) and advantageous to the enemies of the Christian faith, whom it has inspired with greater boldness to attack it and rend it to pieces". In concluding his letter, he begged them to settle any further difficulties they might have with the Templars in accordance with the original agreement between them which had received the sanction both of Pope Alexander III and of himself.

"There is no reason to wonder", said Innocent to his trustworthy legate, Albert II, patriarch of Jerusalem, "that, provoked by our sins, the Divine indignation has exposed the Holy Land and the place of the tabernacle of His glory to the enemies of His cross. So many crimes are there committed by those who are Christians in name but not in fact, that the small remnants (of the Latin kingdom) may, with the prophet, admire the mercies of God that they are not consumed. Perhaps, however, this may proceed less from the mercy of God than from His justice, as it may be said that the false Christians who live there are worse than the infidel. The wretched inhabitants betray one another, hate one another, scandalise one another". The Pope proceeds to denounce the count of Tripoli for laying violent hands on the patriarch of Antioch, his liege lord, and to authorise Albert to take such steps to liberate the prelate as are demanded by justice and the condition of the Holy Land. How far Bohemond, count of Tripoli, and *de*

facto prince of Antioch, was prepared to go in defence of his usurped position, may be inferred from his conniving at the intrusion of a Greek patriarch into the province of Antioch, whilst he was keeping the Latin patriarch in prison. Innocent felt compelled to instruct his legate Albert to depose the intruder, and, by ecclesiastical censure, to force Bohemond to cease his patronage of the Greek patriarch or of the Greek rebellious clergy. But when Albert attempted to carry out Innocent's orders, the wily Bohemond replied that the emperor of Constantinople, from whom he held Antioch, had obtained from the Pope a privilege to the effect that he should not have to answer to an ecclesiastical court concerning the principality; an assertion which Innocent had to brand as wholly untrue.

So truculent a personage was Bohemond that we find Innocent appealing to the sultan of Aleppo to protect the successor (Pietro II of Capua, c. 1208-1219) of the patriarch, who had died in prison. "We have learnt", wrote the Pope, "from many reliable persons that, though you have not yet embraced the Christian faith, you nevertheless have veneration for it". After expressing a hope that God will give him the grace to receive the faith, and exhorting him "to practise justice and love truth", Innocent begged him to help Pietro as far as ever he could.

Undeterred, however, by the difficulties which he could see on all sides, or by those which he could easily conjecture. Innocent took up the cause of the Crusaders from the very first hour of his reign, and throughout the whole of it ceased not to labour for its success. He could indeed be deeply distressed that, despite his great efforts, he was able to effect so little for the Holy Land, but he could write with confidence: "In the affliction of the Holy Land, which the Lord has purchased by His precious Blood, we are ourselves deeply afflicted, and our grief will be daily renewed, until we shall have learnt that it has been restored to its former liberty. Although the care of all the churches is upon us at every instant, still our chief anxiety and that of our brethren is for the liberation of the Lord's sepulchre, and we are for ever engaged in exhorting all men to assist it".

Innocent's Registers show how exact was this assertion. He worked incessantly for the "Lord's sepulcher" both directly and indirectly. His legates were everywhere trying to make peace in the interests of the Holy Land, and he was for ever trying to raise men and money for its service. Hence his biographer assures us that "he most ardently longed to bring help to and to recover the Holy Land, and that he was always anxiously considering how he could best assist it. And because certain detractors were in the habit of saying that the Roman Church was wont to impose unsupportable burdens on others, but was unwilling to put out even its little finger to move them, he selected two cardinals, Soffred, cardinal-priest of Sta. Prassede, and Peter, cardinal-deacon of Sta. Maria in Via Lata, and gave them the Cross in order that by word and example they might summon others to take it. Then he enjoined that all the rest of the clergy should contribute a fortieth of the revenues of the Church for the good of the Holy Land, while he himself and the cardinals gave a tenth of their incomes".

The letters of Innocent more than bear out the inciting to language of his biographer. In the very first year of his pontificate, he sent letters into every European country calling on all, priests and people alike, "to fight the battles of Christ, and to

avenge the injuries done to Him crucified". "At the present day", cried the indignant Pontiff, "though the glory of Israel has to our loss been transferred from its proper place, our princes give themselves up to adulterous embraces, abusing their luxuries and their wealth; and, while they are harassing one another with inexorable hatred, and while each one is endeavouring to take vengeance on his neighbour for some injustice, there is not one left who is moved by the wrong done to the Crucified". Hear how our foes exult over us: "Already, they say, have we weakened and broken the spears of the Franks, baffled the efforts of the English, overcome the strength of the Germans, and now for a second time have we subdued the spirited Spaniards ... What is left but that we should attack your domains, and for ever blot out your name and memory".

"Let then every man gird himself", cried Innocent, "so that in the following March every city, and every count and baron may, in accordance with their means, send to the land of our Lord's birth for its protection, a number of armed men with pay to enable them to remain there for two years at least".

In his own name, he continued, and at his own cost and at that of his brethren, he is commissioning two cardinals to accompany the Crusaders. Meanwhile, however, he is sending one of them, Cardinal Peter of Capua, to Philip of France and Richard of England to persuade them to make peace, or at least a five years' truce. The other delegate, Soffred, cardinal-priest of Sta. Prassede, he has despatched to Venice to obtain succour for the Holy Land.

To those who took the Cross his letters announced the usual plenary indulgence to such as had confessed their sins, and were sorry for them; and their property was declared to be taken under the protection of the Holy See. Finally, if any intending Crusader is under any kind of bond to pay interest, the papal letters direct that his creditors are to be compelled, by ecclesiastical penalties, if Christians, and by the secular power, if Jews, to cease from demanding the said interest.

Innocent was not content with sending his legates to entreat Richard and Philip to make peace. He addressed earnest letters to them begging of them to turn their arms against the Saracens and not against each other. He addressed them in the name of Christ, "whose place, though insufficiently, we occupy on this earth". Their strife, he pointed out, was injuring their churches, the poor, Christendom itself, and the cause of the Holy Land. He would be compelled to lay both their countries under an interdict if they did not cease from fighting.

Innocent also employed special preachers to stir up the hearts of men to take the Cross, especially a priest of the diocese of Paris, Fulk of Neuilly, the fame of whose preaching had penetrated even to Rome.

One Satisfactory result followed from Innocent's efforts almost immediately. His legate, Peter of Capua, succeeded in effecting a truce of five years between Richard and Philip (January 1199). Had not Richard died soon after (April 8), great good, as far as the Crusades were concerned, might have resulted from this peace. The lion-hearted king's mind was still centred on the Holy Land, and he had been heard to declare that, when once again possessed of the territories which Philip had taken from him, "he would make a great expedition. He would conquer Egypt, and the land of Jerusalem, and would then take Constantinople, and would be crowned emperor".

A year or two later, after Richard's death, his successor John and King Philip promised the Pope's legate that they would give a fortieth of all their revenues for one year for the benefit of the Holy Land, and they called upon their subjects to do the same.

These requests or demands for money were viewed with suspicion by clergy and laity alike. They believed that such requests were capable of being very greatly abused, and expressed themselves so loudly to this effect that both Pope and king found it necessary to soothe the rising discontent. Innocent declared to "all the prelates of Holy Mother Church" that all the chief men in the East, including Leo, king of Armenia, had assured him that there was now a substantial hope of recovering Jerusalem, seeing that, since the death of Saladin, the infidels had been torn with dissensions. By way, therefore, of setting an example, he and the cardinals had decided to give a tenth of all their revenues for the Holy Land; but, in strictly commanding the clergy to give a fortieth, he was careful to explain that it was not his intention to lay down a law, so that in future the fortieth might be levied as due and customary. The tax was an extraordinary one which had been begotten of dire necessity, and which it was hoped might not have to be imposed again.

In the same way Geoffrey Fitz Peter, the chief-justiciar of England, in calling on the nobles of England to pay the fortieth, was at pains to assure them that "it was not conceded nor demanded as a right or custom or as a compulsory exaction, or in virtue of any other papal authority (than the request of the cardinal legate).

From the letter of the Pope just cited, as well as from others, it appears that he sanctioned other methods of raising money for the purposes of the Holy War. Chests locked with three keys, one to be kept by the bishop, another by the local priest, and the third by a good layman, were to be placed in the churches, so that any of the faithful might deposit money therein. He also allowed the bishops to commute other penances or vows into almsgiving for the same purposes.

From the obligation of contributing to the needs of Holy Land, Innocent would not exempt any one. He reminded the Syrians that they also must give money for the defence of their country, and insisted on even privileged religious Orders, like the Cistercians, paying their share.

Especially did Innocent rely upon spiritual arms for the recovery "of the province of Jerusalem"; for he knew that by God's assistance, secured by prayer, the few could overcome the many; whereas if the anger of God were not softened by prayers and good works, all efforts would not suffice to guard "even the remnant of the land of the nativity" which was still held by the Christians.

In his efforts to rouse Europe against the Moslem, Innocent seemed not to forget anything which might help the cause he had so much at heart. He was not then likely to fail to enter into negotiations with Constantinople.

With a view to putting a check on the designs of hostile German emperors either upon the territories of the Holy See or upon Constantinople itself, some of Innocent's predecessors had listened to the diplomatic approaches of the Eastern emperors. Celestine III, whom he succeeded, had corresponded with Alexius III, and Innocent was the more disposed to follow his ex-ample, seeing that Philip of Swabia, whom he did

not favour, was the son-in-law of the deposed emperor Isaac Angelus, and was consequently at enmity with Alexius III, who had dethroned him. Innocent was most anxious to make the Byzantine ruler, whose power he appears to have much overrated, an earnest supporter of the Crusades. But he realised that unless he were in religious unity with the West, he would never be in real political unity with it. He accordingly devoted himself to bring about that religious unity which was always the hope of the Popes of this period.

It was then with alacrity that Innocent complied with a request which, on his accession, he had received from Alexius III begging him to send envoys to Constantinople. Along with his envoys Innocent sent letters to the emperor and to the patriarch John X, Kamateros. He exhorted Alexius to forward both the cause of the Crusades and the union of the churches; and to the patriarch he pointed out that the Roman Church was the Mother of all the churches, and that from her the Greeks had no right to break away.

In reply to his “spiritual father”, Alexius observed that, in Innocent’s exhortations to humility, he detected a note of passion that was contrary to the humility. But he was aware, he continued, that the Pope’s words had sprung not from pride but from his zeal for the Lord’s sepulchre.

With regard to the Crusade he was afraid that, in the designs of God, the time had not yet come for the deliverance of Jerusalem. Besides, the Pope must not forget what injury the Crusaders under Barbarossa had inflicted on the Eastern Empire. However, he must pray that God will keep it tranquil, and then its ruler will be able, when the time arrives, to fight for the sepulchre of the Lord. As regards the union of the churches, all that is required is for the prelates of the Church to lay aside all thoughts of self in the matter, and for the Pope to summon a council at which “our most holy Church will not be slow to attend”.

The patriarch returned a similar evasive answer. He began by praising the Pope’s zeal, but professed himself unable to understand how the Roman Church could be called one and universal, seeing that it was divided into different churches, or how the Roman Church could be called the Mother of all the churches, inasmuch as Jerusalem was the cradle of the faith. Finally, it would seem, so argued the patriarch, that it was the Latins and not the Greeks who had divided the Church on the subject of the procession of the Holy Ghost.

To both these documents Innocent returned lengthy replies. To the patriarch he pointed out that it was clear from the testimony of the Scriptures, and from the decrees of canon law, based upon them, that the Roman Church was the Mistress and Mother of all the churches. In the course of developing the well-known and many other texts of the New Testament on the primacy of Peter, he called attention to the fact that certain privileges were bestowed by our Lord on all the Apostles, but never on all of them without Peter, but that privileges were conferred on Peter alone without the others. The Roman Church is universal in the sense that it presides over all the various members of the Body of the Church. The church of Jerusalem was the first certainly in point of time, if not the first in point of dignity.

Innocent brought his long letter to a conclusion by saying that he had in mind to summon a General Council, and that he expected the patriarch to be present at it, as the emperor had given him to understand that he would. In his response to the emperor, the Pope pointed out what a mistaken notion it was to think of putting off action till it was known when the time appointed by God had come. We are not counsellors of God. He also told him that he was going to summon a General Council for the needs of the Church, and exhorted him to see to it that the patriarch attended it.

This readiness of the Pope to call a General Council, and his insistence that the patriarch should be present at it, alarmed the emperor, and he hastened to explain to the Pope that the council must be held in the Eastern Empire, where the four ancient councils were held, if the Greek Church was to be represented at it. Then, to make it still more plain that there was no real anxiety for union with Rome, he went on to assert that the Pope ought not to attempt to blame him, seeing that the Empire was superior to the Church. With admirable temper Innocent quietly replied that in temporal affairs the emperor excels, but that in spiritual matters the Pope is pre-eminent, and that spiritual concerns are as much more important than temporal as the soul is superior to the body. If he has blamed him, he has done so as a father. It is his to induce even emperors and kings to do what is pleasing to God, and he has only asked Alexius to work for the unity of the Church and the defence of Jerusalem.

Still further to embarrass the Pope, the Greek emperor urged him to cause Amaury, king of Jerusalem and Cyprus, to give up Cyprus to him peacefully, inasmuch as it had belonged to the Empire. Innocent, however, made answer that, when Richard of England seized the island, he took it from one who was independent of Constantinople. Besides, the Western princes had begged him, in view of the importance of the island for the defence of the Holy Land, to request the emperor not to molest its king at the present juncture. He therefore trusted that he would continue to refrain from attacking it.

Fortunately, there were others more in earnest about the recovery of the Lord's sepulchre than was Alexius III. The letters of Innocent and the words of such men as Fulk had roused the people of many lands, especially those in France. Needless to say, they had not moved the selfish Philip himself, but they had stirred up many of his feudatories—nobles almost as powerful as himself. Like the first, this new Crusade was to be the work not of kings but of the nobility. Chief among those who took in hand its organisation were Theobald, count of Champagne; Louis, count of Blois; Simon de Montfort; Baldwin, count of Flanders; and Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, who succeeded Theobald (*d.* May 6, 1201) as leader of the Christian host.

One of the first steps taken by the French leaders was to come to an arrangement with Venice, which under the guidance of its blind old doge, Henry Dandolo, in response to frequent exhortations on the part of Innocent, agreed to transport to Egypt some thirty-five thousand men for eighty-five thousand marks, and the half of all such lands as the Crusaders should conquer. Egypt was selected as the point of attack, as it was felt to be the keystone of the Moslem power.

On May 8, 1201, Innocent, at the request of the contracting parties, confirmed the treaty, on condition that a legate of the Apostolic See should accompany the host,

and that the Crusaders should refrain from injuring any Christian peoples, unless they attempted to interfere with them. Innocent's biographer assures us that the Pope gave this conditional approval because he foresaw the future; and, if we turn to one of his letters, we shall see what it was that made him anxious about the future of the Crusade which he was striving to bring into being.

Since the death of Manuel Comnenus, Constantinople had seen rather more than the usual number of dynastic struggles. In the course of them Alexius III had, as we have seen, dethroned and blinded his brother Isaac Angelus, and had imprisoned him along with his son Alexius, whom, in view of his afterwards becoming emperor, we shall speak of as the young Alexius IV.

In the spring of the year 1201, Alexius IV made his escape from Constantinople, fled to Rome, and laid his case before the Pope (*c.* the beginning of May). Having only his version of the case Innocent could not come to any definite conclusion on its merits.

As the young Alexius at once went to Philip of Swabia after his stay in Rome, Innocent could not but fear that Philip, his brother-in-law, would espouse his cause, and endeavour to get the Crusaders to fight for him. Hence his guarded approval of the Pact of Venice. Later on he had the more reason to fear what Philip might be able to effect when he heard that Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, had been appointed leader of the Crusading host (August 1201), through the influence of his relative Philip of France, the ally of the Swabian. His anxiety, moreover, cannot have been lessened when he learnt that Boniface had been with Philip of Swabia for some months (*c.* November 1201-February 1202), and had, so it was reported, come to an understanding with him to use "the Christian army" to place Alexius IV on the throne.

In March (1202) Boniface came to Rome, and it was no doubt from his ambiguous language that the Pope concluded that he had arranged with Philip of Swabia to try to use the Crusaders against Alexius III. Innocent, however, made it plain that, if the marquis had formed any such scheme, he would not give it his approval.

After much inevitable delay the Crusaders began to pour into Venice (June 1202), and as they made their way along, many of their leaders were interviewed by the young Alexius IV. He implored them to help him to obtain the Byzantine throne, which he assured them was his in virtue of the rights of his father. This they agreed to do if, meanwhile, he would help them to recover the Holy Land.

Arrived at Venice, the soldiers of the Cross found that there was awaiting them on the Venetian waters the finest fleet that any of them had ever seen. Many, however, never went to Venice at all. They would appear to have been disturbed by rumours which reached them of an attempt to use the Crusading host for some purpose other than the Holy War. Villehardouin says more than once that several Crusaders did not come to Venice "on account of the great peril that was there".

As the Crusaders arrived at Venice, they were transferred to the island of Lido, and soon found themselves in great straits. Owing to the numbers who had gone to other ports, the leaders at Venice found themselves unable to pay the Venetians the full sum agreed upon, —a sum, it may be remarked, equal to more than half the revenue of the king of Hungary. Thereupon the doge, primarily intent upon the commercial prosperity

of Venice, resolved to utilise the Crusaders for the private advantage of the Republic. The Crusaders were practically kept as prisoners on the Lido, and the papal legate was in fact driven away. The Venetians, who had resolved to use the Crusaders to recapture Zara in Dalmatia, had not been at all pleased when the Pope only gave a conditional approval to their treaty with the Crusading chiefs, and when Cardinal Peter of Capua arrived to take over the direction of the Crusade, he was told by them that he might come as a preacher but not as legate. The Franks were indignant but helpless, and the cardinal returned to Rome to inform the Pope of the craft of the Venetians.

After the legate had withdrawn, the doge proposed to the leaders of the Crusade that, on condition of their helping the Venetians to recover Zara, which the king of Hungary had taken from them, the balance due to Venice would be remitted. Feeling themselves in a hopeless dilemma, the chiefs accepted the offer, despite the fact that letters were received from Rome threatening them with excommunication if they should venture to touch Zara, which was in the hands of a king who had himself taken the Cross.

At length, on October 8, the Crusaders set sail for Zara. Some of them, however, including their chief, the astute marquis of Montferrat, would not brave the Pope's displeasure, and refused to take part in the expedition.

When the Crusaders arrived off Zara (November 10), its inhabitants sent letters which they had procured from Rome to their chiefs. The letters threatened excommunication to all who should dare to attack the city. The papal threats produced their effect on some of the leaders,—among others, on Simon de Montfort, the father of the Simon of English parliamentary fame. He, with a number of others, left the army for a time; but the other Crusaders, influenced by the Venetians, stormed and plundered the unfortunate city. The Venetians had carried through their scheme. The rival city on the eastern shore of the Adriatic, the capital of Dalmatia, was in their hands.

But the great mass of the Crusaders were profoundly discontented. They, at any rate, were sincere. Their real wish was to fight for the recovery of the Holy Land, and not to make war on their fellow-Christians. They had no sympathy with the wiles of the Venetians, nor with the duplicity of their leaders; and as it became more clear to them how they were being tricked, and how, instead of earning the blessing of God they were under the ban of His vicar, their indignation knew no bounds. They fought with the Venetians, and insisted that efforts should be made to induce the Pope to remove the sentence of excommunication under which it gradually became more widely known that they had fallen. Accordingly, the bishop of Soissons and others were sent to Rome to appease the Pope, and to beg his forgiveness on the ground that the Crusaders had acted, practically, on compulsion.

Indignant letters from Innocent soon reached Zara. As usual, his indignation found vent in a torrent of scriptural language and allusions. "Lo", he cried, "the gold turned to dross and the bright silver became blackened when you turned aside from the purity of your intention, took your hands from the plough, and with Lot's wife turned back. When you ought to have fled from the cursed land of Egypt, and hastened to the land flowing with milk and honey, you wandered into the desert, and, calling to mind how you used to regale yourselves with the fleshpots of Egypt, you sated yourselves

with the blood of your brethren. The ancient enemy of mankind has contrived to infect all of you by a small portion of leaven. He knew that greater love cannot be shown by man for man than that one man should lay down his life for another. In order that he might deprive you of the reward of such love, he contrived to make you turn your arms against your brethren instead, and attempt to pay your debts with the spoils of Christians, as you have done at Zara”.

The Crusaders were then reminded that they had acted against the Pope’s orders, and were commanded to cease from wrecking the city; to restore what they had plundered; to promise the papal legate, if they were to obtain absolution, that they would submit to whatever penance was imposed upon them for their evil deeds; and to beg the king of Hungary’s forgiveness. The Pope, however, added that he found some consolation in the fact that they had sent to acknowledge their fault, and that they had acted under compulsion.

Having thus delivered his soul, Innocent ordered a form of absolution to be drawn up, and given to the envoys, on the understanding that it was to be used if his conditions were complied with. He showed himself so considerate, says Gunther, “because he was a man of great discretion and kindness. He was youthful indeed as far as his age was concerned, but by his prudence, mature judgment, and settled character he was a man of advanced years. Distinguished by his birth and appearance, he was a lover of justice and a hater of iniquity, so that he was called Innocent not so much by chance as by desert”.

On receipt of the Pope’s letters, Baldwin, count of Flanders, Louis, count of Blois, Hugh, count of St. Pol, and other Crusading leaders at once (April) publicly proclaimed that, in the matter of the Zara incident, they would obey the Pope’s injunctions. At the same time they wrote to Innocent himself a letter full of expressions of submission. They threw themselves at his feet, and in return for the absolution they had received, sent the Pope the required promises. But they begged him to forgive their chief, Boniface of Montferrat, for not having shown his letters, involving their excommunication, to the impenitent Venetians. Had he done so, the expedition would have come to an abrupt conclusion. The marquis himself wrote to the same effect. Recalling to mind, he said, that the Pope had told him that there might be need for dissembling if the Venetians should aim at ruining the expedition, he had suppressed his letters to them till he should hear further from him, because he had been informed that the Venetians had meanwhile sent a special messenger to him.

In reply to the leaders’ protestations of regret, Innocent let them know how grieved he was that so far his efforts had been marred by them, and that their action had discouraged other Christians from taking the Cross, but had encouraged the Saracens to renewed efforts. He hoped, however, that they would show that they were truly sorry for their conduct, by avoiding similar conduct for the future. Hence they were to be on their guard not to allow themselves to be induced to injure “the land of the Greeks” on the ground that it was not properly submissive to the Apostolic See, or that its present emperor was a usurper. His letters must be delivered to the Venetians. However, in another letter, he gave them permission, if the Venetians would not repent, to communicate with them and use them for the transport services for which they had

already paid them so much. It would not be fitting that their penitence should injure them, and that, on the contrary, the Venetians should profit by their contumacy. Unless, however, they repented, they were not to be allowed to fight with the Crusaders.

The first act of the drama of the Fourth Crusade is now to all intents and purposes over. We have seen the crafty Venetians utilising to the full the opportunity which had come in their way; and, despite the strenuous opposition of the Pope, successfully using, to further their ends of vengeance and business, the needs and difficulties of the unfortunate soldiers of the Cross.

Innocent never forgave them for their conduct. Years after he bitterly upbraided them for diverting from the Holy Land “so grand, so noble, so powerful a Christian army—an army that had been brought together with so much care and toil, and at such great expense. It was an army that might well not merely have recovered the province of Jerusalem, but might have even occupied a considerable part of the kingdom of Babylon. For if it proved able to conquer Constantinople and Greece, how much more easily would it have wrested Alexandria and Egypt, and hence the Holy Land, from the hands of the pagans? It is true, I am glad that Constantinople has returned to the obedience of the holy Roman Church, its mother, but I should have been much more pleased if Jerusalem had been restored to the Christians”.

We have now to unfold the second act, in which we shall see the valour and energy of the Crusaders again, in defiance of Innocent, diverted from their proper course, and made to serve private purposes of greed, ambition, and vengeance.

We shall not, however, behold the same stout objections on the part of the Crusaders themselves to being driven to fight against Christians in Constantinople as they displayed in the case of the Zara episode. One reason of this is to be found in the fact that very many of those most reluctant to fight their fellow-Christians had managed to leave the main body either before or soon after the siege of Zara; but perhaps the more accurate reason is to be sought in the fact that there was a general feeling throughout the West that the Greeks were largely responsible for most of the disasters which had befallen the Crusading hosts, and that, consequently, Constantinople itself ought to be seized.

There can, indeed, be little doubt that the Western feeling in this matter was justifiable. The Crusaders had certainly inflicted much injury on the Byzantine Empire. But their faults were faults which arose from ignorance and want of discipline, and had not inflicted any lasting damage upon it. The advantages which they procured for it by the heavy blows which they dealt its foes, far more than counterbalanced the harm done to it by the lawlessness of some of their bands. But the ruin which the petty policy of the Byzantine rulers had often brought upon the Crusaders was the result of cold calculation. They wished to use the religious zeal of the Crusaders for their own advantage; and when they found that they could not effect their purpose, they contrived to thwart their efforts by a judicious withholding of cooperation, or by deliberate malice. Small wonder then that some of the most moderate statesmen in the West were convinced that the success of the Crusades would never be assured till Constantinople was taken from the Greek schismatics, and that the less moderate ones did not pause to

consider, or did not care whether such a course would render those schismatics more schismatical than ever.

Especially were the Venetians angry with the Byzantine Empire for wanton wrongs which had been inflicted by the Greeks upon them, and, in common with the rest of the West, for the massacre of the Latins which had taken place at Constantinople in 1182. Dandolo himself is said by some to have been blinded by them, and, according to the contemporary canon of Faenza, Tolosanus, he openly declared that he wished to punish the Greeks for their crimes, and to restore the young Alexius, in the hope that, after the conquest of the Byzantine Empire, it would be more easy to recover “the most Holy Land”.

Those, therefore, of the leaders of the Fourth Crusade who were plotting the capture of Constantinople no doubt felt sure that the opposition which they would encounter from their men would not be very hard to overcome. However all this may be, it is certain that the young Alexius came to Zara at the close of the year 1202, and renewed his request for the help of the Crusaders to restore his father to the throne. With him came envoys from Philip of Swabia, who pointed out that by working in the interests of the young Alexius the Crusaders would be furthering the best interests of the Holy Land, as he would support them with men and money, and would bring about the submission of the Greek Church to that of Rome.

Some of the leaders, notably Simon de Montfort, would have nothing to do with this new scheme against another Christian people. Rather than disobey the Pope, they left the army. But the greater number, first of the chiefs and then of the ordinary soldiers, from various motives, accepted the proposals of the young Alexius.

On April 20 the Crusaders left Zara, and their fleet seemed, says Villehardouin, “destined to conquer the world, for so far as the eye could reach one could see nothing but the sails of the transports and the warships, in such sort that the hearts of men were filled with gladness”. Two months later (June 23), the fleet cast anchor off Constantinople, and the Western warriors were astounded at the sight of the many domes and palaces, circuses, public buildings of all kinds, walls and towers that seemed to spring out of the water and mount up to the skies. “They could not”, so the marshal assures us, “have imagined that there was in the whole world a city so rich as this queen of cities. And as they looked, sturdy and stout-hearted men as they were, they every one shook with dread. And well they might”, continues our naive historian, “for since the world began never was so mighty an enterprise taken in hand before”.

It is not for us to tell how the Crusaders stormed the suburb of Pera, how their great galleys broke the chain which was to have kept them out of the Golden Horn, how they stormed the city, drove out Alexius III, and assisted at the crowning of the young Alexius as co-regent with his blind father, Isaac (August 1). Towards the end of the month (August 24) Alexius wrote to the Pope, “who holds the place of God on earth”, that “the pilgrims” had been induced to restore him to his throne principally on account of the oath he had sworn, both to recognise himself “the ecclesiastical head of all Christendom, to wit, the Roman Pontiff, the Catholic successor of the Prince of the Apostles, and, with all his power, to induce the Oriental Church to follow his example”. He had determined, he continued, to act thus because he believed it would be for the

good of the Empire and his own everlasting glory, “if in his time and by his efforts the seamless garment of the Lord were made whole again”.

In a letter written to the Pope presumably about the same time, the Crusaders, in their own way, told him what had happened after their departure “from the city of transgression”, *i.e.*, as they explained, Zara, “the destruction of which, under compulsion, we beheld with grief”. Convinced, they declared, that, in the state of want to which they had been reduced, they would be a burden rather than a help to the Holy Land, they had decided to restore the exiled Alexius IV, who was anxiously awaited in Constantinople by the great majority. To their great amazement, however, they said, when they reached the city, they found that the usurper had meanwhile turned the people against Alexius by telling them that the Latins were going to subject them to the Pope. They had therefore been compelled to restore Alexius by force; but in all they had done they had invariably been favoured by Providence. Alexius had behaved very well to them, and was going to march with them to the Holy Land as soon as his position was assured.

The means used by Alexius IV to reach the throne were not likely to commend him to the people of Constantinople, and his efforts to fulfil his obligations to the Crusaders roused general opposition to him. The laity were infuriated against him by the extortionate methods to which he had recourse to pay his debts, and the clergy by his attempts to subject them to the See of Rome. He had to implore the Crusaders to remain in the neighbourhood of Constantinople.

The general discontent at length took form and substance. Alexius Murzuphlus deposed and strangled Alexius IV, and was himself crowned as Alexius V in January 1204. He even made an attempt to come to an understanding with the chiefs of the Crusaders. But the negotiations were soon abandoned, as the usurper made it plain that he would sooner die and see the overthrow of the Empire than behold “the Oriental Church subject to Latin bishops”.

The Crusading chiefs had now excuse enough for attacking the city. Villehardouin declares, in vague terms indeed, that even “all those who had papal powers” assured “the pilgrims” that they had ample reason for attacking the city, and would by so doing merit the indulgences granted to those who fought the infidel.

After it had been decided to elect an emperor from among themselves who was to have a quarter of the Empire (Romania), whilst the other leaders were to have the rest, and after various privileges had been assigned to the Venetians, the marquis of Montferrat, heedless as before of papal prohibitions, let loose the dogs of war against the unfortunate city. It was heroically carried by assault. Murzuphlus fled, and Constantinople, so long the bulwark of Christianity, was delivered over to the flames and to the passions of the soldiery (April 12). Gunther, whose abbot Martin did not scruple to carry off relics of the saints, speaks as though only a few of the people were killed; and Villehardouin, Robert de Clary, and other Western writers pass over the details of the sacking of the city altogether. But, whether many or comparatively few non-combatants were killed, the evidence, not merely of the Greek, Nicetas, but of many Latin writers, and especially of Pope Innocent, shows that, after the capture of the city, it was sacked with all the horrible circumstances usual on such occasions. Not

merely was no secular property sacred, not merely were lay women violated, but the ornaments of the churches and the possessions of the clergy were seized, and virgins dedicated to God were treated in the same outrageous manner as their sisters in the world. It seemed to the Crusaders that, because the Greeks were schismatics, all was lawful against them. They are said to have rifled the very tombs of dead emperors; and even men who were under normal circumstances exceptionally good, did not hesitate to steal relics which they believed the Greeks were unworthy to possess.

As soon as law and order had been restored in the captured city, Baldwin, count of Flanders, was elected emperor, and crowned a week afterwards (May 16). The rival candidate for the throne was the commander-in-chief of the Crusading army, Boniface of Montferrat, who in accordance with an agreement made before the election, had to be content with a portion which was not in the hands of the Crusaders to give, *i.e.*, with the imperial territories on the Turkish side of the Bosphorus and the isle of Greece, or the Peloponnesus. This portion was afterwards exchanged for the kingdom of Salonica.

After the election of Baldwin as emperor, the Venetians, who had taken so commanding a part throughout the whole of this misdirected Crusade, took upon themselves to appoint a patriarch. Telling the Franks that, as they had the emperor, they would have the patriarch, they put their clergy in possession of the church of Sophia. The Venetian canons promptly elected as the new patriarch one of their countrymen, Tommaso Morosini. But, says the author of the *Devastatio*, “a schism was thereby (for a time) caused between our clergy and the Venetians. Our clergy appealed (to Rome), and reserved to the lord Pope the appointment to the patriarchate”, while Tommaso with the envoys of the new emperor and of Dandolo set out for Rome to obtain the confirmation of his election.

This mention of the lord Pope naturally leads us to ask what had Innocent been thinking and doing while these momentous events were in progress. Having but little doubt after the termination of the Zara incident that the Christian army would at length proceed to the East, he sent on before it to the Holy Land cardinals Peter of Capua (Capuano) and Soffredus (April 1203). By August 10, he had heard a report that the Crusaders “had turned aside to Greece”, but, even by January 23, 1204, he was seemingly still ignorant that Alexius IV had by that time already been forcibly placed on the throne of Constantinople by the Crusaders, and that the fleet had not continued its voyage to the Holy Land. It appears to have been only at the end of the month that he received the official letters, already quoted, relating to the restoration of Alexius IV, and to the reunion of the churches.

Merely arguing from the version of the restoration of Alexius IV furnished him by that prince and by the Crusaders, Innocent expressed himself as anything but satisfied with what had happened. Two points were clear even from the official letters. The Crusaders had not proceeded against the Moslem after their departure from Zara, but had again attacked a Christian people. Innocent could not, of course, from the meagre data furnished him, pretend to be able to give an absolute judgment on their conduct, but he gave them to understand that he believed that their pretended zeal for the union of the two churches was merely a pretext to cover a second transgression of his orders, and that consequently they were still under excommunication, as he had

clearly laid down that the absolution extended to them at Zara was granted strictly on condition that they should not again attack a Christian people. Their zeal, if true, for their mother the Roman Church, may extenuate their conduct, but they must bewail their wrong-doing, so that with clean hearts they may be able to devote themselves with all their might to the recovery of the Holy Land. In his reply to Alexius IV, the Pope exhorted him to let his actions correspond with his words.

If Innocent was annoyed at the forcible restoration of Alexius, his indignation at the second storming of Constantinople and at the horrors of its sack may be easily imagined.

After the installation of the new emperor of Constantinople, and the election of a Latin patriarch, the Crusading chiefs lost no time in trying to obtain the Pope's approval. Baldwin "ever Augustus" sent a long and deferential letter to the Pope, in which he assured him that no sooner had they placed Alexius IV on the throne "by the help of God", than, "Greek in everything", he repaid them with the usual Greek perfidy. But the Greeks would not keep peace either with themselves or with the Crusaders. Among themselves Murzuphlus arose, and strangled Alexius, and then attacked us. We retaliated, and "unanimously assaulted the city for the honour of the Holy Roman Church and for the advantage of the Holy Land. After some severe fighting we captured the city and an enormous amount of booty". Then was the writer unanimously chosen king, and crowned even amid the applause of the Greeks,—again, "for the honour of God and of the Holy Roman Church and for the advantage of the Holy Land". Now, continued the new emperor, the city which had so long been hostile to the holy places would be their real friend.

After denouncing the Greeks especially for their hostility to the See of Rome, for their refusing to make images of our Lord, and for their abuse of the Latins, Baldwin assured the Pope that the Lord had punished them through the Latins, and had given him a glorious land. As soon as he had settled it, he would proceed to the Holy Land. Meanwhile, he begged the Pope to be a partaker in the great work that had been accomplished by sending out people to defend and colonise the new possessions, and priests and monks to convert the inhabitants. Finally, as a last inducement to catch the Pope, Baldwin pointed out how much it would conduce to the good of the Church and the glory of the Roman See if Innocent would convene a General Council at Constantinople, and preside over it in person. "Now, Holy Father", he cried, "now is the acceptable time, now is the day of salvation". In conclusion, he impressed upon the Pope that all his clergy were eagerly awaiting the apostolic benediction for all they had done.

Somewhat later, apparently, the marquis of Montferrat and the other leaders wrote to Innocent to the same effect. Moreover, in order the better to be able to ward off the wrath of the Pope, the Crusading leaders sent to Palestine for the legate Peter of Capua. This they did in the assured hope of being more easily able to circumvent the cardinal, and thus of compromising Innocent. After making a truce with the Saracens for six years, Peter, along with his fellow-legate Soffredus and a very large number of others, came to Constantinople in obedience to the summons, and proceeded to deal with the many political and ecclesiastical questions which were brought before him.

Ignorant of what had really taken place at Constantinople, and with little more than the official letters of the Crusaders to guide him, Innocent may well have been literally overwhelmed with the news that reached him from the “city guarded by God”. Not only his biographer but he himself says that he, “along with all those who were with him, was utterly astounded at the miraculous news which had been sent to him”.

Acting under the influence of the clever letters he had received from Baldwin and the other leaders, he wrote “to the illustrious emperor of Constantinople” saying practically in Baldwin’s own words that he was rejoiced that God had wrought such wonders through him “to the honour and glory of His name, to the advantage of the Apostolic See, and to the profit of the people of Christendom”. Relying on his devotion to the Roman Church, he declared that he would take himself and his territories under his protection, and would exhort the Crusaders to protect that empire, by which the Holy Land might be more easily freed from the hands “of the pagans”. Finally, he exhorted the new emperor to restore the Greek empire to the obedience of the Roman Church, and to guard the ecclesiastical property till such times as he could make arrangements with regard to it, “so that without any confusion there may be rendered to Caesar what is Caesar’s, and to God what is God’s”.

But when Innocent came to treat of the election of the patriarch, Tommaso, “our subdeacon”, he pointed to the clergy of Constantinople that, though he had no objection to Tommaso himself, he had condemned his election, as it was uncanonical for a patriarch to be elected by the authority of any secular prince. Besides, the Venetian clerics who elected him had no right to do so, as they had not in any way been instituted canons of St. Sophia by him. However, as the present was not a time for delay, he would himself, “from the plenitude of power conferred upon him”, elect Tommaso in conformity with the emperor’s wishes.

Accordingly, on mid-Lent Sunday (1205), he himself consecrated Tommaso in St. Peter’s, and gave him the pallium, as well as the power to grant it in turn to his suffragan archbishops.

By degrees the truth about the establishment of the Latin rule in Constantinople began to find its way to the Pope, and then he gave full vent to his vexation. As early as February 17, 1205, Cardinal Peter had been blamed for leaving Palestine without the Pope’s permission. Some five months later, when Innocent had learnt all the truth about the fall of Constantinople, Peter was blamed still more strongly. Especially was the Pope angry with him for daring to absolve from their Crusading vows such as had stayed a year for the defence of Constantinople. These men, he exclaimed indignantly, have been looking after their temporal advantages. Their conduct has caused him to fail just where he had hoped to succeed. How can the Greek Church return to the unity of the Apostolic See, after the Latins have done such deeds of darkness that it may justly loathe them more than dogs? Reeking with Christian blood, they regarded neither religion, nor age, nor sex; in their adulteries they spared not even virgins consecrated to God, and in their plunderings, not content with the riches of the great and of the small, they feared not to lay their hands on the possessions of the Church, nor even to plunder the very altars themselves.

As soon as the new legate, Benedict, cardinal-priest of St. Susanna, reaches Constantinople, Peter must return to Palestine at once.

Not long after, he wrote a similar letter to Boniface of Montferrat, which, with Pears, we may say, “will ever remain as a monument of just scorn, and of the lofty statesmanship of the greatest man of his time”. “Without having any jurisdiction or power over the Greeks”, cried the Pope, “you rashly violated the purity of your vows; and, turning your arms not against the Saracens but against Christians, you applied yourselves not to the recovery of Jerusalem, but to seize Constantinople, preferring earthly to heavenly riches”. He then repeated the vigorous denunciation which he had already sent to Cardinal Peter of the outrages committed by the Crusaders when they took Constantinople. But still it was possible (though he could not say it was certain, as he was still without complete knowledge of what had happened) that the Greeks had suffered by a just judgment of God for refusing to return to the unity of the Church, and to give succour to the Holy Land. However, concluded the Pope, giving a definite answer to Boniface, “leaving aside doubtful issues, we consider that, if you would consult the interests of the Holy Land, of the Apostolic See, and of yourselves, you should defend the territory which has been acquired by the will of God, rule your subjects with justice, restore the property of the Church, atone for the wrongs you have probably committed in effecting this conquest, and devote your attention to the good of the Holy Land, for there is every hope that it may be easily recovered by means of the country you have acquired”.

Though these letters furnish a plain indication of Innocent’s annoyance at the turn events had taken, they also supply clear evidence that he saw the necessity of accepting the situation. He was certainly distressed at the failure of the Crusade, for even when he refused to absolve the aged hero Dandolo from his vow to fight the Moslem, he had to acknowledge that he believed that the expedition as a Crusade was doomed. He had to declare his conviction that “the Crusaders intended to defer their pilgrimage and to remain for a further length of time in the parts of Romania to consolidate the Empire”. Still undoubtedly, as Pears puts it, “his letters leave the impression that he never ceased to regret the failure of the Crusade, which had been so carefully organised, and from which so much might reasonably be expected. In the comprehension of the Eastern question of his day, and of what statesmanship required for the interests of Europe and of civilisation, he seems to stand, at the opening of the thirteenth century, head and shoulders above all other kings and potentates”.

Nevertheless, although the Fourth Crusade had proved such a miserable failure, both from a political and from a religious point of view, Innocent did not lose heart. He felt, indeed, the awkward condition in which the guile and folly of others had placed him. But though, in the year 1205, he could ask with bitterness “with what face could he again appeal to the peoples of the West to go to the succour of the Holy Land”, we find him a few years later endeavouring once more to arouse the nations to make another effort for the defence of the Holy Land. He was afraid that “if the Saracens seized the remnant of the Holy Land the Christians would have no occasion for betaking themselves thither, and that hence the Greeks would recover the Empire of Constantinople”.

One of the thoughts which had reconciled him to the unfortunate attack on Constantinople was the hope that it would prove a centre whence vigorous attacks could be made upon the Moslem power. Of this, too, the Moslems themselves were much afraid. Even in 1207 he still hoped that the Crusaders who had settled there might be able to fulfil their vows and march to the help of the Holy Land. But, as time went on, he perceived that Constantinople was much more likely to divert men from the Holy Land than to send them to it. He himself had already appealed to Europe to help the Latin emperors of Constantinople, and they were to follow his example.

It was necessary, therefore, for Innocent to look elsewhere for help for the Holy Land, and he turned again especially to France. By the death of Amaury II of Lusignan (1205) the kingdom of Jerusalem fell to the lot of his stepdaughter Maria. At the time there was peace in the Holy Land. The fall of Constantinople had for the moment frightened the Moslems, and they had agreed to a truce for six years (1204-1210). Seeing that the days of the truce were running out, the barons of the kingdom both appealed to the Pope for help, and asked Philip of France to recommend a suitable spouse for their queen. He fixed upon John of Brienne, of whom along with his brother Walter we have already spoken. These events gave Innocent another favourable opportunity for interesting himself in the affairs of the Holy Land. As John, the third merely titular king of Jerusalem, was a subject of Philip of France, the Pope once more endeavoured to interest that monarch in Palestine. He pointed out to him what an honour it was that the king of Jerusalem should come from his kingdom as “from a public treasury of men”. He urged him to support John, in order to increase his own glory, already, except for the matter of his divorce, so transcendent; and, in order to move him by example, he told him that he was lending John the sum of fourteen hundred marks of silver. But from this effort no particular result followed. The truce with the Saracens, which expired in 1210, was not renewed, and, after his marriage with the young Queen Mary (September 1210), John took the field. He was not, however, able to accomplish much, and at length in 1212 appealed to the Pope for help.

For some years difficulties with the Emperor Otho and with the Albigensians had prevented Innocent from taking active measures on behalf of the Holy Land. Besides, the proclamation of Crusades against the pagan Prussians and the heretical Albigensians was not calculated either to keep Christian effort concentrated or to maintain the lofty ideal hitherto connected in the minds of men with the holy war. Encouraged, however, by the fact that the youthful Frederick II in Germany had taken the Cross after his coronation (December 1212); inspired by the great Spanish victory over the Moors at Las Navas de Tolosa (1212); and urged by the appeal of John de Brienne, he in 1213 again took up the cause of the Holy Land. “He sent word throughout all Christendom to the best clerks whom he knew to preach the cross *d’Outremer*. Moreover, he despatched cardinals to comfort us, and to confirm what was done by the preachers, and many took the Cross in many lands. His letters were directed to every country. “Because”, he cried, “there is greater need than ever for succour to be given to the Holy Land, and because greater advantage than ever is hoped to be reaped from that succour, do I cry to you with renewed vigour, and for Him do I cry who with a loud voice yielded up His soul on the Cross”. The Saracens, he said, were seriously threatening Acre, which they hoped soon to capture, and then to possess

themselves of the remaining remnant of the Holy Land still left to the Christians. He called upon clergy and laity alike to furnish as large a body of armed men as they could, for three years, and he begged the maritime cities to supply ships. He revoked all the indulgences granted to those who should fight against the Moors in Spain or against the heretics in Provence, except in the case of the peoples themselves of those countries. The indulgences could only be gained by fighting against the Saracens in the East. Finally, to secure the help of God, he ordered fasts, almsgiving, solemn processions and prayers, especially at the time of the Communion in Mass, “when the saving Victim is about to be received”.

Innocent also wrote to Saladin’s brother urging him to give up Jerusalem and its territories in order to avoid further bloodshed. He assured him that its detention would bring him more trouble than profit. If this letter did nothing else, it no doubt served to deepen the conviction, already very justly entertained by the Saracens, that the Popes were the cause of the Crusades, and to strengthen their resolve to revenge themselves upon them. Already the Emir Amuminin or Anasir (the Almohade, Mohammed an Nasir) had proclaimed that he had been assured that the Crusades were the work of the Lord of Rome, and he affirmed that the Saracens would never rest till they had taken Rome, and “handed over its Lord to contumely and misery”.

The great Lateran Council which Innocent summoned to meet in 1215 occupied itself with the new Crusade. The Pope himself urged it upon the assembled fathers in his opening discourse; and the Council, adopting the recommendations made in the Pope’s letters, fixed the departure of the Crusade for June 1217. The Crusaders were to assemble in Sicily, where Innocent announced that he would meet them. He also promised them thirty thousand pounds on his own account, and three thousand marks of silver which he had received in alms, as well as transport for the Crusaders from Rome and the district. The clergy had to give a twentieth, and the Pope himself and the cardinals a tenth. It was also decreed that there must be peace throughout Christendom for four years at least.

According to the Annals of Reiner, Innocent induced well-nigh “the whole world” to take the Cross; and, as a matter of fact, an armament (known as the Fifth Crusade), in which figured Andrew, king of Hungary; Leopold, duke of Austria; Ranulf, earl of Chester, and many other great nobles, left Europe for the Holy Land in 1217. It was not, indeed, the overwhelming host which Innocent had hoped to bring together. Europe was surely, if slowly, dividing into clearly defined and sharply distinct nations which, daily becoming more and more conscious of their own separate existence, were daily thinking more and more of their own private interests, and less and less of the general good. And yet, in spite of the innumerable difficulties which this process of division brought about, the incomparable energy of Innocent III succeeded in a comparatively short time in organising two Crusades. What other man, it may be asked, has ever accomplished such a gigantic task? That the result of his efforts in the case of the second of his Crusades was not commensurate with his efforts, Innocent did not live to see. He died about a year before the new Crusade left the shores of Europe. But nevertheless to the historians of the East the men of this Crusade were emphatically the soldiers of the Pope.

