www.cristoraul.org

EL VENCEDOR EDICIONES

THE

LIVES OF THE POPES

IN

THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

THE POPES IN THE DAYS OF FEUDAL ANARCHY
A.D. 891-1048

Horace k. Mann

FIRST PART
The Popes and the House of Theophylactus
(891-999)

FORMOSUS (891-896)
BONIFACE VI (April? 896)
STEPHEN (VI) VII (896-897)
ROMANUS (897)
THEODORE II (897)
SERGIUS III (904-911)
ANASTASIUS III (911-913)
LANDUS (913-914)
JOHN X (914-928)
LEO VI (928 or 928-9)
STEPHEN (VII) VIII (929-931)
JOHN XI (931-936)
LEO VII (936-939)
STEPHEN (VIII) IX (939-942)
MARINUS II (942-946)
AGAPITUS II (946-955)
JOHN XII (955-964)
BENEDICT V (964)
JOHN XIII (965-972)
BENEDICT VI (972-974)
BENEDICT VII (974-983)
JOHN XIV (983-984)
BONIFACE VII (ANTIPOPE ?) (984-985)
JOHN XV (985-996)
GREGORY V (996-999)

PART TWO
(999-1048)

SYLVESTER II (999-1003)
JOHN XVII (1003)
JOHN XVIII (1003-1009)
SERGIUS IV (1009-1012)
BENEDICT VIII (1012-1024)
JOHN XIX (1024-1032)
BENEDICT IX (1032-1045)
GREGORY VI (1045-1046)
CLEMENT II (1046-1047)
DAMASUS II (1048)

The Popes and the House of Theophylactus
896-999

BEFORE we proceed to give the details of the Lives of those popes who held the See of Rome during the period when Italy sank lower in the scale of civilization than at any other period of its history, it will be of advantage to say something as to the causes which brought about the evils of that age. We would say something of an age when the supreme Pontiffs of Rome, dragged down with Italy, were so degraded, in part by the treatment to which they were subjected, and in part by the vices of some of those whom brute force thrust into the chair of Peter, that one might have been tempted to believe that their authority must for ever have come to an end.

To the reader who has in mind the facts recorded in the preceding volume of this work, these introductory remarks may scarcely be necessary; but they will at least serve to impress still more upon him that the scandals in high places which he will soon see, if he continues his reading, were due rather to external circumstances than to any internal decay of the institution of the Papacy itself.

The period we would discuss — the tenth century and the first half of the eleventh — is often spoken of as the "unhappy or obscure, the iron or leaden age". And for many reasons it richly deserves the hard names which have been given to it; but it must at once be noted that it is very often the subject of undue generalization. It is frequently asserted that, for Europe at large, it was the blackest period of its long life. No doubt, when the head suffers grievously, the body cannot be in a very satisfactory condition. For Italy, and for Rome—the head and centre at this time both of Western civilization and of Christianity—the epoch in question was assuredly the most miserable of all the times they have passed through. But, though most of the other countries of Europe were in anything but a flourishing state, the second half of the tenth century saw them in a much better condition than the first half, and they had seen darker days some three centuries before. And so we find that this epoch witnessed at least a temporary revival of learning and discipline in England through the noble efforts of St. Dunstan and his monastic brethren. France, indeed, suffered almost as much as Italy at this time. Its historians are agreed that it never sank so low as in the tenth century. Yet even in France the very beginning of the tenth century saw the foundation of the monastery of Cluny, the influence of which, in the eleventh century, was to be the leaven which was destined to permeate and elevate the whole mass of European corruption. But, apart from what Fulbert of Chartres called "the strong capital of the monastic life", the Church in France was in as miserable a condition as the State. Christian Spain, however, on the other hand, advanced its frontiers during this age of woe; and Germany, which under powerful rulers broke the violence of the barbarian invaders, aided by its great bishops and by the comparatively prosperous state of its monastic institutions, experienced a decided advance in civilization generally. It was through Germany that Divine Providence seems to have worked in effecting the reform of the Church in its head.

The life of the Spirit, too, was not altogether dead in the tenth century. There were saintly men in every land, and great saints in some. St. Bernard of Menthon, "the apostle of the Alps", the founder of the hospices on the Great and the Little St. Bernard, was one; St. Odo of Cluny, not to mention his three saintly successors, was another. England produced St. Dunstan, St. Oswald, and others. Italy profited by the presence of St. Nilus, the famous Basilian monk, and St. Adalbert was a source of light to the Slavs.