CHAPTER II.
THE NEW LATIN KINGDOM OF CONSTANTINOPLE. ORGANISATION
OF CHURCH AND STATE.

In 1204, as we have seen, the Latins took Constantinople, and elected a Latin emperor who, under the terms of partition agreed to by the conquerors, was intended to have under his direct control Constantinople, with the Thracian territories surrounding it, several of the more important islands, and the portions of Asia Minor which were subject to the Byzantine Empire at the time of the conquest of Constantinople. But the establishment of the new Greek Empire of Trebizond, and of that of Nicaea, by Theodore Lascaris, son-in-law of the Emperor Alexius III, and the ablest of the Greek fugitives from Constantinople, practically limited this immediate jurisdiction of the new Latin emperor to his European dominions.

Following up their capture of Constantinople, the Franks turned their attention to Greece; and, almost without an effort, a small body of Lombards, Burgundians, and Germans overran continental Greece and the Morea. A “new France” was thus established in Greece, and we hear of feudal “lords or dukes of Athens”, “princes of all Achaia”, “dukes of the Archipelago”, and the like. And, as the civil administration of the Byzantine Empire went to pieces under the onslaught of the feudal warriors of the West, so also, though not perhaps to such a large extent, its ecclesiastical. Most of the Byzantine bishops fled from the lands where the Frank erected his feudal castle, and betook themselves to countries where their countrymen still held sway. It devolved, therefore, upon Innocent to organise the establishment of a hierarchy of the Latin rite in southern Thrace, Macedonia, and Greece. In doing so, his first care would naturally be the see which was to rule over this area, the patriarchal see of Constantinople. We have already told how he himself elected the Venetian, Tommaso Morosini, to be the first Latin patriarch,—a man in whom he saw noble birth, good character, prudence, and sufficient learning, but in whom the spiteful Greek, Nicetas, could only see a clean-shaved, grossly fat man whose garments fitted him so closely that they seemed to have been sewn upon him.

The Pope’s action with regard to the election of Tommaso did not please the Venetians. They wished to have a patriarch wholly dependent upon themselves, one who would make it his first concern to look after their interests. Accordingly, when Morosini passed through Venice on his way from Rome back to Constantinople, he was detained there. Advantage was taken of monetary difficulties in which he was involved to compel him to swear that he would appoint only Venetians to be canons of St. Sophia, and would do all he could to ensure that only Venetians should be made patriarchs.

Even when he reached Constantinople, the new patriarch's difficulties were not over. A number of the Frankish clergy, declaring that he had obtained his consecration by fraud, would not obey him, and, because they had appealed to Rome against him, would not take any notice of the sentence of excommunication which he pronounced against them. They were supported, to some extent at least, by the legate Peter. However, the tact of the new legate, Benedict, cardinal-priest of St. Susanna, quickly put an end to the schism, and left Tommaso at liberty to cope with the enormous difficulties of the situation. Successfully to grapple with them would have required a greater and more prudent man than Tommaso Morosini. It must be borne in mind that the Latin civil rulers throughout his patriarchate were for the most part mere adventurers who cared little for the laws of the Church or of the State when their own interests were in the balance. Many, too, of the ecclesiastics who, in response to the invitation of the Pope or of the emperor, came from the West to the new Latin kingdom, were also but too often men who looked rather to their own advantage than to that of the Church. If the conquering Latins gave Tommaso trouble, the conquered Greeks too were often a thorn in his side.

In his efforts to deal with the difficulties which surged all round him, the patriarch could often count on the support of Innocent. The Pope insisted that foreign prelates visiting the patriarchate should not communicate with persons whom Tommaso had excommunicated, and he called upon the Latin rulers in their own interests to enforce the reasonable sentences which the patriarch passed on contumacious Greeks. In their jealousy of the Venetians, certain Pisan priests, rather than apply to the patriarch, ventured to confirm certain children. They pleaded papal permission for their conduct; but when the patriarch appealed to Rome, Innocent strictly forbade them to venture to repeat their practice, "for", he said, "confirmation of children belongs only to bishops". We find the Pope also insisting that certain monasteries which belonged to the patriarch's immediate jurisdiction, and which had been usurped by laymen or clerics, should be at once restored to him; ordering the Pisans, Danes, English, and other strangers in Constantinople to pay tithes to him; and, moreover, himself confirming a sentence of excommunication issued by the patriarch, "because it had been decreed in accordance with right reason".

It may have been noticed that Innocent often qualified his support of Morosini by saying that he sustained him because he had acted "reasonably". The Pope, indeed, was often convinced that Tommaso acted "unreasonably". As we have seen, he had to condemn him for attempting to make "the sanctuary of God" an heirloom by distributing the ecclesiastical positions in his gift to his Venetian countrymen. But besides regarding some of Tommaso's acts as against reason, Innocent regarded many of them as against prudence. He had on several occasions to remind him that, "on account of the change of government being but recent", he must act with great circumspection, avoid undue haste, and not embroil the State by interference with the emperor's rights of ecclesiastical patronage.

If at times Morosini acted against reason and against prudence, Innocent frequently said that he, moreover, acted against his supreme authority; and he had to take occasion to impress upon him that it was by the consent of the Holy See that in course of time Constantinople acquired the second place among the patriarchs, and that

it was subject to the See of Rome. Hence, because in the presence of Peter of Capua, “who was taking my place”, Morosini had made various appointments to bishoprics without consulting the legate. Innocent would not annul various ecclesiastical appointments made in Constantinople by the legate without consulting the patriarch. He insisted, however, that the holders of the said benefices should be subject to Tommaso unless their churches had been legitimately exempted from the patriarch’s jurisdiction “before the capture of the royal city”. Nor would the Pope listen to Morosini’s request to restore to his jurisdiction the Church of Cyprus. That church was already exempt from the jurisdiction of Constantinople “when it was disobedient to and rebellious against the Church of Rome”. Moreover, he would not allow him to unite episcopal sees without his special permission; for by so doing he was trenching on the Pope’s rights and the emperor’s interests. Hence, with regard to the latter, he urged him “not to interfere with the rights of one who does not interfere with yours”. For, as he wrote elsewhere, “as we do not want laymen to usurp the rights of clerics, so we do not want clerics to usurp the rights of laymen”.

It may be remembered that the papal legate at Constantinople, Peter of Capua, had installed certain clerics in the city without the concurrence of the patriarch, and that, against the patriarch’s protest, Innocent had supported the act of his representative. Morosini, seemingly, had not accepted the situation, and had borne heavily on the said clerics, refusing to recognise them. They appealed to Rome, and, by their proctors, made definite charges against the patriarch. They accused him of plundering their churches after their appeal; of even taking a hundred thousand marks from the treasury of St. Sophia; and of annexing part of the money set aside for the proper support of the legate Benedict. They therefore demanded restitution. They further accused the patriarch of disobedience to the Pope in the matter of perpetually appointing only Venetians to important ecclesiastical positions, and of having sworn to continue so to do.

After Innocent had heard the proctors of both parties “in public consistory”, he appointed a commission to see that the patriarch made restitution of the money he was accused of confiscating, and abjured the oath he was said to have taken. If, said the Pope to Morosini himself, the charges against you are well founded, “behold what fruit we have gathered from a fresh tree. Behold how your actions have offended God, outraged the Apostolic See, injured ecclesiastical liberty, and, in the eyes of kings and peoples, brought disgrace upon the whole Church”.

The finding of the commission, however, was on the whole favourable to the patriarch. Their rather wordy and at times obscure report was issued in the names of three suffragan bishops of Heraclea, viz., the bishops of Selymbria, Panium (Panidensis), and Gallipoli. The bishops began by saying that they knew that it was the Pope’s wish that justice should not be wanting to any one, and that they were aware that it would not be wise for any one to do the Pope’s work carelessly. They then proceeded to show that the patriarch had been calumniated in the matter of the clerical appointments. They urged that he had received the Pope’s letters with the greatest respect, and that, with their aid and that of others, he had endeavoured to ascertain their exact import and to act in accordance with it. He had, moreover, in presence of the clergy of the city, declared : “Brethren, as an obedient son I desire to be ever faithful

and devoted to the commands of the Apostolic See and to the lord Pope Innocent, and never from any cause to cease to be submissive to him". He then, as the commissioners declared, unfolded to the assembled clergy in all simplicity what exactly under pressure he had promised the Venetians. He had sworn, he said, not to accept any one as a canon of St. Sophia unless he were a Venetian and would take a similar oath. He had, however, he said, only made this promise "saving the obedience he owed to the Apostolic See and the oath he had taken to the lord Pope Innocent", and saving any special order that Innocent or his successors might give him on this matter. He had also promised, he continued, to strive that "throughout all Romania" no one but a Venetian should be made an archbishop.

When he had made this confession, proceeded the report, he solemnly abjured his oath, and made the canons also abjure those he had forced them to take. He next recognised all those as canons whom the Pope had ordered him to receive.

Also before the whole clergy he declared that, instead of a hundred thousand marks, he had, in the presence of the canons and with their knowledge, not taken even eighteen thousand marks from the treasury of St. Sophia. Finally, concluded the commissioners, he had just as publicly proved that he was guiltless of having deprived the legate of any "procuration" that was his due.

With the verdict of his commissioners Innocent was no doubt content; but with the money transactions of their patriarch his clergy do not appear to have continued to be content. Again were there complaints to Rome, and again had Innocent to issue instructions to commissioners to see that Tommaso paid certain sums to the clergy "if their contentions were well founded".

From a letter of Innocent dated August 5, 1211, we learn that Morosini was no more. Some six years previously the Pope had laid down the manner in which his successor was to be elected. All the heads of religious houses had to meet in the great church of St. Sophia along with the canons of the cathedral. The new patriarch was then to be chosen by the unanimous vote of this assembly, or by the vote of its "greater and more respectable portion".

From what has been already said of the jealousy between the Venetians and the Franks, a disputed election might have been anticipated. Surrounded by an armed band of their countrymen who established themselves in the cathedral and threatened death or mutilation to such as should oppose the election of the Venetians, a section of the Venetian canons elected their dean. The rest of the electors appealed to Rome, and begged the Pope to select one of the three whose names they presented to him, viz., the bishop of Cremona, Cardinal Peter, or Master Robert de Courçon or Curzon, a canon of Paris. Owing, however, to the uncanonical nature of the proceedings. Innocent ordered a new election altogether. Unfortunately, the factious feelings continued. A fresh election again only resulted in the election of rival candidates; and the Pope sent first his notary Maximus and then the legate Pelagius to administer the patriarchate and to strive for the settlement of the election. The final candidates, the archbishop of Heraclea and the parish priest of St. Paul's *de Venetiis*, came to Rome at the time of the Lateran Council (1215) to plead their respective causes. Regarding it as the best way out of this

interminable trouble, Innocent for the second time set aside the rival candidates, and put an end to the four years' dispute by the nomination of the Tuscan priest Gervase.

As we have already had occasion to note, when Innocent heard of the outrageous conduct of the Crusaders at the capture of Constantinople, he expressed a strong fear that they had destroyed the possibility of unity between the Greek and the Latin Churches. He was not, however, the man to let things drift. For, as he wrote, "now that the Empire has been transferred from the Greeks to the Latins, the rights and customs of the Church must also be transferred, so that Ephraim, having returned to the land of Judah may, after the expulsion of the old leaven, be nourished with the azymes of sincerity and truth. In order, therefore, that the Greek Church may be thoroughly instructed in piety and in the purity of the faith, according to the institutions of the holy Roman Church, we, who have the care of all the churches, and whom in the person of Blessed Peter the Lord commanded to feed His sheep, wishing to visit that Church in person as it is our very special daughter, are unable to do so, inasmuch as we are more than usually overwhelmed by pressing business; and hence we send our beloved son, Benedict, cardinal-priest of St. Susanna. He is a man of great prudence and learning, and will be able to do what is necessary".

By every means in his power, then, did Innocent work with the greatest perseverance to bring about the religious union of the East and the West. Especially did he hope that by issuing conciliatory instructions for the treatment of the Greek clergy he might bring about that union which was so dear to his heart. But though his moderate regulations caused the Greek Church to be "better treated than might have been expected", they did not heal the wounds which had been caused by a century and a half of schism, and which the violent deeds of the Crusaders had aggravated.

Innocent was, in the first place, naturally most anxious to induce the Greek bishops to accept the new regime, and to return to the sees whence they had fled. He would have them summoned to return not once only but many times, and he would have sentence of suspension and excommunication issued against them in the hope of forcing them to return, before he would allow their sees to be filled up. Even then he would not have them degraded, nor were they to be compelled to be anointed when they submitted to Rome. Although new Greek bishops were to be consecrated according to the Latin rite, still Greeks, if loyal to the Pope, were to be nominated for sees where the population was Greek. On the other hand, the Greeks were not to be compelled to use the Latin rite; and if Innocent insisted that they must pay tithes, he would have their rights of ecclesiastical patronage respected, and would not allow their monastic establishments to be handed over to secular canons if a sufficient number of regulars, whether Greek or Latin, could be found to keep them up. In fine, not only did he exhort the Franks to send suitable men to bring about the reconciliation of the Greeks, but he earnestly begged those Greek bishops who had become reconciled to Rome to exert themselves to bring over their brethren.

Unfortunately, Innocent was not always well represented. Among others who did not at times do justice to their master was the legate Pelagius, who succeeded the amiable Benedict at Constantinople. But it must be borne in mind that what is said against him comes from the pen of a Greek (George Acropolites), who was not exactly

his contemporary, for he was only born (1217) after the events we are about to narrate had taken place. According then to Acropolites there arrived “in the queen of cities” during the reign of the Emperor Henry, whom he praises for his considerate treatment of his countrymen, a prelate, Pelagius by name, “who is called a legate, and who was entrusted with all the papal prerogatives. He wore scarlet buskins, and was clad in robes of the same colour. Even the saddle-cloth and bridle of his horse were of the same tint. But he was a man of rough character, and full of insolence, and hence inflicted much misery on the inhabitants of Constantinople. He compelled all to bow in subjection to old Rome. Monks were imprisoned, priests were cast into chains, and all their churches were shut up. Moreover, it was necessary to acknowledge the Pope as the first of bishops, and to make mention of his name in solemn services, or die the death.

“Much cast down at this, the chief men of the city went to the emperor and thus addressed him: ‘We are men of another race and have another chief priest, and we submit to your power so that you may rule our bodies, but not our souls. We must fight for you in war, but we cannot abandon what we revere and hold sacred. Either then save us from the evils that have come upon us, or permit us to withdraw to our countrymen’. Unwilling to lose so many excellent men, the emperor, against the will of the legate, reopened the churches, set free the monks and priests, and calmed the agitation. Many monks and priests, however, “continues the historian”, had already betaken themselves to the emperor Theodore Lascaris at Nicaea.

But, despite all the efforts of Innocent, and despite the fact that here and there individual Greeks submitted to Rome, and here and there a group of them, still very little substantial progress was made in the direction of ecclesiastical unity. More harm than good was done to the cause of the reunion of the Greek and the Latin Churches by the Latin capture of Constantinople. Driven on by their blind prepossessions “in favour of their own national prejudices and ecclesiastical practices”, the Greeks threw away their last chance of social advancement and of ultimate salvation from the power of the Turk in rejecting communion with Rome. “It must be remembered”, writes Finlay, “that the papal Church was at this time often actively engaged in defending freedom, in establishing a machinery for the systematic administration of justice to the people, and in impressing men with the full value of fixed laws for the purpose of restraining the abuses of the temporal power of princes. In short, the papal Church was then the great teacher of social and political reform, and those who scorned to listen to its words and study its policy could hardly perceive the changes which time was producing in the Christian world”. But the Greeks would have none of the Papacy, and, though they were destined in a few years to recover Constantinople from the Latins, their national prosperity was over, and they were to be devoured piecemeal by the Turk.

Meanwhile, however, Innocent did what he could to help the Latin Empire in its difficulties. He had not, indeed, approved of its establishment, but he saw that in this instance there was nothing for it but to accept accomplished facts. He did so perhaps the more readily because, at first at any rate, he hoped that the capture of the city would prove advantageous to the Crusades, and also to the cause of unity between the Greek and the Latin Churches. Although, with regard to the latter matter, he always feared that the violent seizure of the city would rather retard than accelerate the desired union.

It was not long before the Latin Empire stood greatly in need of help. The Greeks summoned to their aid Jonitza (Joannisa) or Caloian, king of the Bulgarians and Vlachs (or Wallachians), one of the founders of the second Bulgarian empire. The first Bulgarian empire was brought to an end in 1018 by the Byzantine Emperor Basil II, the Slayer of the Bulgarians. Then, for over a hundred and fifty years, the Bulgars were subject to the Greeks both politically and ecclesiastically. Not many years before the capture of Constantinople by the Latins, the oppressive conduct of the Greek tax-gatherers caused the Bulgarians to rise. They placed themselves under the leadership of the family of Asen, and founded a fresh Bulgarian kingdom, after having allied themselves to the Vlachs, as they were called by the Greeks, or Roumanians as they are called now. These latter were the descendants of Trajan's Dacian colonists, who had been forced by their enemies into the highlands, whence during the twelfth century they had poured down into the plains, and had penetrated even into Greece. Hence in that century Thessaly came to be known as Great Wallachia. This second Vlacho-Bulgarian empire lasted from about 1186 to 1398, when, after having passed for a time under Servian domination in 1330, it fell, along with all the southern Slav powers, before the destroying hand of the Turks at the terrible battle of Kossovo (1389).

Baldwin, who was as brave as a lion, took the field against his enemies, but was overwhelmed by them at Adrianople, and fell into their hands (April 1205). No more is known with certainty of the unfortunate monarch than that, in the words of Innocent, "he ended his days in the enemy's prison". He was succeeded by his brother, Henry, first as regent, and then, after it seemed certain that his brother was dead, as emperor (August 20, 1206).

One of the first acts of the regent, who proved himself a most capable ruler, was to inform Innocent of the disaster which had so soon overtaken the new Empire, and to implore his assistance. Writing from the famous old palace of Blachernae, and signing himself "the moderator of the Empire", he told the Pope of the rebellion of the Greeks, "ever prone, from their innate malice and wonted perfidy, to be traitors", of their alliance with Jonitza, "the lord of the Blachi", and of the capture of his brother. He went on to say that intercepted letters, which he is forwarding along with a translation "to your apostleship", prove that Jonitza is forming alliances "with the Turks and the other enemies of the Cross of Christ". As "their father, as the patron of their cause, and as their lord", it behoves the Pope to take cognisance of their difficulties, the more so because it is "the general view of all the Christians living in the East" and especially of the Knights Templars and of the Hospitallers, that on the maintenance of the Latin Empire depend both the liberation of the Holy Land and the unity of the Church. "Realising, therefore, as we have done from the very beginning, that we are of ourselves incapable of accomplishing this great work, we turn to you as to the greatest and chiefest, nay, as to the only refuge and foundation of our hopes. We are giving our lives for the Roman Church, and we know that we are closely bound to your paternity and you to us as your soldiers, and as men in the service of the Roman Church". Henry brought his earnest appeal to an end by imploring the Pope to rouse the West to march to the assistance of the new Empire, by offering the same indulgences to those who came to its help as to those "who spent a whole year in Syria in the service of the Crucified".

To this epistle Innocent sent a hurried answer urging Henry to make peace at once “with our most beloved son Caloian, king of the Bulgarians and Bla(n)chi”. Then he set to work to induce both those already in the East, and others who were leaving Europe, to take up vigorously the protection of the Latin Empire in the interests of the Holy Land.

About the same time he wrote to Caloian himself to urge him by the favour he had done him in sending him a regal crown, and by the danger he was in himself from a great army then setting out from the West to Greece, and from the Hungarians, to make peace with the Latins and to liberate Baldwin. In his reply, however, the Bulgarian king told the Pope that the Latins had spurned the offers of peace which he made them on their capture of Constantinople, and that consequently, under the banner of St. Peter adorned with his keys which he had received from Rome, he had to defend himself against false Crusaders. He could not comply with the Pope’s wishes with regard to Baldwin, because he had died in prison.

Innocent’s zeal for the defence of the new Empire was quickened by another letter from Henry imploring help after a fresh defeat of the Latins at Rossa (January 1206). “To you”, wrote Henry, “as to the Father of all, nay, as to our special Father, do we have recourse in the midst of our troubles”. The reply of Innocent was practical. He induced a body of Crusaders to proceed forthwith to Constantinople, and he again wrote “to the illustrious king of the Bulgarians”, who had meanwhile assured the Pope that he was ready to give his head for him, begging him to make a truce or peace with the Emperor Henry. Soon after this the vigorous Caloian was murdered, and was succeeded by Boris or Boril, a feeble usurper.

Thereupon Henry, helped by his own energy and talent, and constantly supported by Innocent, who had meanwhile tried to induce Theodore Lascaris, now emperor of Nicaea, to acknowledge his overlordship, succeeded in making headway against his enemies, and was soon able to report to the Pope a decisive victory over Boris at Philippopolis. At the same time he declared that “unless our territory and empire is guided by your patronage, it will certainly succumb. We can do nothing without you”.

Shortly afterwards, Henry made his Empire secure on the north by marrying Boril’s beautiful daughter (1209).

Henry, the ablest of the Latin rulers of Constantinople, passed the whole of his life in fighting against the internal and external foes of the new Empire, and predeceased Innocent by a few weeks (June 1216). His declaration, “We can do nothing without you”, sums up the Pope’s political relations with the Latin Empire. If that unfortunate creation lasted fifty years instead of five, it was due to the sustaining hand of Innocent III.

The following extracts from two of his letters give us an insight into the spirit, and into some of the ways, in which he gave his support. “We embrace your imperial highness”, he said, “in such a spirit of affection that we are filled with an earnest desire to grant your petitions if we can do so with due regard to the honour of God and our own. Wherefore, dearest son in Christ, giving ear to your request, by the authority of these presents we grant your serenity permission to exact fealty for the temporalities granted them by you from the archbishops and bishops of your own (immediate)

territory, and from such others prelates throughout the Empire as you can exact it without scandal. This we grant on the understanding that the temporalities are of such a nature that, in return for their like, fealty is wont to be offered to other secular princes”.

“Supporting you, as a special son of the Apostolic See, with the arms of love, I will never fail you”, wrote Innocent to Henry, “but my hand shall help you, and my right arm strengthen you, so that, with the help of God, your enemies may never be able to prevail against you, but you may rather prevail against them”.

If, however. Pope and emperor were in complete agreement on the more important political questions affecting the new Empire, the same cannot be said with reference to the more important ecclesiastical affairs. The conquerors were disposed to regard the rights and property of the Church as the spoils of war, and to act as though it were theirs to deal with them as with the goods and chattels of the conquered state. And so when the leaders of the Crusaders and the Venetians drew up their compact, March 1204, before the final seizure of Constantinople, they agreed that as much of the ecclesiastical property of the city should be assigned to the new Latin clergy as would enable them “to live honourably”. Such an assumption of right over Church property was not likely to be tolerated by Innocent, who, as head of the Church Catholic, regarded all questions of the property of the Church as coming ultimately under his jurisdiction. Hence, when he was asked to confirm the treaty of partition, he made it plain by various letters, addressed to the Doge Dandolo, to the Emperor Baldwin and others, that, as the treaty constantly set forth that all was done “for the honour of the Roman Church”, it was impossible for him to confirm the clauses relative to the division of Church property. It must not, he said, be touched until the arrival of the new patriarch; and it was not to be expected that he would confirm what might prove an injustice to the patriarch and to the Church.

This determined stand of the Pope brought about a pause in the designs of the Crusading leaders. At last, however, a concordat was arranged between the legate Benedict and the patriarch Tommaso on the one hand, and the regent Henry and his barons on the other (March 1206), which, “considering the necessities of the times”, Innocent ordered to be observed.

The *pagina concordiae vel pactionis*, as the Pope calls it, contained various provisions; but the most important one was that the Church was to receive, with certain comparatively small exceptions, a fifteenth of the property outside the walls of Constantinople taken by the Crusaders, as also a fifteenth part of certain dues paid to the State, and the usual tithes from the Latins, and, if “exhortation” can procure them, from the Greeks also. Finally, clerics and their property, “according to the more liberal custom of France”, were to be free from all lay jurisdiction.

But it was one thing to bind the emperor, and quite another to bind men who paid little obedience to anyone. Innocent’s registers contain many letters addressed to various more or less independent barons of the empire of Romania, bidding them refrain from seizing ecclesiastical property, usurping different Church rights, and favouring the Greeks at the expense of the Latins, and at the same time ordering them to pay tithes. By degrees, however, a more regular state of things set in, helped considerably by two important concordats at Ravenika. The first was held in May 1210; was approved by

Innocent; and regulated the relations between the Church and the feudal lords of northern Greece. In the presence of the archbishops of Heraclea, Larissa, Athens, Neopatras, and of many bishops, of our historian Geoffrey of Villehardouin, “the marshal of the whole empire of Romania”, and of other nobles, it was agreed that all churches and ecclesiastical property generally in the kingdom of Salonika and in all the country up to Corinth should be “entrusted, free from all feudal services, to the Latin patriarch (Tommaso), as representing the Pope. On the other hand, it was stipulated that the clergy, whether Greek or Latin, should pay the old Byzantine *akrostichon*, or land-tax, to the temporal authorities”. It was not, however, till the year 1223 that this concordat, somewhat amplified (*i.e.* the *resignatio Ravenicae ampliata*, as the second agreement is described), was accepted for southern Greece at another assembly of Ravenika, and received the approval of Honorius III.

It is not, however, to be supposed that these concordats put an end to all usurpations of ecclesiastical rights even with regard to the matters discussed by their signatories. Such adventurers as Otho de la Roche, lord of Athens, were not to be easily bound by oaths and treaties. But, of course, not all the points of possible adverse contact between the Church and State could be settled at two or three conferences. Accordingly, we find Innocent having to threaten the Emperor Henry and certain of his barons with ecclesiastical censures, if they persisted in forcing regulations of mortmain. Henry, moreover, had also to be urged to punish rather than favour those whose excesses had brought upon themselves the sentence of excommunication.

But it was not the lay lords who gave Innocent all the trouble. A great many of his letters are addressed the erring ecclesiastics, many of whom were just as much pure adventurers as the majority of the barons.

Although Innocent exempted certain sees from archi-episcopal jurisdiction, and, on account of poverty, occasionally allowed a temporary junction of two sees, he does not appear to have otherwise attempted to alter the organisation of the Byzantine hierarchy as he found it at the time of the capture of the city. At that period the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople was limited to Thrace, Macedonia, and Greece, and to a few provinces in the north-west of Asia Minor. But the new Latin patriarchs can never have had much sway in Asia Minor, as the recently founded Greek empire of Nicaea soon deprived the “Franks” of any little hold they had had there. Under the immediate jurisdiction, therefore, of the patriarch of Constantinople were the metropolitan sees of Heraclea (in the province of Europe), Philippopolis (Thrace), Hadrianople (Haemimontus), and Trajanopolis (Rhodope), with their subject archiepiscopal and episcopal sees. In Macedonia there were Philippi and Thessalonica, in ancient days the seat of the papal vicar of the province of eastern Illyricum. Finally, in Greece the chief sees were, in the north, Athens, Larissa, Naupaktos, Neopatras, Thebes; and in the south, *i.e.*, in the principality of Achaia, were Corinth, Patras, Lacedaemonia, and Argos, and the island sees of Naxos (for the Cyclades), Corfu, the ancient Corcyra, and Gortyna in Crete. With regard to the personnel of these sees, it may be said that Innocent would have touched it as little as the organisation of their sees, if only their bishops would have submitted to Rome.

The new Latin occupants of some of these sees differed but little in many respects from their lay compeers. Like all feudal potentates, some of them were desirous of freeing themselves from the control of their immediate superior, and of extending their own jurisdiction. Others, like mere adventurers, were anxious to get as much profit as they could out of their dioceses and to do as little as possible for them. Hence came innumerable letters from Innocent, written with the object of promoting ideas of justice and peace among the members of the new hierarchy.

Bishops were urged to obey their archbishops; for it not unfrequently happened that, relying on the secular power or on the unsettled state of the country, certain bishops “refused to render to their ecclesiastical superiors that obedience and reverence which were their due”. Then it was necessary to impress upon many of them, especially upon those in Achaia, where it took longer than in other parts of the new empire to evolve law and order, that they must be content with the already fixed boundaries of their diocese. Moreover, in their zeal to defend their real or supposed rights, many of the new hierarchy were disposed to use the spiritual weapon of excommunication much too freely. They must be more chary in its employment. Again it was the episcopate of Achaia that was mostly at fault, so that the Pope averred that “the new plantation of Latins which the hand of God has transplanted to Achaia seems, in consequence of this recent transplantation, to have less firm roots”.

Even the evil of clerical non-residence had struck its roots in Achaia as well as in other parts of the Greek patriarchate; for most, if not all, of the letters addressed by Innocent to different ecclesiastical authorities urging them to stop the revenues of those clerics who did not serve their own churches, were addressed to bishops in Achaia, *i.e.*, in the Morea. Among the other prelates addressed on this subject by Innocent was the archbishop of Athens, a see which he had greatly favoured on account of its glorious history. “The implanting of divine grace did not cause the glory of the city of Athens to fade away. In its first foundation it displayed, as it were, the figure of the faith that was to come to it hereafter; for the worship which, in its three divisions, it paid to three false deities it changed at length to worship of the three persons of the true and undivided Trinity. It changed, moreover, its zeal for the wisdom of this world into a desire for heavenly wisdom, and the citadel of the most famous Pallas has been humbled to become the seat of the most glorious Mother of the true God; for the city long since acquired the knowledge of Him to whom when unknown it had erected an altar. This city of illustrious name and perfect beauty, at first teaching philosophy, and afterwards instructed in the faith of the apostles, whilst it imbued the poets with literature and then expounded the prophets by means of its literary skill, was known as the mother of the arts, and the city of letters. This city ... we may call Cariath-sepher; and after Othoniel had reduced it to the rule of Caleb, the latter ‘gave him his daughter Axa to wife’ (Judges I. 12, 13)”. It was with his mind full of the glories of Athens, then for the most part passed away, that Innocent confirmed the privileges and property of its see. In a word, it may be said that, as though he had nothing else to occupy his mind, he devoted himself heart and soul to the well-nigh impossible task of introducing into the Eastern Empire new ecclesiastical machinery, and of making it run smoothly.

CHAPTER III THE COUNTRIES OF THE EAST OF EUROPE

HUNGARY.

OF all the countries in the Near East, the one in which the Papacy had perhaps the greatest interest was Hungary. Ever since their conversion to Christianity at the end of the tenth century, the Hungarians had been specially attached to the Holy See. Their sainted sovereign King Stephen I, who stands to them as Alfred the Great stands to us, or as St. Louis IX stands to the French, had received his crown from Rome, and his successors had in turn been loyal to the Popes, owning allegiance to them, and supporting them energetically in the work of the Crusades.

A year or two before Innocent became Pope, the enlightened Hungarian monarch, Bela III, died (1196). He had made avow to take the Cross, but his last illness overtook him before he had time to fulfil his vow, and he charged his younger son Andrew to fulfil it in his behalf.

The death of Bela III, whose devotion to the Holy See is praised by the Pope, brought trouble to Hungary and to the Pope. Of Bela's sons, the eldest, Emeric (Imré or Henry), his successor, was a man somewhat wanting in energy, whereas the second son, Andrew, was at once ambitious and pushing. On pretence of fulfilling his father's vow, he collected men and money, and then used them with no little success against his brother. Emeric appealed to Rome for help, and first Celestine III and then Innocent III exerted themselves in his behalf. In his interests Innocent permitted many important men in the kingdom to put off the fulfilment of their vow to take the Cross till tranquillity should be restored to the kingdom; summoned before him ecclesiastics who were said to be supporting Andrew; exhorted that prince honestly to fulfil the vow he had freely made to take the Cross, under penalty of not succeeding to the crown of Hungary should Emeric die without an heir (January 1198); and warned him that he had instructed the bishops of Hungary to excommunicate him and his followers, and to lay their territories under an interdict, if they should venture to wage war on King Emeric. And, as justifying this strong action in the internal affairs of Hungary, Innocent wrote thus to "the noble man, Duke Andrew": "Such devotion has ever joined the kingdom of Hungary to the Holy See, and such sincere love has ever united the Church to that kingdom, that the Apostolic See has always, both in spiritual and temporal concerns, bestowed upon it true fatherly solicitude, and the kingdom of Hungary in turn has never in any emergency separated itself from the faith and unity of the Apostolic See".

But Andrew paid no heed either to the claims of his elder brother or to the threats of Innocent, the suzerain of Hungary. Emeric, who styled himself, "by the grace of God, king of Hungary, Dalmatia, Croatia, and Rama" (which then embraced part of Bosnia and Herzegovina), had again to face a fresh effort made by Andrew to deprive him of

his kingdom. On this occasion he was successful, and Andrew had to fly to the protection of the duke of Austria, from whom he had already received support (1199).

More than ever anxious for permanent peace between the two brothers, inasmuch as the Fourth Crusade was in active preparation, Innocent despatched Gregory, cardinal-deacon of Sta. Maria in Aquiro, to negotiate between the rivals (March 2, 1200). He considered, he said, “the prosperity and adversity of Hungary as his own”. By the efforts of the cardinal a peace was arranged, and both brothers agreed to take the Cross. But they did not trust one another, and when Innocent tried to put pressure upon Emeric to fulfil his vow he was told that, owing to the enmity of Culin the Ban of Bosnia, the bishops of Hungary declared it was not safe for the king to leave the country. The Pope could, therefore, only urge him to take the Cross “if it could be done without danger to the kingdom” (November 8, 1200). Before the end of the year fresh difficulties arose. The Venetians succeeded in inducing the Crusaders to seize Zara, then under the sway of Hungary; and in the beginning of the year 1203 Emeric, now calling himself king of Hungary, Dalmatia, Croatia, Rama, and Servia, after thanking Innocent for the way in which he had upbraided the Crusaders for their conduct, begged him to continue his exertions for the restoration of Zara to its rightful owner.

When the Pope had to some extent been able to satisfy Emeric’s just demands, he again urged the question of a Crusade. To encourage him “to lead the pilgrims to their fatherland”, Innocent ordered the bishops of Hungary to cause all to take the oath of fealty to his son, the young Ladislaus, and he assured the king that he would be responsible for his kingdom in his absence. Still further to facilitate matters, he, as it would appear, again sent Gregory, now cardinal-priest of St. Vitalis, to arrange a final understanding between the two brothers. But, as it would seem, immediately after the departure of the cardinal, hostilities once more broke out between them. They ended in the capture and incarceration of Andrew (October? 1203). Hence, when, in November, Innocent was confirming the agreement made by Cardinal Gregory, and exhorting Emeric to help Andrew to lead a Crusade, that monarch had him a prisoner in a fortress.

Trusting, no doubt, that the seizure of Andrew had now smoothed the way for Emeric’s departure for the Holy Land, Innocent gave the archbishop of Gran permission to crown Ladislaus, “though he was a minor”, on condition of his receiving “from the father in person the oath concerning obedience to the Apostolic See and the liberty of the Hungarian Church which his predecessors had taken with humble dutifulness” (1204).

But now Emeric’s relations with neighbouring states not only prevented him from going to the Holy Land, but brought about trouble with Rome. At this time the Balkan Peninsula was in a ferment. Bulgaria, as we have seen, had thrown off its allegiance to Constantinople, was striving to enlarge its boundaries, and had designs on Servia, of which Emeric called himself king. Its monarch, Jonitza, was also trying to obtain a regal crown from Rome. At the same time Stephen II, “the first crowned”, the Megajupan of Servia, was working for the same object. Culin, the Ban of Bosnia, was endeavouring to keep himself independent of Emeric, and was for that purpose favouring the Bogomilian heretics. And if Emeric also called himself king of Dalmatia, he had as little real power in Dalmatia as he had in Servia; for Vulcan (Voukan), the

brother of Stephen II of Servia, was, as he styled himself, king of Dioclea and Dalmatia. To comply with the Bulgarian demands, Innocent had despatched Leo, cardinal-priest of Sta. Croce, to crown Jonitza. The cardinal in passing through Hungary was well received, but when he was about to enter Bulgaria he was suddenly stopped by order of Emeric, and had, with his suite, to submit to a most humiliating confinement. At the same time Emeric expressed his indignant surprise that the Pope should think of crowning an upstart Bulgar who, in the first place, had no right to any territory at all, and, in the second place, had dared to attack Servian lands subject to the crown of Hungary.

In his replies to Emeric, sent both directly and through his legate, Innocent expressed his grief and astonishment at the conduct of the Hungarian monarch, impressing upon him in a small note (*cedula interclusa*), enclosed in the principal letter, that he had written to him in a milder strain than the occasion demanded, because he did not wish it to be thought that he had lost the apostolic favour. Then, in detailed answer to the king's protests, he pointed out that the Bulgarian Jonitza was the descendant of a race of kings who had long before received crowns from the Holy See; that the Greeks had ruined the independence of the Bulgarian people; and that Jonitza and his brother Peter had just begun to recover the territory of their fathers. He regretted that Jonitza had attacked Emeric's territory; he would arrange an understanding between the two rulers, and would instruct his legate to crown Jonitza as king only of his own territory. "Because, although we love Jonitza, we love you incomparably more".

With regard to Servia, Innocent said that he would remind Emeric that Stephen (II, known as the "first crowned"), the Megajupan of Servia, had promised to bring back his country to the Roman obedience and had asked for a crown. This request, continued Innocent, we granted, and sent the cardinal-bishop of Albano to bestow the crown; but when we found that this would "greatly displease your highness, we, not without confusion, withdrew from the undertaking". But after you had overcome Stephen (1202) and replaced him by his younger brother Vulcan (or Voukan), you intimated that you wished to bring back Servia to the obedience of the Roman Church, and that you were willing that Vulcan should receive a crown from Rome, if it were worn with subjection to yourself. Do not", concluded the Pope, "hinder the spread of the Catholic faith, or of the influence of the Apostolic See".

The representations or protests of the legate, however, had already prevailed, and he continued his journey and crowned Jonitza.

This incident was barely closed when Emeric died (December 1204), and Innocent practically found himself in the position of guardian of his youthful son Ladislaus. The dying king had trustfully commended his son to his brother Andrew, whom he had released from prison for the purpose. The new regent at once notified his position to Innocent, who exhorted him to be true to the youth, and called upon all the nobles and bishops of the country to be loyal to the young king and to those who were his tutors.

But Ladislaus did not survive his father a year and a half (May 1205), and Andrew at last reached the throne he had so long desired. Innocent felt himself regretfully compelled to refuse the new king's first request, but he showed his goodwill

towards him by ordering all the nobles of Hungary to take the oath of fealty to Andrew's son as soon as he should be born.

Unfortunately, the new king's wife, Gertrude, daughter of the duke of Merania in the Tyrol, was an avaricious, unscrupulous woman anxious only to forward the interests of her countrymen. Among others whom she wished to benefit was her brother (*germanus*) Berthold, provost of Bamberg, whom she desired to see archbishop of the vacant see of Colocsa. In response to Andrew's request that the Pope would acknowledge the provost and send him the pallium, Innocent replied that he would gladly confirm the election of one whom the king had declared useful and even necessary for his kingdom, but he must first be informed as to the age and learning of the candidate. The result of the inquiry into these points ordered by the Pope was unfavourable to Berthold. Innocent, accordingly, told the king that he much regretted that the candidate's age and want of learning were such that he could not confirm his election, seeing that an archbishop had to be "a father of fathers and a master of masters". Some months later, however, in consequence of a renewed request for Berthold on the part of the canons of the cathedral of Colocsa, supported, of course, by the king, Innocent gave way, as he was assured that the candidate's knowledge was at least competent, that he was of good character, and that his election was necessary and useful. But he soon had cause to regret his condescension. Reports reached him that, not content with staying in his archiepiscopal palace, Berthold was going from place to place, and making a public display of his ignorance. Innocent blamed the king for putting pressure on him to confirm the election of such a man, and urged him to support the order which he had given the archbishop to return to his cathedral city, and study under able men. If Berthold will not do this, then, said the Pope, "what we have built up by circumvention, we will destroy by circumspection".

But Berthold was well supported by the queen, and neither of them would pause in that career of aggrandisement which was in a brief space to bring Gertrude to a violent death, and to make Andrew himself bitterly regret that in promoting Berthold he had incurred the hatred of his people.

Meanwhile, though Innocent had confirmed the general privileges of the archbishop of Gran (the ancient Strigonium), and also the special ones, such as his right to crown the Hungarian king, Berthold did not hesitate to attack them. When the Pope was duly informed by the king of the strife between the two archbishops—strife like to that between York and Canterbury, Dublin and Armagh, and other prelates similarly situated in different countries—, he begged the king to try to settle the matter along with the disputants, their suffragans and others. Innocent's advice was acted upon, and a settlement of their respective claims was drawn up which was duly despatched for his confirmation. The archbishop of Gran was to have the first right to crown the king, and was to have a tenth part of the profit of all the mints in Hungary. He was not, however, to have any other rights with regard to the province of Colocsa.

In giving a general confirmation to this agreement, Innocent excepted the ambiguous clause about the first crowning, and pointed out the importance of definitely settling the question as to who had the right of crowning the sovereign. "Disputes", he wrote, "have often arisen between the coheirs of the kingdom of Hungary for the

possession of its crown; and these disputes would arise the more readily if there could be found different men who had each the right to crown the king". Hence he could not and ought not to confirm the said clause. The Pope's ruling was seemingly accepted, for when granting Andrew a further delay of three years for the fulfilment of his vow to go to the help of the Holy Land, he said there was now an agreement between the two archbishops which was satisfactory to him.

But before the year in which these words were written had closed, both the queen and her brother had paid heavily for their unscrupulous treatment of the people. When the king was fighting the Ruthenians in Galicia, Gertrude was murdered by a furious body of Hungarians (at the close of the year 1213), while Berthold, with his German clerics, was so maltreated that he was glad to escape to Germany with his life. By a letter dated January 7, 1214, Innocent ordered the bishops of Hungary to excommunicate those who had outraged the archbishop of Colocsa and his clergy. But a letter which he received soon after from Andrew must have lessened his zeal in Berthold's behalf, and turned his thoughts into another channel. The king informed the Pope in the first place that the Ruthenians or Galicians had submitted to him, had asked him to give them his son Coloman to be their king, and had promised submission to the See of Rome if only they might be allowed to retain their own peculiar rites. As delay in these matters might be dangerous, Andrew begged the Pope to allow the archbishop of Gran to crown his son at once, and receive from him his oath of obedience to the Roman See. He next informed Innocent that he was making active preparations for the Crusade, and, as he intended to make the archbishop of Gran and other ecclesiastical officials guardians of the kingdom in his absence, he asked the Pope to free them from the obligation of their visit *ad limina*. He then proceeded to ask the Pope to excommunicate the authors of the late outrages, and, "because we believe it is contained in your Register", to send him a copy of his decision relative to the coronation rights of the archbishop of Gran, as the original was stolen at the time of the murder of his wife "of happy memory".

Finally, with his heart full of the bitterness of outraged feelings, he explained to the Pope that the archbishop of Colocsa, "a man of our peace", for whose sake he had incurred his people's hate, had gone off with the treasure, amounting to about seven thousand marks, which the queen had amassed for the benefit of her children. He besought the Pope to enforce the restitution of the treasure.

The unfortunate loss of the letters of the last two years of Innocent's pontificate prevents us from knowing what precise answer the Pope addressed to this most interesting communication. It is, however, believed that he succeeded in securing the restoration of the treasure, for it is known that in 1218 Berthold became patriarch of Aquileia.

After what we have now seen of Innocent's action in Hungary, we can have no difficulty in accepting the conclusions of Marczalis, one of Hungary's latest historians. He says that the action of the Papacy on his country at this period was most beneficial. Had it not been for the controlling hand of the Popes, the clergy of Hungary, as corrupt as they were rich, would have become completely secularised. And if the Popes had great power in Hungary, their power "was in the hearts of the Hungarian people. Two

centuries of intercourse with Rome had prepared them to venerate in the successor of St. Peter the source of their moral strength and their comfort in the hour of trial”.

BULGARIA.

The preceding narrative dealing with the Latin Empire of Constantinople, and with Hungary, has already called our attention to Bulgaria, and to its renewed assertion of national freedom. The founders of this second Bulgarian empire are said by Innocent to have been two Wallachian or Roumanian brothers, Peter and John, to whom the Greek historians Nicetas and George Acropolites add a third, Asen, who was no doubt the eldest. John, known as Jonitza, and also, to the Latins, as Calojan or Little John, and to the Greeks as Scylo-Joannes or Puppy John, succeeded Asen in the leadership of the now independent Bulgarians (1197-1207).

It was with this Bulgarian chief that Innocent, hearing that he was anxious to free his people even from ecclesiastical dependence on Constantinople, entered into correspondence. He sent “to the Lord of the Blaci and the Bulgarians”, Dominic, the archpriest of Brindisi, “a man skilled in both the Greek and Latin tongue”. The archpriest, despite all the difficulties of the journey, succeeded in reaching his destination, and presented to the Bulgarian ruler a letter from the Pope addressed to the noble man Jonitza”. After speaking of the success with which God had blessed his arms, Innocent went on to say that, after he had heard of his Roman origin, and of his affection for the Apostolic See, he had for some time intended to write to him. Hitherto a multitude of concerns had prevented him from carrying out his intention. At length, however, he has found time to write to him to confirm him in his attachment to the Holy See. He is sending him the archpriest of the Greeks of Brindisi, to whom he would be glad if he would make known his mind. When, through the report of the archpriest, he has learnt the sincerity of his intentions, he will send him more distinguished envoys, or even legates *a latere*, to confirm him and his people in their devotion to the Apostolic See, and to make known his goodwill towards him.

Sometime, seemingly during the course of the year 1202, there arrived in Rome a letter from Calojan, “emperor of the Bulgarians and Blaci”, as he called himself. It is to be found in Innocent’s Register, “translated from Bulgarian into Greek, and thence into Latin”. Jonitza assured the Pope that he valued the letter he had received from him more than gold or precious stones, and he thanked God for bringing him back “to the memory of the blood and of the country whence we are descended”. He told “the head of all faithful Christians” that his brothers before him and he himself had often wished to send envoys to him, but had not been able to do so. He is, however, now sending him the bishop-elect of Brandizuberen to offer him his submission as his spiritual son, to inform him of his wish to be incorporated in the Roman Church, and to receive from it a crown; for he had learnt from the ancient books of Bulgaria that his predecessors, Peter and Samuel and others, had received crowns from the Pope. He excused himself for his long delay in replying to the Pope’s letter on the ground that many men had come into his country with intent to deceive him, and it had taken him some time to verify the credentials of the archpriest Dominic.

At the same time there came a letter from Basil, the archbishop of Zagora or Ternovo, “to the most honoured and most holy Supreme Pontiff the Pope”, offering him “as to his spiritual father, health, joy, and reverence”. “Although”, the archbishop began, “we cannot pay you our homage in our own persons, we do so in spirit. We rejoiced to see your envoy Dominic, as we ardently desired the favour of the Apostolic See. Both our emperor and we ourselves have for many years desired in vain to enter into communication with you. We are thankful to God that you have sent to us, and we all beg you to grant our emperor’s requests: because he and his whole empire have great devotion to the Roman Church, as being descended from the blood of the Romans”.

In his reply to Caloian, “the lord of the Blaci and the Bulgarians”, Innocent showed himself cautious, because, though the papal registers showed indeed that many Bulgarian kings had received crowns from Rome, they also showed that, corrupted by Greek gifts, and circumvented by Greek promises, the Bulgarians had expelled the Roman clergy and had received Greek priests. The remembrance of such levity, he wrote, has prevented him from sending at present a cardinal to Bulgaria, but he has sent John, the chief of his chaplains, to organise the Church in Bulgaria, and, with the aid of neighbouring Catholic bishops, to consecrate such bishops as may be needed. By him, too, he has sent, in order that it may be given to Basil, “the pallium, the emblem of the plenitude of episcopal power”, and he has commissioned him to examine the ancient books of Bulgaria, in order to find out all the details connected with the sending of the crowns from Rome to Caloian’s predecessors. On the receipt of his chaplain’s report, he will know how to act.

In answer to Basil, the Pope rejoiced that he had recognised the magisterium (*i.e.*, the teaching authority) of the Apostolic See, informed him that he had sent him the pallium, and begged him to cause his legate to be accepted in his stead by the whole people, “so that those who are of Roman descent may follow the practices of the Roman Church”.

Innocent also sent to Basil by his legate a mitre and a ring, to be given to him along with the pallium after he had taken the usual oath of obedience to the Roman Church.

But it took the chaplain John a long time to reach Bulgaria. The fact was that he had had some business to transact with the Ban of Bosnia regarding the Bogomils. Caloian did not know whether his envoy had ever reached Rome, so that he and Archbishop Basil became impatient. The latter had, as he afterwards assured the Pope, been longing for eighteen years to be united to the Apostolic See, and so, when by July 1203 no answer had yet been received from Rome, Basil resolved to go to Rome himself, and on July 4 set out for Dyrrachium (Durrazzo). When he reached that ancient seaport, the Greeks would not allow him to embark for Italy, but threatened to throw him into the sea. However, by the help of the Latins, he managed to leave the city and to send on “two good men” of his suite to Rome. He remained in the neighbourhood for some time, till he was recalled by a message from Caloian saying that the chaplain John had meanwhile arrived at Ternovo.

The “two good men”, the constable Sergius and the Bulgarian priest Constantine, succeeded in reaching the Pope, and in delivering into his hands a letter from “the

emperor of the Bulgarians to the most holy patriarch of the Christian faith from the East even to the West, to the Roman Pope". He again tells the Pope of the repeated unsuccessful efforts which he had made to get into communication with him, and of the arrival of the Pope's messenger, the archpriest of Brindisi. He assures Innocent that he had given a most favourable reception to his envoy, and had sent him back with letters to the Pope. But he does not know whether the letters have ever been delivered. Meanwhile, he continued, when the Greeks had heard of my relations with you, their emperor and patriarch sent to offer to crown me and to grant me a patriarch, "because the State (*imperium*) cannot stand without the Church (*patriarcha*)". "But I was not willing to listen to them, but have again had recourse to your Holiness, because I wish to be the servant of St. Peter and of your Holiness. I have, moreover, sent you my archbishop in suitable style, and with money, silks, wax, silver, horses and mules in order that he may pay homage to your Holiness for me thy servant". In conclusion, he begged the Pope to send "cardinals" to crown him emperor, and to institute a patriarch over his territories, "in order that I may be thy servant all the days of my life".

The Pope, who had meanwhile heard from his legate John that he had met envoys of Caloian at the court of the king of Hungary, and that he was going to set out with them for Bulgaria on August 24, wrote both to Basil and to the king to tell them this. Further, in his letter to the archbishop, not knowing that he had already returned to Bulgaria, he begged him to try to finish his journey to Rome, so that, after conversation with him, he might be able to arrange matters regarding the crown and the patriarchate. Moreover, in his letter to Caloian, Innocent added the request that he would make peace with Vulcan, or Voukan, at the moment ruler of Servia (September 1203).

As soon as ever the chaplain John reached Caloian (end of August 1203), that prince recalled his archbishop Basil whom he had sent off to Rome.

John appears to have conducted his mission to Caloian with the same judgment as he did that to the Ban of Bosnia. He bestowed the pallium on Basil of Ternovo, "on the feast of the Nativity of our Lady the most holy Mother of God" (September 8, 1203). Full of joy at the gift he had received, Basil wrote the very same day to thank the Pope. Greeting "the Father of all Christianity, my lord Innocent III Pope", he offered his thanks to God inasmuch as that which his soul had desired for eighteen years, had "that day" been granted by Him. He assured Innocent that, after he had "with very humble devotion" received the pallium, he took the oath of fidelity to him in the presence of the bishops and of his sovereign. Moreover, he begged the Pope to settle the ecclesiastical hierarchy of Bulgaria, to send him palliums for the newly created metropolitan sees of Preslav (the old Bulgarian capital, now the village of Eski-Stambul) and Belesbudium (identified with Kostendil), and whatever else the Pope knew was needful for his office.

Along with the letter of his new primate, Basil (or perhaps somewhat later), went another letter from "the emperor of all the Bulgarians and Blaci" . . . "to the most holy Dominator and universal Pope sitting in the chair of Blessed Peter, the lord Father of my kingdom, the third Innocent, Pope of the Apostolic See and of the Roman Church, and master of the whole world". After this magnificent prelude Caloian goes on in simple style to express the hope that the Pope and his cardinals are well, and to inform the Pope that he himself and the princes of his empire are well. He then proceeds to ask

for a pastoral staff and other privileges for the new primate, and, for himself, he begs that a cardinal may be sent to crown him. "And if your Holiness shall do all this I shall take it that I and all my people are well-beloved sons of the orthodox Roman Church". He leaves the settlement of his disputes with Hungary as to the respective boundaries of the two kingdoms to the just judgment of the Pope, and concludes by enumerating a list of splendid presents which he is sending him.

Along with this letter went the "instrument by which the king of Bulgaria and Blacia subjected his empire to the Church of Rome". This document, to which a golden bulla was attached, set forth that never would Caloian or his princes cut themselves off from the Roman Church, but would ever be its true sons; and that, moreover, any lands he might hereafter obtain should also be subject to the Apostolic See. At the end of "the instrument" it was stated that it was given into the hands of the legate of the Holy See, the chaplain John, "in the year six thousand seven hundred and twelve, the seventh indiction", *i.e.*, in the year 1204.

With this document and the letter of the Bulgarian king, and in company with Caloian's envoy the bishop of Brandizuberen (Branitschewo), John made haste to Rome.

On the receipt of such evidence of Caloian's sincerity, Innocent could delay no longer. Cardinal Leo was at once sent to crown the Bulgarian monarch, and a series of letters, addressed to him, to Archbishop Basil, and to his subject bishops, notified them of the despatch of Leo, and of the granting of the privileges they had respectively sought. In one of his letters to Caloian, whom he now addresses as king of the Bulgarians, after setting forth the position of St. Peter and his successors in the Church, he says: "Since, by the Lord's precept, we are bound to feed His sheep, wishing with fatherly solicitude to provide both spiritually and temporally for the Bulgars and the Blaci (who for a long time have been alienated from the bosom of their mother), and relying on the authority of Him by whom Samuel anointed David king, we constitute you their king. Moreover, by our beloved son Leo, we send you a regal sceptre and a kingly crown which as it were with our hands he will place upon your head, receiving from you an oath that you will be loyal and obedient to the Roman Church. Moreover, at the request of our venerable brother Blasius, the bishop of Brandizuberen, whom you sent to the Apostolic See, we freely grant you the right of coining money stamped with your effigy in your kingdom". He also informed him that he had made the archbishop of Ternovo primate of Bulgaria.

Similar information is given to the new primate. Besides, he is told that the holy oils may be blessed on Holy Thursday according to the custom of the Roman Church, and that in future bishops and priests must be anointed. He may, moreover, carry his cross before him throughout the whole of his province; and, though the Roman pontiff does not carry a crozier, he, like other bishops, may use one. The Pope concludes his second letter to the primate by informing him that he has sent him by Leo all the necessary pontifical insignia, buskins, sandals, orarium, a large ring with five topazes which he had been wont to use himself, etc.

We have already told of the difficulties encountered in Hungary by Cardinal Leo on his journey to Caloian, despite the fact that he had been specially recommended to

the clergy and laity of that country. They were, however, at last successfully overcome, and the Bulgarian king was duly crowned (November 8), and presented with the standard of St. Peter, decorated with the cross and the keys, “which he might use against those who honoured the Crucified with their lips, but whose hearts were far from Him”.

In gratitude for what he had received, the new king wrote to tell “the father of his kingdom” that all Bulgaria, Blacia, and the whole of his empire have greatly praised and glorified your Holiness for granting all his petitions. He also begged the Pope to instruct the Hungarians and the Latins of Constantinople not to molest his kingdom, though at the same time he assured him that if they did he would not be slow to retaliate. He then informed the Pope that he was sending him two boys, one of whom was his own son, to be taught Latin, since he had no “grammarians” to translate the Pope’s letters.

Supplementing the letter of Calojan, there was despatched to Innocent a letter from Basil also. He told the Pope that Cardinal Leo had anointed him and instituted him patriarch on November 7, and that “with great joy he had anointed” his suffragans on the same day.

Writing in January 1205, Innocent had good reason to rejoice at the return to the unity of the Church of Bulgaria and Wallachia; but hostility towards the new Latin empire of New Rome was, after a few years, to lead the Bulgarians to fall away again from the Pontiff of Old Rome. Innocent had warned the bishops of Bulgaria against fickleness: “Beware of being easily moved from your resolutions, but stand firm in your good intentions, and humbly persist in your loyalty to the Apostolic See”.

But the new Bulgaria proved itself as changeable in matters of religion as the old Bulgaria; and John Asen II (1218-1241), the most powerful of the rulers of the second Bulgarian empire, once more broke off union with Rome, setting up a national church. He obtained from John III (Ducas Vatatzes), emperor of Nicaea, and from the Greek patriarch Germanus (1234), decrees recognising the primate of Ternovo as an independent patriarch “subject neither to the patriarch of Rome nor to the patriarch of Constantinople”. But after his death the Bulgarian power rapidly declined, not to rise again till our own time. We find Innocent IV exhorting Coloman (*i.e.*, Kaliman I., 1241-1246) to return to the unity of the Church, but the Bulgarians returned neither to unity of faith nor to national glory; and we shall leave them in that pontiff’s hands trying to save them from being sold as slaves by the Genoese.

SERVIA

About the time of the formation of the second Bulgarian kingdom, the great mass of the Servian tribes began for the first time to be grouped together to form an independent nation. For two or three centuries there had been autonomous tribes under their own *Jupans* (or *Zupans*); but, somewhere about the year 1160, Stephen I, Nemanja, drove out the Greeks, and welded all the *Serbs* together under his authority as Megajupan. He appears to have ruled over what is still called Servia, and Raza or Rascia (now known as Novi Bazaar), Montenegro, a large portion of Herzegovina, and part of the Turkish district of Prizren. Of these territories he left Montenegro to a

younger son, Vulcan (Voukan), and the rest to Stephen II, “the first crowned”, when in 1195 he resigned his crown, and, following the example of his youngest son (Sava or Saba), retired to a monastery on Mount Athos. Two years later (1197) we find the ambitious Vulcan also ruling over Herzegovina. He had seemingly received it as a fief from the Hungarians, with whom he was in league against his brother Stephen II.

The next move on the part of Vulcan to strengthen his position was to organise the Church throughout his dominions. He wrote to Innocent begging him to send legates to establish a regular hierarchy under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Dioclea. “Understanding”, wrote the Pope in reply to Vulcan, “by your letters presented to our apostleship the ardour of your devotion which leads you to wish to love and honour the Roman Church, your mother, above all things after God, and in all things to obey our behests, we have, in accordance with what your nobility has demanded of us, despatched to you our beloved sons the chaplain John and the sub-deacon Simon”. We have instructed them to confirm in you the doctrine of the Apostles, to reform whatever they may find necessary, and to take the pallium to the archbishop of Dioclea so that he may share our solicitude”. A number of similar letters informed the bishops of the country, Stephen, the Grand Jupan of Servia, and others of what he had done.

We are told by Thomas of Spalato that Diocletian built a city “near a certain lake” (Scutari), which he called after his own name Dioclea. This city was destroyed in 1027, and its episcopal see was transferred to Antivari, the present port of Montenegro. Whether it was the recollection of this fact, or whether it was simply that the request of Vulcan caused the papal chancellery to study the history of the diocese of Dioclea-Antivari, certain it is that, soon after the departure of the legates, it was discovered that Antivari was subject to Ragusa. Innocent wrote off immediately to his legates. “A few days after your departure”, he said, “I was informed (and an inspection of the *Liber Censuum* confirmed the statement) that Antivari was subject to the metropolitan see of Ragusa”. Then after expressing his astonishment that John, who had read the *Liber*, had not “more expressly” made known the truth to him, the Pope forbade him to give the pallium to the elect of Antivari unless it was proved that it had been given to his predecessors, and that they had enjoyed the dignity of metropolitans. At the same time he sent his legates another set of letters similar to the previous set, with the exception of the omission of the clause relative to the pallium. They were to use the first or the second set as circumstances dictated.

When the legates had crossed the Adriatic, they held a synod at Antivari, passing some twelve decrees for the improvement of ecclesiastical discipline, modelling them on the decrees of the “most holy Roman Church, which is the mother and mistress of all the churches”; and they conferred the pallium on John, archbishop of that city. Evidently Archbishop John had no difficulty in proving to the legates that at one time Dioclea-Antivari had certainly been a metropolitan city.

In thanking the Pope for acceding to his wishes, Vulcan tells him of the heresy of Culin, the Ban of Bosnia, of which mention will be made shortly.

Realising his precarious position, seeing that he had against him the king of Hungary and his own brother, steadily becoming more powerful, Stephen II now endeavoured to strengthen himself by applying to Innocent for a crown. He felt he

would be safe under the aegis of Rome. Accordingly, “the Grand Jupan of all Servia” wrote “to the universal Pope ... as to his spiritual father”, and assured him that it was his intention ever to follow, like his father before him, the footsteps of the Roman Church, and to observe its precepts. He concluded his short note by telling the Pope that he had conversed with his legates, who would inform his Holiness of his desires.

These desires, which he afterwards impressed upon the Pope by his own envoys, were that the Pope should send a legate into his *country* to bring it back to the obedience of the Roman Church, and to confer on himself a regal diadem. Innocent at once commissioned the cardinal-bishop of Albano to proceed to Servia in order to put Stephen’s wishes into effect. But this would not have suited the Hungarian king and his ally Vulcan. Emeric, accordingly, addressed a strong remonstrance to the Pope, who, unwilling to offend the most solidly Catholic monarch in the east of Europe, “not without confusion”, as he says himself, thereupon refused Stephen’s request. Not long after (*postquam*) Emeric invaded Servia, expelled Stephen, and replaced him by his tool Vulcan (1202). Owing to the solidity of his devotion to the Holy See, Innocent congratulated the Hungarian monarch on his success, which he accounted as his own; and he exhorted him to cause the institutions of the Roman Church to be observed in Servia, and to bring that country more fully back to the obedience of Rome; for this, he said, “appears to be very much to the advantage of you and of your kingdom”. After his conquest, perhaps with a view to soothing the Pope’s wounded feelings concerning the matter of the crown for Stephen, Emeric gave him to understand that he would have no objection to his granting Vulcan a crown, which was, of course, to be worn in subjection to him. Innocent at once entrusted the execution of this affair to the primate of Colocsa (1202). But in 1204 he had occasion to note that the archbishop had for two years taken no steps in the matter; and it consequently remains a subject for doubt whether Emeric was in earnest in this particular or not.

Whether, however, Vulcan was to wear a crown or not, Innocent was none the less in the meanwhile anxious about his spiritual condition, and about that of his new territories. He therefore wrote “to the noble man, Vulcan, Grand Jupan of Servia” (1203), telling him that he was going to visit him through the medium of the archbishop of Colocsa. That prelate was to confirm Vulcan in the faith, and was, after receiving from him in the Pope’s name spiritual obedience and corporal reverence, to bring him back to the apostolic fold. If Vulcan should show himself amenable to the archbishop, Innocent would in his turn devote himself to advancing the Jupan’s glory, *i.e.*, no doubt, he would further his desire for a crown. In another letter in which the Pope commissioned the archbishop to go in person into Servia, he is instructed to declare the Servians absolved from any bond of obedience by which they may seem to be bound to the patriarch of Constantinople.

These letters would seem to show not only that the Servians proper were as a body in communion with the patriarch of Constantinople, but that Vulcan himself, to curry favour with his new subjects, had also attached himself to the Greek Church. However, as in September 1203 Vulcan is still spoken of by Innocent as “his beloved son”, we may perhaps conclude that the Pope’s letters refer rather to the heterodoxy of the mass of the Servian people than to that of their new ruler.

A last effort to bring the Servians to the Roman Church seems to have been made by the Pope when he commissioned Cardinal Leo to proceed to Servia after he had crowned the king of Bulgaria. If Leo ever went to Servia, no record of his work there would appear to have survived.

All through the centuries many of the Slav princes have been guided by the exigencies of politics and not by the claims of religion, and they have often twisted either their own consciences or those of their people to suit their momentary political advantages. To judge from what has been said of Stephen II of Servia by many modern authors, one would naturally suppose that he was one of that class of rulers. But their statements are rather conjectures based on our want of knowledge of these early days of Servian history, than the records of ascertained facts. What these latter are we shall proceed to unfold, though the telling of them will take us beyond the pontificate of Innocent. At some date which has been assigned to 1205, and which was certainly anterior to 1215, Stephen II was once more Grand Jupan of Servia. Undeterred by his previous failure, because he knew that Rome was really with him, he again applied to the Pope for a crown, possibly in some way taking advantage of the Hungarian king's departure for the Crusade (1217). At any rate, the archdeacon Thomas says that it was at the time of King Andrew's departure that Stephen, "the lord of Servia or Rascia", sent envoys to ask Honorius III for a crown. Our best authority for this transaction is the history of St. Sabbas (Sava or Saba), Stephen's brother, by his disciple Dometian, a monk of Khilander on Mount Athos, who wrote perhaps as early as 1243. According to this authority, "Sava chose one of his disciples, a man wise in the things of God, the most reverend Bishop Methodius, and sent him to Rome to the most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, and to him who sits on the same throne with them, viz., to the great Pope of the great Roman Empire; and he sent presents worthy of their holinesses, in order that they in turn might bless his country, and of their own goodness might crown its prince. He moreover wrote a letter to the great successor of the holy and glorious apostles, the Pope, and begged him to send him ... a blessed diadem with which he might crown his own brother king of his paternal state, *i.e.*, of Dioclea ... The blessed crown (at length) arrived, and the most holy prelate (Sabbas) glorified his benefactor (the Pope) for all the favours he had bestowed upon him ... and crowned his own pious brother, and anointed him king".

A year or two after his coronation, "Stephen, by the grace of God crowned king of Servia, Dioclea, Tribunia, Dalmatia, and Ochlumia (*i.e.*, Zachlumia or Herzegovina), offers homage and inviolable fidelity to the most holy Father and lord Honorius, universal pontiff of the Roman See and Church". "As all Christians", wrote the Serb monarch, "love and honour you, and account you as Father and Lord, so we also desire to be reckoned a son of the holy Roman Church and of your paternity, desiring that God's blessing and approval, and yours too, if it so please you, may ever rest on our crown and country. Hence have we sent you our Bishop Methodius, in order that through the bearer of these presents you may make known to us what is your holy will" (112o).

That Stephen II then was crowned by the authority of the Pope and that he afterwards honoured and remained in communion with his benefactor is certain, but to

affirm that Stephen was twice crowned (as is done by some authors), is to introduce into history a chimera, which would be too much honoured if treated seriously.

The separation of Servia from Rome was gradual, and took place after the death of Stephen (1227), perhaps not till after that of his son Radoslav, who according to the ancient Serb authors also received his crown from Honorius III. At any rate, in 1288 Nicholas IV was certainly engaged with some merely seeming success in trying to bring back King Stephen Ourosh Milutin (1275-1321) to the unity of the Catholic Church. In connection with these Servian kings of the thirteenth century, d'Avril, whom we are here following, observes that, as suzerains more or less immediate of Dioclea and Primoria (parts of Dalmatia and Albania), where there were many Latins, they kept up regular relations with Rome, whatever might be their personal predilections. But, as kings of Servia, properly so called, they followed with their subjects the Greek rite, and adhered in matters of Church government more or less closely to Constantinople. It was not, however, till the fourteenth century that there ceased to be a Catholic community in Servia.

BOSNIA.

In the beginning of the twelfth century the Slavs of Bosnia, the land of the yellow Bosna, fell under the sway of Hungary; but in the year 1166 Manuel I Comnenus, once more subjected them to the Byzantine empire. After his death, however (1180), his feeble successors were unable to hold his conquest, and the Bosnians under their Ban Culin (1180-1204) for the moment found themselves free. To keep himself independent was the one aim of Culin's life; and, in order to resist the Hungarians across the Save, his northern frontier, he not only tried to secure the help of the Servians, from whom he was merely separated by the Drina, but, as we shall see, even embraced Bogomilism. In common with his subjects and most of the adjoining Slavs, Culin was a Catholic, *i.e.*, was in communion with the See of Rome; and the first ecclesiastical document which we possess concerning him shows him in friendly intercourse with the Pope (1180). The document in question is a letter from Theobald, one of the papal legates with whom the Balkan States were so familiar in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The legate forwards the Pope's letters to Culin, and asks him by his reverence for the blessed Apostle Peter and the lord Pope to send him two slaves (*famulos*), and some marten skins.

The next time, however, we hear of Culin he is being denounced to the Pope as a Bogomil. Imitating the conduct of other Slav rulers in similar cases, Culin embraced that degrading heresy in the hope that, if he alienated his subjects in religious matters from Hungary, he would be the more easily able to maintain his independence against its ruler. He was to find that his action brought about a combination between Innocent and Emeric which was to prove too strong for him.

In 1199 Innocent received from Vulcan (or Voukan), the king of Dioclea and Dalmatia, the letter we have already cited. At the close of this communication, Vulcan informed the Pope that heresy had taken such a hold of Bosnia that Culin, his wife, and

many other relatives, together with some ten thousand of his subjects, had succumbed to it. The king of Hungary, he continued, had sent a number of the heretics to Italy to be examined by the Pope, but they had returned with forged letters to the effect that he had approved their teaching in some way. Vulcan begged the Pope to urge Emeric to drive the heretics out of his dominions.

To anyone who will calmly weigh the tenets of the Bogomils, which had been introduced into Bosnia by two brothers, citizens of Zara, it cannot seem anything but reasonable that rulers should wish them driven out of their territories. Bogomilism had been invented, or rather reinvented, in the beginning of the twelfth century by a physician of Byzantium named Basil; but there was very little really new in his production. It was merely a revival of Manichaeism, and of that form of it which had been prevalent in Bulgaria in the tenth century, and which had been devised by the priest "Bogomil", "the friend of God", probably one Jeremiah. The dualism of the Bogomils, however, did not, as a rule, run to the extremes taught by strict Manichees. They believed in two equal deities, one good and the other bad; but the Bogomils, for the most part, taught that the good God was superior to Satanel, his revolted son. The latter, however, was lord of man's body, and of the world in which we live. His power was, however, much curtailed by Jesus Christ, the younger son of God. The Bogomils rejected most of the Old Testament, worship of the saints and angels, the use of churches, all set forms of prayer, except the Lord's Prayer, the Mass, the Sacraments of the Church, and even marriage and the use of flesh-meat. It is even asserted by Zigabenus, in that part of his work which he devotes to Bogomilism, that they inculcated a certain amount of devil worship in order to induce the powers of evil not to injure them. They also despised learning, and abused the Catholic clergy. All contemporary authorities agree that they were full of pride and hypocrisy, and that, to escape detection and persecution, they considered that they might practise any kind of dissimulation. The Byzantine princess, Anna Comnena, gives a graphic picture of the Puritan Bogomils of her day going about with unkempt hair, with their sad faces muffled up to the nose, with their heads bent down, and muttering something as they walked along.

She also tells us that the heresy of the Bogomils existed indeed in secret before her father's time (Alexius I. *d.* 1118), but that he cunningly dragged their pernicious teachings to the light of day, and finally caused their leader, Basil, and his twelve apostles to be burnt. But after the imperial lady has given certain points of the teaching of the Bogomils, she says that, though she would like to give it all, modesty, "as beauteous Sappho says", forbids her; for, "though she is an historian, she is a woman, the most honoured of those born in the purple, and the eldest of the children of Alexius". Having no claim to any of these distinctions, we may, while keeping our tongue as clean as the princess was anxious to keep hers, add that she alludes to the debaucheries to which a teaching which condemned lawful matrimony was bound to lead the rank and file at any rate of such as embraced it. This later form of neo-Manichaeism, condemned at Constantinople, spread so widely among the Slavs that it soon became known by the Slavonic name of Bogomilism. The "Bogomil" in Slavonic is either "one who begs God's mercy" (Bog is the Slavonic for God), or, more exactly, "a friend of God".

Nor was the new heresy confined to the Near East. It spread into the West, and there too caused or very strongly influenced a revival of those Manichaean doctrines which had never, as we have seen, been quite lost sight of. Our English historians distinctly connect the Albigensian heretics with the Bogomils of Bosnia or of the countries near Hungary. Ralph Coggeshall says that “in the province of the *Burgarii* (Bulgarians) and of Dalmatia near Hungary there arose a certain heresiarch who strove to establish his see in the north, and to depress the Apostolic See in Rome. To him (Niquinta, *i.e.*, Nicetas, by name) flocked the Albigenses as to their pope, in order that he might reply to their consultations. He sent them a man, named Bartholomew, who created bishops, and who signed himself Bartholomew, servant of the servants of the hospital of the holy faith”. Matthew Paris connects the Patarenes, the Albigensians, and the *Bugari*, and tells of one *Bugre* who was converted from them. Western continental writers speak to the same effect. Reinerius Saccho (or Rainerius Sacchoni), who, as he tells us himself, had once been a leader of the Cathari and a member of their body for seventeen years, and who had later as a Dominican often been present “at the inquisition and examination of the heretics, enumerates among the sixteen churches of the Cathari “the *church* of Slavonia, ... the church of *Bulgaria*, and the church of *Dugranicia* (Dobronicha or Ragusa?)”, and adds : “they all derive their origin from the last two”.

Innocent himself, who, as his correspondence proves, was thoroughly well informed on all that passed in Europe, whether in the domain of religion or politics, had no hesitation in connecting the Patarenes of Italy with the heretics of the Balkan peninsula. Their identity in teaching is proclaimed by him in a letter to Emeric, king of Hungary. “Since”, he declared, “God has put the sword into your hands for the protection of the good and the punishment of the wicked, you must protect the faithful, and repress those audacious heretics who take no notice of ecclesiastical censures. These heretics, then, who like wolves in sheep’s clothing spread their perverse teachings in secret are not to be acknowledged in any way. They must not be admitted to any public office, nor be allowed to inherit property. No one must be compelled to respond to any summons they may issue, nor must any act they may perform in any official position have any value. If the offenders are clerics they must be deprived of their position and their benefices. All such as shall communicate with those who have been denounced by the Church are excommunicated. In the territories subject to our temporal sway”, continued the Pope, “we have ordered their goods to be confiscated, and we have instructed the secular authorities in other lands to do the same, and have given orders that they are to be compelled, if necessary, to carry out these instructions by ecclesiastical penalties ... so that at least temporal penalties may punish those whom spiritual discipline cannot amend. We have heard that the *Patarenes* expelled from his diocese by the archbishop of Spalato have been received with open arms by the noble man, Culin, Ban of Bosnia. Lest this heretical plague should spread into Hungary, we bid you proscribe the Ban himself along with the heretics, unless he is willing to proscribe them himself”.

Acting on Innocent’s injunctions, Emeric called Culin to account, and the Ban at first replied by a display partly of force and partly of what by courtesy may be called diplomacy. He attacked a people over whom Emeric claimed suzerainty, and assured

Emeric that he believed the accused were not heretics but Catholics only anxious “inviolably to preserve the doctrines of the Apostolic See”. At the same time, convinced of the hopelessness of a successful struggle with Emeric, Culin begged the Pope to send a legate to look into his own faith and that of the accused. To comply with this request, in what ever spirit made, Innocent sent his trusted chaplain John, abbot of Casamari.

The legate fulfilled his mission with great tact, and very gratifying results followed. In his presence and in that of “their patron the Ban Culin, lord of Bosnia, the priors of those men who up to this have been known specially by the title of Christians promised to submit to and obey the Holy Roman Church, the head of all ecclesiastical unity, to have altars and crosses in their churches, to read, like the Roman Church, the books both of the Old and of the New Testament”. They also engaged to have priests, to hear Mass, to go to Confession, to receive Holy Communion at least seven times a year, and to observe the fasts of the Church. The relations between the two sexes were to be such that in future no suspicion of improper conduct could arise, and they undertook not to receive among them knowingly any Manichee or other heretic. They agreed in the future no longer to take the name Christians, lest they should reflect upon other Christians, but that of brethren. Finally, they consented that in future their head should only be a prelate confirmed by Rome, and that they would accept whatever alterations the Roman Church might think fit to make in their profession of faith. This act of submission was signed by the Ban himself, and by a number of the “priors”. After the close of the assembly of Bilino Polje, the “white plain” on the Bosna, some of the “priors”, in company with John, went on to Emeric, and in his presence also, and in that of some Hungarian bishops, repeated the profession of faith they had already made.

At the same time Emeric caused Culin’s son, who was then at his court, to undertake to see to it that in future his people should faithfully observe the ecclesiastical decrees of the Roman See. The young prince, moreover, in case he should wittingly favour heretics, bound himself to pay a fine of a thousand marks of silver, of which half was to go to the Pope and the other half to the king.

In forwarding to the Pope a report of what he had done, John suggested that, as the bishop of the one see in Bosnia was dead, he should be replaced by a Latin, and that, as Bosnia was a kingdom of at least ten days journey, three or four new bishoprics should be created.

With all the skill and tact of John of Casamari, the heresy of the Bogomils did not now die out in Bosnia. Either the “priors” could not bind their fellows, or, as their creed allowed them, they were merely bowing for the moment to superior force. At any rate, not only were there Bogomils in Bosnia in the days of Innocent’s successor, but their sect survived long enough to facilitate the conquest of their countrymen by the Turks.

BOHEMIA.

Turning from the southern to the western Slavs, we will touch first on the Bohemians and then on the Poles. Owing to strife for supremacy between different

members of the Premysl family, Bohemia had for many years previous to the pontificate of Innocent been in a state of great confusion; but a little before his election, Premysl Ottokar I, the real founder of the Bohemian monarchy, became its undisputed ruler. He was first its duke and then its king from 1197 to 1230. Now under one master, Bohemia was one of the most important of the feudal dependencies of the Empire, and it became a matter of moment to the rival candidates Otho and Philip to secure the adhesion of Ottokar. Accordingly, to use the words of a Bohemian chronicle, Philip made a treaty “with our king Primizl, then our duke”, and, when he had himself been consecrated king of the Romans (1198), he “at the same time made our duke king of Bohemia”. That so powerful a feudatory should support the candidature of Philip was not to the mind of Innocent. He therefore wrote “to the duke of Bohemia”, praising him for having a care for his dignity and advancement, but blaming him for seeking a crown from one “who as yet has not himself legitimately secured the royal dignity”. He urged him, therefore, to apply for the royal crown to Otho, emperor of the Romans elect, and went on to promise that “since the Apostolic See ... is the foundation of the whole of Christendom ... we, from the plenitude of power conferred upon us, will bring it about that the dignity when granted you shall become hereditary”.

This letter produced such an effect on Ottokar that a papal envoy was soon able to report that the duke of Bohemia “is with us”. It was not, however, seemingly till 1203 that he broke out into open opposition against Philip, and, as a reward, had his title of king confirmed by Otho and by the Pope (1204).

But Ottokar was no match in the field for Philip, who, after having defeated the landgrave of Thuringia and the king of Hungary, compelled the unwilling Ottokar to submit to his authority (c. November 1204). After Philip’s assassination Ottokar naturally again gave in his adhesion to Otho, and then once more followed the Pope’s lead, and was one of the first to abandon Otho and to attach himself to the young Frederick (1212). The golden bull of privileges which he obtained on this occasion from Frederick, and which made him practically independent of the Empire, is a very tangible proof that self-interest was as much the guide of the king of Bohemia as honour and conscience, or the Pope.

In fact, when it suited him, Ottokar was not too ready to obey the Pope. He had married Adelaide, the daughter of Otho, marquis of Mesnia or Meissen, but had divorced her in the year 1199, after an unjust sentence had been given in his favour by the bishop of Prague. He then married Constance, the sister of Bela III, king of Hungary, and begged the Pope to confirm his action. Like every other person in distress, the injured Adelaide appealed to the Pope, who at once commissioned the archbishop of Magdeburg to inquire into the case. But when the Pope’s commissioners cited Ottokar to appear before them, he treated their messengers so shockingly that they allowed the affair to drop. However, after his defeats by Philip (1204), Ottokar acknowledged that his troubles had been brought upon him by his treatment of Adelaide, and promised to take her back. When, however, his difficulties had passed away, the time-server refused to fulfil his solemn engagements, and the matter was again referred to the Pope. The immediate result was the appointment of a second commission of inquiry (1206). But no progress in the case was made. First Ottokar declared that the judges named by the Pope were prejudiced against him, and then the murder of Philip of Swabia caused the

sudden return to Rome of the papal legates, Cardinals Leo and Ugolino, whom Innocent had appointed as the final judges of the affair (1208).

After Constance, Ottokar's second wife, had introduced fresh complications into the affair by offering to prove that Adelaide was related to Ottokar within the forbidden degrees, Innocent decided to try the case in person, and in April 1210 ordered the parties concerned to send to him before the feast of St. Martin persons qualified properly to plead their cause. But at this juncture the matrimonial affairs of Ottokar appear to drop out of the papal Register. The Bohemian king, however, would seem not to have sent anyone to Rome in order to plead his cause; or, if he did, he appears not to have submitted to the adverse decision of the Pope. Although throughout this case Innocent was no doubt hampered by political considerations, as he was naturally anxious not to offend either the king of Hungary, his most reliable auxiliary in the Near East, or even Ottokar himself, Otho's most influential supporter, still, it is possible he may have taken action after Ottokar's manifest display of contempt of his decision. At any rate, so at least we are told by the Annals of Cologne, the princes of the Empire decided that Ottokar's treatment of Adelaide rendered him unworthy to rule, and in the presence of a large number of the nobility of Bohemia, the Emperor Otho made over his kingdom to his son Wratislav (1212). But by having attached himself to the cause of Frederick, the Bohemian monarch, while putting both Innocent and the youthful candidate for the Empire under an obligation to him, had naturally irritated Otho. The assertion, therefore, just quoted from the annals of a city which had throughout been ardently devoted to the cause of Otho, may mean no more than that the emperor, in conjunction with certain Bohemian malcontents, endeavoured to punish Ottokar's desertion of his standard. In any case, it does not appear that Ottokar was forced to give up Constance, though he must have satisfied the Holy See in some way regarding his divorce, as he contrived to retain its favour.

In the latter portion of his reign Ottokar was engaged in various more or less obscure quarrels with his clergy. He seems to have imitated our Henry II, and to have carried on a dispute with Andrew, bishop of Prague, similar to that between Henry II and St. Thomas Becket. In the golden bull of privileges which, as we have seen, Frederick II gave Ottokar, he granted him "the right and authority of investing the bishops of his kingdom", but on the understanding that "they were to enjoy that liberty and security which they were wont to have from our predecessors". How far Ottokar observed this condition is not easy to say; but Andrew, bishop of Prague, accused him of violating the rights of the clergy in the matter of tithes and of ecclesiastical immunities generally. In defence of the rights of the Church, Andrew placed Bohemia under an interdict (April 1216), and betook himself to Rome in order to enlist the sympathies of the Pope. Honorius III took up his cause, and in the following year Ottokar asked the Pope to send a legate to Bohemia to settle the dispute. After much negotiation, though Andrew died an exile in Rome, the dispute was settled by a concordat in favour of the Church (1223).

POLAND.

During the whole period from the death of Boleslas III, Wry-mouthed (*d.* 1139), to the days of Przemyslaw I (1295-1296), Poland was in a very anarchical condition. Various local dukes disputed the authority of him who was known as duke of Poland; and the kings of Bohemia claimed to be his suzerains. Especially was the country troubled during most of the pontificate of Innocent by the wars for ducal supremacy between Leszek (or Lesko) V, the White (1194-1227), and his uncle Mieczyslaw (or Mesko), the Elder, and his nephew Ladislaus III. If Leszek was ultimately victorious (1207-1227), it is certain that for many years the chief power in the land was in the hands either of his uncle or his nephew.

Into a country distracted by divisions which were ultimately to be its ruin, Innocent, following in the footsteps of his predecessors, endeavoured to introduce some measure of law and order. His work, and that of the Popes generally for Poland, was not in vain; and the gallant Poles, ever true to the Church of Rome, were for centuries the bulwark of western Europe, first against the Tartars, and then against their kinsmen the Turks.

The Roman Pontiffs had a particular reason to be interested in Poland, as its princes had, in the tenth century, placed it under the special protection of the Holy See, and paid the Pope a tax as a sign of their dependence. To introduce some of the work of Innocent III in connection with Poland, we may note that Urban III, who had consecrated Fulk, bishop of Cracow, confirmed the privileges of that see, naming its incumbent the second bishop of the Polish hierarchy, and giving him the right to consecrate the archbishop (1186). This we mention because it is recorded that in 1208 Innocent confirmed the election of his successor, who was no other than Vincent of Cracow, known as Kadlubeck, the father of Polish history.

More immediately concerned with the work of Innocent III in Poland was the mission of Cardinal Peter, who was sent into that country to try to effect a moral reform amongst its clergy and people. The political disorders of which we have just spoken had, as usual, been accompanied by a considerable decline in public morality. The priests ceased to observe their vows of chastity, and the laity played fast and loose with the bonds of matrimony. Sent to Poland by Celestine III in 1197, Cardinal Peter renewed the Church's laws regarding clerical celibacy, and, in order to impress upon the laity the sacredness of the sacrament of matrimony, decreed that in future marriage was to be publicly celebrated in the church, according to ecclesiastical law.

The reform thus inaugurated was pushed forward vigorously by Innocent. He ordered the archbishop of Gnesen and his suffragans not to admit to ecclesiastical dignities such clergy as were publicly married, to prohibit the performance of stage plays in the churches, and especially to forbid the clergy from taking part in them. He ordered the chaplains of the nobility to pay to their ecclesiastical superiors the *cathedratica*, and their other dues; bade all the clergy assist their archbishop in his labours for the liberty of the Church; and exhorted the bishops to give pecuniary help to him, as he had lost so much money during the exile he had endured for the same great cause.

Particularly did he address the powerful ones of the land. Very strongly did he write to Duke Ladislaus III, who was at one and the same time usurping the regal rights

of his uncle Leszek (Lesko) and the recognised privileges of the Church. He blamed him for wishing, contrary to the custom of the country, to bestow the prebends of the church of Gnesen at his pleasure, for seizing the treasure of its church, for causing a prisoner to be guarded and supported by it, for handing over to prison and even to torture clerics in sacred orders, and for other injuries inflicted on the archbishop and his church. “Gather together your senses”, wrote the Pope, “and with them enter into yourself; carefully consider what is the extent of your power, measure your strength, calculate your abilities, and see if by your own strength you could so oppress the Church of Christ unless He gave you those gifts without which (whatever tyrannical desires you may harbour in your mind) you could never have any such power”.

Dealing with all the dukes of Poland, he forbade them to seize the revenues of vacant sees, to confer ecclesiastical benefices, to plunder the clergy, and to interfere with the freedom of ecclesiastical elections and with the payment of tithes.

The exertions of Innocent and the sufferings of Henry, archbishop of Gnesen, met with their reward. A number of the dukes, headed by Lestco, duke of Cracow, and including Wladislaus, duke of Calis (Kalisch), guaranteed by charter the freedom of the Polish Church. “As our holy mother the Church”, opens the document, “gives freely to those who love her the things which are of the spirit, it is not a great thing if every Christian should serve her somewhat in what concerns this world”. Hence the dukes propose to bring back the affairs of the Church to the state in which the pious deeds of their ancestors had placed it. They therefore promise the bishops to observe the immunities of the Church, to respect and to restore its property, to allow the dependents of the Church to be judged by the Church’s judges, and to free them from certain civil obligations.

The struggles of Andrew of Prague and Henry of Gnesen were the same as those of Thomas of Canterbury. In every country of Europe during this epoch the Church had to fight to prevent its absorption by the State, and in country after country we find the clergy and the nobles, under the guidance of the Popes, wresting from kings the declaration that the Church of that country is free.

Poland, like England, had long been in the habit of paying Peter’s Pence. As in this country, it was a land-tax; and a very curious letter of Innocent regarding it has come down to us. It appears that in Poland there were constant issues of new coins, and each new issue resulted in a depreciation in the value of its predecessor. In consequence of this, large numbers of people always paid their Peter’s Pence, the *Swentego Petra*, in a depreciated coinage. For this fraud the Pope reproached them, and by the example of Ananias and Sapphira exhorted them to be just in their dealings with the Almighty. “Although”, wrote Innocent, “He does not need your gifts (*honorum*), still, because it is dangerous for you fraudulently and ungratefully to keep back what you owe Him, we bid you pay what you owe without fraud”.

Whilst Poland in general was under the protection of the Holy See, certain provinces and dioceses placed themselves under its more particular protection. In 1211 Ladislaus Plwacz, or the Spitter, duke of Kalisch, in order to shield himself from the designs of his powerful neighbours, offered his patrimony to the Pope, and received back from him the reply: “We take thy person and thy property ... under our protection

and under that of Blessed Peter, ... and, as a mark of this protection ... you shall pay every three years to us and to our successors the four marks (of gold) *ad pondus Poloniae*, which you have freely offered”.

Even such a powerful ruler as Boleslas III understood the value of papal support, and strove to obtain it. He had made a decree that the capital of Poland, Cracow, should always belong to the eldest son of his direct line, and had caused it to be approved by the Apostolic See. This decree, “evidently”, as he said, “made in the interests of the general good and of the peace of the whole country”, Innocent solemnly ratified, and ordered the archbishop of Gnesen to see to its observation.

RUSSIA AND ROME

A document printed by Turgeneff, who collected the historic monuments of Russia, serves to remind one that the Popes had not forgotten Russia, which, as its rulers explained to Honorius III, was wishful to lay aside all the doctrinal errors into which it had fallen “through a want of preachers”. The Russians had received their Christianity from Constantinople, and had rather ignorantly fallen into the schismatical footsteps of their instructor than walked into schism with their eyes open. Hence many centuries had to elapse before they were definitely separated from Rome. Large sections at least of the Russians were constantly entering into union with the Holy See during the Middle Ages.

In 1207 Innocent addressed (October 7) a letter to all the clergy and laity in Russia. “Although like strangers you have up to this time severed yourselves from the bosom of your mother, still we who, though unworthy, have been placed in the pastoral office by God to dispense wisdom to His people, cannot put away from us a father’s feelings, but by exhortations and sound doctrine must strive to make you conform as members to the head, so that Ephraim may return to Juda, and Samaria to Jerusalem”. After expressing a wish that, after their wanderings, they may return to the one whom the Saviour named the teaching head of the Church, he adduced the well-known passages from St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John to show that his authority was indeed derived from God. Especially did he elaborate the point that our Lord committed to St. Peter all His sheep, and that He made him the teaching head in order that all of them might be kept together in one fold. Hence as the Pope was his successor, it was not strange that he should seek to bring back wandering sheep in order that there might be one shepherd and one fold, and to prevent the disfigurement of the body of the Church. “Now that the empire and Church of the Greeks”, he continued, “has almost wholly returned to its devotion to the Holy See, receives its injunctions and obeys its commands, does it not seem outrageous that the part should not conform to the whole?” Innocent concluded his letter by telling the Russians that he had sent to them in his stead Gregory, the cardinal-priest of St. Vitalis, a man of noble birth, literary culture, and conspicuous virtue, a man whose merits have endeared him to all. He earnestly exhorted them to hearken to the voice of the cardinal, and then perchance the evils under which they were groaning (caused by the perpetual petty wars between the Russian dukes) might be brought to an end.

Whether the efforts of Innocent brought forth any immediate fruit in Russia does not appear; but no doubt it was one of the causes which helped to bring about the return to Catholic unity of various Russian dukes and bishops under his successors during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

If what our space has permitted us to say of Innocent's intercourse with eastern Europe be reviewed, it will, we believe, be seen that his enormous influence there was, almost always, exercised with justice in the cause of law and order, reasonable national aspirations, and peace. He did a work for the development of the various nationalities of Eastern Europe which merits their lasting gratitude.

CHAPTER IV

THE EAST, ARMENIA, THE MARONITES, GEORGIA, AND AFRICA.

THE last native dynasty which held any considerable power in Greater Armenia, *i.e.*, in Armenia proper, and which battled first against the Byzantine Empire and then against the conquering Turks, was that of the Bagratidae. When their sway was finally ended by the Seljukian Turks in the second half of the eleventh century, Rupen, one of this family, established himself in the fastnesses of the Taurus, and, at the expense of the Byzantines, founded in Cilicia a new Armenia, Armenia the Lesser, with the mountainous stronghold of Sis as his capital.

Of his dynasty, which lasted for about three centuries (1079-1375), when its power was finally broken by the Mamelukes (1375), the most remarkable ruler was Leo (Livon or Ghevont) II, the Great (1185-1219). To strengthen his position, he sought to ally himself both in Church and State with Constantinople. But, finding that the Greeks showed a disposition to domineer over him both in Church and State, he turned to the West, and sought the title of king from the Emperor Henry VI and from Pope Celestine III. His request was granted, and on January 6, 1199, he was solemnly crowned king in the name of the Pope and the emperor by Cardinal Conrad of Wittlesbach, archbishop of Mainz.

This we know, among other sources, from a letter addressed to Pope Innocent by Gregory Abirad, who styles himself "the man of Jesus Christ, by God's grace the *Catholicus* of the whole Church of Armenia, the son of your holy Church, which is the foundation of the law of the whole of Christianity". The Pope, on the other hand, he calls, in true Oriental style, "the head after Christ, consecrated by Him, the head of the Catholic Church of Rome, which is the mother of all the churches, the sublime Pope distinguished by that prudence and sanctity which becomes one who holds the place of the Apostles". Moreover, in the beginning of his letter the *Catholicus* expresses a hope that our Lord will preserve the Pope in safety, "because, when you, the head, are safe,

we who are the body will, through your blessing, be safe too. Later on in the letter he informs the Pope that the king has shown them his injunctions, and that they freely embrace “the law and fraternity of the sublime Roman Church which is the mother of all the churches. She used to be our mother, and she is now; and all the archbishops and bishops and all the clergy of our Church who are numerous and in many lands are firmly resolved to obey your behests. We beg you in God’s name to send us such help and advice as will enable us to preserve God’s honour and yours and our Christianity”.