Earnest and zealous men spread the truths of Christianity into countries where they had not as yet penetrated. And the darkness of the tenth century was lightened towards its close by the conversion of the Northmen, the Hungarians, and some more remote Slavonic peoples whose ignorance had not been illumined by the great apostles of the Slavs, SS. Cyril and Methodius.

But if not the darkest day for Europe in general, the tenth century, with the first half of the eleventh, was confessedly the blackest night for Italy, and for Rome and its rulers. The causes which brought about the degradation of the Papacy were, to a large extent, those which brought about the fall of the empire. First of these was the barbarians. Under the strong rule of Charlemagne, civilization had grown apace in Europe. Religion, and consequently learning, flourished under the protection of that great ruler; and, broadly speaking, till the fall of the Frankish empire north Italy at least enjoyed a term of peace and prosperity. The strong right arm of Charlemagne had pushed back the borders of the barbarians, whose inroads were so fatal to the cause of civilization, and who hung over the empire ready to take advantage of the smallest symptoms of weakness which it might exhibit. These symptoms were not long in showing themselves. Following the example set by Charlemagne himself, the empire was progressively split up by his descendants among their children; and, worse still, those who succeeded him in the title of emperor were destitute either of physical vitality, mental ability, or both. The reins of government slipped from their nerveless grasp under the pressure of the barbarians from without, and of the turbulent dukes and counts from within. The nobility grew unruly, and the inroads of Normans, Saracens, and Slavs became incessant. Bad enough before, things became much worse on the deposition of the last Carolingian emperor, Charles the Fat, in 887. The empire was split up into seven kingdoms, and soon into more than fifty feudal sovereignties. In bringing these kingdoms into being, racial and linguistic tendencies and pressing local needs certainly had their share. But beyond doubt the greatest factor in producing them was the personal ambition of those who became their rulers, of men who by their birth considered themselves all equal. And "the ambition of the powerful, together with the deplorable miseries of the times", — we have it on the authority of the famous Gerbert — "turned right into wrong". Already, on the division of the empire at the time of the death of Louis the Pious, Florus, the deacon of Lyons, had, in verse not wanting in pathos, bewailed its partition. He had called on the lofty hills and the deep valleys to mourn over the race of the Franks who had fallen from empire. "A beautiful empire once flourished under a glorious crown. Then was there one Prince and one subject people. Every town had its laws and its judges ... The word of salvation was preached to all; and the youth everywhere studied the sacred Scriptures and the liberal arts ... The name and dignity of empire lost, we have now kinglets for kings; instead of an empire, its fragments ... Of the general good no one has a thought. It is each one for himself ... The bishops can no longer hold their synods. There are no assemblies of the people, no laws. Vain were it for an embassy to come hither, for there is no court to receive it". What would the high-minded deacon have said had he lived to see the deposition of Charles the Fat, and the divisions and wars that followed it?

That which rendered these wars specially disastrous was the fact that one or other of the contending parties was constantly inviting hordes of different barbarians to aid them in attacking their opponents and devastating their territories. Drawn by these invitations, and by the prospect of booty, Northman and Slav, Hungarian and Saracen "sometimes trod the same ground of desolation; and these savage foes might have been compared by Homer to the two lions growling over the carcass of the mangled stag".

In addition to the progressive subdivisions of the empire, and to the inroads of heathen or infidel invaders, a third most potent cause of the degradation of Europe in the tenth century and in the first half of the eleventh was the enslavement of the Church in its episcopacy. Freedom of election had been lost in the ninth century, and in this Dark Age the Popes and the bishops became the creatures not simply of emperors or kings, but of petty local barons. Though there were some great bishops in Germany and in England, the tenth century saw an episcopate largely composed of men who cared not for the glory of God and of His Church, who looked not to the beauty of His house, who had no concern for the spiritual and temporal welfare of their flocks, and who held learning in no esteem. Naturally, from the mode of their appointment, very many of them became barons rather than churchmen, and worked more for the privileges of a class than for the welfare of the whole body. Under such bishops there can be no difficulty in imagining what their priests were like. And when the salt of the clergy had lost its savour, the great mass of the laity necessarily became acquainted with corruption.