No doubt about the same time the king addressed a letter to the “lord Innocent, Supreme Pontiff and universal Pope, one most worthy of such great honour”. He told him that he hoped to bring all the Armenians to the unity of the Catholic Church, and then went on to what was evidently the chief point of his letter. Saying that he had exposed to the archbishop of Mainz the destitute condition both of his own kingdom and of that of Syria, he entreated Innocent to send them the help of Christendom before they were swamped by the deluge.

In his replies, the Pope congratulates the *Catholicus* on what he had heard first from the archbishop of Mainz, the “cardinal-bishop of Sabina, one of the seven bishops who in the Roman Church are to be found by our side”, and then from himself, viz., that he had accepted “the teaching authority of the Roman Church, and he urges him to persevere in his devotion to the Apostolic See, and to meditate on the law of God day and night... Towards your subjects show yourself a master in doctrine, a father in correction, and a mother in love”.

Moreover, he assures both the *Catholicus* and the king that at his exhortation “many have taken the Cross”, and are ready to proceed to the help of the Holy Land.

Unfortunately, the question of the complete reunion of the Armenian to the Roman Church was complicated not only by the war against the Moslems, but by the inter-Christian wars caused by the ambition of the count of Tripoli. Hence, in his letters to Leo and his nobles, Innocent urges the Armenians to prefer the common weal to their personal advantage, and “the work of the Crucified to their own profit”; and, in response to the king’s request, sends him a banner of St. Peter to be used only against the enemies of the Cross.

Leo, however, was a man far too full of ambition to think of allowing his private gains to be lessened by any consideration of the general profit. Heedless of the numbers dragged into the quarrel, he pursued his grand-nephew’s claim to Antioch with unceasing violence. Moreover, what was even less justifiable, he kept forcible possession of a fortress (Gaston or Gastim) which on very good grounds was claimed by the Templars.

Meanwhile, however, the preliminaries for the reunion of the two churches were being settled. Anxious about the complete independence of his country, Leo did not desire that it or even strangers dwelling in it should be subject to any foreign local bishop. “For the future”, he wrote to the Pope, “be assured that we are bound by the chains of obedience to the Roman Church; but for that very reason, if so it pleases your Holiness, we do not desire to be subject to any other Latin Church”. Also to express submission to the Apostolic See there was sent to Rome from Gregory, “the bishop *Catholicus* of all the Armenians ... and from all the archbishops, bishops, abbots,

priests, and clergy under his authority”, a letter addressed to “him who holds the Apostolic See, to the supreme head of the whole Church, and of all the sees on earth, to the great confessor of Christ, to the chief asylum of religion and of the whole people, to the successor of Blessed Peter, the first ruler after Christ and father of the whole world, to the one who sits in the place of God, and who carries Christ in his body; to Innocent, by God’s grace Supreme Pontiff and Universal Pope of the chief see of the city of Rome ... and to our spiritual Father”. After this eulogistic address the Armenian clergy declared that, though they were far removed from the eyes of the Pope, they were one with him in charity, and were the sheep of one shepherd. They had received from Rome, they said, their faith, which they had not altered, and they would never separate from the Roman Church, and would, moreover, strive to make the king and all the people subject to the Pope’s authority. Finally, rejoicing that it is reported that the kings of England and France have made peace, they implore the Pope to send them help.

In his answers Innocent granted Leo’s request that ecclesiastical censures should not be inflicted on his kingdom except by the Pope himself, or by his legate, or at his special order, and he exhorted the *Catholicus* Gregory to strive to keep “the king and the whole Church of the Armenians in obedience to the law of the Lord and in devotion to us”. At the same time, in compliance with the request of John, archbishop of Sis, chancellor of the king, and afterwards Catholicus of the Armenians, he granted him a ring, a mitre, and the pallium, to be taken to him by the cardinal-priests, Soffred (or Geoffrey) and Peter of St. Marcellus.

The time had now come for the formal reconciliation of the Church of Armenia with that of Rome, and the two cardinals just named, who were being sent to Palestine in connection with the Crusade about to leave Venice, were commissioned to devote their attention in the meanwhile to the spiritual and temporal concerns of Armenia.

Splendid receptions were accorded by the Armenians to both cardinals on their arrival in Cilicia. Soffred was the first to reach the Holy Land (1202), and occupied himself in vain efforts to make peace between Leo and the count of Tripoli. When Cardinal Peter arrived in Cilicia (1203), “in my kingdom”, wrote the Armenian king himself to Innocent, “we deliberated for some days on the obedience due from the Armenian Church to the Roman Church; and we, after much toil, have accomplished what our ancestors were for a long time unable to accomplish. We have brought the Armenian Church to that obedience ... The Lord *Catholicus* (John VII the Magnificent), in accordance with your instructions, solemnly offered obedience and reverence to the holy Roman Church and to you by the hands of the legate. Then in our presence, in that of some of his suffragans and the clergy and in that of our own nobles and many foreign ones, he received with all respect and devotion the pallium which you had sent him. Moreover, he promised, in deference to the apostolic injunctions, to visit the holy Roman Church by his envoys every five years. Finally, while he promised to be present in person or by deputy at the councils held in Asia, it was decreed on the other hand that no ecclesiastical synods should be held there in the absence of himself or his legate”. The same history of the reunion of the two churches is given to the Pope by the *Catholicus* himself, who adds that the Armenians had already adopted some even of the customs (*institutiones*) of the Roman Church, and propose to adopt others in course of time, when it can be done without causing scandal.

It was apparently at Cis that this most important meeting between Cardinal Peter and the ecclesiastical and civil authorities took place; and we are assured by Salimbene, who gives us this information, that the legate presented a mitre and a crozier to the Catholicus and to each of his fourteen suffragans.

But whilst the Armenian king was declaring that the Pope had “the care and presidency of the a whole Church of the Christian religion”, and John, “the humble Catholicus of the Armenians”, was saluting him with becoming obedience and reverence, we meet with hints at least that the work of reunion was not effected quite as smoothly and completely as the letters of Leo and John would suggest. In any case, it is certain that the political mission of the cardinals did not succeed as well as the spiritual one. The king and the Catholicus maintained that in judging of the respective merits of the case between his grand-nephew Rupen and the count of Tripoli, and of that between himself and the Templars, Cardinal Peter did not hold the balance fairly. Accordingly, he implored the Pope not to allow him any more power in connection with these questions. But it would appear that Leo was neither so straightforward as he pretended, nor was Cardinal Peter so unfair. This was at last brought home to Innocent, and he at length confirmed the excommunication which his delegate the patriarch of Jerusalem had pronounced against the Armenian monarch for his treatment of the Templars (1211).

This severity brought Leo to his knees, and he begged the patriarch to grant him absolution, as, “out of respect for the Pope”, he had made full satisfaction to the Templars. The patriarch referred the matter to Innocent, who bade him absolve the king, but at the same time let him know that his misdeeds had, for the moment at least, rendered him unworthy of the help of the Church with regard to Rupen’s claims to Antioch.

Leo’s desire to remain on good terms with Rome was sincere; and communion with it, which we have seen him win back after a brief period of excommunication, he retained to the day of his death under Honorius III.

National establishments of the Armenians which have been found in Rome, at any rate from the thirteenth century to our own, either in the neighbourhood of St. Peter’s or of St. Paul’s outside-the-walls, testify eloquently to the fact that a section at least of the Armenians has for all these centuries remained in that union with Rome which was renewed under Innocent III. And if far the greater number of the Armenians are today Monophysites, *i.e.*, are members of what may be called the national Church, the pontificate of Pius X has seen a council of Uniat (Catholic) Armenian bishops in the Eternal City. Rome and not Etshmiadzin is the religious centre of tens of thousands of the long-suffering Armenians.

THE MARONITES.

On the slopes of Mount Lebanon there have been from the seventh century to the present day a number of Syrians who, according to their own story, have, from that century till now, ever maintained themselves in communion with the See of Rome, and

in some kind of political independence. These Syrians, heirs, they say, of the orthodox traditions of St. Maro of Apamea who died in the fifth century, and of St. John Maro who died in the eighth, have long been known as Maronites from the monastery of St. Maro on Mount Lebanon. These Catholic Maronites must not be confused, so they warn us themselves, with the Monothelite Maronites of Mesopotamia who follow the heterodox doctrine of Maro, a priest of Edessa in the sixth century, and of whom the traveller Ricold of Monte Crucis (d. 1309) wrote (*c.* 1294) that, as he descended the Tigris between Mossul and Bagdad, he met “Maronites, wicked and schismatical people. They have an archbishop, and err in maintaining that Christ had but one will”.

Others, however, are convinced that the history of the Maronites of Mount Lebanon is not so ancient, nor so simple, nor so honourable. It is contended that the people around the monastery followed its religious lead, and became Monothelite with their teachers in the seventh century, and that they only became Catholic again in 1182 under Aymeric the Latin patriarch of Antioch, when forty thousand of them became Catholics.

Whether or not, then, the Catholic Maronites know more about their past history than their critics, they are at any rate now regarded by some as perhaps the most ultramontane people on the earth, and they were certainly Catholics when Innocent summoned their bishops to the Lateran Council (April 19, 1213).

Their patriarch, Jeremias al Amshiti, obeyed the papal summons, came to Rome, and was rewarded by the Pope with various privileges, as we find set forth in a bull which he addressed to him whilst he was still there. This document would seem to attest the fact that, for a time at least before it was issued, the Maronites had for some period ceased to recognise the supremacy of Rome, and had relapsed or fallen into Monothelism. In it Innocent told the patriarch how pleased he was at what had recently occurred in the Greek Church and in the Church of the Maronites: “For you were formerly like wandering sheep, not properly understanding that the Catholic Church was the one spouse of Christ, that Christ was the one true Shepherd, and, after Him and through Him, that Peter was His Apostle and Vicar to whom the Lord had thrice committed the feeding of His sheep, whose faith and that of his successors, the Roman pontiffs, cannot fail, as the Lord has promised that he shall confirm his brethren in their faith”. The Pope proceeded to note that it was when Cardinal Peter of St. Marcellus was in “your locality” that the patriarch “was converted to the true Shepherd”; acknowledged the Pope “as the Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church and Vicar of Jesus Christ”; and with a number of his suffragans and clergy in the presence of Cardinal Peter promised obedience to the Roman Church. The said cardinal, continued the Pope, then bade you acknowledge that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Son as He proceeded from the Father, and that “in Christ there were two wills to wit, a divine will and a human will”. In fine, he granted the patriarch the use of the pallium, which the patriarch of Antioch was to bestow upon him.

Though, however, it is clear that the Maronites were in full communion with Innocent III, many non-Maronite authors maintain that it was not till the sixteenth century that they were unwaveringly fixed in loyalty to the Holy with Rome. See. But in any case it is certain from the narratives of missionaries or pilgrims to the Holy Land

that large numbers of the Maronites of Mount Lebanon, if not all of them, were from the days of that Pope always in communion with Rome. Dominican friars “of the province of the Holy Land” informed their General about the year 1256 that the Maronites, who had once for a long time been schismatics, were then only anxious to have their books corrected by the brethren. Burchard of Mount Sion, who is regarded as the most notable of all medieval pilgrims, writing about the year 1283 of the valleys of the Lebanon and the Antilibanus, says that “in them dwell many races such as Maronites, Armenians, Greeks, Nestorians, Jacobites, and Georgians, all of whom are Christians, and are, by their own account, subjects of the Church of Rome”. Furthermore, Ludolph de Suchem (in the diocese of Paderborn), whose *Description of the Holy Land* is said by some to be the best *Itinerarium* of the fourteenth century, is even more explicit. Writing in the year 1350, he says that Mount Lebanon, which “is exceeding long and in some places exceeding high”, is filled with towns and villages, “in all of which dwell Christians according to the Latin rite, who daily long for the coming of the Christians (on a Crusade), and many of whose bishops I have seen consecrated after the Latin rite”. These assertions he repeats in a subsequent chapter: “At the foot of Mount Lebanon”, he says, “dwells a vast multitude of Christians, conforming to the Latin rite and the Church of Rome, many of whose bishops I have seen consecrated by Latin archbishops”.

GEORGIA.

As though it were impossible that any corner of the Christian world should escape the paternal watchfulness of Innocent, not even distant Georgia succeeded in evading his notice.

In the hilly isthmus between the Black and Caspian seas, and between the mountains of Caucasus and those of Armenia, have dwelt from time immemorial a brave and handsome race, known to themselves as Iberians, and to their neighbours, at least since the Middle Ages, as Georgians. For some two thousand years these bold mountaineers retained their independence, though at times they owed in turn some allegiance to the Romans, Byzantines, Arabs, Mongols, and Tartars. To this heroic people Christianity was preached in the fourth century, and from that day to this, despite the most cruel persecutions at the hands of the Moslem, the majority of them have ever held fast to the chief doctrines of Catholic Christianity. Many, moreover, have never wilfully been false to any tenet of Catholicism; and some, at any rate, have never deliberately cut themselves off from due subjection to the See of Rome, but, since the Middle Ages at least, have been in actual communion with it.

Unfortunately, in 1783 the Georgian monarch, Heraclius II (1762-1798), whose bravery called forth the admiration even of Frederick I of Prussia, made himself the vassal of Russia. Wearied by centuries of the cruellest warfare with the implacable Moslem, this splendid little people hoped to enjoy a measure of peace under the aegis of their great Christian neighbours. But the Russians, by no means for the last time in their history, proved false to their pledges. In 1801 the Czar Alexander I annexed Georgia to the Russian empire, and the Georgians lost not merely their political independence, but that religious autonomy which they had enjoyed for ages. For centuries the only

religious superior they had ever at any time acknowledged was the successor of St. Peter. Now their church is absorbed by that of Russia, and the people are enduring politically and spiritually a more systematic, if not more violent, persecution than ever they have suffered before.

When Gregory, afterwards the first Pope of that name, was a young man, the historian Procopius in 565 could say not only that the Iberians (Georgians) were Christians, but that, of all those whom he knew called by that name, they were the most tenacious of whatever the faith prescribed, and that, too, despite Persian persecution. With the hierarchy of this most Christian people, whilst the Church of Christ was still one, Gregory, when he became Pope, was in regular communication. Again, whilst the great Gregory was still a young man, there was born into the world the greatest enemy the Christian name has ever known, the Arab Mohammed. The fanatical followers of this conscious or unconscious impostor soon overran the greater portion of the Byzantine empire; and, if communion between Georgia and Rome ceased for some centuries, it was not because it was the will of schismatical patriarchs of Constantinople or Antioch that it should, or because such was the wish of its people, but because intercourse between the two was cut by the sword of the Moslem.

The Crusades, however, brought travellers from the West among them, either in their native land or in their famous monastery of the Holy Cross at Jerusalem, known as "At the Trunk" or "At the Stock". They reported not merely that the Georgian women were, as brave and warlike as the men, that their laymen wore a square tonsure, and their clerics a round one, and that the latter were distinguished from the former by a white linen cloth which they wrapped round their neck and shoulders, but that the people declared themselves "subject to the Church of Rome", and their prelates that "they would most willingly belong to the Church of Rome".

One of the results of the onslaught of the Crusaders on the Moslem power in the East had been a striking revival of Georgian independence under David II, the Renewer or the Restorer (1089-1125), a scion of that remarkably long-lived dynasty, the Bagratidae. This, perhaps the most prosperous period in the history of Georgia, thus happily inaugurated by the great Restorer, lasted for over a hundred years, and reached its climax during the reign of that valiant woman the beautiful Queen Tamar (1184-1212). It was to this distinguished sovereign, whose deeds won for her the praises of her contemporary, the greatest of Georgia's poets, Chota Rustavdi, that Innocent III despatched a letter (June 7) in 1211. It was addressed "to the illustrious king of Avognia (Georgia)", and was an exhortation to him to march to the succour of the Holy Land. After pointing out that our Lord's dying for our salvation ought to make Christians wishful to defend the place where He expired, he urged that Christian princes ought to be the more anxious to defend it, the more they see "the enemies of the Christian faith" wishful to crush it. "Since, then, following in the footsteps of your predecessors, you are zealous in your opposition to the perfidious occupants of the patrimony of Jesus Christ, we heartily praise this your earnestness. But at the same time we exhort your Highness, for the remission of your own sins and of those of your people, to carry out the designs with which God has inspired you, so that the perfidy of the pagans may be crushed, and your temporal toil may be replaced by eternal rest".

What precise part was taken by the Georgians in the Crusades is not clear; but it seems that they assisted the Western Crusaders rather by the wars they waged against the Turks on their own account than by actually fighting in their ranks. At any rate, they were soon struggling with the overwhelming hordes of the Mongols for their very existence, and, in turn, appealing to the Popes to help them.

The great Queen Thamar was succeeded by her son, Giorgi Lasha, who, after severe fighting with the Mongols of Chingiz Khan, died in 1223, and left a troubled inheritance to his sister Rusudan (*d.* 1243), as famous for her beauty as was her mother Thamar. She at once wrote “to the most holy Pope, the Father and Lord of all Christians”, and said that, “to him who holds the See of Blessed Peter, Rusudan, the lowly queen of Avognia (Anegnia, Avognia), his devoted handmaid and daughter, with head bowed to his feet, sends greeting”. Begging the Pope to show himself “sweet to her, and to interest himself in her welfare”, she informed him of the death of her brother, and asked his blessing for herself and her Christian subjects. She assured the Pope that her brother was preparing to carry out his wishes, made known to him by the papal legate at Damietta, and to march to the help of the Christians when the Tartars invaded Georgia. At first they had taken the Georgians by surprise, as the latter had supposed the invaders to be Christians. The necessity of driving out these “bad Christians” had been the cause why the Georgians had not obeyed the behest of the legate. Now, however, she continued, that she is free, she will send her Constable John and her whole army to join the emperor (who she is delighted to learn is about to embark for the Holy Land), if only the Pope will let her know whither they must be sent. The Constable himself wrote to the same effect, promised to march with forty thousand men, begged the Pope’s blessing, and concluded by saying that his nephew, “Sanxa by name”, the lord of fifteen great provinces, also humbly asked the Pope’s blessing. In his reply to the queen (May 12, 1224), Honorius praised her devotion to the Roman Church, and the faith of her people, which was the more remarkable in that it shone forth in the midst of pagan darkness. He told her to get ready her troops, as the Emperor Frederick would be sailing on the feast of St. John the Baptist; granted to all who took part in the Holy War “the full pardon of their sins which they had confessed and were sorry for”; asked the queen to have his letters read to her people, and finished by granting the blessing which had been sought. But Frederick could not or would not keep his promises at the time, and before the help of the Georgians was again needed they had themselves been overwhelmed by the terrible Mongols, and had to ask for help from the Popes. Meanwhile, Gregory IX utilised the friendship of the queen by begging her to help the Franciscans whom he was sending to the neighbouring nations “who knew not God” (April 11, 1233).

About the year 1236 the Mongols again invaded Georgia, and in her distress Rusudan turned to the Pope, and, no doubt with a view of interesting him still more in her affairs, proposed a formal reunion with the Church of Rome. This we know from a long letter which Gregory addressed (January 13, 1240) “to Rusudan and her son David, the illustrious queen and king of the Georgians”. Expressing his pleasure at their assurance that the faith of their Church had ever remained firm and without blemish, he averred that what they had told him of the dread doings of the Tartars had lessened his joy, which, however, had been again increased by what he had since learnt of their

subsequent defeat. He, however, continued, stood in turn in need of their sympathy. The enemies of the faith—the Saracens in Syria and in Spain, and apostates from the faith in other parts—were causing him such trouble that he could not have sent any help to Georgia even if its distance from him were not such as almost to prevent the news of their struggles from reaching him. “As to your request for union with us, we are the more pleased with it that anything which may be wanting in what is necessary for your salvation and our joy may be completed by this union”. In fine, he would have the Georgian sovereigns receive with good-will the eight Friars Preachers whom he is sending to them.

War, however, which had caused the Georgians to drift away from communion with Rome, also kept them away from Rome. The ravages of one Moslem horde after another ever prevented the consummation of that union which was desired by the Georgians almost as much as by Rome. But age after age was the desire for union repeated both by the Georgian rulers and by the Popes, especially when the former enjoyed a measure of peace; and all the correspondence between Georgia and Rome shows that the Popes regarded the Georgians as Catholics, at heart at least, and that the Georgian sovereigns regarded the Popes as their spiritual rulers. When sending missionaries among the Tartars, Innocent IV appealed to the prelates of Georgia to help them; and Nicholas IV urged King Demetrius to continue his efforts for reunion. Then, after a sad period of Tartar ravages, when the country revived by the efforts of King George V, the Brilliant (1318-1346), the Popes again turned their attention to that long-suffering land, and John XXII sent to George several letters concerning union which must have been favourably received, as a bishopric dependent on Rome was founded at Tiflis, the Georgian capital, in 1329.

But still worse times were in store for Georgia. Between the Tartars, the Turks, and the Persians that unhappy country had no peace. It became so weak that it could not keep itself together, and internal dissensions added to the misery of the land. Still, in the midst of all their troubles, the tradition of attachment to Rome lived on. In 1457, Calixtus III could praise the devotion of the Georgians to the Apostolic See, and he listened to Georgian envoys declaring that “they venerated him as the Vicar of Christ, and knew that they must obey him”. In the fifteenth century the Catholic bishopric of Tiflis was stifled by the endless wars, and for some time after the year 1500 no travellers even seem to have found their way into Georgia. Yet from out the gloom which oppressed the land, we hear the voices of kings and people pathetically hailing the Pope as “the new Peter, the judge and key-bearer of the kingdom of heaven, the new Paul”, and receiving with extraordinary veneration priests from Rome. We see, too, the dim outlines of the famous Princess Helen Atabeg; of the Princes Bagrat and Dadian; of the *Catholicus* Malachy, and of Archbishop Alaverdéli, who gave in their submission to the “new Peter”.

Then in the middle of the seventeenth century the Theatines, under whom the conversions just mentioned had taken place, were succeeded by the Capuchins, and again kings, princes, and bishops of Georgia returned to the Catholic faith. But, as we have seen, the stress of war forced the Georgians to confide in Russia, with the result that the Czar expelled the Capuchins in 1845, and has since made every effort to force the Catholic Georgians to submit to his Church. The efforts of the Russian Government,

however, have been as powerless with the Catholic Georgians as with the Poles, and today “the wall of brass which Russia has kept between the Catholic world and Georgia is beginning to crumble”, and some forty thousand Georgians are in communion with that Church of Rome for which so many of their ancestors suffered so much.

AFRICA.

Passing over Innocent’s relations with other non-European countries, for instance with Aleppo, because they have already been noted, we may, in order with the Pope himself not to neglect any of the then known quarters of the world, direct our attention to Africa.

When Innocent took his place among the successors of St. Peter, Moorish Africa was under the sway of one of the greater princes of the now decaying dynasty of the Almohades (1149-1235), Abou-Yousouf-Yacoub El-Manzor (or Almanzor), 1184-1199, who had gained some important victories over the Christians in the Spanish peninsula, particularly that of Alarcos (1195), and had brought back with him to Africa thousands of Christian captives. To this Berber prince Innocent despatched the following letter in the second year of his pontificate (March 8, 1199). It was addressed “to the illustrious Miramolinus, king of Morocco, and to his subjects in the hope that they may arrive at the knowledge of the truth, and to their profit remain therein”. “Among the works of mercy”, wrote the Pope, “which Jesus Christ our Lord in the gospel commended to His faithful, that of the redemption of captives holds not the least place. Hence to those who are engaged in this work we owe the apostolic favour. Now quite recently certain men (among whom the bearers of these presents are to be reckoned), inspired by God, have devised a rule of life (*regulam et ordinem*), by the constitutions of which a third part of the revenues which they now have or may hereafter acquire must be spent in the redemption of captives. Moreover, since it is often easier to redeem captives by exchange than by money, they have been permitted, in order that they may be the better able to carry out their designs, to purchase from Christians pagan captives whom they may offer in exchange for Christian prisoners. Since, then, work of this kind is for the mutual benefit of Christians and pagans, we thought it right to bring it to your notice by our apostolic letters. May He who is the way, the truth, and the life inspire you to know the truth, which is Christ, and to embrace it without delay”.

The result of the Pope’s letter was satisfactory, and the members of the Order for the Redemption of Captives, to whom Innocent here alludes, were well received by Almanzor, as were later on the Franciscans and Dominicans by his sons.

As far, however, as Moorish Africa was concerned, it would seem, to judge from Innocent’s letters, that at length the ancient African Church was dead. The once bright flame of the Church in Africa was burning but low even in the days of Gregory VII,

when but two or three bishops represented the six hundred who governed the African Church before the coming of the Vandals. After his time we have watched it gradually dying out. The Christians in Africa for whom Innocent exerted himself were but captives. A native organised Christian Church had ceased to exist in what was once Roman Africa. But in the continent of Africa the faith was not wholly extinguished. The most important part of the Dark Continent has ever been the land of the Nile, and in that land an organised Christian Church still maintained a feeble existence.

During the pontificate of Innocent III the Ayyubid dynasty (1169-1252) held sway over Egypt; and during the greater part of his reign that country was ruled by El-Adil Seyf-ed-dln (the Saphadin of the Latin historians), the brother of Saladin (1200-1218). Although the relations of the Ayyubids with their Christian subjects grew more friendly as time went on, Saphadin followed the example of Saladin and was severe and exacting in their regard. Besides having to suffer from the oppression of their civil rulers, the unhappy Christians, in common with the other inhabitants of Egypt, had, in the early portion of Saphadin's reign, to endure the famine and its attendant miseries caused by two successive failures in the overflow of the Nile.

The sufferings of the Church of Alexandria did not escape the notice of Innocent, and a regular correspondence on the subject was kept up between the Pope and Nicholas I, the Greek patriarch of Alexandria. It would appear that Nicholas must have acknowledged Innocent's supremacy, for in that Pope's first letter to him (of which only a fragment remains), he bade him persevere in the Catholic faith, and do his best to advance it by prayer and the example of a good life.

A few years later the patriarch, in the midst of his troubles, wrote to the great Pope for sympathy. In his reply Innocent praised him "for giving forth the sweet odour of devotion like a lily among thorns in the midst of an evil and perverse nation", and for seeking consolation both for himself and for the Christian captives from the bosom of the holy Roman Church. He reminded him that the trials of this life were as nothing in comparison with the reward they would win in the next, and that God would not allow him to be tried beyond his strength.

Again a year or two later came more praise for the patriarch. Innocent congratulated him on the work he was doing for the redemption of captives, and assured him that he would secure for him the cooperation of the military orders, of the kings and princes of the Oriental province, and of the patriarch of Jerusalem. At the same time he exhorted him to strive to induce some of the Christian captives to amend their lives, because they commit sins "which not only offend the divine Majesty, but lower the Christian religion in the eyes of the infidel". He concluded his letter thus: "Moreover, as you have informed us, the aforesaid captives have only an old priest to minister to their spiritual needs. Hence have they respectfully begged Your Fraternity to ordain one of their number, who is learned in ecclesiastical matters, a deacon. This you said you were unwilling to do without our permission". This permission we freely accord.

The deference displayed by Nicholas towards the Pope lasted throughout the whole of his pontificate, and, when he was summoned to the Lateran Council, though he could not go himself, he sent a deacon, named Germanus, as his representative.

PART IV.
**THE WEST AND NORTH OF EUROPE. FRANCE, THE BRITISH
ISLES, SPAIN, SCANDINAVIA, AND LIVONIA.**

CHAPTER I
FRANCE

AMONG the very first letters written by Innocent after he became Pope was one to Philip of France. In it he informed the king of his election, and then added that he had thought it fitting that “the first-fruits of his letters” should be addressed to the king of the Franks, because France had ever “stood firm in the unity of the Church”, and because its king “was a special son of the Roman Church”. He concluded his short letter by exhorting the king so to revere his mother the holy Roman Church as to follow the footsteps of his father in loyalty to it, and, “as became a Christian prince”, sincerely to assist him who had been called to the work of ruling the Apostolic See.

About the same time that this letter was despatched, Innocent sent another to the bishop of Paris, treating of what proved to be the most important of the relations between himself and the French king. After pointing out that God made man and wife for the propagation of the human race, and that our Lord had forbidden any man to put asunder what God had joined together, he expressed his profound sorrow that King Philip had put away his lawful wife, and taken another. He accordingly urged the bishop, whose learning, character, and kinship would naturally give him influence with Philip, to exhort him, in the Pope’s name, to restore the queen to her rights. He was to point out to him that, if anything happened to his only legitimate son, his kingdom would pass to strangers, should he not take back his wife; and he was to hint that, disagreeable as it would be to Innocent, he could not allow the affair to pass in silence. He was determined not to let the matter rest as Celestine had done. To understand the import of this letter we must now recall what it was exactly that Celestine had done.

Philip’s first wife, Isabel of Flanders, died in March 1190; and, on his return from the Crusade, the grasping monarch thought to strengthen his hand by marrying the sister of Canute VI, king of Denmark, the young Princess Ingeborg, described as “beautiful in face, but even more beautiful in soul” (August 14, 1193). For some unexplained reason, however, he repudiated her the very next day after the marriage,

and had no difficulty in inducing a number of servile bishops to declare the marriage void on account of some distant relationship. "Various causes", says one of our historians, "are assigned for this disgraceful levity"; but whatever was the true cause (and it appears to have been a cause similar to that which makes some "mad if they behold a cat"), feminine opinion was not slow to condemn Philip. Accordingly, when he approached the daughter of the count palatine of the Rhine and asked for her hand, he was met by a curt refusal. She had no wish, she said, to experience the fate of Ingeborg. Many other noble ladies, we are assured, followed her example. Adverse feminine opinion, however, was not the only force which was soon arrayed against Philip. Both Ingeborg and her brother appealed to Rome, and easily proved that the alleged relationship was extremely remote.

The unhappy lady herself, ignorant of French, but crying out in Latin: "Wicked France! Rome! Rome!" wrote a short but feeling letter to Pope Celestine. All believe, she said, that the successor of the Prince of the Apostles has the supreme power in the Church, and that recourse is had to him all the more readily, as it is known that so many have been saved by his assistance. "I, then, taken from my father's home, brought into the realm of the Franks, and, by the will of heaven, raised to the royal throne, through the wickedness of the enemy of the human race, envious of my happiness, have been thrown on the ground like a dry and useless branch, destitute of all comfort and advice. My spouse, Philip, king of the Franks, has left me, though he could find nothing to condemn in me, except what malice had forged on the anvil of lies. ... In my wretchedness I fly to the seat of mercy, so that, having won your pity, should better fortune befall me, I would henceforth be your handmaid, ever ready to obey your commands".

Celestine was perhaps a little slow in acting; but, finding that Philip took no notice of his first letters and legate, he at length formally notified the archbishops of Sens and Rheims, as well as Philip himself, that he had definitely annulled the decision of the bishops in favour of the divorce (May 13, 1195). At the same time he earnestly exhorted Philip to take Ingeborg back and to treat her affectionately; and he commanded the archbishops to forbid Philip to marry again as long as Ingeborg was alive. Especially did he express his indignation that the bishops had decided the case against her, "seeing that she was undefended" and ignorant of French.

Philip was, however, deaf to honour and conscience, at length found a woman willing to become his wife, "if indeed", says William of Newburgh, "she may be called his wife, who appears rather to have been his concubine" (June 1196). The woman was Agnes de Meran, the daughter of Berthold V, duke of Merania and Dalmatia. Again did a cry of agony from the outraged Ingeborg go up to the Pope. She tells him how Philip married her, but, "seduced by the devil and the advice of some wicked nobles", repudiated her; and then how, giving up any pretence of relationship or any other excuse, married again, and put her in prison. She grieves not only for herself, but for the king also, who has given so bad an example to the world. If the Apostolic See help her not she will die. Her brother at the same time called upon Celestine to lay France under an interdict.

Up to the time of Philip's attempted marriage with Agnes de Meran, Celestine acted vigorously in behalf of Ingeborg. But after that he did nothing for her; and, "not without much scandal", says the author of his successor's biography, appeared to acquiesce in the situation. It must not, however, be forgotten that when Philip married Agnes, Henry VI entered Italy, and it may well be that a Pope of nearly ninety years of age felt incapable of struggling against the emperor and the powerful king of France at the same time.

When Innocent, as we have seen, took up the cause of the injured queen, the political situation was as much in his favour as was his own age. The kingdom of Sicily was in the hands of his own ward, and the rivalry of Otho and Philip prevented either of them from being a menace to him. His natural zeal for justice was, moreover, quickened by a fresh appeal from King Canute in his sister's behalf (1198), and he followed up the letters we have already quoted with a strong one to Philip himself (May 17). He tells the king that God has made him Pope to judge not only along with the princes of the earth, but also, if need be, these very princes themselves. He then assures Philip that, owing to the immense literary benefits that France has bestowed upon him, and to the unvarying devotion of the kings of the Franks to the Roman Church, he feels that he is specially bound to him and to his kingdom. Then, after dwelling on the scandal which his divorce has caused, and on the wrong he has done the Church of Rome by flouting the mandates of Pope Celestine, and after reminding him that if an impediment of affinity could be alleged against Ingeborg, an impediment of consanguinity could be urged against the *intruder*, he begged him to consult his honour and his eternal salvation, and to take back his wife. At the same time he impressed upon the king that, if he did not obey his injunctions, he would be all the more severe with him as he loved him the more, and that from no consideration of love or money would he move from the path of rectitude. "However much", he said in conclusion, "you may trust in your power, you cannot hold your ground against, I will not say my face, but against the face of God, whose place we, though unworthy, hold on earth".

As this noble letter made no impression on the infatuated monarch, a cardinal legate, Peter of Capua, of the title of S. Maria in Via Lata, was sent into France to endeavour to make peace between it and England, and to place France under an interdict if Philip should persist in his unworthy conduct for one month after the legate's final warning (September 1198).

On December 5, 1199, as Philip took no heed of the legate's exhortations, Peter held a council at Dijon, and, in accordance with his instructions, taking no notice of the king's appeal to Rome, placed France under an interdict, but delayed its publication for a few weeks. Still was the heart of the king hardened, and on January 12, 1200, the legate solemnly renewed his sentence at a council at Vienne.

Furious because his bishops, one after the other, obeying the commands of the Pope, carried out the provisions of the interdict, Philip began a bitter persecution of the Church in his dominions. This conduct caused Innocent to change his policy. Feeling that the interdict was causing more suffering to the innocent than to the guilty, he began to speak of revoking the interdict, and of excommunicating Philip instead. "It is better", he is reported to have said, that one should be punished, than that the whole nation

should perish” (cf. St. John XI. 50). This threat had its effect, and Philip’s envoys once again appeared in Rome to offer terms on their master’s behalf. Accordingly, another legate, Cardinal Octavian, bishop of Ostia, a relative both of the Pope and of Philip, was sent into France, where he arrived in September (1200). He was received with the greatest enthusiasm by all classes, and at once set about his task with great tact.

At St. Leger-en-Iveline, between Paris and Etampes, the bishops of France met the new legate. Thither also came Philip and Ingeborg, “his queen, and the German adulteress; and the king of France, at the exhortation of the aforesaid cardinal, and at the advice of his nobles put away his adulteress, and took back his queen Ingeborg (or Botilda, as Roger always calls her)”. This was “on the vigil of the Nativity of the Blessed Mother of God, the ever-virgin Mary (September 7)”.

When the king had thus publicly acknowledged Ingeborg, the cardinal removed the interdict, with the result that “such joy filled the whole kingdom”, wrote Octavian to the Pope, “as we can scarcely tell in a letter. All bless you and praise your mercy and your justice—your justice for your defence of the queen, and your mercy for the removal of the interdict”. “The Roman Church”, cried the bishops of France, “is the city of our strength”.

But the legate could not persuade Philip to accept Ingeborg definitely as his wife. On the contrary, the king declared that “she was too closely allied with him by consanguinity, as he was prepared to prove, and he demanded that a divorce should be effected between them”. The legate accordingly fixed Soissons as the place where the case was to be thoroughly investigated, and, in accordance with the orders of the Pope, he sent word to the queen’s brother, Canute, king of Denmark, and to the archbishop of Lund, to come to defend the queen with all the necessary documents.

Meanwhile, however, Philip did not honourably fulfil his engagements. The queen complained that, so far from being treated as a queen, she was practically a prisoner at Étampes. Much distressed, Innocent implored Philip to treat his “good and holy wife” affectionately; and he impressed on his legate that, “holding fast to justice and to truth, if need be even to the shedding of his blood, he would not, with the help of God, tolerate any underhand work in connection with the affair ... You doubtless remember”, he continued, “how I told you myself that this affair would, if it were conscientiously conducted, bring great credit to the Apostolic See, but, if it were improperly treated, would redound to its greater confusion”.

However the unfortunate Ingeborg was treated in the meanwhile, she appeared, along with envoys from Denmark, before Octavian at Soissons in March. Before him also appeared Philip.

The king no doubt came with a light heart. He had received a communication from one of his agents in Rome which led him to suppose that Innocent had at length come to view the case as he wished. The Pope, wrote the envoy, “advised that the king should bring forward both the pleas, viz., that of affinity and that of the physical repugnance (or sorcery, *causa maleficit*). If the queen should not choose to produce witnesses in the matter of the affinity, the Pope will be content; but if she should choose to produce them, she cannot be denied her right... With regard to the repugnance or bewitchment, the Pope is ready to grant this point to the king. If he is prepared to cause

an oath to be taken on his soul that he attempted to consummate the marriage and could not, and that he has no other grave reason for hating the queen, then his word is to be accepted, unless the queen should swear the opposite. Moreover”, continued the royal agent, “the Pope believes she could easily be induced not to take such an oath. If, however, the king is afraid that sentence will be given against him on these points, the matter could be so arranged that sentence should not be pronounced; and then the king will be in the same condition as he is now. But there is one point on which the Pope will not make any concession. The king must make another effort to consummate the marriage, as such repugnances (or bewitchments, *maleficia*) are overcome by prayer”. But Philip’s hopes were doomed to disappointment. The Danish envoys would not recognise Octavian as judge, declaring to the king: “We appeal to our lord the Pope from the judge here Octavian, who is suspected by us, inasmuch as he is your kinsman by blood, as he admits, and shows too great favour in your cause”. Ingeborg also appealed to the Pope. Thereupon Octavian, who, to do him justice, had already, in conformity to Innocent’s orders, requested to have John, cardinal-priest of St. Prisca, associated with him in the trial, begged the envoys to await John’s arrival and sentence. “They, however, took their departure, saying: We have appealed. After three days, the other legate arrived ... and, sitting in judgment, he found no cause why there should be a divorce; but when it was his intention to pronounce final sentence against the king of France, the king”, continues Roger of Hoveden, whom we are quoting, “being forewarned thereof, departed before the sentence was pronounced, taking with him his wife”, from whom, adds Rigord, he sent word to the judges to say that he would never separate. “Thus for this time Philip escaped out of the hands of the Romans”.

By this artifice, indeed, for it was nothing else, as it is plain that he never intended to accept Ingeborg, Philip gained more time. But he had really outwitted himself. Agnes of Merania, who had just given birth to a child “filled with sorrowful anxiety at the rumours she heard that the king had abandoned her”, died at Poissy, c. August (?) 1201. Philip’s only thought now was to procure from Innocent the legitimation of the children he had had by her. To spare the guiltless, and to secure the good-will of the king towards his hapless wife, Innocent agreed. Accordingly, though by his charity he earned the ill-will of many, before the close of the year he issued letters acknowledging their legitimacy, without thereby intending, as he specially stated, any prejudice to the case between Philip and Ingeborg.

But not even by this kindness on the Pope’s part was the French king moved to restore her rights to his injured queen. Once more was she shut up at Étampes, and for years did her heartless husband employ every means in his power to try to procure from Innocent a sentence of divorce from her. In his untiring efforts many things favoured him. First there was his own skill in the arts of diplomacy; and then he knew that the Pope would sacrifice much to further either the cause of the Crusade, or that of his candidate for the Empire, Otho of Brunswick, or to secure the repression of the Albigensian heretics. At one time, indeed, he had sworn that, though he had often been urged to join a combination against the Pope, he had refused to do so; still there is no doubt that, at any rate as time went on, he profited by every favourable turn of politics to put pressure upon the Pope. Knowledge of this line of action on the king’s part had its effect upon Innocent. It rendered him cautious in the unceasing efforts which he

made on Ingeborg's behalf; though it must be borne in mind that, since Philip was no longer living in adultery, the Pope was not in the same position to act as vigorously against him as he had been before. And yet, as his biographer assures us, "the Supreme Pontiff, although he could not induce the king to love the queen, never ceased, now by kind words and now by severe ones, to urge him to treat her like a queen, ... and, though he very much displeased the king thereby, he never ceased to use every opportunity in the queen's interests".

Year after year the letters of the Pope continued knocking at the heart of the king, in the hope, as Innocent himself expressed it, that they would at length wear down his resistance, as water hollows out the stone, not by violence, but by constantly dropping upon it. To all Philip's importunities and threats he replied that the queen must not in any trial be left undefended nor tried by judges who were not above suspicion, and that, anxious as he was to serve the king, he must not be asked to do any thing which would involve a violation of justice, and which would bring infamy on both their souls. He moreover urged him, "as a powerful and prudent king who ought to have dominion over his soul, to compel himself to offer the affection of a husband to his wife Ingeborg, queen of the Franks". At the same time he asked him "whether the Apostolic See could possibly refrain from giving heed to the complaints of the oppressed, and especially to those of women, who on account of their weaker state ought to be the more protected by its justice".

To the touching letters of Ingeborg begging him to help her, he assures her that he is doing all that man can do, and he sends her envoys to encourage her, and letters of consolation, urging her to be patient for her ultimate greater merit.

About June 1203 there reached Innocent a letter from the unhappy queen. "You are", she said, "by God's grace the successor of Peter and the colleague of Paul, who did not shrink from striking the Corinthians with the sword of the spirit; you are the topmost peak of the mountains to which all eyes turn; you are the saviour of the oppressed, and the refuge of the wretched ... Save me from those who hate me... My lord, my husband, Philip, the illustrious king of the Franks, persecutes me. Not only does he not use me as a wife, but in scorn of my youth he does not blush to strive by the solitude of a prison and the opprobrious calumnies of his satellites to prevail on me to violate the rights of matrimony and the law of Christ ... Here in my prison no one, except some monk or nun, dare come to console me, and I can never hear from any one the word of God to refresh my soul. Nor have I a choice of confessors to whom I may make my confession. Mass I am rarely able to hear; the other services of the Church never. Not one of my countrymen is allowed to come near me, and but a poor supply of food is brought to me. Neither medicine nor doctor can I have, and I am not allowed a bath. Hence do I fear for my appearance, and lest grievous illness should come upon me. I have but a poor supply of clothes, nor are they such as are suitable for a queen. Worse than all this are the vile creatures with whom the will of the king has surrounded me; ... and I am not allowed to have the letters which your Holiness has sent me ... To you, most holy Father, do I turn my eyes lest I perish—perish, I do not mean in body, but in soul. For as I daily die for your honour, and to preserve inviolate the laws of matrimony, how sweet and pleasant would the death of my body be to me so wretched and so desolate, the despised and rejected of all!". In fine, the heart-broken woman

implored the Pope not to accept any proposition derogatory to her marriage which her feminine frailty, frightened by threats, might induce her to make.

In reply to this most touching letter Innocent at once despatched John, abbot of Casamari, to Philip with a letter which concluded by asking him to allow the abbot access to the queen in order that he might console her in the Pope's name, and in which he begged him to treat his wife becomingly, "if not for the fear of God or for respect for the Apostolic See, or for the noble birth and virtuous life of the queen herself, at least to silence evil tongues, and to preserve his good name a treasure to be set above great wealth". If anything, he urged, were to happen to the queen, "all men would say that you had brought about her death, and that you had thus killed a part of your own body". A few months later Innocent warned Philip that he could not leave the queen's ill-treatment unnoticed, and that, without respect of persons, he would be compelled to take action.

Although the queen's condition, as far at least as food and raiment were concerned, was improved, Philip remained obdurate on the main question, and continued to put forth as grounds for a divorce not merely the alleged affinity, but more than ever the suggestion of invincible repugnance, or of witchcraft (*maleficium*). Writing, therefore, to Ingeborg on this subject, Innocent assured her that "we have done for you whatever man could do". At the same time he sent to her his chaplain, to whom he assured her that she could open her mind. Somewhat later, Philip, either fearing that the Pope would not tolerate the state of things much longer, or because he was at length moved by his representations, informed him that he was about to make an effort to overcome the bewitchment, or his natural repugnance (*maleficium*), and to consummate the marriage. Needless to say, Innocent wrote to encourage this new resolve, and in the following year commissioned Gualo, cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Porticu, to examine into this alleged enchantment or repugnance.

But Philip of France was not anxious for justice. What he wanted was a divorce. Accordingly, in a fresh letter to Innocent he put forth a new reason. Ingeborg was herself anxious, so he said, to go into a convent. Innocent, however, let him know that he, at any rate, was only anxious for justice, and wrote him a long and scathing letter, in which he unsparingly upbraids his cruel and cunning conduct. Still, on condition that a fair trial is allowed, the new reasons for a divorce may be examined by Cardinal Gualo.

A fair trial, however, was exactly what Philip Augustus was unable to face, and so, telling Gualo that he was convinced that the Pope had no intention of setting him free, bade him leave France forthwith. Still the weary game went on once more. On the one side we see Innocent continuing to console the outraged lady, and refusing, despite his political difficulties, to allow himself to be bullied into granting a divorce; and on the other side we see Philip endeavouring to put every kind of pressure on the Pope in order to force him to grant the divorce,—promising, for instance, to marry the daughter of the landgrave of Thuringia if he could make the Pope free him from Ingeborg.

At last, contrary to all that seemed likely, the steady adhesion to the cause of justice on the part of Innocent met its reward. The constantly dropping water had at length worn away all opposition. "To the great joy of the whole people", Philip at last accorded her rights, both as a wife and as a queen, to that brave and long-suffering lady,

Ingeborg of Denmark (1213). Some see in Philip's surrender merely his desire to further his designs on England; but, merely noting with one of his modern biographers that "the effects of political changes on the action of Philip ... may be easily exaggerated", we will leave to the reader to assign motives as he pleases. At the same time, with the author just cited we may call attention to the fact that: "So far as it was possible to succeed, (Innocent) succeeded. He enforced the withdrawal of the illegal and dishonest divorce. He compelled Philip to put away Agnes. He compelled him again to recognise Ingeborg as his lawful wife. But not even a Pope could compel a man to live with his wife or to give her more than the necessities of life. He could remonstrate and even threaten, but there was a point at which the legal sanction of the Church definitely ceased. Innocent went as far as he was justified in going, and not an inch further".

The courtier William the Breton, after telling us of the reconciliation between Philip and his wife, says that the people conceived immense joy thereat, "because there was no other fault in him". But it is certain that Innocent III would not have so panegyricised him. More than once he had to threaten him with ecclesiastical censures for his high-handed treatment of the Church in his kingdom. Indeed, as will be related at length in connection with the Pope's vassal, King John, Innocent was apparently preparing to excommunicate Philip when death silenced his powerful voice for ever.

Of all the contemporary princes of Europe, Philip Augustus was the only one fit to be compared with Innocent. Both of them knew exactly what they wanted, and pursued their ends with the same inflexible tenacity of purpose. The main object pursued by the French king was the increase of the royal power. Both secular and ecclesiastical princes felt the weight of his hand, and we have seen how for twenty years he kept largely at bay both public opinion and the power of the Church in order that even in the domain of the moral law his will might not be thwarted. Had he met a less determined Pope than Innocent, he would have bent all laws to serve his purposes. As it was, he is reckoned with St. Louis IX and Louis XI as among the sovereigns who have done most to consolidate the kingdom of France.

CHAPTER II.

THE BRITISH ISLES.

ENGLAND.

In previous biographies it has been told how Innocent brought to a conclusion the great dispute between the archbishops and the monks of Canterbury by insisting on the demolition of the church at Lambeth; how he endeavoured to help, or threatened to

punish, the headstrong Geoffrey Plantagenet, archbishop of York; and how he enforced Celestine's decisions against the Austrian captors of King Richard.

During the brief period of their joint reigns the relations between Innocent and Richard were for the most part very amicable. The Pope assured the king that he wished to honour him very specially among the other princes of the world, and, "with paternal foresight", to provide for his interests. And, apart from the support which the king gave to the archbishop of Canterbury against its monks, nothing arose to interrupt the harmonious relations between them. Innocent looked with great hope to Richard as the leader of another crusade, and hence worked hard to make peace between him and Philip Augustus; while Richard was anxious to gain the good-will of the Pope in order the more readily to induce him to support his nephew Otho in his candidature for the Empire. Moreover, the Church in England was not merely, as usual, devotedly attached to the paternal authority of the Holy See, but, for the moment, had no cause of complaint against the civil authority. For the king, apparently really grateful for the sacrifices which churchmen had made to help to raise the large sum required for his ransom, had issued a decree in which he not merely promised not to use as a precedent against them the amount of money they had raised for that purpose, but undertook to preserve intact, and even, where possible, to increase their immunities and liberties. As this rescript had been confirmed by Innocent, there was every hope of continued peace between the Church and State in this country.

Innocent's first letter to Richard accompanied a present of four rings. Whilst presuming that the king had many more beautiful ones than those which he is sending him, he begs him to consider their "form and number, their material and their colour, in order that he may look to the mystery rather than to the gift itself. Their roundness reminds us of eternity, which has neither beginning nor end. Hence from their form the king may learn to pass from the things of earth to the things of heaven, and from what is temporal to what is eternal. Their number, four, which is a square, denotes constancy, ... and this the king will have when he is adorned with the four fundamental virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance.... Gold is emblematical of wisdom, because just as gold is the best of all the metals, so wisdom excels all other gifts.... Nothing more becomes a king than its possession, and hence we see Solomon, that king of peace, asked of God, in order that he might be able to govern his people well, only wisdom. Finally, the greenness of the emerald signifies faith, the heavenly blue (*serenitas*) of the sapphire is the symbol of hope, the redness of the garnet shows charity, and the golden gleam of the topaz typifies good works in accordance with those words of our Lord: Let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven (Matt. v. 16)".

In thanking the Pope for his beautiful rings, rendered more precious by the dignity of the giver, Richard took advantage of the opportunity to urge the claims of Otho for papal support; and he assured Innocent "that there live not in the world two Christian princes who have so great a desire to serve your majesty, and by whose aid you could more easily overcome the adversary of the peace of Christendom". Needless to say, he spoke of his nephew Otho and himself.

But Innocent's principal concern was, in the interests of the Holy Land, to make peace between England and France. Naturally indignant at Philip's having taken advantage of his captivity to seize part of his territories, Richard was bent on taking vengeance on the unscrupulous monarch, and as soon as he was free made war upon him. In his efforts to make peace, Innocent, after reminding the English king of all he had done and was doing for him, urged him to conclude a treaty with Philip, and did not hesitate to warn him that he might be forced to compel him to make peace by ecclesiastical censures.

To support his letters the Pope despatched to France Peter of Capua, cardinal-priest of S. Maria in Via Lata; gave him powers to compel the hierarchy of England to assist him; and besought the kings of the two countries to make peace, or at least a truce for five years, so that the work of preparing for the Crusade might proceed. His efforts were crowned with success, and a truce for five years was arranged between the two monarchs, one of the conditions being that Philip should aid Otho "to obtain the Roman Empire" (January 1199).

Unfortunately, the death of Richard (April 8, 1199), "of illustrious memory", was held by Philip to have dissolved the truce. The king of France realised that the new ruler of England was a very different man to his brother, and that his chance had come. Although Richard had named John his heir, Philip at once espoused the cause of John's nephew, young Arthur, duke of Brittany; and, to cover his own designs on the English king's continental dominions, declared war on him, nominally in Arthur's behalf. However, by the untiring exertions of Cardinal Peter, the truce was renewed, but only till the following January. Before the truce expired a definite treaty was concluded between the belligerents, and for the time there was peace (January 1200).

England was now, unfortunately, ruled by one whom both ancient and modern authors describe as the worst of our kings, and who is regarded by William of Newburgh as "the enemy even of Nature itself". John Lackland or Softsword, strong only in crime, soon became in turn the sport of the king of France, to whom he lost Normandy; of the Pope, to whom he lost his kingdom; and of his barons, to whom he lost his independence. Licentious, cruel, and cowardly, John appears as the meanest and most despicable of our kings. If it is possible for a man to be without a redeeming feature, John Lackland was that man. This "crooked king", as a foreign historian calls him, soon brought upon himself the reproaches of Innocent.

John's mean avarice was one of the first causes which called forth Innocent's remonstrances. Berengaria, his sister-in-law, and Otho, king of the Germans, his nephew, complained bitterly to the Pope that the English king was retaining what was theirs by the will of Richard. On January 4, 1204, Innocent addressed the first of a long series of letters to John urging him not to be an oppressor of widows, but to give up her dowry to his brother's widow. Your action, said the Pope, has well-nigh reduced her to beggary. Reminding the king that he was the special protector of the widow and the orphan, he commissioned John, abbot of Casamari, and others to compel the English monarch to restitution. But John was an adept at procrastination, and the Pope had to institute a committee of inquiry into the matter. Then followed other letters and threats in 1207, 1209, and 1210, and at length came an undertaking from John, when he had

become the Pope's vassal, to compensate Berengaria. In the formal document issued by the chancellor of the realm on the subject, John declared that "for the greater security of the compact we will obtain its confirmation by the Pope. Accordingly, we beg and humbly entreat the lord Pope to attach such sanctions (*securitates*) as he may think fit to this agreement, and we will accept whatever he may decide".

But though by this deed of settlement John declared that his successors were to be bound, the luckless Berengaria had, after John's death, again to turn to Rome; and again did the helpless widow receive the support she needed. Honorius III wrote in her behalf, and for the second time, at the request of Henry III, confirmed John's compact with her. But the queen-dowager did not find her pension secure till King John's compact was once more confirmed in 1228 (March 5) by Gregory IX.

Unjust to his sister-in-law in the matter of her dowry, John was also unjust to his nephew Otho, king of the Germans, in the matter of the legacy left him by King Richard. Like Berengaria, the injured king turned to the Pope; for when he had demanded his money, John had cunningly replied that he could not give it to him, inasmuch as by his treaty with Philip of France he was debarred from giving him any assistance in men or money.

In response to Otho's appeal, Innocent exerted himself in his interests, and from October 1200 onwards, for some seven years, he addressed letters to John and to various English bishops on Otho's behalf. Towards the end of the year 1205, he threatened to compel John to pay, and at last, whether in consequence of the increasing severity of Innocent's language, or because he thought it desirable to help his nephew lest Philip of France in alliance with Philip of Suabia should become too powerful, John offered to come to terms with Otho. Accordingly, in May 1207 that prince visited England, and obtained from John five thousand marks of silver, the first, but by no means the last, grant he was to wring from him.

In the midst of these difficulties with Rome regarding money, John was nearly getting into worse trouble regarding the sacrament of matrimony. In August 1189, he married his cousin, Isabel of Gloucester, without a dispensation, and despite the protest of Archbishop Baldwin. Accordingly, in his turn, despite John's appeal to Rome, the archbishop laid his lands under an interdict. But, owing to this irregularity on Baldwin's part, the papal legate, John of Anagni, removed the interdict in virtue of the appeal. Baldwin died in the following year, and the affair seems to have dropped.

But after some eleven years of married life with Isabel of Gloucester, another Isabel, Isabel of Angouleme, took John's fancy. Although she was already espoused to one of his vassals, John, having procured from the bishops of his continental dominions a decree of nullity regarding his marriage with his relative, Isabel of Gloucester (1199), married Isabel of Angouleme (August 1200).

When news of this reached Rome, John, says Ralph de Diceto, "incurred the great displeasure of the Supreme Pontiff, Innocent III, and of the whole Roman Curia, seeing that, contrary to the laws and canons, he had presumed rashly to dissolve what had been bound by their authority". But the English Isabel, no doubt well satisfied to be rid of such a husband, did not appeal to Rome, and John promised to atone for his presumption by sending a hundred men to the succour of the Holy Land, and by

building a Cistercian monastery. Innocent accordingly ratified, at least by tacit consent, the decision of the bishops of Normandy and Aquitaine. Though this decision did but reaffirm the original valid decision of Baldwin, which, as we have noted above, does not seem to have been officially annulled, still we may well apply Hurter's dictum to this case: "Laws", he says, "designed to ... put a term to man's wanderings from the right path, not unfrequently serve to give them a helping hand".

Throughout all his reign John's arbitrary conduct raised up bitter enemies against him. Hugh Lusignan, count de la Marche, whom he had outraged by carrying off his affianced bride, the youthful Isabel, appealed to Philip of France, John's suzerain. Though duly summoned to give an account of his conduct, John paid not the slightest heed to the summons. Philip, accordingly, took advantage of the situation to reassert Arthur's claims, and renewed the war against John. Distressed at the reopening of a war which he had once succeeded in bringing to a close, the Pope again endeavoured to bring about a cessation of hostilities. Owing to Philip's treatment of his wife, and to his support of Philip of Swabia, Innocent was naturally inclined to favour John, and he had already, on March 7, 1202, despatched a letter to the archbishop of Rouen reminding him of the interest which he had hitherto always taken in John, and bidding him employ ecclesiastical censures to subdue those on this side of the sea who should "presume to rebel against him".

After war had broken out between Philip and John, Innocent followed up this recommendation by sending into France John, abbot of Casamari, as his legate. He also sent a number of letters to the two kings, and to the bishops of France. He reminded Philip that it was not proper for the Pope to be "an acceptor of persons", and that men would even blame him if he looked to the will of kings and princes rather than to their salvation. He reminded him also that experience must have taught him what harm the dissensions between himself and John had brought, not only upon their respective kingdoms, but upon the whole Christian people. "When you are fighting against each other, churches are destroyed, the rich are impoverished, and the poor oppressed. No place nor sex is spared, and so religious men who used to have leisure for prayer are compelled to beg, and, we say it with grief, religious women who have dedicated their virginity to its author, are prostituted to the lust of plunderers". Peace is the message he sends to the two kings, and he urges the French bishops to help in its promotion. Philip, however, was impatient of the Pope's interference, and declared that he was not bound to accept his ruling with regard to fiefs, and that the business of kings was no concern of the Pope. This declaration of an independence which was not in accordance with the ideas of the age, called forth a strong letter from Innocent. He had sent John, he said to Philip, as a messenger of peace, mindful of the ready reception which he had formerly given to Cardinal Peter. But he has now heard with astonishment that Philip wishes to narrow the ample jurisdiction which God has given the Apostolic See in spirituals.

Then, before proceeding to give a strictly logical support to his position, Innocent begs Philip to remember the fortune of war, and that one day his answer may be turned against himself or his descendants. Besides, after all, what is he asking, except that, saving the rights of both parties, peace, or at least a truce, should be made? The sacred Scriptures are ever impressing peace upon men.

“Moreover, no one of sound mind doubts that it is ours to judge of those things which concern the salvation or damnation of the soul. And surely to attack God’s servants, to destroy religious houses, ... and to shed human blood deserves perpetual damnation and the of eternal salvation? If on such a matter the word of God was tied in our mouth ... with justice would the blood of so many thousands of men be required at our hands ...” The king of England has complained to the Roman Church that his brother of France has been wantonly attacking him. “But the Church”, continues the Pope, “wishes to treat you with the affection of a father rather than with the power of a judge, and hence she has simply begged you to refrain from injuring your brother. But if you continue to despise her voice, then must she treat you as a heathen and a publican. If, however, you hold that you are simply maintaining your rights against John, you should humbly allow the abbot John and others to examine the matter, not in so far as there is question of the fief, of which you are the judge, but in so far as there is a question of sin, the condemnation of which undoubtedly belongs to us. If, however, you should be proved to be in the wrong, and yet remain contumacious, we will do our duty in your regard, as we fear nothing when justice is concerned”.

Then, to let Philip understand how thoroughly he was convinced by his own arguments, the Pope ordered his legate, and the archbishops of Sens, Rheims, and Bourges, to excommunicate all, even the king himself, who should attack King John. At the same time, he told that monarch that in his dealings with him he was guided by what he thought to be his duty rather than by any belief that John had done anything to merit his favour, and that, because he was Philip’s liegeman, he must answer to him regarding certain charges alleged against him.

Meanwhile, in the field, John had had at first some success by capturing the young prince Arthur, but Philip, while keeping up a pretence of negotiating with Innocent’s representative John, and while appealing to Innocent himself, soon recovered from this blow, and proceeded rapidly to overrun Normandy. He paused in his victorious career for a brief space in March 1204, whilst the abbot went to England to meet King John and the great ones of the kingdom at a council in London. Soon afterwards the abbot, in company with some English envoys, returned to France with certain peace proposals from King John. Philip, however, would not entertain them; but resumed hostilities, and before long was master of nearly all John’s Continental dominions. A truce for two years, concluded on October 13, 1206, left the French king in possession of nearly all his conquests.

These losses did not improve John’s temper, and our historians tell us that his softness, which led the people to call him “Softsword”, gradually changed into a cruelty that surpassed anything ever seen in any of his predecessors. As he became more cruel so he became more arbitrary, and in his wantonness he began to try to order the Church according to his will. For some years, however, he succeeded, though at times with difficulty, in keeping on good terms with the Pope. From 1202 to 1206 he constantly incurred Innocent’s displeasure, and received many letters urging him not to interfere with the liberties of the Church, and threatening him with one kind of ecclesiastical censure or another for his ill-treatment of the bishops of Limoges, Bath, Poitiers, and of the archbishop of Dublin and various abbots. Innocent had also to complain of his violation of the rights of freedom of election in the cases of the sees of Lincoln and

Seez, and he had to send a legate, John, cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Via Lata, to protect the dean of Salisbury and others who were contending for the rights of the see of Winchester. “Would that”, wrote the worried Pope to the tyrant, “you would give thought to the sorrows which you so frequently bring upon me by your oppression of churches and your ill- treatment of clerics”.

But there was to be a limit to John’s arbitrary attempts to set aside the liberties of the Church. The English king reached that limit in attempting to nominate a successor to the see of Canterbury,— an event which brings us in contact with perhaps the most fateful election to an episcopal see ever made in England.

On July 13, 1205, there departed from this life Hubert Walter, archbishop of Canterbury. If, like Wolsey, he was more a prime minister than a bishop, he was also, like Wolsey, able to keep a tyrant within some bounds. When he heard of his death, John exclaimed: “Now for the first time am I king of England”, and forthwith resolved to replace him by a favourite, John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, as he had just secured the election to the see of Winchester of Peter des Roches (de Rupibus), “a man of knightly rank, skilled in warfare”.

But the monks of Canterbury were anxious to secure their right of election both against the king and against the bishops of the province. For, though our kings on their election swore to respect the liberties of the Church, they nearly always endeavoured to deprive the chapters of their right of episcopal elections, and often succeeded in so doing; and the bishops of the province of Canterbury, though they had no canonical right to share in the election of their superior, considered that their very position naturally gave them such a right.

Accordingly, before the time appointed by the king to hold the election, the monks of Canterbury secretly elected their sub-prior Reginald, and sent him with some companions to Rome to obtain the confirmation of the Pope.

Despite the instructions he had received, Reginald could not keep a secret, and the fact of his election was soon known to the king. In the month of December John appeared at Canterbury, and the monks were so overawed by him that some of them at least joined the suffragan bishops and elected a fresh candidate in the person of “a very great friend of the king”, John de Gray, bishop of Norwich. Six more monks were then sent to Rome to obtain the Pope’s confirmation of their new candidate.

The Pope was, of course, both astonished and angry at this action of the monks, and in a long letter to them (March 30, 1206) let them know that for their want of truth and honour he regarded them as degenerate sons. The first five monks who came with Reginald had made it plain, so the Pope reminded them, that he had been elected by all the brethren, and now six other monks had come and declared that they had “all freely and spontaneously” elected the bishop of Norwich.

To arrive at the knowledge of the real truth of the affair, Innocent sent a mandate to the bishop of Rochester to examine the monks at Canterbury, while he caused all those who had come to Rome on the subject to be also carefully cross-questioned. The result of the examination was that the Pope declared that both elections were void—the first because it was conducted in an irregular manner, and the second because it was

made under pressure from the king (December 20, 1206). He then told the monks who were present, and who had received power from their brethren to elect another archbishop in Rome should their first candidate not be accepted, to elect a suitable pastor. At first some made further efforts to secure the election of Reginald or of John de Gray as the case might be; but at length they unanimously elected the Englishman, Stephen Langton, cardinal-priest of St. Chrysogonus, who had, it appears, been suggested to them by the Pope. Though the king's proctors would not give their assent to this election, Innocent approved of it; but, as he assured the king, it was only because he regarded the see of Canterbury "as the chief member of the Apostolic See, and the brightest gem of the English crown", that he would allow "so strong a pillar of the Apostolic See" as Stephen to be taken away from it. Pointing out to John that Stephen is an Englishman, and sprung from a family that is faithful to him, he begs him to write back within three months to intimate that the newly elected prelate may present himself to him. Otherwise, however much he may love the king, he will have to proceed in accordance with canon law.

It was, says Gervase, "on account of reverence for the king" that Innocent asked his assent to the election of Stephen. But, he continues, "seduced by the advice of wicked men", John not merely refused to receive him, but, after Innocent had consecrated Stephen (June 1207), he expelled the monks of Canterbury from England, upbraided the Pope for interfering with his rights, threatened to stop any moneys leaving England for Rome, and so oppressed the bishops and others who supported them that many were only too glad to save themselves by a voluntary exile. The bishop of Winchester, Peter des Roches, his warlike favourite, was at last the only bishop who remained with him.

"As though he were the sole power on earth, he feared neither God nor man ... nor was there one left in the land who dare resist his will in anything".

During his seven years quarrel with the Pope, John prepared the way for his fall by his oppressive taxation of all classes, by his spoliation of the clergy, and by his licentious life, which engendered against him the deepest hatred from many an outraged husband, lover, or brother. At the same time he displayed no little energy in crushing his enemies in Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, in endeavouring to bring about a coalition against his archenemy Philip, and in delaying papal action by insincere negotiations.

Meanwhile, when Innocent found that he was not likely to effect much by persuasion, he issued a mandate to the bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester to make another effort to induce the king to acknowledge Stephen, and, if he would not, to put the kingdom under an interdict (c. August 1207). He bade them point out to the king that he was entering on a dangerous course; for he must be sure that the English people, so zealous for the faith, would not follow him against the Church. Other letters followed urging the other bishops and the great laymen of England to work in the same direction, as they were all in favour of the election of Stephen. For a moment John was moved, or affected to be, and promised the three bishops to comply with the Pope's orders.

But John quickly changed his mind, and swore "by God's teeth" that if any bishops dared to lay an interdict on his dominions, he would send all the clergy out of

England to the Pope; and, if any of them were Roman clerics, they should go with their eyes plucked out and their noses slit.

Despite all this savage bluster, the interdict was duly laid on the country on Passion Sunday (March 23), and many of the bishops straightway left the country. Mad with rage, John proceeded to confiscate the property of the clergy with brutal violence,—a measure he was able to carry through because the barons, instead of making common cause with the clergy, held their hands, only to find that in due time John turned upon them.

“In the midst of these and similar impious proceedings”, writes Roger of Wendover, “King John, on reflection, was afraid that after the interdict our lord the Pope would lay hands on him more heavily by excommunicating him by name, or by absolving the nobles of England from allegiance to him”. To guard against the latter contingency, he forcibly exacted hostages from the chief members of the nobility, and to put off the former he reopened negotiations with Rome. Soon after the proclamation of the interdict he sent Hugh, abbot of Beaulieu, in the New Forest, to inform the Pope that, though he considered himself aggrieved in the matter of Stephen’s election, he was willing to acknowledge him and make reparation for his violence, “on account of his devotion and reverence towards the Roman Church and towards our person”.

Finding he was but being mocked, Innocent sent the king a peremptory order to fulfil his promises, letting him know that, if he did not do so within the three months “after the reception or rejection of these presents”, he would cut him off from the communion of the faithful (January 12, 1209).

John, however, would not hearken either to the kind words or to the threats of the Pope; nor would he listen to the advice of his nephew Otho of Germany, urging him to accept Stephen. On the contrary, he continued his career of arbitrary violence, and with the aid of his mercenaries oppressed clergy and laity alike. He seemed of set purpose “to be steadily provoking against him the hearts of all his subjects”.

Innocent was now losing patience with the deceitful monarch, and in June (22) he instructed the bishop of Arras to hold himself in readiness to join the three episcopal commissioners in excommunicating King John when he should be requested so to do by Cardinal Stephen. Once more, however, in the hope at least of postponing the threatened sentence, John negotiated, and numerous letters passed between him and the archbishop or the three papal commissioners. He succeeded in getting the date of his excommunication postponed to October. But as usual nothing came of the negotiations, and John’s excommunication was at last officially proclaimed. Gervase says, “he was excommunicated by many ecclesiastical persons”; *i. e.*, not by the Pope’s commissioners, because they had fled, but by the lesser clergy, so that “in a short time the decree became known to all in the roads and streets, and even in the places of assembly of the people it afforded a subject of secret conversation to all”. The excommunication was also publicly proclaimed throughout France.

John now suffered not himself to be restrained by anything. Listening to the words of a certain Master Alexander, who told him that it was the business of the king to break his subjects, if need be, like the potters’ vessels, and that the Pope had no right to interfere with the lands or peoples of kings, as the Lord had only given him power

over the Church and Church property, he not merely continued to prevent the payment of Peter's Pence or of any revenues possessed by cardinals in England, but treated with the greatest cruelty clergy and laity alike. The Jews especially were at this time cruelly tortured by him in order to wring money from them, and he even turned against the Cistercians, who in the beginning of the interdict had incurred the Pope's displeasure because, in the fond hope of gaining John's favour, they had not properly carried out the conditions of the interdict.

With all his recklessness, John was conscious that his situation was eminently precarious, and he did not cease to keep up the pretence of negotiating. As a consequence, there landed in England in June 1211 the subdeacon, *cardinal* (?) Pandulf, and Durandus, a Templar, charged to make peace between the king and the archbishop, or, as Wendover expresses it, between "the civil and ecclesiastical powers, the *regnum* and the *sacerdotium*". They were instructed, as Pandulf was afterwards in the beginning of the year 1213, "prudently" to urge the king to accept the conditions of peace which, after much care, had been drawn up "between us and the king's envoys". If the king will swear that he will submit to the Pope's ruling on the matters for which he has been excommunicated, then he can be reconciled to the Church. If, moreover, he will give security to recall to England the archbishop and the other exiles, and will restore their property, the interdict may be removed.

John met the legates in August (1211); but, as usual, the negotiations came to nothing. According to the most important authority, Roger of Wendover, John agreed to dereceive Stephen Langton, and to allow the bishops and monks to return to their sees in peace, but would not consent to compensate them for the losses they had sustained. But other, less reliable, authorities state that John agreed to all the other conditions laid down by the Pope, but would not recognise Stephen as archbishop. At any rate, the conference was a failure. Innocent now went a step further. From a general interdict over John's territories, the Pope had proceeded to personal excommunication of the iniquitous monarch. From personal excommunication he passed in 1212 to declaring him deposed from his kingdom. To this he was urged by the cardinal-archbishop and other exiled English bishops who went to Rome, and pointed out to the Pope that the oppression of John had brought the English almost to the last extremity. Accordingly, though hampered by the enmity of the emperor Otho, and with the war against the Albigensians on his hands, Innocent, after taking "the advice of his cardinals, bishops, and other wise men, definitively decreed that John, king of England, should be deposed from the throne of that kingdom, and that another more worthy than he, who should be chosen by the Pope, should succeed him".

Innocent then wrote to Philip of France, urging him to undertake the task of deposing John, and declaring that, if he expelled him, he and his heirs should be kings of England, and that he would make a general appeal to the fighting men of Europe to help him to avenge the insult which John "had cast on the universal Church", offering them the same privileges as were offered to those who fought in the Holy Land.

When the news of this action of the Pope reached England, there was great joy in the land, for the king's enemies were as numerous as his nobles, and, says Roger of Wendover, whom we are here following, "if report is to be credited, they sent a

document (*charta*), furnished with the seals of the said nobles, to the king of France, telling him that he might safely come to England, to be received and crowned with both glory and honour”.

The action of the Pope brought joy also to Philip of France. That schemer, as Walter of Coventry takes notice, “did not stand in need of much exhortation to invade England, as he had been contemplating such a course for a long time, both because he hated John, and because he wanted to lay his hands on the silver and gold with which the land was believed to abound”. Accordingly, he set to work to prepare for the invasion with the heartiest good-will, and was well seconded by his nobles. Ships were collected and built, and men were gathered together from all parts.

John, meanwhile, was not idle, and made great preparations to repel the invasion. But, says our simple Flemish historian in his quaint old French, “a very bad man was King John. He saw that he was excommunicated, and he also saw on the one hand that every man in his kingdom hated him, and on the other that there was coming against him the king of France, who was so strong and powerful that he knew full well that if he landed in his kingdom he could not resist him, because he would bring so many good knights with him. Accordingly, in taking thought, he soon saw that if he could not get help from the Pope, then there was no help for him. He then sent to Rome, and begged the Pope for God’s sake to have pity on him, and to send him one of his trusty clerks, through whose advice he would make amends for all the wrongs he had committed against Holy Church. When the Pope heard this news he was very pleased, and at once sent him one of his clerks, who was called Pandulf”.

John’s messengers had left England for Rome in November 1212, to offer to accept the terms which Pandulf had offered on his former visit. Naturally, the Pope could not reject a penitent sinner, and, on the other hand, his knowledge of the character and power of Philip cannot have made him desirous of trusting him too far or of too much increasing his influence. Hence he had made his request for his invasion of England dependent upon John’s attitude. There was to be no invasion if the king of England repented.

Accordingly, after the arrival of John’s envoys, Innocent wrote to the king to remind him that there was question not merely of the Church of Canterbury, but of the whole Church of England, which the king had been striving to enslave, and that, as he had formerly rejected the terms offered by Pandulf, he was no longer bound to offer the same favourable terms again. However, if the king will unreservedly accept them before the first of June, he will offer them once more by the hands of the same legate.

When Pandulf landed in England in May, he told the king of the great force which Philip had already assembled at the mouth of the Seine, and that the French king had declared that he had every hope of a successful issue of his enterprise, because he held deeds of submission “from almost all the nobles of England”. Convinced of the truth of the legate’s words, John, “not without pain”, swore to be obedient to the sentence of the Church, and “sixteen of the most powerful nobles of the realm swore on the soul of the king himself that, should he repent of his promise, they would to the utmost of their power compel him to fulfil it”. Then on May 13, in presence of the legate and of a large concourse of barons and people at Dover, John issued “letters

patent sealed with our seal” which exactly repeated the terms of peace laid down by the Pope. He agreed to grant letters patent “to our lord the Pope” and to the exiled bishops to the effect that he would receive the prelates kindly, and would allow them in peace to fulfil their duties, and would compensate them and all concerned in the quarrel for the losses they had sustained, and in earnest thereof would pay down at once eight thousand pounds “of lawful sterling money”. He also agreed never again to pronounce the sentence of outlawry against ecclesiastics, and to refer all disputes connected with the question of compensation to the Pope’s delegate.

Fear had now taken complete possession of the mean and cowardly heart of King John. The vision of the great armament, now in process of being gathered together by the man who had already deprived him of nearly all his Continental dominions, burnt into his soul. He grew afraid that Philip would take England from him as he had already taken Normandy, and so, to ensure its safety, he decided “on his own account” to hand it over to the Pope, and to hold it from him as his vassal. Accordingly, two days after he had signed the charter acknowledging Stephen Langton, he signed another (May 15) in presence of Pandulf and “the nobles of the kingdom” in the house of the Knights Templars near Dover. The deed set forth that, to make proper satisfaction for his sins, John, of his own free will, and by the advice of his barons, granted to God and to our lord Pope Innocent and his Catholic successors the kingdoms of England and Ireland, and declared that he and his successors would in future hold them of the Popes, and in token of their allegiance to them would henceforth pay one thousand marks a year, exclusive of Peter’s Pence. When this charter had been handed to Pandulf, the king took the usual oath of allegiance to the Pope.

John now felt at ease; for though, says Walter of Coventry, “what he had done was regarded by many as ignominious”, his infeudation of the country was perhaps the only course which could have completely ensured the safety of his territories. When, continues Walter, “he had made his kingdom the patrimony of Blessed Peter, there was no prince in the whole Roman world who, to the injury of the Apostolic See, would have dared to harass or invade it, seeing that Pope Innocent was more generally feared than any of his predecessors for many years”. However, to make assurance still more sure, John also took the Cross in order that he might have all the privileges of immunity granted to Crusaders.

With an instalment of the compensation money which John was to pay to the exiles, Pandulf returned to France, bade them now return to England, and exhorted Philip to give up all thoughts of the invasion of England, as John had submitted and was prepared “to obey the catholic commands of the Pope”. Considering especially that Philip had only been waiting for an excuse to invade England, it will be readily understood that he listened to this exhortation with but little patience. He angrily pointed out to the legate that it was “at the command of the Pope” that he had taken up the arduous task of preparing for the invasion of England, and that his preparations had already cost him sixty thousand pounds. It was only because at this juncture the powerful count of Flanders refused to follow Philip that the king had, for the time, to give up all thoughts of putting his deep designs into execution.

When John had notified Innocent regarding his acceptance of the terms proposed by him, and his voluntary surrender of his dominions to papal suzerainty, he had begged him to send a special legate to England with full powers to settle all the difficulties which might arise. In his reply, Innocent, after thanking God for moving the king to accept the terms of peace, and to place his territories under the dominion of the Holy See, continues: “Who but the Holy Spirit of God ... has been able so to lead you that at one and the same time you should, with such discretion and piety, consult your own interests and provide for the Church”. He informs him then that, in accordance with his request, he is sending him a legate *a latere*, his especially beloved friend Nicholas, cardinal-bishop of Tusculum.

In his letters on the same subject to the barons of England and to the king of France, the Pope exhorted the former to stand by their king, and the latter to follow the legate in his efforts to make peace between England and France.

About the time that these letters were written, Cardinal Stephen and a number of the exiled bishops returned to England; and, after John had sworn to protect the Church, to restore the laws of Edward the Confessor, to compensate for losses sustained in connection with the interdict, and to be loyally obedient to Pope Innocent and his Catholic successors, he was duly absolved from the sentence of excommunication, to the great joy of the people.

Though the king had thus been restored to the communion of the Church, England was still under the interdict. It was to arrange the preliminaries regarding the removing of that penalty that Nicholas, cardinal-bishop of Tusculum, landed in England in September; and, although the country was under the interdict, he was everywhere honourably received with solemn processions and with music, and by the people dressed in their holiday clothes.

A few days after the arrival of the legate, there was held in London, in his presence and in that of the king, a great assembly of the bishops and nobles of the realm. The question of compensation to the clergy was discussed but not finally settled, and then John renewed his surrender of England and Ireland to the Pope by doing homage to the legate, and by presenting him with the charter of homage, not sealed with wax like the one he had presented to Pandulf, but with gold, “for the use of our lord the Pope and the Roman Church”.

Still, however, the interdict was not removed. The question of compensation and that of ecclesiastical elections were not yet settled. John was anxious that the customs of the realm should be observed in the matter of the elections, and such bishops at least as the primate Langton were desirous of the full freedom proper to them. The latter question was referred by the legate to the Pope, who sent him the following communication on the subject: “As the Lord’s churches cannot be better provided for than when suitable pastors are appointed to them, we bid your fraternity to cause suitable persons to be ordained with your advice, either by election or canonical appointment, for the bishoprics and abbaties now vacant in England. The candidates must be distinguished both for purity of life and for learning; they must be also loyal to the king, and of use to the kingdom, and the king’s assent to their election must be sought. Accordingly, when we have enjoined the chapters of the vacant churches to

abide by your advice, do you, keeping God before your eyes, take counsel with prudent and honourable men who have a thorough knowledge of the candidates, lest you should be overreached by any one". At the same time he took care to warn the king not to behave contentiously towards his bishops in matters of ecclesiastical law.

It would seem, however, that Nicholas was scarcely worthy of the confidence placed in him by the Pope. Both Roger of Wendover and Walter of Coventry accuse him of being too favourable to the king. Perhaps in order to induce the king not to interfere with his own arbitrary conduct in giving vacant parish churches to his own clerics without asking the consent of their patrons, the legate set aside the advice of Archbishop Stephen and the bishops, and, with the aid of the king's agents, appointed, "according to the old evil custom of England", unfit persons to the vacancies "more by force than by canonical election".

Indignant at what he regarded as the legate's high handed conduct, the archbishop appealed to the Pope against him (January 1214).

Whilst all these disputes were going on, the country was still groaning under the interdict; and at length both the king and Stephen Langton sent envoys to the Pope to point out to him that, if "great loss of property and serious danger to souls" were to be avoided, the interdict should be withdrawn without delay. Moved by this joint declaration, Innocent, after consultation with the delegates, prescribed the amount of compensation that the king had to pay to the bishops, and the period in which it had to be paid, and ordered the immediate suspension of the interdict when his terms had been complied with.

On the receipt of this mandate (February 1214), Nicholas summoned the spiritual and temporal of the realm to meet in St. Paul's at London, where the Pope's decision was explained, and then on the feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul (June 29) "Nicholas, bishop of Tusculum, legate of the Apostolic See, went to the cathedral church, and there amidst the ringing of bells and the chanting of the *Te Deum* solemnly revoked the sentence of interdict, which had lasted for six years, three months, and fourteen days".

But the relaxation of the interdict was far from bringing peace to the country. The archbishop and bishops were irritated at the arbitrary conduct of Cardinal Nicholas; the humbler clerical and lay sufferers from John's violent behaviour during the interdict were indignant that no notice had been taken of their right to compensation; and all, both nobles and commoners, were angry at the taxes which John was constantly imposing upon them.

The subdeacon Pandulf, who had returned to England some time towards the close of the year 1213, was sent to Rome on behalf of the king and the legate. According to Roger of Wendover, he vilified the archbishop and bishops and praised the king. The former were, he said, covetous in their demands for compensation, whereas a more humble and moderate king than John he had never seen. But though he made a good impression on the Pope about the king, Innocent was seemingly not satisfied with regard to Nicholas. At any rate, a sharp reprimand from Innocent brought him back to Rome (c. October 1214), "greatly fearing for his tunic" says Ralph Coggeshall.

Meanwhile, in the midst of the general discontent, John had sailed to France (February 1214), in the hope of recovering some of his Continental dominions. He effected little, however, and his allies were hopelessly defeated at Bouvines (July 27, 1214). The Emperor Otho managed to escape; but the earl of Salisbury, and the count of Flanders and many others were taken prisoners. All this fighting among the princes of Europe was most painful to the Pope, who, as we know, had his heart fixed on another Crusade. He therefore made renewed efforts to bring about peace between France and England, and through the agency of the English cardinal, Robert de Courçon (or Curson), a truce for five years was arranged between the two kings.

John returned to England cursing his ill fate (October 1214). “Since I became reconciled to God”, he cried, “and unhappily subjected myself and my kingdoms to the Church of Rome, nothing has prospered with me”. His ignominious return increased the feeling of discontent with his rule which had been much aggravated by the arbitrary conduct of his justiciar, the foreigner, Peter des Roches, bishop of Winchester.

As the misunderstandings between the king and the barons, especially those of the north, became more acute, both parties turned to their common suzerain the Pope. The barons, moreover, instigated by the archbishop, demanded from John the confirmation of the charter which Henry I had granted on his accession, and which had proclaimed the freedom of the Church and many liberties for the barons—in short, “the law of King Edward (the Confessor), with the amendments which my father, by the advice of the barons, made in it”.

Full of anxiety to keep the peace, Innocent urged the king to deal gently with the barons, and to admit their just requests, while at the same time he urged the barons to be moderate in their dealings with the king (March 1215). John, however, was obstinate; but so too were the confederates and their chief, Stephen Langton. Convinced it was to be a life-and-death struggle, both parties looked around for allies. The barons approached John’s bitterest enemy, Philip Augustus, and John sought to secure the support of the Pope by taking the Cross (March 4), and by impressing upon him that the insurrection of the barons was the hindrance to his proceeding to the Holy Land.

Matters now came to a head. Rejecting John’s proposal to leave the questions in dispute between them to the arbitration of their mutual “superior” the Pope, the barons in arms compelled John, in presence of the legate Pandulf, who had replaced Nicholas, to sign the Magna Carta (June 15, 1215).

Speaking of the king’s acceptance of the Great Charter which guaranteed the freedom of the Church and the rights of the people, Ralph Coggeshall says “that as it were a peace was made between the king and the barons”. It soon proved that the peace was mostly a pretence. The Magna Carta was hardly signed before the barons opposed the king’s authority in arms. John was now desperate. He enlisted mercenaries from every quarter; and, in order to strike with the spiritual as well as the temporal sword, he sent off envoys, including Pandulf, post-haste to Rome.

His agents assured the Pope that a number of barons had rebelled against his vassal King John, and that they had extorted from him concessions which were derogatory to the royal dignity, and which the king averred ought not to have been granted without consultation with the suzerain of the country, the Supreme Pontiff.

Despite the king's consequent appeal to Rome, the barons had seized his capital, and were in arms against him. Their conduct was the principal cause which prevented him from proceeding to Palestine.

The envoys then handed the Pope a document in which were contained such articles of the Charter as seemed to tell in favour of the king's assertions, such, for instance, as those connected with the king's right to scutage.

After perusing them, the Pope, we are told, exclaimed: "Are the barons of England endeavouring to drive from his throne a king who has taken the Cross, and who is under the protection of the Apostolic See, and to transfer to another the dominion of the Roman Church? By St. Peter, we cannot pass over this insult without punishing it".

Innocent had already, in response to some of John's earlier complaints against the barons, issued a mandate to the bishop of Winchester, the abbot of Reading, and Pandulf, in which he reprimanded "some" of the bishops for not opposing "the disturbers of the kingdom", and for not protecting the king who had taken the Cross; and, in order that "all the interests of the Crucified" might not be ruined, he excommunicated all "the disturbers of the king and realm of England", and laid their lands under an interdict. "In virtue of obedience" the archbishop and his fellow-bishops were ordered to continue to proclaim the papal sentence till the barons submitted.

The Pope's decree was, indeed, notified to the barons on August 26; but, as the archbishop refused to take any steps to enforce it till he had himself seen the Pope, it remained a dead letter, though Stephen Langton himself was suspended by the papal commissioners for his refusal.

Innocent was very much moved by the story which John's ambassadors poured into his ears. Considering that the barons' conduct had slighted his authority as suzerain, and naturally predisposed to favour authority, especially where that authority was represented by a vassal king, he took John's part, and condemned not so much the Charter itself, but "chiefly the means used to obtain it". On August 24 he issued an encyclical which he forwarded to the English king. It set forth that if John had sinned greatly he had made great atonement. He had subjected his kingdom to the Apostolic See, and had taken the Cross. But now he was being "attacked by those who had stood by him whilst he was offending against the Church". The letter went on to point out that the Pope had previously urged the barons to make their demands in a proper way, and the king to give a favourable ear to their just petitions. But the barons, acting "as judge and executioners in their own cause", had taken up arms against their king; seized his capital; refused his offer "to do them justice in presence of us to whom the decision of this matter belonged by right of dominion"; disregarded the rights of a Crusader, and forced him to sign an agreement derogatory to his position. "We, therefore, by the general advice of our brethren", condemn the agreement, and forbid its observance.

In a letter of the same date to the barons, the Pope blamed them in the matter of their dealings with the king for not having given greater heed to their "oath of fealty, to the right of the Apostolic See, and to the privileges granted to those who have taken the Cross". Hence he condemned the Charter "chiefly on account of the means used to obtain it", and exhorted them to make reparation to the outraged majesty of the king. He trusted the king would then "of his own accord make such concessions as he ought to

make”; and he promised that he would himself urge him to make them “in order that under our dominion the kingdom of England may not be oppressed by evil customs and unjust exactions”. Warning them, as the event proved most truly, that, if they did not follow his advice, they would fall into difficulties from which they would not be easily able to extricate themselves, he urged them to trust their cause to him, and to send representatives to the General Council which he had summoned; and he assured them that he would so arrange matters that abuses in the country should be done away with, so that the king should be contented with his lawful rights, and that “both the clergy and all the people should enjoy peace and freedom”.

But the barons, most of them at least, were determined, come weal come woe, to manage the dispute in their own way, and dire to the country were the consequences of their resolution. They were not ready for war, nor were they united. Some of them, including William the Marshal, earl of Pembroke, the most worthy knight of his age, stood by the king, as they held that the barons had not observed the terms “of the peace”, and they were not prepared to go the length of deposing John. England was now ravaged with civil war. The king’s mercenaries harried the unhappy land in the most merciless manner; and the rebellious barons were forced to beg Louis, the son of Philip Augustus, to come and reign over them (c. October 1215).

Although the French king went through the farce of nominally discountenancing his son’s acceptance of the barons’ offer, he not only did not place any obstacle in the way of his accepting it, but favoured his enterprise in every way. Accordingly, the young prince accepted the invitation, and began at once to send troops to London, which had declared for the barons (November).

Meanwhile, Stephen Langton, still under the sentence of suspension, and other English bishops were making their way to Rome to take part in the Lateran Council which Innocent had summoned to meet in November. Among the many important matters discussed at this great diet of Christendom was that of the dispute between John and his barons. The king’s agents made out a strong case against the archbishop. They accused him of being the mainstay of the barons in their attempt to drive the king from his throne, and told the Pope that his commissioners had been compelled to suspend Stephen because he would not enforce the papal excommunication of the rebellious barons. According to Roger of Wendover, the cardinal was so overwhelmed by the manner in which the charges against him were set forth, that he could do nothing but ask for the removal of his suspension. Whereupon he says the Pope is reported to have exclaimed: “By St. Peter, brother, you will not easily obtain absolution from the sentence, seeing that you have wrought so much harm both on the king of the English, and also on the Roman Church”. At any rate, by a formal document published on November 4, Innocent renewed the sentence. He also further favoured the king not only by refusing to confirm the election of Simon, Stephen’s brother, as archbishop of York, but by endorsing the translation to that see of Walter de Gry, bishop of Worcester, a man acceptable to the king. Moreover, “despite the opposition of many”, says William the Breton, he excommunicated the barons and their supporters; and lest, by being general, the excommunication might again become a dead letter, he issued a mandate to the abbot of Abingdon and others ordering them to cause it to be proclaimed throughout all England that the earl of Winchester and many others whom he named individually

were excommunicated, as were also “those citizens of London who were the chief promoters” of the rebellion against their king (December 16, 1215).

On receipt of this injunction the abbot of Abingdon caused the excommunication of the barons to be duly proclaimed throughout all England, and his injunctions were generally obeyed (c. February 1216). But in London no heed was paid to the sentence, and clergy and barons alike appealed against it on the ground that it had been obtained by false representations. Some even said that the management of lay affairs did not pertain to the Pope.

Although the revocation by Innocent of the suspension of Cardinal Langton may show that he was gradually beginning to take a different view of John and the archbishop, he did not alter his course, but did all he could in John’s interest. In the spring of the year 1216 he despatched to France Gualo, cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Portico. On his arrival the legate’s first care was to place in the hands of Philip (April 25) the Pope’s letters, in which he urged him to prevent his son from invading England, which now belonged “by right of dominion” to the Holy See. To this Philip replied that by the murder of Arthur John had forfeited his kingdom, and therefore could not give away what was not his. Besides, even if he had not forfeited his kingdom, he could not arbitrarily give it to the Pope or to anyone else without the consent of his barons—a proposition which was justly loudly applauded by the assembled barons of France. Although Gualo forbade Louis to invade England under penalty of excommunication, he made as little impression on the son as he had made on the father. He could obtain no more than a declaration from Philip that he had always been “faithful and devoted to the Pope and the Roman Church”, that he would not help his son against them, and that he would give the cardinal himself a safe-conduct on his way to England through his dominions, but could not be responsible if, when he left them, he fell into the hands of his son’s men.

After the break-up of this abortive conference, Louis, having obtained his father’s permission and blessing, despatched envoys to Rome to plead his cause by words, and hurried to his fleet to plead it in England by the sword. He landed on our shores on May 21, and was soon in London.

Meanwhile, he had been followed by Gualo, who contrived to slip through the troops of Louis, and landed safely in England at Romney. The king, we are told, “received him with great pleasure, and rested all his hopes of being able to oppose his enemies on him”.

A few days later the legate, rejoining the king at Winchester, and meeting a number of the English bishops and clergy who had come thither at his summons, solemnly excommunicated Louis by name with all his abettors (May 29).

Of this excommunication the baronial party affected to take no notice. They had appealed, they said, in Louis’ behalf. Whilst, therefore, the fighting continued in England, the envoys of the French prince were pleading his cause before the Pope. Roger of Wendover has fortunately preserved for us some of their interesting communications to their master. Writing “to their most excellent lord the first-born of the king of the French”, they inform him that they waited on the Pope on Sunday *ad mensem Paschae* (i.e., on May 8, the Sunday four weeks after Easter, April 10), and

found him in good spirits, but not favourably disposed to their master. Moreover, continued the envoys, on a second visit, “after we had stated our case, he said much in the way of blame of your conduct, but added: Woe is me, seeing that in this matter the Church of God cannot escape trouble. If the king of England is conquered, we are concerned because he is our vassal, and we are bound to protect him; and if your lord Louis is conquered, then in his misfortune the Church of Rome is injured, for we have ever considered that in all its necessities he would be its arm, and in all difficulties and persecutions its solace and its refuge”. The envoys closed their communication by observing that they are awaiting Ascension Day (May 19) in the hope of preventing any decree being issued against him; for, they said, the Pope is then wont to renew his sentences, and he had himself told them that he was awaiting the arrival of messengers from Gualo.

Whether or not Innocent awaited the arrival of communications from Gualo, it is certain that he lived long enough to excommunicate “Louis and some of his counsellors by name and also all such in general as made war on his vassal the king of England”. But the day was close at hand when the lord Pope Innocent was no longer able to give his powerful help to his vassal, and when that vassal was incapable of receiving it. The former died in the July of this year, and the latter some three months later (October 18-19). With regard to the former we may say with William the Breton, whose misplaced patriotism or sycophancy induced him rather to rejoice than grieve over Innocent’s death, “May He whose place he filled on earth have mercy on his soul”. And with regard to the latter, we have no hesitation in adding with our worthy fellow-citizen who compiled the Chronicle of London’s mayors well over six centuries ago: “He perpetrated many evil deeds and atrocious cruelties of which no mention is made in this book”.