Of the barbarians who devastated Europe in the tenth century, the Northmen, that is, the Norsemen and the Danes, were destined in the sequel to be as great agents for good in the civilization of western Europe as they had once been powerful factors in its disintegration.

Though the piratical raids of the Norsemen had begun even before the close of the eighth century, their expeditions for permanent conquests did not begin till about the middle of the ninth century. About the same time, Harold Fairhair (863-934) in Norway, and Gorm the Old (860-935) in Denmark, strove successfully to make them- selves effective rulers in those countries. Their success caused many of the vikings to leave their Northern homes for ever. After their light ships had spread the terror of their name not only over the British Isles, the Low Countries, and France, but even into Spain and the countries of the Mediterranean; and after they had carried "property" back to Norway and Denmark from every other European country, the vikings, about the middle of the ninth century, turned their attention, as we have said, to making regular conquests. Large portions of the British Isles and of France soon fell under their control. This, however, proved fortunate for Europe. Skilled in the art of war, no strangers to the refinements of life, and now masters of a considerable tract of sea-coast themselves, they checked the ravages of their countrymen. When, in 912, Charles the Simple, of France, making a virtue of necessity, ceded to the viking Rolf or Rollo what was, from these very Northmen, afterwards known as Normandy, the wild Norseman and his followers not only became Christians, and adopted the civilization they found attached to it, but presented a strong barrier to future marauders. In the following century their proficiency in the arts both of peace and war caused them to become one of the chief agents in bringing the anarchy of the tenth century to a close. But before they thus settled down, these terrible sea-rovers, who "never put awnings on their ships, never furled their sails to the wind", and would have no "straw-made beds outside their ships' berths", were a scourge indeed, as our countryman Alcuin, and, long after him, Pope Formosus, had the best reason to note. Their aims were as lofty as their methods of striving for their accomplishment were ferocious. Hasting, the Danish sea-king, who invaded England in 893, had nothing less in view, so we are told, than the making of his king, Biorn Ironside, emperor of the West; and, driven by a storm out of his course, he seized Luna, near Carrara, in mistake for Rome (c. 857).

Worse, however, in themselves than the Norsemen, and certainly much worse for Italy, with which we are especially concerned, were the Saracens. While the Norse

dragon was devouring the north, the Moorish crescent was casting its blighting glare on the south of Europe.

In the preceding volume enough has been said to show the mischief they wrought in south Italy in the latter half of the ninth century. To the centres of ruin and devastation which they established there during that period on the Garigliano, in Cetara, and in other places, they added others, towards the close of the same century, among the fastnesses of the Alps. Of these the most important was Fraxineto, in the neighborhood of Fraxinct or Garde-Frainet, situated perhaps on the promontory of the maritime Alps, which shuts in the bay of Villafranca to the east of Nice. Here and in the adjoining passes of the Alps they maintained themselves for the greater part of a hundred years. For though attacked at various times, as for instance even by a Greek fleet in 931, it was only in 942 that they were expelled from Fraxineto. Protected by the sea and by woods rendered almost impassable by a dense under- growth, they despised all local efforts to subdue them. At length, in 942, Hugh of Arles or Provence, king of Italy, obtained the aid of a Greek fleet to attack them by sea, whilst he assaulted them on the land side. The joint attack was successful. The Moors had to abandon their fortress, and fly to the passes of the mountains. But it is significant of the type of men who then controlled the destinies of Europe, that, instead of destroying this band of bloodthirsty bandits, Hugh agreed to let them remain on Monte Moro (Mons Maurus) on condition that, to the best of their power, they would hinder his rival, Berenger of Ivrea, from returning to Italy. It was not till 972 that they were ousted from this last coign of vantage.