IRELAND

Even in the extant Register of Innocent there are three hundred letters dealing with the affairs of England. It will therefore be obvious that we are far from having exhausted the subject of his relations with our country. We, however, must now pass on, leaving it to the specialist to speak at greater length of the intercourse between England and Rome in the days of Innocent.

In reviewing the history of “Rome and Ireland” during the same period, there is no event striking enough to demand our attention with the same insistence as did, say, the divorce question of Philip Augustus in France or the affair of the Magna Carta in England. Still, if not in any sense dramatic, the influence of Innocent on Ireland was important and continuous. We find him, for instance, occupied in developing the important see of Dublin by granting it privileges. Among other favours which he bestowed on that rising see was to attach to it the old see of Glendalough with its revenues. This he did because he was assured that, though “the church in the mountains (Glendalough) was held in great reverence ... on account of St. Keywvyn, who lived as a hermit there, it had for nearly forty years become so deserted and desolate as to be used

as a den for robbers, where more homicides were committed than in any other part of Ireland (1215)".

But Innocent's principal work in connection with for freedom Ireland was for the reform of abuses. With this end in view, he was ever striving to promote the freedom of episcopal elections, and ecclesiastical discipline generally.

We are informed by Giraldus Cambrensis in his *Itinerary through Wales* that "many churches in Ireland and Wales have a lay abbot". This abuse, he tells us, arose from the appointing of powerful patrons to protect the churches. In process of time these protectors seized the possessions of the churches for themselves, and handed them on to their children. "Such defenders or rather destroyers of the Church have caused themselves to be called abbots, and presumed to attribute to themselves a title as well as estates to which they have no just claim". In Ireland, unfortunately, this abuse was not confined to abbeys. The see of Armagh, for instance, had become the hereditary possession of a family who held it for some fifteen generations. Eight married men, "without orders" had held the see in succession before Celsus, the predecessor of St. Malachy, the friend of St. Bernard.

To correct these abuses in the Irish Church, Innocent sent to Ireland in 1201 John of Salerno, cardinal of S. Stefano Rotondo on the Coelian. The cardinal soon had occasion to report to the Pope that the particular enormity of which we have just spoken was still common in Ireland, and he informed the Pope of certain efforts which he had made to put it down. In reply he received a letter to the following effect. His letters had made it clear to the Pope that "among the other enormities which he had found in the Irish churches was the detestable abuse of sons succeeding to their fathers, not merely in the minor prelacies but even in the archbishoprics and bishoprics, and especially in the church of Tuam and other parts. John had further informed the Pope, so continued the letter, that the archbishop of Tuam had died just before his arrival, and that he had found the see occupied by the nephew of the late archbishop, who had consecrated him in order that he might succeed to the see, which had been already held by his grandfather and great-grandfather. The legate had, with difficulty, expelled the new bishop, and caused the suffragans to elect unanimously, on his nomination, Felix C'Ruadan, abbot of Sabhul or Saul. The archbishop-elect, on account of the disturbed state of the country, was unable to go to Rome in person for his pallium, and therefore the cardinal-legate had begged the Pope to send it. "We therefore", continued the Pope, "moved by your request, and anxious to save the elect trouble, and the church of Tuam expense, have sent the pallium to you ... to be given to him according to the form we have set forth in the bull we have herewith enclosed to you".

Very soon after he landed in Ireland the legate held synods for the reform of morals in Dublin and in Connaught. With the king of Connaught Innocent was frequently in communication, writing to him especially on the subject of freedom of election. Towards the close of his life even, he addressed him a letter urging him "to cause the decrees of the General Council of the Lateran to be observed, and especially to oppose the great numbers in your kingdom who, as we have heard, blinded by the darkness of avarice, are striving to gain possession of the sanctuary of God by hereditary right".

The reader will be able to form an idea of Innocent's active work to secure freedom of episcopal election in Ireland, if we simply state that he intervened, to a greater or less degree and for one reason or another, in the elections to the sees of Raphoe, Ross, Leighlin, Armagh, Ardfert, Emly, and Lismore.

Innocent's beneficial influence made itself felt in other matters also. If on the one hand his sense of justice and knowledge of law compelled him to exhort the Irish bishops to take greater care in coming to their legal decisions, he did not hesitate to stand by them even against the king when they were in the right.

As in other countries so too in Ireland, Innocent endeavoured to lessen the evils of war; and, moreover, as in other countries so also in Ireland did he support the movement in favour of the regular payment of tithes; for in that country the systematic payment of tithes had hitherto not been one of the ordinary means for the support of the clergy. At the synod of Cashel (1172) it had been decided that "all good Christians do pay tithes of beasts, corn, and other produce to their parish church". However, at the synod of Dublin in 1186, Giraldus Cambrensis declared that "as yet tithes were not paid", and so that synod renewed the decrees regarding the payment of tithes. Still there were difficulties in the way of payment, and the archbishop of Dublin, Henry of London, wrote to Innocent to complain of the non-payment of certain tithes at least. In his reply to the arch bishop (July 30, 1214), the Pope said: "You have intimated to us that most people backed by laical power refuse to pay the tithes of fruits, of the fodder for animals, of mills, and of their labour; that others pay not to the cathedral churches, unless to those whom they like best, and as much as they please. On which account, in compliance with a request you humbly made us, we order the payment of tithes". This decree would appear to have settled the question, for the *Annals of the Four Masters* state that in 1224 "the tithes were legally gathered".

SCOTLAND.

A glance at the Calendar of Papal Letters will show that Innocent's relations with the Church of Scotland were in all respects similar to those which he had with the Churches of England and Ireland. To avoid monotony, notice of these relations may therefore for the most part be omitted here, and our attention confined to one or two more exceptional points.

We may note, for instance, that to Scotland as elsewhere Innocent sent not only letters, but a legate in order to bring his authority more home to the people. Cardinal John of Salerno, whom we have seen in Ireland, visited Scotland on his way to that country, and held a synod at Perth in which he issued a number of decrees (1201). Among the many decrees which had to be observed, only one rather curious one has been preserved. It is one suspending such priests as had been ordained on a Sunday, as Alexander III had forbidden any bishop other than the Pope to ordain on a Sunday. Before the legate proceeded to Ireland "throwch Gallway", he went to Melrose, where he was honourably received. He remained there for more than fifty nights, chiefly to settle a dispute, apparently about boundaries, between the monks of Kelso and those of

Melrose. The chronicle of the latter monastery, perhaps because judgment was not given in favour of Melrose, declares that the legate gave satisfaction to neither party, but, after receiving numerous gifts in gold and silver, went off, leaving the dispute much as he found it.

Though Hadrian IV, when he granted Henry II permission to take over the government of Ireland, insisted that he should order the payment of Peter's Pence in that country, still the Popes do not appear to have claimed that tax from Ireland, as it was never established there by lawful authority. But the case was different in the Orkneys. Harald, earl of Orkney, had, in atonement for his sins, ordered the payment to Rome of one penny from every house in the county of Caithness. This had been duly collected in the days of Pope Alexander by Andrew, bishop of Caithness; but his successor, John, had presumed to forbid the payment of the tax. Innocent accordingly ordered the bishops of Orkney and Ross to compel their brother bishop to do his duty. What was the final issue of John's contumacy as far as the Pope was concerned does not seem to be known; but in so far as he himself was concerned it was very serious. The earl's men dreadfully mutilated the unfortunate bishop by cutting out his tongue, as we learn from a letter in which Innocent records the severe penance he inflicted upon the man who, on compulsion as he declared, had done the dreadful deed.

In the preceding narrative we have had occasion frequently to record the sending of a blessed golden rose by different Popes to certain princes who had deserved well of the Church. The rose was, as we have seen, blessed in Lent. Later on, the Popes blessed on Christmas Eve a cap and a sword, and sent these also as presents to favoured princes. The design of these ornaments, like that of the rose, varied somewhat, but in general the caps were of velvet trimmed with ermine, adorned with pearls, and bound round with a gold cord. On the top there was sometimes a dove to represent the spirit of wisdom. They were of various colours, purple, grey, or crimson, as the case might be. Though not a single one of these caps, which have been confused with our sovereigns' caps of maintenance (or of liberty, as they are occasionally called, appears to be extant, the state sword of Scotland, which was sent by Julius II to King James IV, is one of these specially blessed swords. At state functions the cap was often carried on the point of the sword before their owner.

There is considerable doubt as to when these gifts, emblematical of the civil and military defence of the faith, were first presented. It has been held that Boniface VIII was the first to bless a sword and send it as a gift; and it is certain that in the *Ordo Romanus* of Cardinal Cajetan Stefaneschi, drawn up about the year 1320, there is special mention of the investing of any royal personage who might be present at the Pope's Mass on Christmas night with a sword and cap. Moreover, according to Ciaconius, Urban VI, when on his way from Genoa to Rome, gave the cap and sword to Fortiguerra, the Gonfaloniere of the republic of Lucca (1385).

In connection with these facts, we may add that one of our own historians, Adam of Usk, gives us an interesting piece of personal experience: "On Christmas Day" (1404), he writes, "I was present at the papal Mass and banquet together with others, my fellow-auditors and officers. And, in the first Mass, at the right horn of the altar was placed a sword adorned with gold, bearing on its upright point a cap with two labels

(lappets) like a bishop's mitre, for this purpose: that the emperor, if present, holding the naked sword, should read, as deacon, as having been anointed, the gospel: 'There went out a decree from Caesar', and should have the same sword from the Pope for himself. But, owing to the absence of the emperor, a cardinal-deacon read the gospel, and the Pope delivered the sword to the count of Malepella (?), as being the most noble then present".

The sword and cap were presented at the end of the Mass with the words: "Receive this sword and be a defender of the faith and of the Holy Roman Church, in the name of the Father, etc." The recipient then kissed the Pope's hand and foot, and straightway handed the sword to one of his followers so that it might be carried before him.

The cap and sword appear to have been sent for the last time to any ruler of this country in the year 1555. In that year, after a golden rose had been sent to Queen Mary by Julius III, he sent to her husband, Philip of Spain, the sword and cap.

If, however, we can trust so late a chronicler as Holinshed, the cap and sword were given as early as the beginning of the thirteenth century. "About the year 1202", says that chronicler, "the Pope (Innocent III) sent a legate to King William (the Lion) of Scotland, presenting him with a sword, with a sheath and hilts, set full of precious stones. He presented unto him also a hat or bonnet made in the manner of a diadem of purple hue, in token (it should mean) that he was Defender of the Church".

CHAPTER III SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

CONTEMPORARY SPANISH SOVEREIGNS.

ARAGON.

Pedro II, 1196-1213

Jayme I (The Conqueror)
1213-1276.

CASTILE.

Alfonso (III) VIII, 1158-1214

Henry (Enrique) I, 1214-1217

St. Fernando III, 1217-1252.

LEON.

Alfonso IX, 1188-1230

NAVARRRE.

Sancho VI, 1194-1234.

PORTUGAL.

Sancho I, 1185-1211.

Alfonso II, 1211-1223.

WHEN Innocent III became Pope, far the greater part of the Iberian Peninsula had been recovered from the Moslems. The Christian portion was divided into the kingdoms of Castile, Leon, Aragon, Portugal, and the small kingdom of Navarre. The extreme south was in the hands of the African dynasty of the Almohades, who ruled it by a Vali sent from Morocco. But, despite the great victory of Almanzor at Alarcos (near Calatrava, in New Castile) over Alfonso (III) VIII of Castile, the Moorish power in Spain was drawing rapidly near its termination. Had it not been for the rivalries, ecclesiastical and civil, that distracted the Christians, Innocent III would have lived to see its close. As it was, his devoted efforts to foster peace and unity among the Christian rulers, and to procure help for them from abroad, led to the glorious Christian victory of the Navas de Tolosa (1212), which broke for ever the Moselm power in Spain.

It would be impossible for us to deal with all the relations between Innocent and Spain, and there is the less need to do so because, as we observed in the case of Scotland, most of them were similar to those which he had with other nations. There were the usual cases, matrimonial and clerical, on which he had to adjudicate, and the ordinary appeals to which he had to listen. Our attention must therefore be confined to the more important events and to the more exceptional people.

Perhaps the most striking figure in Spain at this period was the bold and energetic Pedro II of Aragon. He stands out prominently for his success in war, and for his final failure in it, for his submission to Innocent, and even for his ultimate opposition, at least to that Pope's policy.

Pedro's territory was already tributary to the Holy See. In 1091, Raymond Berenger II had subjected the county of Barcelona to the Holy See. This county Pedro had inherited from his father along with the kingdom of Aragon, which had also already been subjected to the overlordship of the Popes. Anxious to attach his suzerain still closer to his interests, to increase his personal prestige by a solemn coronation at the hands of the Pope, and to assure himself of the support of the fleets of Genoa in his intended attack on the Moors in the Balearic Isles, Pedro set sail for Italy. With five galleys, and accompanied by a number of the higher clergy and nobility, he landed at the Isola Sacra in November 1204. Innocent at once sent a number of cardinals, the senator of the city and other nobles, and a force of horse and foot to escort the king to the quarters of the canons of St. Peter's.

On the third day after Pedro's arrival in Rome, *i.e.*, on the feast of St. Martin of Tours (November 11), the Pope, surrounded by the College of Cardinals, escorted by the primicerius, the senator, the cantors, judges, notaries, and nobles, and followed by a huge crowd, betook himself to the monastery of St. Pancratius on the Aurelian Way, not far from the gate of S. Pancrazio. In the basilica of the monastery Pedro, after having been anointed by Peter, cardinal-bishop of Porto, was crowned by Innocent himself, who invested him with a mantle and dalmatic (*colobium*), a sceptre and an orb, and a crown and mitre—all most precious and beautiful, which he had caused to be specially made. After his investiture with the insignia of royalty, Pedro took the usual oath to the Pope: "I, Pedro, king of Aragon, promise that I will ever be faithful and obedient to the lord Pope Innocent, and that I will faithfully maintain my kingdom in that obedience,

defending the Catholic faith and putting down heresy. I will guard the liberties and immunities of the churches and protect their rights, and in all the territories subject to my rule I will strive to preserve peace and justice”.

From the basilica of St. Pancratius the king, wearing his crown, proceeded in great state to St. Peter’s. There he laid his crown and sceptre on the high altar, and, after receiving a sword from the Pope’s hand, formally made over his kingdom to him by deed of gift. “I believe and profess”, ran the document, “that the Roman Pontiff, who is the successor of Blessed Peter, is the Vicar of Him by whom kings reign. ... I, Pedro, by God’s grace king of Aragon, count of Barcelona, and lord of Montpellier, desiring above all things, after God, to be supported by the protection of Blessed Peter and the Apostolic See, offer to you, most reverend Father and Supreme Pontiff the lord Innocent, and through you to the holy Roman Church, my kingdom. And I offer it to you and your successors moved by divine love, and for the good of my soul and of those of my predecessors. Moreover, from the royal treasury there shall every year be paid to the Apostolic See two hundred and fifty *massamutinae* (*byzants*), and I and my successors shall be accounted specially faithful to it. I decree that this sum shall be paid in perpetuity, because I trust that you and your successors will with their apostolic authority ever defend me and my successors and the aforesaid kingdom ... That this royal concession may remain inviolate I have, with the advice of the nobles of my court ... set my seal to it. Given at Rome, November 11, 1204, in the eighth year of my reign”.

At the close of the ceremonies in St. Peter’s, Pedro was escorted to St. Paul’s outside-the-walls, close to which he embarked for his native land. In the course of the year after his return Pedro received many privileges and helpful letters from the Pope. Among other privileges which he received was that his successors, after having asked Rome for their crowns, might be crowned by the archbishop of Tarragona at Saragossa. Innocent is also said to have given to Pedro the title of “Catholic”, to have declared him the standard-bearer (*gonfaloniere*) of the Holy See, and to have adopted as a papal standard one modelled on that of Aragon.

Although, as we have seen, in his action at Rome Pedro had the support of the chief bishops and lay nobility of his country, still, when his extravagances caused him to face the Cortes at Huesca (1205) with a demand for money, that assembly, or some of its members, based a refusal of his request on the ground that he had given up to the Pope privileges which belonged to them. Their protestations were, however, of no avail. The kingdom of Aragon remained a tributary of the Holy See.

Early in his long reign, Pedro’s son Jayme (James) I, who owed his crown to the exertions of Innocent, endeavoured to avoid payment to Rome for the county of Barcelona. Honorius III promptly ordered him to be compelled to pay (October 5, 1218); and, as we find the Pope soon after taking the kingdom of Aragon and the county under his protection, we may presume that Jayme duly paid what was owing. Or perhaps it would be more just to say that it may be presumed that he promised to pay his dues; for he himself records that he was upbraided by Gregory X in 1274 for the non-payment of the large arrears that he then owed.

Though Innocent was naturally disposed to favour so orthodox a sovereign as Pedro II, he would not listen to him when he preferred an unjust request. In 1204 Pedro

espoused Mary, the “Lady of Montpellier”. Whether he had married her merely to strengthen his position in Provence, or because he really loved her at the time, he at any rate soon wearied of her, and applied to Rome for a divorce. The reasons put forth by this “Catholic and God-fearing man”, as Innocent calls him, were threefold. One had reference to his own dissoluteness, the second turned on the fact that Mary had been previously married to a count who was still alive, and the third set forth that she was related to him in the forbidden degrees of kindred. Innocent put the case into the hands of the bishop of Pamplona and other delegates; but it was delayed first by the death of two out of the three delegates, and by the subsequent appeal of the queen to the tribunal of Innocent himself. The Pope’s decision was at length (January 19, 1213) communicated by him both to the queen and to the king. He pointed out that in the sentence which he gave in the queen’s favour he had not swerved either to the right or to the left, and, reminding Pedro that in his action he was consulting not the king’s pleasure but his eternal salvation, he begged him to receive his wife with real affection, especially as she had given him a son, and was moreover a very good woman. In fine, he told the king that, in the event of his refusing to comply, he had written to the bishop of Carcassonne and others instructing them to compel him to obey by ecclesiastical censure.

Soon after the despatch of this letter, the death of Mary in Rome, whither she had gone to plead her cause, freed Pedro from any danger of papal hostility on her account, and left him more at liberty to pursue his impure pleasures.

No doubt Pedro’s endless amours were almost as much the cause of his perpetual pecuniary embarrassments as his unceasing wars. His efforts to obtain money led him to devise new methods of taxation which brought him into opposition with his nobles, and to debase the coinage, which brought down upon him the blame of the Pope. Innocent impressed upon him that the needs of war did not give him the right, “without the consent of the people”, to continue in circulation the inferior coins issued by his father.

Though Pedro’s wars were honourable, and, in the main, approved by the Pope, especially, as we shall see presently, that war which led to the glorious victory of Las Navas de Tolosa, still his martial zeal against the Moors had occasionally to be tempered by Innocent’s prudence. In 1203 Innocent had not effected that union among the Christian kings which he afterwards succeeded in bringing about; and so, reminding Pedro that he himself recognised that he needed the help of the other kings; that there was at the moment no unity among his fellow-princes; and that on the other hand the king of Morocco was strong in recent victories, he advised him to refrain for the time from attempting to fight him. Even if Pedro followed the Pope’s advice on this occasion, he at any rate did not when it was a question of his fighting against Simon de Montfort, as we shall point out when treating of the Albigensian wars. From being a lifelong “soldier of the Church and defender of the faith, and a special son of his Holiness the Pope” he became, as his sister Queen Constance of Sicily bitterly bewailed, “towards the close of his life something quite different”; embraced the cause of Raymond of Toulouse; and was ignominiously defeated and slain at the battle of Muret (1213). His unhappy sister had to beg that “the lord of so many provinces” might get at least “a little tomb”, and that the Pope would watch over his infant son.

Meanwhile, we may turn to Alfonso VIII of Castile, who, with Pedro as his chief supporter, gained over the Moors the decisive victory of Las Navas. After his marriage with the English princess Eleanor, daughter of Henry II (1170), Alfonso's position within his own dominions was more assured, and he was able to direct his arms against the Moors. But, though he had the support of Alfonso IX of Leon, he was not at first successful against them. He and his ally suffered a severe defeat at the hands of Yusuf at Alarcos in Cuenca (1195). After the battle, war broke out between the allies; but Alfonso of Castile was much the abler sovereign, and had soon so far reduced his adversary that he was able to devote all his energies to avenging the defeat of Alarcos. His chief preliminary endeavour was to induce the Christian rulers to act together. He would, however, have been unable to effect this united action but for the hearty cooperation of the Pope. Innocent hearkened to Alfonso's cry for help, and supported the efforts of the Castilian monarch with all his heart. He exhorted the bishops of Spain to urge all who were not specially bound by treaties of peace with the Moors to support the efforts of Alfonso; he appealed to warriors outside Spain to help in the great work, offering them the same indulgences as were offered to the Spaniards themselves; and he refused to let the consideration of any other question, such as that of the primacy of Toledo, interfere with the all-important question of the Saracen war. Fortunately, the historian Rodrigo, who was then archbishop of Toledo, was not one of those who will pursue their own rights at all times no matter what evil may thereby fall on the whole community. On the contrary, abandoning all thoughts of his own interests, he devoted himself to seconding the efforts of his sovereign and of the Pope.

Much need there was for hearty cooperation on the part of Pope and king, bishop and noble, Spaniard and foreigner; for, encouraged by the victory of Alarcos, and, according to some invited by the Albigensian heretics, the Moors were making great preparations to recover lost ground. From Seville the Almohade sovereign, Mohammed an Nasir, issued a haughty letter to all the princes of Christendom, especially to the king of Aragon, calling on them to embrace victorious Mohammedanism. He informed Pedro that he was given to understand that he was acting against the Moors, "under the instigation of the Lord of Rome", who, said an Nasir, has acted to the ruin of Christendom and his own, as it was his intention to march to Rome and to devote its lord to "degradation and misery".

Fortunately, this insolence served but to rouse both the Pope and the king to greater efforts. Innocent urged the archbishops of Toledo and Compostela to insist by every means in their power on the Spanish kings keeping peace with one another, and to compel them, especially the king of Leon, to refrain from giving any help to the Saracens.

At the exhortation of the Pope, who was specially moved to act by the imploring letters sent him by Alfonso, crowds of warriors from nearly every part of Europe flocked to Toledo; Pedro II and Sancho of Navarre heartily cooperated with Alfonso of Castile, and troops joined them even from Alfonso IX of Leon. The united forces of the Christians met the great Moslem host on the plateaux (navas) of Tolosa, and on July 16, 1212, broke for ever the power of Mahomet in Spain. Ready as Alfonso had been before the battle, so he told the Pope, "to die for the faith of Christ", after it, he attributed the victory solely to God. The letter in which the Castilian monarch gave Innocent a full

account of the great victory was read aloud and explained by the Pope himself to the assembled people of Rome, and, after giving thanks to God for the success of the Christian arms, he gave such praises to Alfonso that, as he wrote to the king, “he would prefer that they were told to the king by others rather than by him”.

Among the presents which, out of the enormous booty which fell into his hands, the king of Castile sent to the Pope, there were the lance of an Nasir, a silk tent, and a gold-embroidered banner. These were hung up in St. Peter’s, and as late as 1474 the banner at least was still to be seen there.

Whilst the other kings of Spain were freely exposing their lives in gaining that glorious victory which gave the death-blow to Moslem power in the west of Europe, Alfonso IX of Leon was ignobly engaged in attacking the territory of his namesake of Castile. This mean man, who sought his own in the hour of his country’s sore need, had previously come in contact with the Holy See for seeking his own in ways forbidden by the Church. Without asking for a dispensation, he had, for reasons of state, in the year 1191 married his first cousin Theresa, daughter of Sancho I of Portugal. The dissolution of the marriage was ordered by Celestine III, but it was not till after an interdict had been laid both on Leon and on Portugal that “what had been illegally done, was quite undone” (1195).

“As at this period as well in the East as in the West” marriage within the forbidden degrees was being commonly practised, the Popes made a determined effort to put down the abuse. Hence when, untaught by his previous experience, Alfonso repeated his offence, and married another cousin, Berengaria, the daughter of Alfonso (III) VIII of Castile (1197), he had to face the opposition of Innocent. When word of this new marriage reached the Pope, he sent “his beloved son, brother Rainer”, to look into the case, and to act as ascertained facts should dictate. At first the royal pair braved excommunication and interdict, but endeavoured both by argument and persuasion to induce the Pope to allow their union to stand. Alfonso even offered to give Innocent and the Cardinals twenty thousand marks of silver, and to maintain two hundred knights during the space of a year for the defence of the Christians against the pagans, on condition that the lord Pope would permit them to live together till God should give them offspring, or at least for three years. But Innocent was inexorable. He did not wish to be “an acceptor of persons”, nor to seem to act for money. For some years neither the words nor deeds of the Pope produced any effect; but at length, through pressure brought upon the father of Berengaria, she besought the pardon of the Church, and left Alfonso (1204). Innocent was, however, neither unreasonable nor inconsiderate. He induced Berengaria not to insist on keeping the dower which had been given to her, and for the sake of the peace of the two countries he legitimatised the children she had had by Alfonso.

PORTUGAL

Passing over the few recorded relations between Innocent and the brave but self-willed and moorishly inclined Sancho VI of Navarre, we may close our story of the

Iberian peninsula with a few words about Portugal. We have previously told how the first rulers of Portugal, in order to secure their independence, made themselves vassals of the Holy See; how Alfonso I, who had been acknowledged its king by Alexander III, agreed to pay in return two marks of gold. But when once they had obtained their end, the Portuguese sovereigns were not too careful to fulfil their engagements. When Pope Celestine III sent to inquire why the annual tax of one hundred bezants was not paid, his envoy was informed by Sancho I, a man distinctly the slave of avarice, that his father, Alfonso, had paid Pope Alexander III a thousand bezants in advance for ten years, and that the ten years had not expired. But Innocent contended that the thousand bezants were a present over and above the tax, and therefore urged the king freely to pay the amount that was due to his agent, brother Rainer. Accordingly, for the four ounces of gold which Alfonso had paid as duke, Sancho paid over five hundred and four *marabotini*, but declared that, while leaving the ultimate decision in the hands of the Pope, he was not satisfied about the additional annual tax of the hundred bezants. In order, therefore, to make the whole matter clear, Innocent forwarded to Sancho a copy of the “rescript of his father Alfonso, of illustrious memory”, which he had found in the register of our predecessor Alexander III. The pecuniary trouble was at an end, and the kingdom of Portugal, “as one of the dependencies of the Roman Church”, was again taken under papal protection.

But the pecuniary were the least of the difficulties which arose between Sancho and the Pope. Instead of steadily devoting all his energies against the Moor, Sancho weakened his own power as well as that of the Christian resources in general by his wars with his neighbours of Leon and Castile, and, as “he never showed himself over-favourable” to the clergy, the country was distracted by dissensions between him and the bishops. Into the midst of this turmoil Innocent stepped in the interests of order. His legates and his letters promoted external peace, and his diplomacy and quiet firmness did much for the support of the clergy. He had no little to say to Sancho for his harsh treatment of the clergy, especially of the bishop of Oporto, who was compelled to fly to Rome. He reminded him that he ought not to be “the oppressor but the defender” of the clergy; that he was constantly interfering in ecclesiastical affairs; that he often supported his soldiers, his horses, dogs, and hawks on the revenues of poor churches; that he handed over the clergy to secular tribunals; and that he endeavoured to interfere with appeals to Rome. He had also to complain of his superstitions; of his daily consultations with a witch; of his regarding meeting with a cleric as an unfortunate omen; of his supporting excommunicated persons, usurers, and the enemies of the Church generally, and of his hostility to the bishop of Oporto in particular. Finally, Innocent expressed no little indignation at the letters which Sancho had sent him, letters “full of indiscretions, and not free from presumption”. Among other matters, “not worthy of mention, you have presumed to write to us that we are wont willingly to lend our ears to anyone who may wish to speak against you, and have not been ashamed to give vent to opprobrious language against you ... The successors of St. Peter”, continued the Pope, “are in the habit not of inflicting injuries, but, after Christ’s example, of bearing them”. In conclusion, he begged the king to leave to the Pope the things of the Church, as he left those of the State to the king; and he assured him that, much as he loved him, he would not be wanting to the bishop of Oporto if the king did not treat him fairly. “For in matters of justice we are debtors to all”.

How far the unaided representations of the Pope, and those whom he commissioned to approach Sancho on the matter, would have influenced him in favour of Martinho, may be doubted. But grievous illness came to help the words of Innocent, and at the eleventh hour Sancho endeavoured to atone for the wrongs he had done. He made a will in which he strove to do justice to all who were bound to him by ties of blood, or whom he had injured. Then, to ensure its being carried out, he sent it to Innocent to have it confirmed. With the exception of certain clauses in it which seemed to dispose of monastic property, Innocent duly confirmed it, praising him for offering to his Creator at least “an evening sacrifice”.

It was as well for some of the legatees that Sancho’s will had been confirmed by the Pope. His son and successor Alfonso II endeavoured to avoid fulfilling its terms, especially those in favour of his sisters. These ladies, suspecting, with justice as the event proved, that their brother would not respect his father’s will, turned to the Pope, and, at their request, Innocent took them and all their property under the protection of the Church. Despite this confirmation, Alfonso endeavoured to prevent the will from being put into execution. The sisters thereupon again invoked the moral support of the Pope, and at the same time the armed intervention of Alfonso IX of Leon, to whom one of the sisters, Theresa, had once been married. Alfonso promptly responded to the appeal, and invaded the territory of the Portuguese monarch. Innocent too, despite the fact that Alfonso had early taken the precaution to place his kingdom under the protection of the Apostolic See and to promise the payment of the tribute, —Innocent too hearkened to the sisters’ appeal, and Alfonso was made to feel the force of the spiritual as well as of the temporal sword. But Innocent was not satisfied with striking. He strove to heal at the same time; and through his legates endeavoured, at last with success, to put an end to the disastrous struggle. In 1216 he settled the difficulties by a compromise. The sisters were to have the revenues, but jurisdiction over their cities was to be given to the king.

CHAPTER IV.

SCANDINAVIA, LIVONIA, PRUSSIA, AND FINLAND.

KINGS OF DENMARK.

Canute VI., 1182- 1202.

Valdemar II (The Victorious), 1202- 1241.

KINGS OF SWEDEN.

Swerker II., 1195- 1210.

Eric II., 1210-1216.

John Swerkerson, 1216-1222.

KINGS OF NORWAY.

Sverri, 1177-1202.

Hako III, 1202-1204.

Guthrum, 1204-1205.

Inge II, 1205-1207.

Hako IV, 1207-1263.

DENMARK.

IN the survey of the world which Innocent immediately took when he mounted the watch-tower of Peter, he saw that there was much in the far north which would need his attention, and in the very first year of his pontificate he began to make his influence felt in the cold and wild regions of distant Scandinavia. Hearing his voice and feeling the pressure of his arm, the men of those countries turned and gazed upon him who from the hills of Rome would guide their destinies, and like the rest of men they pronounced him “a shining example for the prelates of Christendom to imitate; for he was suited for rule, was an almsgiver, and by his laws and sermons proved himself useful to posterity”.

At this period domestic strife and foreign wars turned the whole of Scandinavia into a battlefield. But, as Denmark was the least troubled with intestine broils, it was the most prosperous portion of the Scandinavian Peninsula. Under the reign of Canute VI it became distinctly more consolidated, and, to the great vexation of Barbarossa, its dependence on the Empire became scarcely even nominal. Perhaps most of the communications of this successful monarch with Innocent concerned, as we have already seen, the misfortunes of his daughter Ingeborg, while those of Innocent to the king or his people, apart from the case of the Danish princess, concerned the removal of abuses. Especially did he oppose the irregular doings of certain nobles in Zealand, with which intercourse had been rendered difficult by floods. They were endeavouring to obtain immunity for crimes of all kinds—as, for instance, for marrying within the forbidden degrees of kindred by inadequate money payments. Such abuses must be ended, was Innocent’s decision.

Innocent had many communications with the archbishop of Lund, which then, along with the whole southern corner of Sweden, belonged to Denmark. He recognised him as the primate of Sweden as well as of Denmark, and worked through him for the common weal, issuing orders through him, for instance, that the clergy and people should be protected from improper collectors instituted by the Hospitallers. Innocent’s relations with the Danish clergy and people were, in a word, all in the interests of law and good order.

Canute was constantly at war with the heathen Slavs around him, and so fortunate was he in his expeditions against them, that he took the title, still held by his successors, of king of the Slavs. That his title was not a vain one he proved, among other ways, by a most successful invasion of pagan Esthonia, south of the Gulf of Finland, which he undertook to some extent at least at the instigation “of the Pope”. So at any rate says a modern historian. But the Danish chroniclers assign the expedition of Canute to the days when Celestine was Pope, but do not seem to say anything about the intervention of that Pontiff, and assure us that it was Canute’s successor, Waldemar II, who became master of Esthonia and partly converted it. Their assertions are borne out by the positive statement of Gregory IX to the effect that Esthonia owed its Christianity to the warlike exertions of King Waldemar, and Andrew, archbishop of Lund (the successor of Absalom, *d.* 1201). Innocent’s share in the good work was more peaceable, and is seen in a series of letters which he addressed either to Theoderic, the first bishop of Esthonia, or in his behalf. In his letters to the bishop himself he confirms his nomination, and for the time being at any rate exempted him from the jurisdiction of any metropolitan. In other letters he appeals to the people and clergy of Saxony and to the Knights of the Sword in Livonia to help Theoderic in the good work he has undertaken. Innocent thus exerted himself because, as he explained to Theoderic, “the solicitude of the office entrusted to us requires us to strive to support in an especial manner whatever is seen to be favourable to the spread of the worship of God”.

But Innocent was drawn into most frequent touch with the kings of Denmark by the ambition of Waldemar, Bishop of Schleswig, a natural son of Canute V. He had been named duke of Schleswig till such time as the king’s brother, afterwards King Waldemar II, should be old enough to govern the duchy. When that time arrived, the bishop was loath to resign his office, and rebelled against Canute, declaring that he had as much right to the throne as that prince himself. But fortune deserted him, and he was captured by the king, who at once threw him into prison (1193).

This punishment of a bishop without any reference to Rome was more than Innocent could endure. But, owing to the magnitude of Waldemar’s crime, he does not appear to have made any protest during the lifetime of Canute. On his death (1202), however, he wrote a very tactful letter to his successor Waldemar II. It opened with a wish that such an unworthy bishop, who had tried “to unite kingly power and the priesthood in his own person”, had never existed. But after condemning Bishop Waldemar in the very strongest manner, he pointed out to the king that, seeing that God had preserved Canute’s throne safe for him, “he ought not to have judged the servant of another, nor have treated a bishop with as little consideration as a worthless slave, but he ought to have deferred to the Roman Church, left judgment to the Apostolic See, and kept his own hands guiltless. Nor had he any reason to fear that the bishop would have escaped the judgment of the Apostolic See, or have avoided the discipline of that See from whose mouth proceeds a two-edged sword, more penetrating than any earthly steel, that vibrates from sea to sea in an instant, crosses the ocean, and flies over hills and mountains as it were in the twinkling of an eye, and wounds those whom it strikes not only here but hereafter. Whatever were the crimes of the bishop, it may well be asked what evil has the Apostolic See committed, and what wrong has been wrought by the Universal Church that their rights should be injured in him?” In conclusion, he

begged the king, after taking every precaution, and relying on the cooperation of the Apostolic See, to release the sinful bishop, on condition of perpetual exile in Italy.

To this eloquent appeal Waldemar, “the victorious”, or as he called himself, “king of the Danes and Slavs, duke of Jutland and lord of Nordalbingia”, replied that he knew that all Christians without exception were bound to love, honour, and obey his Holiness, and he realised that he was specially called upon to do so, as Innocent had done so much for him, and therefore, dangerous as it was so to do, he would release the bishop. He had full trust, he said, that the Pope would see to it that no harm should come to him or his kingdom in consequence.

In his reply to the king, whilst most heartily thanking him for acceding to his wishes, Innocent begged him to allow the bishop some portion of the revenues of his see on which to support himself, and, when sending him to Rome, to see him safe into the hands of Andrew, king of Hungary, after which he would be responsible for him.

But Waldemar proved unworthy both of the clemency of the king and of the interest of the Pope. In 1207 Hartwig, archbishop of Bremen, went the way of all flesh, and the chapter of Bremen, no doubt to meet the wishes of Philip of Swabia, king of the Romans, elected the bishop of Schleswig to succeed him. Anxious to have an enemy of Denmark in that important see, Philip begged the Pope to consent to the transfer of Waldemar from the see of Schleswig to that of Bremen; for, as the king said to Innocent, he was aware that “by God’s ordinance the plenitude of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction was centred in his person”, and that “a bishop cannot pass from one see to another without his permission”.

In an evil hour for himself “the ungrateful” bishop endeavoured to precipitate matters. He secretly fled from the Pope, and, under the protection of Philip, betook himself to Bremen. But Innocent was not to be played with in that fashion. The bishops of France and Germany were promptly ordered to declare Waldemar excommunicated, and the bull of excommunication was sent to Bremen itself, where at first no one had the courage to publish it. But at length, under the pretence of making an offering, a person unknown laid it on the altar whilst Mass was being said.

Bishop Waldemar, however, whose hand was more at home on the handle of a sword than on a pastoral staff, and who was more fitted to lead men to battle than to guide their souls to heaven, maintained his position for some time by force of arms. But the murder of his chief supporter, King Philip (June 1208), materially weakened his position, and, in consequence of a letter from Innocent to Otho, “emperor of the Romans”, he was duly expelled from Bremen. Again, therefore, did he become a suppliant for the mercy of that Apostolic See which, to use some of the last words of Arnold of Lubeck, is wont to forgive up to seventy times seven times. For the moment, “as the case was a very complex one”, nothing was decided except that, outside the diocese of Bremen, he might say Mass as a bishop.

Unfortunately, with Waldemar promises were only words, and he forgot all his promises of obedience to Innocent when, after the beginning of Otho’s quarrel with the Pope, he was restored to Bremen by Duke Bernard, “as though in accordance with the will of the emperor” (1210), and the Pope’s nominee was rejected. Innocent once more instituted vigorous proceedings against the refractory prelate. But once more did

Waldemar boldly kick against the goad; and it had to be taken up and applied by Honorius III before he found it no longer worth his while to resist. He sincerely repented, and became a Cistercian; and the last picture which history gives us of this daring prelate shows him with a papal letter in his hand humbly begging to be received into a Cistercian monastery.

SWEDEN.

The development of law and order and of Christianity was at this period greatly retarded in Sweden by a want of national unity. The Swedes of the North had not as yet completely amalgamated with the Goths of the South, and the rival peoples were prone to support rival candidates for the throne. King Charles Swerkerson was slain by Canute Ericson, who obtained the support of the Swedes (1167). The usurper successfully held his own against the sons of Charles, but was not able to secure the succession of one of his own sons. After his death (1195) a son of Charles, Swerker II, was acknowledged king of Sweden through the influence of Denmark.

Throughout the North, as throughout the rest of Europe, great was the political prestige of the See of Rome. A Norse eleventh-century poet, Eilif, speaking of our Lord, sang:

“They say Christ sits upon a mountain throne
Far to the south beside the well of Fate :
So closely has the Lord whom angels own
With Rome and Roman lands entwined His state”.

Accordingly, to render his position more secure, Swerker II placed himself under the protection of the Roman Church.

With a well-disposed king to help him, Innocent applied himself to building up the Church in Sweden. Conforming himself, as he expressly stated, to the regulations laid down by Hadrian IV, he confirmed the primacy of the archbishop of Lund over Sweden, and his relations to Upsala, which had been fixed as the metropolitan see of Sweden. The archbishop of Upsala had to be consecrated by the primate of Lund, and, “saving the fidelity he owed to the Roman Church”, had to take “an oath of fidelity and obedience” to him. With regard to the bestowal of the pallium, the Pope decreed that an envoy of the church of Lund and one of the church of Upsala had to go to Rome to ask for it. When granted, it had to be taken to the primate of Lund, who was to bestow it on the new archbishop.

Still further to enhance the dignity of the see of Lund, and in reward for his zeal for the conversion of the surrounding pagan nations, Innocent named Andrew Sunensen his legate throughout Denmark and Sweden.

Into perhaps the great mass of the Swedes the spirit of Christianity had not as yet sunk very deeply. Pagan superstitions and practices were still deeply engrained in the mass of the laity, who were by no means as much under the influence of civilisation as even their neighbours the Danes; and the clergy did not realise that any special example was expected from them, and may have even viewed with indifference that the Church of their country was, more than in any other land, kept in bonds by the oppression of the powerful. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising to find that Innocent had to complain that, disregarding the laws of the Church in the West, the Swedish clergy were all married men. When, however, Innocent, in cooperation with the primate of Lund, endeavoured to compel them to keep these laws, they replied that their conduct was justified by a privilege granted them by a papal bull. No privilege was, however, forthcoming on Innocent's demanding to see it; but, pending the gradual establishment of canonical discipline, he had in Sweden to tolerate many things, such as the elevation of a priest's son even to an archiepiscopal see, which he would not have tolerated elsewhere.

Meanwhile, he bade the primate of Lund act in his place; never to cease his efforts to reform both clergy and people by regularly visiting his province; and to collect for him the taxes due to the Holy See in Denmark and Sweden.

But Innocent's work of reform in Sweden was hindered by civil war which led to the dethronement of Swerker II, who had been raised to the Swedish throne despite the claims of the sons of his immediate predecessor Canute Ericson. According to a letter of the Pope which is our test authority on this subject, Swerker had treated Canute's sons with the greatest kindness, but, induced to rebel against him, three of them were slain in battle (1205). The fourth, Eric, however, escaped, gathered a force of Swedes, and forced the Gothic Swerker to fly into Denmark. It was in response to an appeal from Swerker to Rome for help that Innocent despatched the letter in question to the bishops of Sweden, exhorting them to support the defeated king in every way (1208). But either the Pope's letter or the bishop's help was inefficacious. Eric remained master of the field, despite the assistance which his rival received from Denmark (1203). Swerker was slain in 1210, and, as he left only a boy under age, Innocent, for the sake of peace, recognised Eric as king; but on his death (1216) was unable to keep the throne in his family.

NORWAY.

Innocent's relations with Norway were mostly in connection with King Sverri, that "sacrilegious apostate", that "cruel tyrant", "that limb of the devil", "that monster who only spares those he is unable to injure", "that excommunicated apostate, the enemy of God and his saints on account of his crimes" as the Pope describes him at different times.

Before proceeding further we must answer the question who was this "apostate", concerning whom Innocent used stronger language than he applied to any other of the many men of whom he had to speak. Regardless of his mother's good name, says the

Pope, he declared that he was of royal blood; and what Innocent reports him to have said, we find Sverri himself asserting through his scribe, Abbot Jonsson. The monk tells us that Sverri (*b.* 1151) for many years supposed himself to be the son of Unas Kambari, an armourer of the Faroe Islands, and of Gunhild, a Norse woman. When he was five years of age, his father sent him to his native place in the Faroe Islands, and the young Sverri was there trained by Bishop Hroi, the brother of Unas, and was at length ordained priest. “But”, says his biographer, “when he reached a ripe age, he did not shape himself to the priesthood, and was rather unruly”; and, as he said of himself: “I am not well suited to be a priest”. “A strange matter now happened”, continued his biographer. “Gunhild, the mother of Sverri, left the land to go south to Rome (1175). There, to one who heard her confession, she confessed that the man whom hitherto she had stated to be her son’s father was not so; but that a king was his father, and her son himself knew it not. This confession being laid before the Pope (Alexander III), she was commanded in her penance to inform her son of his real parentage as soon as she saw him. Not long after her return home, she sailed to the Faroe Islands, and told Sverri that he was the son of King Sigurd Munn”. This is no doubt a flight of Sverri’s vivid imagination; for Saxo Grammaticus definitely states that he was the son of the smith, *i.e.*, the armourer. At any rate, it is certain that he was unruly and unfitted to be a priest, that he returned to Norway in 1176, put himself at the head of a band of outlaws, gave out that he was an illegitimate son of King Sigurd, claimed the throne of Norway, and endeavoured to drive its possessor, Magnus, from it.

By the old law of Norway, indeed, illegitimacy was no obstacle to the crown; but such an indulgence obviously opened the way to the claims of impostors, and it had, as a matter of fact, been the cause of dreadful disorders in Norway. It had therefore been decided, at the time of the coronation of King Magnus (1164), that in future only legitimate sons were to be allowed to succeed to the crown of Norway and, under ordinary circumstances, the eldest son was to be the successor. As a further means of putting an end to the violent methods by which for a very long time the throne of Norway had been obtained, “the nobility of that country, a little before the usurpation of this priest, being actuated by pious zeal to apply a remedy to this disgraceful evil decreed that the new king should be solemnly consecrated with holy unction, and crowned, so that in future none might dare to lift his hand against the Lord’s anointed”.

Magnus, therefore, had by the laws of Norway every claim to the throne. But Sverri realised that these laws were recent, and that ancient custom could well be pleaded against them. At any rate, he determined to get the crown of Norway if he could, and, as he was as able as he was unscrupulous, he at length, after some seven years desperate fighting, obtained his end. King Magnus perished in a sea-fight (1184), and Sverri became the sole ruler over all Norway, “seven years after the name of king was given him”. Next year (1185), he completed his breaches of the laws of Norway, of the Church, and of God by marrying a second wife while his first was still alive.

When a man of Sverri’s past history and domineering spirit became sole ruler in Norway, it was to be expected that in any case he would attack the Church, not merely because, as a priest, he had so grievously outraged her laws, but because his lust of power could not suffer any other authority but his own in the land. Moreover, the bishops had, as in duty bound, persistently opposed his unbridled ambition, and their

chief, Archbishop Eystein (or Augustine), had excommunicated him before leaving his diocese for England (1180). Sverri was not the man to forget the action of the bishops and their chief.

At some time after the archbishop's return from England (1183), he is said to have absolved the king, and shortly before he died (January 1 1188), to have even declared that he regretted his opposition to him. At any rate, Sverri opposed the election to the vacant archiepiscopal see (Nidaros, or Drontheim) of Eric, bishop of Stavanger, who had been specially recommended by Archbishop Eystein. However, he at last gave way, Eric was elected (1188), and went to Rome to obtain permission to pass from one see to another, and to ask for the pallium.

It was not long after his return from Rome with the pallium that the struggle between him and King Sverri began. Like Henry II in his dealings with St. Thomas Becket, Sverri covered his real design of being absolute master of the Church by at first attacking the archbishop concerning matters which had no direct connection with his spiritual powers. He complained of monetary privileges which Eystein had obtained for his see on the occasion of the coronation of King Magnus, and of the archbishop's exceeding the state allowed him by the law, in that he sailed a ship "having twenty benches, manned by ninety men or more, and bedecked with shields from stem to stern". But, as is clear from his biography, and especially from his *apology* or reasoned plea which he put forth somewhat later in his own defence, he wished to interfere with the absolute essentials of Church government, with the right of the Church to elect and place her own officers. He insisted that those who built churches at their own cost on their homesteads should not only have control over them, but should have the appointment of the priests thereto; that it should be the right of the king to choose what bishops or abbots he thought fit, and to appoint them as he chose; and, seemingly, that clerics should be amenable to the secular courts.

With regard to some of the points put forth by Sverri, there was obviously room for compromise; but we are told that Eric, producing "God's Roman law, and a part of the Pope's brief which he had with the Pope's seal declared: The Pope of Rome set me to manage this see and the property of the see; therefore I have rightful control over the property; moreover, it is God's property and holy men's. ... It will not seem honourable, when told in other lands, that the archbishop may not decide for himself to whom he shall give his meat and clothes; while your bailiffs ... may have as large companies as they like, fall upon the yeomen, and take meat and ale from them unlawfully, and yet the owner shall be fain that he is not robbed of more".

As Sverri would not listen to Eric's pleas, the latter fled regard to Archbishop Absalom at Lund (1191 or 2). Thence the two archbishops despatched a letter to Rome giving a detailed account of the doings of King Sverri, especially towards his archbishop. For this statement we have the authority of Sverri's Saga, which goes on to state that the Pope pronounced the king excommunicated; that his sentence was "read aloud" in Denmark; and that "every Sunday the ban upon King Sverri was proclaimed in the chancel (1193)". The same document further informs us that Sverri took no notice of this sentence, giving out that "it was an invention of the Danes, and not a message from the Pope". The Saga further states that a papal legate appeared in Norway, and,

after listening to Sverri's story, would have crowned him but for the information regarding his conduct furnished him by the clergy. Finding that he would not crown him, Sverri, pretending that he had only come to Norway to make money, bade him leave the kingdom.

However, whether Celestine actually excommunicated Sverri by name or not in 1193, as appears from the Saga, he certainly in the following year excommunicated in general terms all who interfered with the privileges of the see of Nidaros, especially with those which had been granted by King Magnus (June 13, 1194).

Despite this, Sverri forced the bishops to crown him (June 29, 1194), and continued his tyrannical career, though he ceased not, through his agents, to negotiate with Rome (1195). On their return journey, in company with Fidantius, cardinal-priest of St. Marcellus, his envoys along with the papal legate all died of poison, so it was said by some, in Denmark (1197). Certain Danes, however, afterwards brought the Pope's letter to Norway, and Sverri bought it from them. Then, showing the Pope's seal, the king produced a document which set forth "that, as soon as the Pope knew for certain that the king spoke more truthfully than the archbishop, he freed the king and his whole realm from all excommunication".

This document was, of course, a forgery, as we might be sure from conjecture, and as we actually know from the express declaration of Innocent to the bishops of Norway.

Still Sverri was not altogether satisfied with his position; and no sooner did he hear that a new Pope had ascended the pontifical throne, than he sent his envoys to him. But Innocent would not listen to their pleadings; accounted their master as excommunicated; assured the bishops of Norway that, if the envoys should claim to have obtained any concessions from him, they had got them from forgers; and called on the kings of Denmark and Sweden to take action against Sverri. The kings, however, could not or would not move, and Sverri, throwing in his lot with our own tyrant King John, and receiving from him "two hundred warriors of those called Ribbalds", contrived by the sword to hold his throne till the hour of his death (1202).

After the death of Sverri, Archbishop Eric returned to Norway, and received a letter from Innocent expressing joy that calm had at last followed the storm, and that the new king, Hako III, was fortunately not following in the evil footsteps of his father, but was governing his country in peace. With a view to helping the preservation of this peace, Innocent very sternly forbade the clergy to carry arms.

Unfortunately, however, the tranquillity of the country was disturbed by a rapid succession of kings. Within five years of the death of Sverri four kings had sat upon the throne of Norway, perhaps more than one of them dying by poison. In the midst of the warlike confusion fostered by the consequent weakness of the central authority, the eyes of many turned to the Pope in the hope that his mediation might promote the interests of peace. Letters were sent to him calling upon him to intervene, and apparently the last of his letters to Norway which has come down to us was one addressed to the archbishop of Nidaros asking him to send further information as to the proposed mediation, "that he might be able to proceed more securely in the matter".

ICELAND, GREENLAND, LIVONIA, AND FINLAND.

One of the chief cities in Norway in the days of Innocent, as at the present time, was the city of Bergen, and there, says an historian of his age, you might meet men and ships from Iceland, Greenland, England, Germany, Sweden, and Gothland. Not all the traders, however, who found their way to the port of Bergen were honest men, and among the dishonest ones were some of those who belonged to the diocese of Bergen itself. The bishop of Bergen had complained to Innocent that some merchants, who had been commissioned to collect in Iceland certain tithes that belonged to his Church, kept them for themselves. In his reply the Pope commissioned the bishop by the use of ecclesiastical censures to compel the merchants to restore their ill-gotten gains, and authorised him to proclaim that the Holy See would not listen to any appeals from them on the subject.

This is not the only reference to Iceland in the Register of Innocent. At this period the people in that island, which it was thought must, from its wildness, have been created by the devil, were as instinct with life as in the more favoured countries of Europe. There was in that desolate country the greatest religious, literary, political, and commercial activity. The spiritual needs of the island were looked after by two bishops, some twenty to thirty Benedictine, Augustinian, and Cistercian abbots, and a considerable number of monks and priests. But political dissensions, helped by the struggles between Church and State, kept the people perpetually fighting, and the continued perpetration of deeds of violence engendered a general lawlessness which ultimately led to the loss of Icelandic independence.

To curb the prevailing licence in Iceland was one of the very many laudable endeavours of Innocent. He reminded its bishops and clergy and its princes that, far off as their island was from the rest of the world, it was not outside the jurisdiction of the Roman Church, "which not by the will of man but by that of God was set over each and all the churches throughout the world". Then, after noting that the abbot whom they had sent to him had lost their letters at sea, he assured them that he had, however, instructed him regarding the political and religious state of the country. From what the abbot had told him, he found it necessary, he said, to find fault with the people for their constant murders, burnings, and impurities, and also for presuming to communicate with the apostate excommunicated King Sverri. But he was much afraid, he continued, that the clergy by their remissness were much to blame for the sad state of things in their country, and so, exhorting them to oppose a strong wall of resistance to these evils, he promised them, "when he had found a man after his own heart", to send him to them, in order that he might give them all the necessary instructions. Finally, he urged the laity to obey their clergy in what pertained to God, and to occupy themselves in works of piety, especially in almsgiving.

Whether or not Innocent ever sent to Iceland a man "after his own heart", he unfortunately did not succeed in putting an end to that regime of violent turbulence which resulted in the decay of Icelandic vitality and in the loss of their political independence.

If the only connection of Innocent with Greenland which history has preserved for us is his confirmation of the bull of Anastasius IV subjecting it to Nidaros, a series of letters show his interest in the settlement of Christianity among the heathens to the east and south of the Baltic, in Finland, Livonia, Prussia, and Pomerania. Informed by the archbishop of Lund of the good administrative work which was being accomplished by Peter, bishop of the Finnish seaport town of Abo, he wrote most graciously to approve of what he was doing. After Peter's death, as there was no eagerness for a see which, as the Pope wrote, was more likely to bring martyrdom than honour, Innocent authorised the archbishop of Lund to appoint to it a man who, though of illegitimate birth, was endowed with learning and piety, and had already preached to its people and suffered in their behalf.

Along the shores of the Baltic, south of Esthonia and north of the river Düna (Dwina), dwelt the Livonians or Lieflanders, who, as we learn from Innocent, gave "to the beasts of the field, the trees of the forest, the limpid streams, the green shrubs and unclean spirits the worship due to God". We are, moreover, informed by the same Pope that Meinhard, the first bishop of Livonia, had instructed many of them in the true faith. This worthy bishop died two years before the pontificate of Innocent, during which took place the general conversion of the Livonians. As the new Christians were very cruelly treated by their pagan neighbours, Innocent exerted himself to stir up the adjoining Christian nations to their defence. He exhorted the people of Saxony, Westphalia, and other adjoining parts to defend them by force of arms, permitting such as had vowed to fight in the Holy Land or to go on any distant pilgrimage to proceed to Livonia instead. He also encouraged the new military order of Knights Templars, properly known as the Knights of the Sword. They had been instituted by a Cistercian, brother Theoderic, a man much employed by Albert, the third bishop of Livonia (1201), and Pope Innocent gave them the rule of the Knights Templars; commanded them to wear on their tunics and cloaks the sign of the sword and the cross, and subjected them to the control of the bishop.

Seeing the interest that the Pope took in the work of the conversion of Livonia, the same brother Theoderic took to Rome one of the Livonian princes, Caupo by name. Innocent received him with the greatest kindness, kissed him, and, asking him many questions about the peoples on the borders of Livonia, congratulated him on the conversion of his country. On his departure the Pope gave him with the greatest cordiality not merely his blessing, but a hundred gold pieces, and he, moreover, gave Theoderic as a present for his bishop a book of the Blessed Pope Gregory, no doubt *The Pastoral Care*. His kind reception by the Pope made a great impression upon the Livonian chieftain, and we are assured that, after his return from Rome, he remained most faithful.

But the propagation of the faith by the Cross and by the sword, by peaceful and by violent means, led to difficulties between Albert, bishop of Livonia, or now of Riga, and the Knights of the Sword. The Knights claimed a third of the conquered territory and other privileges which the bishop would not grant. The affair was referred to Rome, and was at length brought to a satisfactory close through the mediation of the Pope. The Knights were to have a third of the territories of Livonia, and were to have the patronage of the churches on their lands. Their Grand Master was, however, to promise

obedience to the bishop of Riga, and a fourth part of the tithes paid by the tenants of the Order was to go to the bishop.

Innocent continued to watch over the establishment of the Church in this distant province and in that of the adjoining province of Esthonia, and we find him arranging for the establishment of a second bishopric in Livonia, working for the protection of the converts, and definitely freeing the bishops both of Livonia and Esthonia from dependence on any see but that of Rome.

History brings Innocent in touch with Livonia for the last time in connection with the Lateran Council. Both Albert of Livonia and Theoderic of Dorpat (in Esthonia) were present at that splendid assembly of Catholic Europe, and the historian of Livonia tells us with pride how the Pope and all the bishops rejoiced to hear what Albert had to tell them of the conversion of the heathens and of the triumphs of the Knights of the Sword. Innocent promised to have the same care of Livonia as he had of Jerusalem, and sent the bishops away rejoicing in the renewal of all their privileges. "Rome", concludes the historian, "gives laws, but Riga gives the waters of life (rigat) to the Gentiles".

Prussia.

Innocent was also interested in another Slavonic country, in Prussia, wherein Christianity had been preached by St. Adalbert some two centuries before the former became Pope. But the Prussians were a very savage people, and regarded those who attempted to effect a change in their religion as men who were conspiring with Poles, Danes, and Germans to deprive them of their freedom. Christianity had made very little progress among them in two centuries. But now other apostles, in the persons of the Cistercian monks Christian, Philip, and others, were, with the authorisation of the Pope, working among them. Considerable success attended their efforts, and in 1209 they went to Rome to report to the Pope the progress they had made, and the difficulties they had met with. Innocent encouraged them in their noble efforts, and by letters to the archbishop of Gnesen, to the various Cistercian abbots, and the princes of Poland and Pomerania, endeavoured to lessen the many difficulties they had to encounter. In his letter to the princes he earnestly exhorted them to cease from making the conversion of the Prussians an excuse for loading them with burdens. The new converts, as little able to bear them as old bottles are to contain new wine, will, if so treated, simply relapse into their old errors.

Relying seemingly on the Prussian chronicle of Peter of Duisburg, a priest of the Teutonic order who died in 1336, it is stated by many that Christian came to Rome again about the year 1214, and was consecrated bishop by the Pope. Despite all his efforts, however, very little progress was made during Innocent's pontificate with the conversion of the Prussians. As soon as some were converted, they were slain by the others. Their savagery had to be tamed by the sword before the truths of Christianity made much impression on them.

PART V
HERESY AND REFORM.

CHAPTER I.
THE ALBIGENSIANS.

The history of previous pontificates has shown that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries various heretics appeared from time to time, especially in France, whose common doctrinal basis was Manicheism, and concerning whom the writers who speak of them almost always note that “they detested matrimony”. At each fresh discovery of the existence of these sects, kings and emperors, bishops and popes passed decrees against them, and peoples and kings put some of their adherents to death. Still, if repressed in one place, they were not extinguished; but, as they propagated their doctrines more or less in secret, they reappeared in another. Churches, meanwhile, continued to call on the Holy See for instruction as to how to deal with them; and at last distracted rulers, like Raymond V, count of Toulouse, who found himself at the very headquarters of the heretics, called upon the kings of England and France to draw the material sword against them, as the spiritual availed nothing (1177). This they were disposed to do; but they were persuaded to make another effort to convert the sectaries by the sword of the Spirit and of the Word instead. Their effort was fruitless, and, as we shall soon see, after the failure of similar efforts by the Pope, they were to be again called upon to draw the temporal sword against these neo-Manicheans. This time it was the spiritual authority that called upon them to draw the sword, and the result of the appeal was very different.

The reason why rulers were, generally speaking, so violently opposed to the Cathari, the Good Men, the the Patarenes, Bulgarians, or Albigensians (men whose doctrines were fundamentally the same, even if they called themselves or were called by different names), was because of their dangerous practices, which they attempted to justify by tenets which were strikingly irrational. Without entering into minute details, or dwelling on the hostility of the Good Men to the Church in its dogmas, organisation, and worship, it may suffice to point out once more that they were not content with believing that there were two equal and antagonistic beings, the one good and the other evil, and that all material things were made by the evil being, but they proceeded to put into act many of the baneful but logical deductions from their theories. Their propositions concerning the intrinsic evil of matter led them to condemn marriage, *i.e.*, to aim at the extinction of the race, and their refusal to take oaths made them the enemies of society as then constituted; for that rested almost entirely on the feudal oath. And if in actual life no very serious harm might have followed their belief that to become an Albigensian was the sure and sole road to salvation, provided no practical conclusion had been evolved from it, very great mischief did actually result

from their putting into execution a practice which they called “*endura*”. After the reception by a Good Man of the *Consolamentum*, a kind of sacrament which they gave to the sick, he was persuaded or forced to refrain from food, and so to die; for if he died after receiving the *Consolamentum* he was sure of Paradise.

In a previous page attention has been called to the fact that a certain Basil about the beginning of the twelfth century revived in Constantinople the Manichean doctrines of the priest Bogomil. Repressed in the capital of the Eastern Empire, these noxious teachings spread over the Balkan provinces, taking such root in Bulgaria that those who professed them came to be known as Bulgarians. From the Balkans the “Bulgarians” or their dogmas spread, as we have already seen, not only into Lombardy and France, but even into the Papal States. Creeping along more or less in the dark, the teachers of the subversive tenets of Bogomil caused everywhere either a revival of decaying Manichean sects or a growth of fresh ones.

The revival was most striking in the south of France, in the great county of Toulouse, with its viscounties of Nimes, Beziers, and Carcassonne, and its seignories of Castres, Albi, Mirepoix, etc. The temporal lord of this great province, who held in fief from the king of France “as many cities as there are days in the year”, was Raymond VI, “count of Toulouse, duke of Narbonne, and marquis of Provence”. His father, Raymond V, thoroughly alive to the mischief which the teachings and practices of the Albigensians were working both in the Church and in the State, opposed them vigorously, and not only begged the Cistercians to come to preach to his people, but declared to them his conviction that it would be necessary to bring in the king of France to put the heretics down by force. Whether it was that attention to public affairs caused him to neglect his son’s religious training, or whether it was that his weak and sensual disposition naturally inclined him to a sect whose doctrines would excuse some at least of his vices, Raymond VI from a very early period showed a strong liking for the Albigenses. Later on he ever kept some of their leaders near him in order that, by the mere reception at the last moment of the *Consolamentum* (or laying-on of hands), he might be sure of salvation, no matter what kind of life he might have led.

Moreover, without accepting all that Pierre des Vaux de Cernai has said about the character of Raymond VI, his acts show him weak and vacillating, his marriages and divorces prove him dissolute, and impartial testimony brands him as a violent oppressor of the Church. For his reckless plundering of Church property, Pope Celestine III had, as early as the year 1196 (March 1), to threaten him with excommunication, interdict, and the releasing of his subjects from their allegiance.

The one who held the greatest spiritual jurisdiction in the county of Toulouse was Berenger II, archbishop of Narbonne, and he set as bad an example in the Church as Raymond did in the State. He was justly denounced to the Pope as the cause of the innumerable evils in Languedoc, and it was said of him “that money was his god, and that he gloried in his shame ... Though”, continued Innocent, “he has held the archiepiscopal chair for ten years ... he has never once visited his province nor even his own see. Ashamed to give for nothing what he has received for nothing, he has exacted five hundred solidi for the consecration of the bishop of Maguelonne”. Innocent had, moreover, to blame him for disobeying his orders, for not helping his legates whom he

had sent to combat the heresy of the Cathari; for allowing his diocese to go to ruin whilst he was living at his ease in a monastery, benefiting his relatives; for employing mercenary soldiers, and conniving at their plundering; for keeping churches without vicars and prebends without prebendaries in order to retain their revenues for himself; and, in short, for permitting enormities of all kinds forbidden by the canons.

Unfortunately, Raymond and Berenger were not striking exceptions to the great mass of the nobility and clergy of Languedoc, but rather types of them. By the necessary constant mutual action between a relaxed clergy and a depraved laity the moral tone of both parties was steadily lowered. The gay life led by the southern nobles, the deteriorating influence exerted on them by the effeminate songs and conspicuously easy morals of the Troubadours, had greatly relaxed the bonds of social discipline. Wealth and luxury, combined with an enervating climate, had loosened them still more; and Jewish and Moslem elements, which had long had no little hold in Languedoc, militated against the formation of a strong Christian public opinion which might have been brought to bear upon them, and so have braced them up. The corruption of the noble families meant the corruption of the episcopate, as the episcopal elections were largely in their hands, and the bishops themselves mostly chosen from their ranks. An inferior episcopate meant an inferior lower clergy; and a poor body of clergy meant a still poorer body of laymen. How inferior were the clergy may be easily gathered from the letters of Innocent. According to him, if “the Prince of Provinces” is in a miserable condition, it is due “to the carelessness” and, in some cases, to the positive connivance of its bishops. “All its prelates (*speculatores*) are blind, dumb dogs unable to bark, who with the unprofitable servant have tied up the talent entrusted to them in a napkin ... They do all things for the sake of money”. They confer orders on the most unworthy, entrust churches even to heretics, and make themselves a byword to the laity. Then, through, the fault of the head, the limbs become corrupt. Monks in no small number, says the Pope, have thrown off their habits, broken their vows of chastity, devoted themselves to usury, gambling, hunting, and have taken up the professions of lawyers, doctors, and even of jongleurs (*joculatores*). Clerics of this stamp could not but be despised. They became the butt of every worthless troubadour.

Such then being the clergy and laity of Toulouse, it is not surprising to find a northern bishop, Stephen of Tournay, who made an official visit there in 1181, speaking of the levity, cruelty, and immorality which he found everywhere rampant amongst its people.

Power in the hands of the impure and the avaricious will, of course, be abused in the interests of their pet vices. Backed by troops of licentious mercenaries, bishops and nobles oppressed whomsoever they were able, and the worthy prelate whom we have just quoted paints a lurid picture of the desolation and ruins which he himself saw in Toulouse—ruined churches and homesteads wherein beasts had made their home. Innocent himself too, also writing some years before the Albigensian crusade, speaks of the churches which the laity had seized and fortified, and of the wars which Christians were waging against one another.

In the midst of this fair but already distracted land appeared the Cathari or Albigenses in sombre clothes, with looks demure, and leading, some of them at least,

ascetic lives, spreading doctrines which did but greatly aggravate the evils they found, and finding their strongest arguments to deceive the unwary in the evil lives of some of the bishops and clergy. At first in secret and then in public, as they gained followers, they taught a body of doctrines in which every man who wished for sanction *from above* for his own particular form of wrong doing found justification. The Church of Rome was the harlot of the Apocalypse. The count of Toulouse and the nobility would, then, but be doing right in despoiling her. Under no circumstances was it lawful to take an oath. The viscounts might, therefore, refuse submission to the count of Toulouse. Men who did not wish to take their share in fighting the battles of their liege lords were satisfied to think that it was never lawful to fight, and such as were desirous of breaking laws that were in those days punishable with death were charmed to hear that the civil authorities had no right to put any man to death. Others who were content to reap where they had not sown, and to share their neighbours goods in common, listened with satisfaction to a sect of the Albigenses, known as the *Communiati*, which declared that “everything ought to be held in common”. Finally, the very numerous class who objected to any restraint being placed upon their sexual passions welcomed the loathsome conclusions on the subject of matrimony which the Albigenses drew from their principle that all material things were the creation of the god of evil. However the *perfect* may have observed a strict chastity, history and a priori deductions agree in affirming that the believers (*credentes*), who constituted the rank and file of the sectaries, were to a considerable extent steeped in impurity. How deeply they were plunged in it may be judged from a remark of Reinerius Sacco to the effect that “many of them often grieve when they recollect that they did not give full licence to their appetites before they made profession of the heresy of the Cathari”.

On the other hand, some souls more earnest than wise, only capable of appreciating what they could see with their bodily eyes, disgusted with the profoundly unworthy conduct of many of their clergy, and captivated by the really mortified lives of many, if not most, of the *perfect*, and by such ascetic ideas as abstinence from flesh-meat and from matrimony, threw over their faith in the Church, and embraced the new doctrines with fervour. They were the men on whose self-sacrifice the Albigensian leaders could count.

Matthew Paris has preserved for us a most interesting letter of Ivo of Narbonne, formerly the lowest of his clerks, to Gerald de Malemort, archbishop of Bordeaux. From it we can see how the Albigenses secretly propagated their unholy doctrines. Ivo had been unjustly accused of heresy before the Englishman, Cardinal Robert de Courçon, papal legate in France (*d.* 1218). Hurt at the injustice of the accusation, Ivo would not submit to trial; and, alarmed by the threats of Robert, “that man of authority”, fled. In his wanderings he came in contact with some Patarenes at Como, and told them that he was in exile on account of their faith, which, he adds, “I had never learned nor followed”. Hearing this, they told him that he was to be envied for having suffered for the sake of righteousness, and treated him well. For months he listened “in silence to the many errors, nay horrors, which they uttered against the Apostolic faith”. Gained by their kindness, he promised to teach henceforth that no one could be saved by the faith of Peter. When he made this promise “they began to disclose to me their secrets, and told me that from almost all the cities of Lombardy, and some of Tuscany, they had sent

apt scholars to Paris, some to study the intricacies of logic, and others the logical disquisitions for the purpose of maintaining their own errors. For the same purpose, also, they send many merchants to the markets to pervert rich laymen, their companions at table, and their hosts ... and so, driving a double traffic, get into their own hands the money of others, and at the same time gather souls into the treasury of Antichrist". Ivo proceeds to tell us that when he left the Patarenes of Como he was able to make his way from one part of Italy to another, and always to receive entertainment from the Patarenes by means of secret signs which had been taught him. The reader will now understand how it was that, as we shall see later, they were so ready to engage in public discussions with the monks who endeavoured to convert them. Their Parisian training had not been acquired to no purpose.

With weak nature to help them, vicious and sensual doctrines, such as we have shown many of the Albigensian doctrines to be, soon spread, and were hard to uproot; and when Innocent turned his searching eyes on Languedoc, he realised that the efforts which had hitherto been made to purge the province had been in vain. Still, with his faith and energy he did not despair, nor listen to those who urged an immediate armed attack on the heretics, but in the first months of his pontificate he made earnest efforts to effect an improvement, primarily by the force of persuasion. On April 1, 1198, distressed at the way in which "simple souls" were being deceived, and at the attempts which were being made to rend the unity of the Church, Innocent addressed a letter to the archbishop of Auch, exhorting him to work against the heretics in every way he could, "even, if necessary, causing them to be restrained by the power of the material sword of princes and people". This letter was followed by many other similar ones up to the year 1208, when the murder of his legate Peter of Castelnau (January 15) caused him to lose all patience, and to call upon the princes to subdue the heretics by force of arms.

Meanwhile, on April 21, he informed the archbishop of Aix and all the southern bishops and nobles that he was sending as his legates to preach to the Cathari two most excellent men, Brothers Rainer and Guido or Guy, and he bade the archbishop secure, if necessary, the help of the secular power in order to be able to send into exile those who would not hearken to his legates, and to confiscate their goods. To encourage the people to cooperate with his legates, he offered them the same indulgences as could be gained by a pilgrimage to Rome or Compostela. As the just man, argued the Pope, lives by faith, he who takes away a man's faith takes away his spiritual life.

A little later a more important personage is commissioned by the Pope to proceed to those parts where there were "more disciples of Manes than of Christ". This new envoy was John, cardinal of St. Prisca, who had been sent to France to deal with the divorce of Philip. Then followed two Cistercian monks of Font-froide, Peter of Castelnau and Raoul (c. the close of 1203), who were ably supported by the new bishop of Toulouse, Fulk, the ex-troubadour.

Despite their hard work, and despite the fact that Innocent had joined to them for their support Arnold Amalric, abbot of Citeaux (1204), these two monks were so disheartened by their want of success that they were on the point of giving up further efforts when they were joined by Diego, bishop of Osma, and his companion, the ever-

famous Dominic Guzman, a canon of his church. Diego had just returned from Rome, whither he had gone to beg the Pope's permission to resign his see, in order that he might be free to preach to the infidel. To this request Innocent would not listen, but bade him return to his diocese. It was at Montpellier that Diego met the dispirited legates. At his suggestion a new method of procedure was adopted. The *Perfect* among the Albigenses made a great impression on the people by their lowly appearance and abstemious lives. "Let us then", said Diego, "imitate the apostles in their dress and lives, and thus preach to the people by word and deed". The words and example of Diego inspired the legates with fresh zeal. Discussions were held at various places with the heretical preachers, and we read more than once that the people were convinced, whilst the "lord of the place" remained unmoved. After one of these public disputations a knight said to Bishop Fulk: "We could not have believed that Rome had such cogent arguments against these men". He would not, however, take any active measures against them, because, as he said, he had been brought up among them, and had relations among them, and, moreover, saw that they were living good lives. Fortunately, seeing that, in the striking words of Tertullian, "the soul is naturally Christian", there are always many whose lives are better than their principles.

The enthusiasm of Diego and his fellow-workers enkindled further enthusiasm, and in 1207 Abbot Arnold, with the approval of the Pope, enlisted the services of twelve other Cistercian abbots who joined in the work of preaching to the heretics with the greatest zeal and devotion. But with all their earnestness the preachers effected but little, and that little was first checked by the death of Bishop Diego and of the legate Raoul (1207), and then, for the moment at least, reduced almost to nothing by the murder of Raoul's fellow-legate, Peter of Castelnau (1208).

The chief stay of the Albigenses was, as we have said, the weak and sensual count of Toulouse. Innocent had frequently exhorted him to expel the heretics, and had even threatened to turn against him the might of Philip of France. But Raymond not only paid no heed to the wishes of the Pope regarding the heretics, but, by the aid of mercenaries, continued to oppress the Church, and to wage war with his nobles. Accordingly, the legate Peter, knowing that the gospel of peace could not well be propagated in the midst of war, went into Provence, and made a great effort to bring about peace among its warring nobles (1207). But Raymond proved a serious obstacle in the way, and only withdrew his opposition to the signing of the peace when the nobles turned against him, and he had been excommunicated by the legate. But Raymond recked little of penury, and soon broke his oath.

His disgraceful conduct brought down upon him the severest letter ever penned by Innocent, who, however, declared that he had very little hope of correcting a "pestilent man who will not keep peace with his neighbours, but ... attaches himself to the enemies of the Catholic faith". Threatening him with temporal and eternal punishment from God for his crimes, he asked him with indignation: "Who are you that, when the king of Aragon and nearly all the nobles of the adjacent districts have, at the exhortation of the legate of the Apostolic See, sworn to keep the peace, you alone should reject it, and, hoping to profit by a state of war, like a carrion crow batten on carcasses? Are you not ashamed of so often breaking the oaths you have sworn to prosecute the heretics in your dominions? Lately, when you were devastating the

province of Arles with your mercenaries (*Aragonensibus*), and you were asked by our venerable brother the bishop of Orange to spare the monasteries, and to refrain from ravaging the country at least on Sundays and holy days, you seized his right hand and swore by it that neither on Sundays nor on Holy Days would you keep from injuring holy persons or places. And this accursed oath you have observed more religiously than those you have taken for a good object. Impious, cruel, and wicked tyrant, are you not ashamed ... to say that you could produce an heresiarch, an heretical bishop, who could prove that their faith is better than that of the Catholics? We know you have committed many other crimes against God. You are strongly suspected of heresy. We ask you, therefore, what is this madness which has seized you, that you listen to these trifles, and encourage the heretics? Are you wiser than all those who are in the unity of the Catholic faith? Are all those who profess Catholic truth damned, and those saved who hold these vain and false doctrines? Because you are an enemy of the Gospel; because you keep mercenaries and with them devastate the country; because with them you have violated the season of Lent, and those days which ought to enjoy the benefit of peace; because you have denied justice to your adversaries who sought it; because in contempt of the Christian faith you have entrusted public offices to Jews; because you have stripped the monastery of St. William and other churches of their property; because you have turned churches into castles whence you do not hesitate to wage war; because you have lately increased the tolls (*pedagia*); and because you have expelled our venerable brother the bishop of Carpentras from his see, we ratify the sentence pronounced by our legate of excommunication and interdict against you and your country". Innocent then urged him to prompt repentance, and warned him that, if he delayed, he would take away from him those territories which he held in fief from the Roman Church; and, if that were not enough, he would urge the neighbouring princes to rise up against him, and authorise them to keep such of his territories as they could seize.

Moved at last, or pretending at any rate to be moved, Raymond invited the legate Peter to come to St. Giles and there to treat about his reconciliation. But the legate could not come to any understanding with the count. First he would agree to the conditions proposed and then he would not; and when Peter asked for permission to depart, he publicly threatened him with death.

Whether Raymond ordered his death or not, it is certain that his words had the same result as the similar ones of Henry II regarding St. Thomas Becket. One of his retainers transfixed Peter with a lance on the day after they had been uttered.

This murder of an ambassador, of one to whom all his contemporaries give a most excellent character for moderation and discretion, was the last act of violence which the Cathari were to commit with impunity. Hitherto, without serious consequences to themselves, they had not merely reviled the Catholics, both priests and laymen, but whenever they had been able they had maltreated them, and had erected castles whence they could attack them and be in safety themselves. But the murder of Peter was to have very different results. The Catholics were now thoroughly roused; and the French bishops both in person and by letter insisted that the Pope should take action.

Unable to resist their request, and feeling that the time had come when violence must be met by violence, Innocent set himself to rouse France and the neighbouring

countries to proceed to battle against the Albigensians. Hitherto, when he had appealed to the secular power, it was simply with the design that it should render efficacious sentences of exile and confiscation of goods which had been passed upon individuals. Now, however, setting forth in detail the shifty conduct of the count of Toulouse; excommunicating him and all concerned in the murder of Peter of Castelnau; and declaring that “these pestilent men now wish not merely to take our goods but our lives”, he called upon king, bishop, and baron to rise up and expel the count and his heretical followers from his dominions, and to replace them by Catholics (March 1208). He also commissioned certain abbots and bishops to endeavour to persuade the kings of France and England to make peace for at least two years, and he offered the same indulgences to those who should take up arms against the Albigenses as to those who fought against the infidel. The bishops of Conserans (or St. Lizier) and Riez, and the abbot Arnold were to be the leaders of the expedition; the usual privileges of Crusaders were to be granted to those who took part in it; and, “because it is reasonable that those who do a public work should be supported at the public expense”, he urged that both the clergy and laity of those nobles who took the Cross should pay them a tenth for a year. Cardinal Gualo too was sent to the French king to promote not only the interests of the Holy Land and of the divorced Queen Ingeborg, but also those of the war against the Albigenses. Especially was Innocent anxious that the king of France himself should undertake the military management of the expedition, in order that it might be conducted properly in every way. But when Philip, desirous enough for the war but ever anxious to have his schemes of aggrandisement advanced by others, again pleaded the unsatisfactory nature of his relations with England in excuse for not complying with the Pope’s wishes, Innocent begged him at any rate to appoint a suitable leader for the Crusading host, in order that he might have the royal authority behind him, and that all might march in unity under the king’s standard. Philip, however, under the circumstances, was of opinion that he was doing sufficient if he allowed his barons to march in order “to disturb the disturbers of the peace and of the faith in the province of Narbonne”, as Pierre des Vaux de Cernai expresses it.

The words of the Pope and of those who preached the Crusade soon began to tell, and everywhere in France and on its borders, men, in sign of their intention to do battle against the Cathari, began to fasten the cross on their breasts. This they did in accordance with the directions of the papal legates, to distinguish themselves from the Crusaders proper, who wore it on their shoulders.

The count of Toulouse was now thoroughly alarmed; for, as he knew, both Pope and king had agreed that any one who seized his territories might keep them, and the king was moreover fitting out thousands of men at his own expense to take part in the war against him. Having failed to obtain help from the Emperor Otho, Raymond turned to Rome, and through his envoys promised submission if the Pope would send a new legate *a latere*. Innocent accordingly despatched to the south of France the notary Milo, “who could neither be frightened nor bribed”, and Thedisius, a canon of Genoa.

Raymond met the new legate at Valence, and as usual was profuse in his promises, declaring that he would obey Milo’s will in all things. But he found that Milo was not to be so easily imposed upon as he had hoped. The legate insisted that, as a guarantee of his good faith, he should hand over to his keeping seven of his castles in

Provence; should authorise the consuls of Avignon, Nimes, and St. Giles to swear that, should he be false to his promises, they would no longer do him homage; and that the county of Melgueil should again lapse to the Pope.

The conditions were not to the count's liking; but thousands of Crusaders had assembled on the north-east and north-west of his dominions, and were almost to march into them. He accordingly gave way, yielded up the custody of the castles, took the required oaths to disband his mercenaries, to remove the illegal tolls, and to help the Crusaders against the heretics, and, in the garb of a penitent, was solemnly reconciled to the Church by Milo at St. Giles. He then, to save his fiefs from devastation, received the Cross from the legate (June 18, 1209), and, a month or two later, congratulations from Innocent for having complied with Milo's conditions.

Some of the other barons of Languedoc followed their count's example; but most of their more powerful compeers, such as Raymond Roger, viscount of Beziers, Carcassonne, *etc.*, if they at first showed no sign of overt opposition, made no pretence at submission.

We have now between the Garonne and the Rhone two armies of Crusaders, one at Agen, and the more powerful one at Lyons, commanded by the duke of Burgundy, Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester, and other powerful lords from castles north of the Lot. To the south of the two centres just mentioned we have a number of strong and wealthy cities whose feudal lords or local consuls and inhabitants were either Albigensians or in sympathy with them. These cities were well fortified, and were crowded with mercenaries in the pay of the nobles. Then there were a number of the lesser nobility, who neither feared God nor regarded man, whose hands were against every man's, and who, from their strong castles or, like William Porcelleti, from a fort constructed out of two churches and a cemetery, plundered the traveller, and, at times, found it convenient to sympathise with the Albigenses. Finally, there were the Albigenses themselves, who, especially since their council of St. Felix de Camaran in 1167 under their pope Nicetas (Niquinta), had become a thoroughly organised body, and possessed such fortified places of refuge as Mont-Segur, which had been built for them with the consent of the count of Foix.

This powerful fortress, in which the Albigenses were destined to make their last stand (1244), had been made over to them by one of their partisans, the knight Raymond of Perelle. He had done this in consequence of a resolution come to by a great assembly of the heretics at Mirepoix in 1206. Fearing lest the Church should one day take active measures against them, they decided to ask their supporters among the nobility for a city of refuge. Raymond accordingly reconstructed his castle of Mont-Segur, and in the very year of the assassination of Peter of Castelnau, the *perfect* were preaching in it in absolute security.

Accompanied by the count of Toulouse, the Crusaders, marched against Béziers, which Pierre assures us was full of heretics who were, moreover, robbers and men stained with every crime. Abandoned by its count, Raymond Roger, who fled to Carcassonne, the town unfortunately fell in the first place into the power of the *ribalds* or camp-followers who were responsible for the wholesale slaughter of the inhabitants which followed, and for the subsequent firing of the city 3 (July 22, 1209).

The fearful massacre in Beziers terrified the whole neighbourhood, scores of castles surrendered at once, and before the end of August the almost impregnable height of Carcassonne, along with its lord, was in the hands of the Crusaders.

After the capture of this important stronghold it became necessary to elect a permanent chief for the army, as some of the leaders who had only taken the Cross for a brief space (the usual forty days of feudal service) were desirous of returning home. Several nobles refused the proffered command. They were perhaps wise enough to foresee the difficulties which would arise in attempting to hold a hostile country with the uncertain support of a volunteer army of ever-varying strength, but they said that they had lands enough of their own, and did not want any more. At length, however, over come by the importunities of the prelates and barons, Simon de Montfort accepted that which, following the example of the others, he had at first refused, saying that the cause of God should not suffer from want of a champion.

But de Montfort had no sooner accepted the command than his troubles began. Though there were a number of strong fortresses to subdue even in the immediate neighbourhood of Carcassonne, many of the nobles, despite their engagements to the contrary, began to return home. According to William of Tudela, it was to Paris they were anxious to go. "The mountains were savage, the defiles dangerous, and they wished not to be killed". But de Montfort was not a man to be easily frightened. He wrote, indeed, to the Pope for help, but at once took the field with his sadly diminished force. Calling himself "Simon, earl of Leicester, lord of Montfort, viscount of Beziers and Carcassonne", he told Innocent of his election as ruler of the conquered country, of the desertion of his fellow-nobles, and of his difficulties from the fact that "the heretics had in their flight left many of their fortresses desolate, but were still holding the stronger ones", and that he had to pay his men twice as much as in previous wars in order to induce them to stay with him. He then passed on to inform the Pope that he had arranged that each house hold in the conquered country should pay the Holy See three denarii a year, and to beg him to confirm him and his heirs in his new possessions.

In the meantime, whilst waiting for the favourable answer which he was to receive in November 2, the earl carried on the war with vigour and, imitating his foes, with no little cruelty.

The successes of the Crusaders were being watched by no one with greater anxiety than by Raymond of Toulouse. He had been with them up to the time of the capture of Carcassonne. After that he left them; but he seemingly showed no signs of fulfilling the promises he had made about driving the heretics out of his own dominions, or about giving up certain of his despotic practices.

Accordingly, to put pressure on him, the papal legates called a council at Avignon in September 1209; and, on the ground that he had fulfilled hardly a single one of his promises, declared that sentence of excommunication and interdict would fall upon him on the 1st of November, if he had not in the meantime carried out his engagements. Against this judgment Raymond at once appealed to the Pope. Failing to obtain any support from Philip of France, not even the authorisation of his new tolls, he went to Rome.

The count would appear to have made a good impression in Rome. He produced documents to show that he had made restitution to certain churches, and promised to complete his obligations in this connection, and he expressed great anxiety to be permitted to clear himself from the charge of heresy, as he was anxious not to forfeit the castles he had given in pledge. Further, with a view to excusing himself for not having expelled the heretics from his dominions, and for not having abolished his new taxes, he pretended not to know who were to be regarded as “manifest heretics”, and what were to be regarded as new taxes. By this show of submission Raymond won honour from the Pope. But though Innocent declared that he had no wish to enrich the Church at any man’s expense, he would not agree to the count’s exculpating himself in his presence from the charges of heresy and of complicity in the murder of Peter of Castelnau. That must be done in the count’s own country, “in order that, where the charges against him had sprung into life, there they might be killed”. He accordingly instructed his legates in Languedoc to call a council within three months, and admit the count “to purgation”, if he had meanwhile fulfilled his promises.

Not too well satisfied with the result of his visit to Rome, Raymond on his return journey made a vain effort to enlist in his favour against de Montfort the support of the emperor Otho and of the king of France. He failed, however, with them even more signally than with the Pope, and merely gained the declared enmity of the earl.

In accordance with Innocent’s mandate, his legates, within the prescribed three months, summoned Raymond to appear before a council which they convened at St. Giles. But, as he had failed meanwhile to fulfil the Pope’s injunctions, the assembled Fathers would not admit him to purgation. They once more, however, urged him to carry out his promises with reference to the tolls and the expulsion of the heretics, as did Innocent himself not long after.

But efforts to bring about an understanding with Raymond were not stopped. Assemblies were held at Narbonne (January) 4 and at Montpellier (February). At the last-named gathering, as the count had not shown signs of any intention to comply with what was required of him, he was formally excommunicated, and the sentence was duly confirmed by the Pope.

The sentence of the Pope soon produced results. Whilst it was under consideration the Crusaders were besieging the important town of Lavaur, “the head quarters of the heretics”, and Raymond was giving further proof of his complete understanding with them. One of his officials secretly sent men for the defence of Lavaur, and he himself permitted only a small quantity of provisions to be conveyed from Toulouse to the Crusaders and absolutely prohibited the taking of a siege train to them. Lavaur, however, was taken (May 3), and, it may be added, in order to show the savage way in which the war was now being conducted, Pierre assures us that “our pilgrims with immense pleasure burnt a very great number of the heretics”.

After the capture of Lavaur, so at least we are told by the same writer, “the men of the count of Toulouse, reflecting that he had abandoned our count (de Montfort) in anger; had prohibited siege-engines and provisions from being conveyed to the army from Toulouse; and had, moreover, been excommunicated and deposed urged that he should now be openly attacked as he had now been plainly condemned”. De Montfort

readily fell in with the suggestion, and began open war upon Raymond by destroying the stronghold of Montjoyre, which directly depended upon him. Simon commenced with Montjoyre because it was in its neighbourhood that the count of Foix and his followers had killed, with circumstance of great barbarity, a number of German Crusaders. He even made a futile attack on Toulouse itself.

War was now bitterly waged between the two counts, and Raymond threw himself more and more deeply into the Albigensian cause. So far from expelling the heretics from his dominions, he opened wide the gates of his city of Toulouse to all those who had fled from Beziers, Carcassonne, and the other cities assailed by de Montfort. He increased rather than diminished the taxes complained of; employed the "free companies" as much as ever; and closely allied himself with such leaders of the Albigenses as the counts of Bearn, Foix, and Comminges. Further, he sought help from every quarter, from the emperor Otho because he was at enmity with the Church, from John of England for the same reason, from Peter, king of Aragon, and even from that king of Morocco whose signal defeat at Las Navas we have already chronicled.

But the only one who appeared able or willing to do anything of any importance for the count of Toulouse was Peter, king of Aragon. He had already certain rights over Montpellier, Carcassonne, and other places on this side of the Pyrenees, and he was desirous of extending those rights. Accordingly, after Raymond had acknowledged him as his suzerain, the king sent ambassadors to the Pope to plead his cause (in the winter of 1212-1213).

Meantime, in accordance with Innocent's wishes, Thedisius held a council at Avignon, no doubt in the summer of 1212, because we are told that Avignon then, as so often in its history, proved its right to the sobriquet of "poisonous" (*venenosa*). In consequence "of the general corruption of the air there", the council had to break up; but it reassembled in the middle of January (1213) at Lavaur. To the Fathers of this assembly Peter of Aragon presented a requisition in favour of the count of Toulouse. He sent in copies of the oaths to which Raymond and his friends, the count of Foix and the others, had affixed their signatures, and which set forth that they had placed themselves under the over-lordship of the king of Aragon, and were ready to obey the behests of the Pope. But the Fathers had had enough of the promises of Raymond. His deeds ever belted them. They accordingly declared that his conduct had been such that they could not absolve him or restore his lands to him without a special mandate from the Pope.

Meanwhile, the envoys of the king of Aragon had met with some success in Rome. They had assured Innocent that the Crusaders had seized lands belonging to Catholics as well as to the Albigenses, and that Count Raymond was prepared to do penance, and to proceed against the Moslems either in the Holy Land or in Spain.

Their words impressed the Pope, and he wrote to his legate to lay aside all prejudice and to hold a great assembly of bishops and barons, and thereat to examine the king's proposals very carefully. At the same time he informed Simon de Montfort of what had been alleged, and bade him restore the lands he had taken from the Catholic vassals of the king of Aragon (January 17, 1213).

At the very time that Innocent despatched these letters the important council of Lavaur was being held; and the letters which his envoys and the Fathers of that

assembly sent to him concerning its doings and those of the Pope to his legates crossed. After telling Innocent that they only wished he could see the striking improvement which his measures had caused in the peace and prosperity of Provence, the Fathers of the council assured him that this happy change was in danger of being all undone by the count of Toulouse. At the same time they forwarded to him the documents connected with the affair of Raymond; implored him to put a check on the presumption of Peter of Aragon; and impressed upon him that if either Raymond or his son recovered the territories he had lost, the prosperity which his policy had inaugurated would be destroyed.

Some of the documents sent to the Pope gave certain details of the conduct of the count. He and his “free companies” had slain more than a thousand clerical and lay Crusaders. He had kept the abbot of Montauban in prison for a year, had seized the abbot of Moissac, and had driven the bishop of Agen from his see, and had damaged his property to the amount of fifteen thousand solidi.

Enlightened by these letters and documents and by the words of their bearers, Innocent despatched a letter to Peter (June 1, 1213) in which he blamed him for the suppression of the truth by his envoys, and bade him abandon without delay the cause of Raymond of Toulouse.

But neither archbishop nor Pope could stop the ambition of Peter of Aragon, which was in a brief space to carry him headlong to his ruin. Simon and his Crusaders were once more drawing near to Toulouse itself; and it became necessary for Peter to decide what course he was to pursue ere it became too late. He therefore definitely threw in his lot with his relative Raymond and declared war on de Montfort, though he had offered to refer any differences between them to the decision of the Pope or his legate. The Aragonese monarch, says Pierre, was desirous of having the lands which the Crusaders had seized, and “of subjugating them to his own sway”.

But the hopes of Peter and Raymond were dashed to the ground. Against overwhelming odds the arms of de Montfort were completely victorious at Muret (or Murwl) 1213. Peter of Aragon fell on the battlefield, but Raymond managed to escape, and in order to get means to continue the war made his way to England.

However, through the action of Nicholas, cardinal-bishop of Tusculum, then legate here, he was soon expelled from the country “as an enemy of the Church”, but not till, as it was said, he had received from King John ten thousand marks in return for his homage.

Terrified by the remarkable victory of Muret, the citizens of Toulouse and several counts hastened to send envoys to Rome to offer to make their subjection to the Church. They would have as little communication as possible with the fierce count of Leicester. Anxious to prevent further bloodshed, and to save the Crusade from being used as a means of personal aggrandisement, Innocent despatched to Languedoc Peter, cardinal-deacon of S. Maria in Aquiro, with instructions to reconcile to the Church those who were willing to submit, provided that they offered sufficient guarantees of their good faith. At the same time he peremptorily ordered Simon de Montfort to restore Jayme or James, the son of their late monarch, to the Aragonese. The legate was,

moreover, specially instructed to see to it that, if the people of Toulouse were reconciled to the Church, their city was not interfered with by Simon or by any of the Crusaders.

At first all went well. The youthful James was duly handed over to his people; the counts of Foix and Comminges submitted to the Church, giving up some strong castles in proof of their good faith; and even Toulouse and its count once more promised obedience to Rome. Raymond, of his own free will, as he declared, offered himself and his territories “to the Holy Roman Church” and to its legate; agreed to do whatever they should prescribe; and promised, if they should think fit, to withdraw to England or anywhere else, till he could in person visit the Apostolic See, there to plead for grace and mercy.

But de Montfort and his followers were, seemingly, unwilling to lose the spoils of war; and when the legate Peter betook himself to Aragon with its young sovereign, Cardinal Robert de Courgon (Curzon), who had been sent into France (*c.* May 1213) to preach a new Crusade for the Holy Land, invested Simon with the lands he had taken from the heretics in the dioceses of Cahors, Agen, Rodez, and Albi (July 1214). Moreover, at a council held in January 1215 at Montpellier, and presided over by Cardinal Peter, the local bishops, naturally well informed as to the needs of the place and time, unanimously urged that Simon de Montfort should be proclaimed lord of Toulouse in place of Raymond; and, as the cardinal averred that it was beyond his power so to proclaim him, they sent to request the Pope to accede to their desires.

By a letter, dated April 2, 1215, Innocent so far granted their petition as to acknowledge Simon’s position as the actual lord of Raymond’s territory till the question could be judged by the general council which he had summoned to meet in the month of November.

Before the fathers of this most magnificent assembly of the intellect and power of Europe there appeared both Raymond and his young son, and other former leaders of the Albigenses, and, on Simon’s behalf, his brother Guy. Although the Pope himself and a number of the prelates are stated to have been averse to depriving at least the young Raymond of his ancestral rights, the great majority of the fathers of the council were of opinion that de Montfort should be recognised as lord of Languedoc.

Accordingly, on December 14, Innocent promulgated the decrees of the council assigning to Simon the territories of Raymond, who was to do penance in exile, but was to be allowed a pension of four hundred marks a year. It was, moreover, stipulated that a pension of one hundred and fifty marks of silver should be given to Raymond’s wife, and that the young Raymond should have the domains east of the Rhone. The lands of the count of Foix were to be held by an abbot for his use. The decision of the council was accepted by Philip of France, and he received the homage of the new count of Toulouse in the following year (April 1216).

Although Innocent did not live to see the end of the Albigensian heresy, his policy had prepared the way for its speedy demise. He heard the ringing of its death-knell. It is true that after his death (because, believes William of Puylaurens, the Crusaders had begun to seek merely their own private interests) the young Raymond, who after the Lateran Council had remained some time with him, recovered most of his father’s territories; that Simon de Montfort himself, whom he had been in the habit of

constantly blaming and checking for acts of wanton violation of the rights of others, fell in battle a few years later (June 1218); and that the only one who ultimately reaped any temporal benefit from the Crusade was the king of France, still the doom of the Albigensians was sealed. The treaty of Paris (April 1229), between Raymond VII and St. Louis IX, practically put an end to the war against them; and in the same year the important council of Toulouse ordered an inquisition against those who were suspected of heresy, which was, a few years later (1233), placed in the hands of the Dominicans or Friars Preachers. In 1244 the Albigensians last, as well as their first, stronghold of Mont Segur, situated on an almost impregnable rock among the Pyrenees, was stormed; and, under the year 1250, Matthew Paris writes that the errors of the Albigensians were finally dissipated by the diligence of the aforesaid Friars Preachers. It was the “common sense” of the Papacy, *i. e.*, especially of Innocent III., that “saved Europe from fanatical heresies”, is a conclusion of Mr. Sedgwick, with which we are in entire sympathy.

It assuredly is a pity that the salvation of Christendom should have cost so much blood. But many more lives have oft been sacrificed for ends much less valuable than those for which Innocent invoked the swords of the Christians of the North. Innocent was striving to maintain the principles upon which rested not merely the human society of the day in which he lived himself, but the principles upon which must rest all healthy society to the end of the world. Considering the possibilities of his time, it is very doubtful whether the progress of the anti-Christian and anti-social doctrines of the Albigenses could have been stopped in any other way than by the sword. It can scarcely be doubted that the men of any age know better than those who come after them the best means at their disposal for meeting the difficulties that come in their path. And the action of Innocent in the matter of the Albigenses was approved by perhaps the greatest international assembly that Europe has ever seen the Lateran Council of the year 1215. No voice was raised against the action of Innocent in his own age; but, on the contrary, his moderation in the Albigensian struggle was praised by men whose sympathies were with the count of Toulouse. After he had let slip the dogs of war, he strove to keep them in bounds, and to prevent them from working unnecessary havoc.

Whatever, therefore, may be our ideas now about putting down views and practices of any kind by violence, it would seem to be wise to conclude that the men of the thirteenth century dealt with the Albigensian trouble in the manner which was to them the most practical. And that Innocent’s connection with it was not regarded by his contemporaries as in any way *outré* may be safely inferred from the language of a troubadour. Although Aimeric de Pegulhan, the troubadour of Toulouse, had been driven from his native land by the Albigensian Crusade, was reported to be a heretic, and was a professed admirer of Frederick II, the Pope was still to him : “lo bos pap’Innocens—the Good Pope Innocent”.

CHAPTER II.

REFORM, AND MATTERS CONNECTED THEREWITH. THE FOURTH GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE LATERAN (1215). DEATH OF INNOCENT

THE labours of Innocent in connection with the Albigenses were part of his work for the reformation of the Church, “for withdrawing the wicked from their vices, and for encouraging the good in virtue”. The two great objects of his pontificate, which he always kept before his eyes and constantly proclaimed, were the rescue of the Holy Land from the grasp of the Moslem, and the regeneration both of the lay and of the clerical elements of the Church. Despite the deplorable failure of his first attempt to redeem the Holy Land, we have seen with how great courage he resumed his efforts for what he regarded as a most sacred object. The necessity of wiping out the disgrace of the loss of Jerusalem was ever before his eyes. So, too, in the midst of all his great enterprises, while judging between rival emperors, while compelling recalcitrant kings to obey the laws of God and the Church, and while reorganising the Greek Church, he never failed in his toil to make the Church more holy. The Papacy, which he declared to be the “foundation of the whole of Christendom” was pure, he knew. He could not but be conscious of his own singleness of purpose. All then in touch with the Papacy must be kept pure or be purified, and the nearer any were to the Papacy, the more spotless must they be.

The clergy must be better than the laity, and all must be ruled by the Apostolic See, whose decrees must be inviolate, was Innocent’s fundamental view of the Church. “Those”, he wrote, “who have in an especial manner been made heirs of God must excel the laity in their lives as in their superior dignity”. And: “the authority of the Apostolic See requires that what is sanctioned by it must remain ever firm and inviolate, so that it cannot be shaken by the rash temerity of any one whomsoever”.

These ideas were not new in the history of the Papacy. They were as much the ideas of St. Gregory VII as of Innocent, and as much the ideas of St. Gregory the Great as of Hildebrand. At work during the whole lifetime of the Papacy before the days of Innocent III, they had from time to time, in the grip of a strong man, or from predisposing circumstances, received a more extended application. Under any conditions, with the leaven of such ideas at work, the government of the Church must have become more and more centralised, must have devolved more and more into the hands of the Popes. But when they had the head and heart of such a man as Lothario Conti as seed-ground, their growth in the direction of centralisation was marked. Innocent was no innovator, but he did not forget precedents; he expounded no new theories with regard to papal authority, but he showed how the old ones could be applied to fresh practical cases; and if he made no new laws, his great legal knowledge and his keen sense of justice enabled him to bring many new cases within the grasp of the old enactments.

His action, no doubt, did increase the growing “effective domination” of the Papacy in the Church, and one is glad to say with Luchaire that his action was in most cases “for the advantage of order, peace, and general morality”.

Innocent, like his predecessors, regarded all that concerned bishops as among those “greater causes” that were always considered as subject to the direct authority of

the Holy See. He would not, indeed, interfere with the initial freedom of election of bishops, but he was not slow to interfere at once if the election was in any way faulty.

The bishops were the officers of the Church, and not of the Crown. They were subjects of the Pope, and not of the king or even of an archbishop. Their jurisdiction must, therefore, not be altered by any metropolitan, and still less by the State. Innocent would never consent to their sees being changed by anyone but himself, or to any authority but that of Rome accepting their resignations. Similarly, if bishops needed correction he would not have them punished by any but himself; but if need arose he did not hesitate to use his authority against them.

Because Innocent believed that bishops were set to rule the Church of God, and because he knew that the subject was like his master, one of the chief tasks he imposed upon himself was the elevation of the episcopacy. He would have his “fellow-bishops” good and zealous, as he could not be everywhere himself. It was especially with a view to being able to correct the luxury of the prelates that he adopted that simple style of living to which attention has already been called. Sometimes their luxury, sometimes their magnificence, sometimes lawsuits, and occasionally no doubt personal avarice, kept some of them in constant want of money, and their impecuniosity led them into simony, and into inventing devices for eluding the laws that already existed against it. But Innocent tracked them to earth, unmasking for instance their attempts to obtain money for the chrism which they consecrated on Holy Thursday. At one time they tried to conceal the moneys they exacted in payment for the chrism by calling them *chrismales*, and then *paschales*; and because these names were too suggestive, they finally named them “mid-Lent dues”.

But if Innocent was called upon at intervals to take proceedings against members of the hierarchy, he had naturally more frequently to urge them to reform the inferior clergy. He encouraged the local bishops freely and boldly to correct their vices, and he instructed his legates-extraordinary to reform churches as they made their progresses through the countries to which they were sent. He strove to check the accumulation of benefices in the hands of one person. Appealing to the action of his predecessors Lucius III and Clement III, “by the authority of these presents”, he authorised the bishop of Troyes to force those to conform to the canon law who, “urged on by depraved cupidity, are striving in opposition to the decrees of the Lateran Council to hold several churches or ecclesiastical benefices, when they could suitably support themselves with the revenues of one”. In this same letter he also opposed another abuse. In order to be able to obtain ecclesiastical revenues, but with no thought of taking upon themselves the obligations of the priesthood, certain self-seekers had themselves tonsured, and thus entered the clerical state. Innocent agreed that the bishop should compel such men to receive the higher orders, if need for their services should arise, and they should be found suitable.

Among the inferior clergy also, as among the superior, he had to contend with the vice of simony, and he urged the bishops to take strong measures against it. Like his predecessors he condemned clerical marriage, and he bade the bishop of Norwich, among others, deprive those clerics of their benefices who, endeavouring “to serve God and mammon”, ... “have contracted matrimony solemnly in the face of the Church”. As

he pointed out to another of our bishops, Henry of Exeter, as well as to his brother of Norwich, clerical marriage was followed by material evils as well as by spiritual. The incumbents either bled their parishes in the interests of their children, or endeavoured to turn “the sanctuary of God into an hereditary possession”. Sons who, under such circumstances, succeeded their fathers were to be at once stripped of all ecclesiastical benefices—“appeals to the contrary notwithstanding”.

The letter from which we have just been quoting reveals another abuse, namely, that of the patrons of livings presenting unfit candidates for them. To cope with this evil the bishop is commanded, “relying on our authority”, to appoint to vacancies himself, if the patrons, after due notice, persist in nominating unsuit able candidates. Further, if any such undesirable persons have been intruded into churches, they must be removed. The bishops must also compel their clergy to residence.

But if Innocent was anxious to reform the lesser clergy, he was also desirous of improving their lot. He strove to protect them against oppression at the hands of their clerical superiors or of laymen, and, in common with the whole body of the clergy, from the encroachments of the lay power. He endeavoured, for instance, to preserve their ancient privileges of immunity from certain taxes, and of exemption from the civil courts. While, too, on the one hand he was constantly protecting them from the undue procurations exacted by archdeacons and their officials, he endeavoured on the other to secure to them their dues in the matter of tithes. Moreover, he did not fail, if he found a bishop like Renaud of Chartres proclaiming the liberties of his clergy by special charter, to bestow upon him his warm commendations.

The Monastic Orders also received a large share of Innocent’s attention. He had to face a period of monastic decay. Relaxations were ruining their spiritual possessions, and perpetual lawsuits were destroying their property. Accordingly, he commissioned bishops to undertake their reformation, and worked for their better ment himself by direct communications with the abbeys concerned, and by gifts of money. He approved of the constitution of the Premonstratensian abbots whereby, in order to preserve monastic simplicity, they decided not to wear mitres or gloves, and he himself commanded a strict adherence to the monastic rules with regard to the dress of the monks. Monks were not to live alone, whilst such as had taken to a wandering life were to be reinclosed in their monasteries. At the same time, as in the case of the lower secular clergy, he did not leave them at the mercy of the powerful in the Church, but forbade any prelate unduly to harass them.

Innocent also encouraged the introduction of fresh blood into the ranks of monasticism. He viewed with favour the rise of new orders of a practical character, whether the clerical or lay element predominated in them. By a brief of December 17, 1198, addressed to John (of Matha) the minister, and to the brethren of the Holy Trinity, he confirmed “the intention of Brother John the minister which is believed to have sprung from divine inspiration, and which he has humbly made known to us”. He granted John a special strict rule of life calculated to help him in his intention to work for the redemption of Christian captives from slavery. Innocent thus brought into being the charitable *Ordo de redemptions captivorum* or Trinitarians.

About a year later we find Innocent concerned about a body of men in Lombardy known as the *Humiliati* (the *Humbled*). In obedience to his mandates, the prelates of north Italy, following a lead of Pope Lucius III, had excommunicated various communities which they had regarded as heretical, such as the Cathari, Poor Men of Lyons, etc.,”and Humiliati who had not yet obeyed the apostolic injunctions”. Some of the ecclesiastical authorities, however, had not been too discriminating, and had included in the ban men who, so wrote the Pope to the bishop of Verona, “are called by the people Humiliati, and who, as it is said, are not heretics but orthodox, and strive to serve God in humility of heart and body”.

In the second half of the twelfth century there had sprung up in Milan (a very hotbed of heretics), Verona, and other cities of northern Italy, a number of associations of workers composed both of men and women. The end which these toilers set before themselves was mutual support, and the sanctification of their work by prayer and good deeds. The sombre habit which they adopted, and their unassuming manners, caused them to be styled Humiliati by the populace. The idea of mutual help for soul and body became popular, and these associations, of the exact origin of which there does not appear to be any knowledge, spread throughout the north of Italy.

In a short time, after a number of the clergy had joined them, they were found divided into three orders. The first consisted of “brothers” and “nuns”; the second of lay men and women living apart but under one male head, wearing a common habit, and following some kind of a regular mode of life; and the third of men and women who remained in the world but were also amenable to a rule of life. Hence that branch which was the first in point of time came to be accounted the third in degree.

Not unnaturally, seeing that for the most part they were composed of simple people, some of these communities were captured by the Cathari. In his general watchfulness over the Church, Innocent perceived that, to save the Humiliati from being lost to the Church, they must be brought into closer touch with the hierarchy and be organised on recognised lines. From his letter which has just been cited, it is clear that the bishops of north Italy did not at first grasp the situation. They found Humiliati contaminated with the doctrines of the Cathari, and excommunicated all of them. But Innocent understood that there were Humiliati and Humiliati. He therefore impressed upon the bishops the necessity of more accurate examination into the condition of the Humiliati. The subsequent search revealed the fact that perhaps the greater number of the associations were quite orthodox in their belief and practice. These communities were definitely approved by Innocent, and a rule, based upon that of St. Augustine for his canons, was imposed upon them.

When he had thus safely launched the Humiliati, he did not forget them. From time to time he wrote encouraging letters to them, and urged the Lombard communes, ever in need of money in order to carry on their perpetual wars against each other, not to impose undue taxes on the Humiliati, “who are leading a common life”.

It is no part of our work to trace the history of the Humiliati, to set forth their influence on the development of the woollen trade, and the great esteem long felt for them by their fellow-citizens, who often entrusted to them the most important offices of

the commune. At last, however, temporal prosperity brought about their decay, and these once interesting and pious communities were suppressed by Pius V.

But the good-will of Innocent was also exerted in behalf of one who was to exercise a greater influence on the world than even whole orders like the Humiliati. Before he had addressed, in behalf of the pious associations of labour, his letter to the podestas and rectors of Lombardy, there had been heard in the golden vale of Umbria a sweet, clear voice that in winning tones again sounded the praises of the simplest forms of Christian life. The voice was as the voice of Orpheus. Men of all ranks were enraptured by it, and followed after it. The very animals paused in their wantonness to listen to it, or laid aside their fierceness to be guided by it. It was a voice that in the midst of the clang of arms preached peace, peace, and mid the vagaries of licence proclaimed obedience to authority. In its timbre there was no harsh clangour; nor did words of bitter denunciation spring from it. The bruised reed it broke not, and the smoking flax it did not extinguish. Yet the voice of Francis of Assisi was strong. It forced its way into the hearts of men and women, and it was soon the leader of a new and mighty chorus of praise and love that day by day rose up to the throne of God.

With his mind full of thoughts of peace and of that respect for authority whence peace flows, his heart naturally turned to him whom he regarded as the earthly representative of the Prince of Peace, and to where he believed authority in spiritual concerns had set its seat. He turned his feet towards Rome, and, to quote the words of his latest biographer: "He seems to have gone to Rome whenever he undertook any scheme of importance." His first visit to Rome was in the beginning of his conversion (*c.* 1206), when, if he saw the Pope at all, it was only on some public occasion.

The second time he appeared in Rome was after a vision he had had of the marvellous spread of his order throughout the world. Accordingly, feeling the need of a worldwide sanction for what was to affect the world, Francis and his company, then no more than twelve in all, went to Rome in the spring (April 23) of 1209, or in the summer of 1210. Jerome of Ascoli, afterwards Pope Nicholas IV (*d.* 1292), who succeeded St. Bonaventure as General of the Franciscan Order (1274-9), giving as his authority the word of a nephew of Innocent himself, tells us that Francis, thinking in the simplicity of his heart that it was best to go to the fountain-head direct, sought out the Pope in the Lateran Palace. He found him walking in a corridor, and at once laid his request before him. But, with his mind full of the Albigensian trouble, Innocent, seeing the coarse garb and generally unkempt appearance of the saint, imagined that he had before him another of those fanatical lay preachers who were then disturbing a large part of Europe, and summarily bade him begone.

But Francis had already learnt the lesson of humility, and, as he longed exceedingly that his pattern and rule of life might be confirmed by the lord Pope Innocent, he was, if somewhat discouraged, at any rate not irritated. Fortunately his bishop, Guido, who had always stood by him, chanced to be in Rome. Hearing of what had happened, he promised Francis his help, and got him introduced to "the reverend lord bishop of Sabina, named John of St. Paul, who among the princes and great ones of the Roman court seemed to be a despiser of earthly and a lover of heavenly things. This man received him with kindness and charity, and warmly commended his will and

purpose. But”, says Thomas of Celano, whom we are quoting, “being a far-seeing and judicious man, he began to question St. Francis on many points, and urged him to embrace the life of a monk or of a hermit. St. Francis, however, as humbly as he could, refused to yield to the cardinal’s persuasion, ... (who), fearing lest he might flinch from so stern a purpose, pointed out easier ways. At length, overcome by the steadfastness of St. Francis entreaties, he gave in, and strove henceforth to further his business with the Pope. At that time”, continues Thomas, “the lord Pope Innocent III ruled over the Church, a glorious man, one, moreover, of abundant learning, renowned in discourse, fervent in zeal for righteousness”.

Convinced now from what he had heard from the Cardinal John of St. Paul and from Bishop Guido that Francis was no socialistic follower of Arnold of Brescia, nor a wild preacher of race-suicide, Innocent agreed to receive him; but he feared, as the cardinal had at first done, that “Francis proposed way of life was beyond his strength”. The same fear was expressed by several of the cardinals who were present. Whereupon the cardinal-bishop of Sabina made answer: “If we refuse the request of this poor man as a thing too hard and untried, when his petition is that the pattern of Gospel life may be sanctioned for him, let us beware lest we stumble at the Gospel of Christ”.

Moved by this appeal, and being a man of the utmost discernment, he said to Francis: “Pray, my son, to Christ, that through thee He may show us His will ... The saint obeyed the Supreme Pastor’s bidding, and confidently flew to Christ”. The answer to his prayer, we are told, came to him in the form of a parable: “Thus shalt thou say to the Pope : A poor but beautiful woman dwelt in a wilderness. A king loved her for her exceeding comeliness. He married her gladly, and begat beauteous sons by her. When they were grown and were nobly brought up, their mother said to them, Be not ashamed, beloved, that ye are poor, for ye are all sons of that great king. Go therefore gladly to his court, and ask him for all that ye need ... They therefore boldly presented themselves before the king, ... who, recognising his own likeness in them, inquired with wonder whose sons they were. And while they affirmed that they were the sons of that poor woman dwelling in the wilderness, the king embraced them, and said: Ye are my sons and heirs. This woman”, continues Thomas of Celano, “was Francis, fruitful in many sons not fashioned in softness. The wilderness was the world, at that time untilled and barren in the teaching of virtue. The king was the Son of God”, whom the sons of Francis resembled.

When Innocent had heard this parable, it “recalled a vision that he had himself seen a few days before, and he affirmed, under the teaching of the Holy Ghost, that it also would be fulfilled in this man. He had seen in his sleep that the Lateran basilica was on the point of falling, and that a certain religious, a man small and despised, was propping it on his own back, that it might not fall”. Hence “he quickly granted what he had asked, and earnestly promised to grant yet greater things than these. And thenceforth, by virtue of the authority conferred on him, Francis began to scatter the seeds of virtue, preaching yet more fervently as he went about the cities and towns”.

The verbal approval which Innocent had thus given to the saint was, we are assured, later on ratified by him in consistory, and, after Francis had “on bended knees humbly and devoutly promised the lord Pope obedience and reverence”, his brethren, in

virtue of the Pope's injunction, promised the saint in like manner obedience and reverence. But it was reserved for Honorius III to give the formal sanction to the Order of Friars Minor by a solemn bull. "The Primitive Rule", to which Innocent had thus given a verbal authorisation, "was the programme of an adventure of faith; and it was in the spirit of high adventure that Pope Innocent approved it. But Innocent himself had ever been bold in adventure for the faith which was in him, as his successors learned when they came to steer the heritage which he left them amidst the shoals of secular diplomacy. And stern and magnificent as the Pontiff was, he perhaps felt a certain spiritual kinship with the gentle, lowly Francis in the adventurousness of faith which was common to them both".

Once more before his death did the great Pope come into contact with the great saint. That Francis was one of the thousands who assembled in Rome for the solemn Lateran Council there can be no reasonable doubt, if only from the casual way in which the fact is mentioned by Gerard de Frachet in his *Lives of the Brethren*. He tells of a vision that St. Dominic had in which he saw the one who was to be his fellow-labourer, and whom on the morrow he recognised to be Blessed Francis. He tells us, moreover, that the vision took place "when St. Dominic our father was in Rome, during the sitting of the Lateran Council, pressing his suit before God and the Pope for the confirmation of his order".

The meeting of the two saints has inspired the production of many a beautiful work of art, and is no doubt an historical fact; but it cannot be said to be so certain Lateran that any kind of approval was given either to the Franciscan or to the Dominican Order by the Lateran Council. At any rate it is certain that the council forbade the introduction of new religious orders. Its thirteenth canon ran: "For fear lest very great diversity of religious rules should produce grievous confusion in the Church, we forbid any further production of new ones. Whoever wishes to embrace the religious life may adopt one of the rules which have been already approved. In like manner, he who in future may wish to found a new monastic house shall make use of one of the recognised rules". On the other hand, the mind of Innocent himself would not appear to have been quite the same as that of the council. He had already approved of the Trinitarians and of the Hospitallers of the Holy Ghost, and had certainly given a verbal approval to the rule of St. Francis, and apparently rather more to the rule of St. Clare, "the little flower of St. Francis" as she called herself, "the chief rival of Blessed Francis in the observance of Gospel perfection" as she was called by others. In her *Life*, which was written down "on the very morrow of her death", and is attributed to Thomas of Celano, we read: "Wishing that her order should bear the title of poverty, Clare petitioned Innocent III, of happy memory, for the privilege of poverty. This magnanimous man, congratulating the virgin upon such fervour, declared hers to be a unique proposal, since never before had a like privilege been demanded of the Apostolic See. And in order that an unusual favour might respond to an unusual request, the Pontiff, with great joy, himself wrote with his own hand the first letters of the privilege asked for".

In addition to this, we have the following definite statement of Angelo Clareno, one of the party of the strict observance, who appears to have known Brother Leo, the secretary of St. Francis, his "little lamb of God". Angelo declares that Innocent, after

his verbal approbation of the rule of St. Francis, “in the general council which he held in Rome in the year of our Lord 1215, informed all the prelates that he had sanctioned a rule of life for St. Francis and those who wished to follow him”. From this assertion of a well-informed if partisan writer, taken in conjunction with the other evidence, we may perhaps conclude that, though no formal sanction was given by the council to the Rule of St. Francis, the Pope caused it to be regarded by the assembled Fathers as one of the already recognised rules.

St. Dominic had come to Rome on a similar errand that of St. Francis. His experiences in Languedoc had convinced him that one at least of the needs of the hour for the Church was a body of men who, while living a simple life, should have learning enough to reply in their sermons to the arguments put forward by heretics to defend their position. As Francis would win men to God’s service through their hearts, Dominic would gain them for Him by their minds.

But when he proposed another new order to Innocent the Pope hesitated. The work of an order of preachers spread over the Catholic world seemed to be opposed to the functions of the bishops. Finally, however, though he would not altogether approve of Dominic’s plan, he would not wholly condemn it. The saint was bidden to return to his brethren, to select an approved rule, and to fix his own constitutions into its framework. The canon of the Lateran was saved, and the idea of Dominic was not lost; and if it was reserved for Honorius III to issue the formal sanction of the Dominican Order (December 22, 1216), it was the genius of Innocent which realised that it, along with the Little Brothers of St. Francis, would be the great bulwark of the Church for many generations. He realised that the time had come for new methods of work in the Church, and that, while the sons of St. Francis would touch the heart and bring consolation to the poor and to the lowly, those of St. Dominic would illumine the minds of the learned and supply their intellectual weapons to those who had to fight the Church’s battles. If it was Francis and Dominic that planted, and if it was God who gave the increase, it was Pope Innocent III who watered.

We cannot pause to narrate at length how Innocent, who sanctioned orders to combat intellectual error, moral depravity, and bodily sickness, also approved of the Teutonic Knights of the Sword, the Knights of Calatrava, and other associations of warriors to fight the fierce heathen and the aggressive Moslem. But before telling how Christendom at the Lateran Council sanctioned his truly heroic labours for God and man, we may briefly say something of his more direct action on the laity. He strove to reform and to protect them as he strove to reform and to protect the clergy.

In days when brute force so often interfered with the course of justice, it was highly desirable that there should be places where men might find security from arbitrary violence. Hence from the earliest times there were cities of refuge, places of sanctuary. In Christian times churches generally came to be regarded as places of sanctuary, and by degrees certain churches were recognised by law as enjoying “more permanent and extended” rights of sanctuary. The need of these sanctuaries may be gathered from the fact that “there were usually a thousand persons in sanctuary during any given year” in England alone. These “green spots in the wilderness, where the

feeble and the persecuted could find refuge”, were naturally sacred to Innocent, and he religiously followed in the footsteps of his predecessors in protecting them.

If it was mainly in the interests of the laity that Innocent upheld the rights of sanctuary, it was as much perhaps in the interests of the clergy as of the laity that he so frequently condemned usury. At any rate, it was certainly to raise the moral standard of the lives of lay-men that he strenuously opposed laxity in the observance of the marriage laws; and it was to safeguard their freedom and their property that he took under his special protection kings, dukes, landgraves, counts, noble men and women, and even the persecuted Jews.

Innocent’s earnestness in the cause of reform may be estimated by the resolute manner in which he endeavoured to break down the obstacles which stood in its way. Unfortunately, as we shall see, he was unable, or, under the circumstances, was unwilling to attack all the abuses which opposed the progress of reform, but at any rate he boldly assailed many of them. He condemned abuse “of the privilege of clergy”, ordering that those who had had themselves tonsured to escape the penalties of their evil deeds should, if they refused to amend their lives, be deprived of “that immunity which is recognised as having been instituted for the protection of the clergy, and to restrain the violence of the laity”. Equally was he opposed to the abuse of the employment of the power of excommunication, and of the right of appeal to Rome. This latter abuse he strove to lessen by very frequently ordering cases to be settled by the ordinary, and at the same time refusing to allow any appeal to himself, and by decreeing that no advantages secured at Rome were to be of any avail, unless reference had been made to the local authority.

The good work of the Pope was often hindered and, as he complained, “the authority of the Apostolic See injured” by the work of forgers. Papal bulls were being forged and carried everywhere, and there was quite a trade in producing an imitation “of our (lead) bulla which is stamped with the images of the apostles, and which is used in transacting the business of the whole of Christendom”. Already in May 1198 Innocent had occasion to notify the archbishops of Christendom and their suffragans that there had lately been seized in Rome itself a number of forgers who had in their possession bulls furnished with false leaden seals (bullae) purporting to be issued by himself or by his predecessor.

Innocent, therefore, under the strictest penalties, forbade anyone to accept any apostolic letters, except from himself or from the properly authorised persons of his chancery. The bishops generally were instructed to examine suspected bulls most carefully, to make it known that those were excommunicated who kept in their possession for more than fifteen days bulls known to be forged, and to imprison bearers of such forgeries during the Pope’s good pleasure. In order to facilitate detection of the forgeries, Innocent affixed to the documents which conveyed these instructions to the bishops one of the false bullae as well as his genuine bulla.

He had even with great indignation to call attention to thefts from the papal registers themselves, pointing out that one could scarcely be guilty of a greater offence against the Roman Church than to steal “the registers and other books” in which the privileges of the different churches are contained. For, urged the Pope, it is only by

recurrence to the registers that doubts can be settled as to whether certain letters have ever been issued by the papal chancery or not.

Unfortunately, however, though he agreed to certain safeguards in the appointment of his nominees, Innocent perpetuated the practice of *Provisions*. Kings had long been making use of the Church as a convenient way of rewarding those whom they wished from one cause or another to recompense. And now the Popes, whose income was constantly being abridged either by the emperor or by the Senate, and who had the work of the world to perform, found themselves wholly unable to reward those to whom in every land they were indebted except by requiring the local ecclesiastical authorities to appoint their nominees to the next vacant canonry or other benefice. In a word, Innocent continued the system of Provisions. He provided for his friends, for some of his relatives in sacred orders, and for his faithful and devoted servants by requiring the bishops and other ecclesiastical authorities in the various countries of Christendom to reserve some “living” for them. No excessive demands were, however, made by him, and consequently but little hostile criticism or opposition was anywhere aroused. Had the practice of Provisions been carried no further than it was carried by Innocent III, no evil results would have ensued.

Still, with all his efforts at internal and external reform, even Innocent could not prevent himself and his court from being almost overwhelmed by the mass of worldly occupations which were forced upon them. He felt and, as we have seen, at the beginning of his pontificate complained about its oppression of his spiritual aspirations. From the words of Jacques de Vitry, who visited the Roman court at Perugia just after Innocent’s death, but before his burial, it appears that the worldly cares were there still. De Vitry, who was, it must be borne in mind, rather prone in his censures to hasty generalisations, says that while, during his stay at Perugia with the Curia, he was comforted by the sight of the virtue of the Friars Minor, who “are highly esteemed both by the Pope and by the Cardinals”, he saw much with which he was entirely dissatisfied. All were so taken up with worldly and temporal affairs, with kings and kingdoms, lawsuits and quarrels, that they would scarcely permit a word on spiritual matters.

Although material for a much more elaborate account of Innocent’s labours in the cause of reform, and indeed of all his other works than we have attempted to give, is easily accessible, we must now pass on to his last important act: the holding of the fourth general council of the Lateran. It was his wish to lay before the representatives of Europe all that he had done, and all that he wished to do; and, as the event proved, the decrees of the council, issued with the approval of nearly all that was wise and good, great and powerful in the Christian world, were a vote of confidence that was truly worldwide in the deeds and aims of the splendid Pontiff who brought it together.

To allow plenty of time for preliminary deliberations, Innocent issued on April 19, 1213, the circular “*Vineam Domini Sabaoth*” to call the spiritual and temporal rulers of the Catholic world to meet together in Rome in November 1215. They were summoned to deliberate especially on the needs of the Holy Land and on the reformation of the Church, which heresy had rendered especially necessary; and they were summoned by the words of the Pope’s legates as well as by his letters. But while they were called together primarily for purposes more or less spiritual, they were also

invited in order to discuss the best means of promoting inter national peace and civil liberty.

To ensure the safety of those who were summoned to the Council, Innocent authorised the expenditure of considerable sums of money through the senator Pandulf de Judice in procuring patrols to guard the roads, and garrisons for the towers in and around the city of Rome.

The result of the Pope's letters and of the exhortations of his legates was that towards the autumn of 1215 so many people assembled in Rome that "the whole world seemed to be there". There appeared in the first place all that was great and learned in the Church, some four hundred and twelve bishops, including, among seventy-one primates, the patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and representatives of those of Antioch and Alexandria. An addition to the chronicle we are now citing assures us that there were also present five cardinal-bishops, nine cardinal-priests, and six cardinal-deacons. There were also present more than eight hundred abbots and priors and an unknown number of proctors of absent prelates and chapters. From a list found by Luchaire of four hundred of the bishoprics which were represented at this council, it appears that there were in Rome bishops from "the Byzantine Empire, the Latin states of Syria, Germany, France strictly so called, England, Scotland, Ireland, Spain, Portugal, Provence the kingdom of Arles, ... Poland, Hungary, Dalmatia, Sardinia, Italy, Corsica, Sicily, and Cyprus". The bishops, however, from the East were mostly of Latin origin.

Representing the civil authorities were envoys from Frederick II, king of Sicily, emperor-elect of the Romans; from his rival Otho; from the emperor of Constantinople; from the kings of France, England, Hungary, Jerusalem, Cyprus, and Aragon; from other ruling princes and nobles; and from cities and other localities also, such as Genoa, Milan, Piacenza, Cremona, etc. There were, in a word, so many attending the council that we read of some being crushed to death.

Apart from subsidiary meetings, three formal sessions of the council were held on November 11, 20, and 30. At the first public session Innocent himself preached to the assembled multitude, taking for his text : "With desire have I desired to eat this pasch with you before I suffer" (St. Luke XXII. 15), *i.e.*, added the Pope, "before I die". He first touched upon the state of the Holy Land, and in impassioned tones proclaimed the disgrace which had fallen on the Christian name seeing that "the sons of the bond-woman (Agar), the most detestable (*vilissimi*) Agareni (Saracens), hold our mother, the mother of all the faithful, in bondage". He declared that he was at the service of the council, ready, if it saw fit, to go himself in order to rouse the nations to free the land which the Redeemer had purchased by His blood. Whatever others may do, he continued, we priests must be ready to sacrifice our persons and our goods for the sacred cause. But if we are to effect anything we must be virtuous, for from the wickedness of the priests flows the evil of the world.

At the public sessions were debated the needs of the Holy Land, the Albigenian heresy, the rebellion of the barons of England against King John, and the claims of Frederick II, "the king of the priests", as against those of Otho. This last topic raised quite a storm, when the Milanese, taking up Otho's cause with vigour, were reminded

by the marquis of Montferrat that they themselves by their patronage of heresy were out of court. All these sessions were presided over by the Pope in person; but the third one appears to have been opened with special pomp, as Richard of San Germano, an eye-witness, assures us that Innocent came forth in the midst of his court and guards “like a bride groom from his nuptial chamber”.

We cannot here enumerate the many other questions concerning Church organisation, canon law, and the difficulties which came up for settlement at this time, and were dealt with by one or other of the committees appointed for the purpose. Attention must, however, be called to the council’s seventy canons, which for the benefit of the Greeks were issued with an indifferent Greek translation.

But, before touching on these important decrees, a few words may be devoted to a scheme put forward by Innocent for the securing to the Holy See of such an assured revenue that all necessity would be removed of its having to exact fees or “presents” for the transaction of business. The accusations of avarice which were often freely and recklessly made against the Holy See would then have no basis whatever. It is Giraldus Cambrensis who tells us of this scheme, and, according to him, it originated, strange to say, with the Emperor Henry VI.

That monarch realised that the poverty of the Holy See forced it to institute such pecuniary arrangements that the charge of avarice could with no little plausibility be urged against it. He further recognised that this poverty had been largely brought about by the action of his predecessors in plundering and annexing papal territory. But as he was unwilling to restore what they had taken away, and as he was perhaps unable to force the other robbers to restore their ill-gotten goods, he put forward a plan to remedy the evil results of this robbery. The remedy he proposed was, of course, not at his expense. He suggested that the best canonry in every cathedral church in the empire should be made over to the Pope for his support, and a suitable number of prebends for that of the cardinals and the papal court generally. A general council was to be summoned, and the other nations of the Catholic world were to be induced to make similar grants.

Henry died whilst maturing his scheme, which recommended itself to Innocent as a practical means of clearing away from the Apostolic See what he regarded as the degrading accusation of venality. He accordingly proposed at the council that a tenth of all the revenues of the cathedrals should be definitely made over to the Roman Church. “Very many of the bishops and other influential men who were present spoke strongly in favour of the scheme, but it was vigorously opposed by others. Whether it was that they did not see why they should be taxed to remedy an evil caused by the civil powers, or whether they feared that if they granted an inch an ell would soon be demanded, or whether again they were themselves ungenerous, some of the bishops, at any rate, would not listen to the Pope’s most reasonable suggestion. In consequence of this opposition, Innocent withdrew his proposal: “lest (the Holy See) might appear to have summoned the council for that reason”.

We may here note that where Innocent failed his successor Honorius III also failed. Although the latter’s share in the attempt to forward this scheme will be discussed more at length in that Pope’s biography, it will be useful to give here a

portion of his letter on the subject to the clergy of England. Considering that as cardinal camerarius he was in close touch with Innocent, his presentment of the matter may be taken as that of his predecessor. "It has often come to our knowledge", wrote Honorius, "that many complain of the expenses to which they have been put in coming to the Holy See". After remarking that the stories on this subject were for the most part calumnies put forth by those who would deny to the Roman Church not merely what equity and kindness would concede to it, but what was actually demanded by justice, the Pope proceeded to say that those were special offenders in this matter who had spent on their own pleasures the monies given them for the transaction of business. To remove, therefore, all cause of complaint against the Apostolic See under this head, he proposed to put into execution an old plan of his predecessors, and required that there should be set apart for the needs of the Holy See in its head and members a prebend in each cathedral and collegiate church, and certain revenues from each religious house. The revenues received from this source would allow of all business being transacted gratuitously, "except the usual fees for the issue of bulls". Unfortunately, as we may well believe, for the future of the Church, the demands of Honorius shared the same fate as the proposals of Innocent. The prelates of Europe may have recognised, but they would not act on their belief, that it was proper that the daughters should reach out their hands to help the mother who for their sakes was involved in many great undertakings. Parsimony on the part of the prelates, or a short-sighted policy, or mistrust of Roman ideas about money, or all these causes combined, brought the same answer to this letter of Honorius as to the corresponding verbal proposals of Innocent.

The canons of the council covered a great variety of subjects. Some of them were new, many of them merely reaffirmed previous decrees. Some of them restated the Catholic faith in opposition especially to the teachings of the Albigensians and Joachim of Fiore, and the pantheistic doctrines of Amalric of Bena. The civil authorities, under pain of excommunication and various temporal penalties, must punish heretics; and those suspected of heresy must clear themselves of the suspicion under pain of excommunication, and then of being regarded as heretics. The bishops of each diocese must endeavour to find out who are heretics, and duly punish those whom they may discover.

The Jews, who were condemned for their usurious practices, were, along with the Saracens, ordered to wear a distinctive dress, lest Christians should be deceived into marrying them; and it was forbidden to advance them to public offices.

The Greeks were bidden to submit to the Roman Church, and the patriarch of Constantinople was recognised as first after the Pope. The important eighteenth canon of the third Lateran council was confirmed and extended. All churches with sufficient means were required to provide a master "to instruct their clerics and other poor scholars free of charge". Ordeals were forbidden, and while many canons were issued for the reform of the clergy, the regulation of judicial procedure, and the freedom of ecclesiastical elections, the laity were ordered to go to confession and communion at least once a year, and to pay the tithes. In future they were to be allowed to marry up to the fourth degree of relationship.

Decrees, which unfortunately remained to no small degree ineffectual, were passed against the abuse of appeals, of the power of excommunication, and of the accumulation of benefices in the hands of one person. Without going further, enough detail of the work of the council has now been given to enable one to judge of its relations towards the Pope.

Although, then, Innocent had to withdraw the scheme for rendering the financial position of the Holy See independent of Roman republicanism or imperial despotism, and although there was some opposition to the assignment of the territories of Raymond of Toulouse to Simon de Montfort; to the claims of Frederick II to the Empire; and to the support given by the Pope to King John still, all that is known of the views of perhaps the most representative gathering of the ecclesiastical and civil powers of Christendom that has ever been brought together, justifies the assertion that the policy of Innocent, whether in the Church or in the State, received the approval of the civilised world. Pierre des Vaux de Cernai, after telling of the opposition to the disinheritance of Raymond, adds that “the more numerous and sounder section of the council” approved of the step. What was true of the Albigensian affair was true of the Pope’s policy generally. Assembled Christendom passed a vote of confidence in Innocent. The grandest diet that Western civilisation has known set its seal on the worldwide activities that will render for ever illustrious the pontificate of Lothario Conti.

The great Pope had now all but done his gigantic work. He knew better than anyone how much remained to be done, and how imperfect must be accounted much of what had been done. But he had seen men testify their approval of what he had accomplished, and well might he hope to hear the “Well done, good and faithful servant” from his Maker.

Leaving Rome towards the middle of April 1216, passing through Viterbo, and consecrating an altar at Orvieto, he reached Perugia towards the end of May. No doubt he went to that breezy hill-city to recruit a little after the labours of the council, before he proceeded to the north of Italy. He had left Rome to visit Genoa and Pisa in the hope of making peace between those warlike rivals, in order, especially, to further the interests of the Crusade. Unfortunately, however, he fell into a tertian fever, from which he recovered, or seemed to recover, in a short time. Thinking himself quite well, he continued his habit of eating a considerable number of oranges every day. The fever revived in an acute form, and he was seized with an attack of paralysis. Blood-letting was, as usual, resorted to; but, if he received any benefit from that operation, he was thrown back by the news that Prince Louis had invaded England. The indignation which this intelligence aroused in him was too much for his enfeebled condition. He fell into a lethargy, and expired on July 16, 1216, in the fifty-sixth year of his age, and the nineteenth of his pontificate. The near approach of death had no terrors for him, for, as his successor tells us, he had prepared for it by penance, and had long desired to be with Christ, “in whom and through whom he had desired to live and die”.

Unfortunately, during the night after Innocent’s death his body was not watched, and we learn from Jacques de Vitry, in a letter we have frequently cited, that the precious vestments in which it had been clad were stolen. Jacques himself, who entered

the church where the corpse had been laid out, found it almost naked, and learnt, as he says, by ocular demonstration, how short and empty is all the glory of this world.

The body of the great Pope was laid to rest on the following day in the cathedral church of St. Lawrence, with the honour befitting one who had so worthily filled the highest position on earth. The marble sarcophagus in which the corpse was placed long remained near the window by the altar of St. Ercolano. Then, at some subsequent period, the remains of Innocent III were joined to those of Urban IV and Martin IV. At any rate, in the sixteenth century the historian Pellini assures us that the three bodies were together in a chest (cassa) which rested on an ambry in the sacristy of the new church which had been built in the fifteenth century. In 1615 the chest was opened, and while the bodies of Urban and Martin were found entire, there were left only a few bones of Innocent. The united remains were then translated to the chapel of St. Stephen, in the left transept, as was set forth by a simple inscription on a miserable monument:

Ossa
 Trium Romanorum Pontificum
 Qui Perusiae obierunt,
 Inocen. III. Urban. IV. Mart. IV.
 MCCXVI. a. MCCLXIV. a. MCCLXXXV.
 Ab hujus tempi! Sacratio
 Hue translate
 Anno MDCXV.

It was not till our own time that a worthy monument was erected to Innocent the Great. 4 When he was bishop of Perugia, the sight of the wretched urn that contained the bones of Lothario Conti no doubt often moved the regrets of Joachim Pecci. At any rate, after he became Leo XIII, of most illustrious memory, he did not forget how little sepulchral honour was being shown to his glorious predecessor, and on December 28, 1891, caused to be erected in the basilica of St. John Lateran the fine monument of which we give an illustration. It bears the modest but telling inscription :

Leo XIII. Innocentio III. MDCCCXCI.

When Innocent became Pope all men were struck by his want of years; at his death they were astounded by their fulness. He was, they exclaimed, “glorious in all his works”, which were manifest alike “in the city and in the world”, and they extolled him because “he lorded it over kings, kingdoms, and empires, drove out the proud heretic, exalted the Catholics, and sent the infidels into exile”. Hence, remarked shrewd Brother Salimbene: “The Church flourished and was strong in his time, as he held the lordship

over the Roman Empire and over all the kings and princes of the whole world. And note that this Pope was a bold man stout of heart; for once [here the gossip comes in] he tried on the Lord's seamless tunic, and thought, as he was getting into it, that the Lord was but of small stature. But when it was on him, it was much too large for him, and accordingly, now in fear, he venerated it as was becoming".

As we have no desire to cite all Innocent's contemporaries, as all speak in his praise, we will but add from them that while the bad, the lax, and some at least of his political opponents rejoiced at his death, good and earnest men sincerely mourned it. And, on our own behalf, to those who may urge that in other modern works on Innocent more is said of his failures than is to be found in this biography, we will but reply in the spirit evinced by Captain Mahan in his work on the last Boer War. After observing that in other books he had found that a very great deal had been written about what the British had failed to do in that war, he declared that it was his intention to set forth what they had done. The distinguished American historian then proceeded to show that, considering the difficulties in their way, they had accomplished what no other people had ever done before, and what, in his opinion, no other people would ever again be able to accomplish. Similarly, it has been the aim of this book to make known what Innocent III actually effected, and, from the data even therein supplied, it may be permitted one to assert that, in the domain of international affairs, he accomplished what no other man had ever done before, and, mayhap, what no other man will ever again be able to accomplish.

It is assuredly true that too much was expected from the Popes of the Middle Ages. It has been even said that the career of Innocent III is the best proof of this, and that he failed to effect what was demanded of him. However that may be, it is certain that neither he nor any medieval Pontiff had the mental and physical strength, the time, the money, the diplomatic machinery or the material power sufficient to accomplish all that they were asked to do by kings and peoples, and by bishops and clergy, from the North and the South and the East and the West. Nevertheless, incomplete as this biography is in many respects, it has shown that, despite his shortcomings and failures, Innocent wrought many works well worthy of everlasting remembrance.

Urbis et orbis apex animarum rector, habenas

Hujus et hujus habens, rex in utroque potens.

Imperiale decus et cleri culmen adeptus

Mitior ad Christum cuncta referre cupit.

THE LIVES OF THE POPES IN THE (EARLY) MIDDLE AGES
VOLUME V