Issuing from one or other of these lairs, the fierce Moors beset the passes of the Alps, plundering and murdering pilgrims on their way to Rome, and generally harassing the north of Italy. All the chroniclers of the times speak with horror of the sea-washed fortress of Fraxineto; and the dread doings of its Saracenic lords form a subject of frequent notice by them. Such as the following are the facts recorded by them or by the sad testimony of monumental inscriptions. In the year 921, says Frodoard, "a great number of Englishmen, on their way to Rome, were crushed to death with rocks rolled upon them by the Saracens in the passes of the Alps". We need not, therefore, suspect Gregory of Catino (who towards the close of the eleventh century drew up the Chronicle of his monastery of Farfa) of much exaggeration when he says of this period : "When at length, in punishment of the sins of Christians, the power of that dynasty (the Carolingian) began to decline, and became altogether impotent, a multitude of pagans of that wicked race called Agareni, or Saracens, invaded Italy, and few were the cities from Trasbido to the Po, with the exception of Rome and Ravenna, which escaped destruction at their hands, or which were not at least brought under the scourge of their tyranny. As for the cities and provinces which they conquered, it was their practice to plunder them of everything, and either to drive away the inhabitants into captivity, or to slay them with the edge of the sword".

The ports of south Italy were crowded with Christian captives waiting to be shipped as slaves to Africa. Saracen buildings all along the coast about Amalfi, Naples, and Vietri attest to this day the baleful presence of the Moors in those districts. Place-names, and Moorish towers on the ruins of Roman amphitheatres, enable their hold on the Rhone valley to be traced with ease. But of all the parts of Italy, it was particularly the Duchy of Rome which experienced the greatest hardships at the hands of the Saracens. They began to threaten it about 725. Rome itself was partially sacked by them in 846, and Liverani points out that their actual ravages in the Roman Duchy lasted for a hundred years; that the whole of it was ravaged at one time or another; and that not far short of four hundred towns were destroyed by them. They burnt such famous monasteries as Mt. Cassino, St. Elia at Nepi, Farfa, St. Sylvester on Mt. Soracte, and

Subiaco; and established centres of aggression at suitable places both in and near the Duchy. But for such Popes as John VIII, John X, and Benedict VIII, they would have become masters of Italy.

If there is any exaggeration in the language of Gregory of Catino when applied to the Saracens only, there is certainly none when referred to the united barbarities of the Saracens and the Hungarians. These latter, kinsmen of the Huns and the Avars, proved the worst of the scourges that wasted the continent of Europe at this period. Known to themselves as Magyars (children of the earth), they were called by others Hungarians, because they came from Jugaria (Ougaria, hence the Greek "Ougroi"), on the slopes of the northern Ural Mountains. This Tartar people, of the great Turanian family, akin to the Turks and to those who gave their name to the "Bulgarians", came South, driven by hunger and enemies, or simply impelled by their nomad instincts. In the ninth century they settled in south Russia, in the district behind the Sereth, watered by the Pruth, the Dniester, the Bug, and the Dnieper, and then known as Ateleusu. Thence they soon advanced further West, either driven by the Tartar Petchenegs, or invited by the Greek emperor, Leo VI, to help him to make war on the Bulgarians, and it is said, by Arnulf, king of Germany, to assist him in his efforts to subdue the Moravians; or, at least partly, urged on again by their love of wandering.

As early as the year 862, what we may call the advance guard of this nation of mounted archers, alluded to by Archbishop Hincmar as a people hitherto unknown to western Europe, threw themselves upon the kingdom of Louis the German at the time when it was being ravaged by the Danes. For some thirty years not much is known in detail of the doings of the Magyars. They were engaged in subduing the Slavs, wedging themselves in between them, and getting a hold of the country about the Middle Danube and the Theiss. But after the year 892, when in the annals of the monastery of St. Gall we read the mysterious words that Arnulf the German relieved the Hungarians where they were cooped up, the chronicles are full of the doings of the Magyars. It is the Ungari here, the Ungari there, the Ungari everywhere, as though Arnulf had let the winds out of the bag! The hoofs of their indefatigable horses clattered over almost every road in Germany, France, and Italy. Their arrows brought death to the men and women of the North as to those of the South. And no "distance", says Gibbon, "could be secure against an enemy who almost at the same instant laid in ashes the Helvetian monastery of St. Gall and the city of Bremen on the shores of the Northern Ocean". And so we encounter such entries as these in the chronicles of the period : — A.D. 919, "The Hungarians harry Italy and part of France; to wit, the kingdom of Lothaire". "This year" (926), record the annals of Reichenau, "the Hungarians laid waste all France, Alsace, Gaul, and Germany (Alemanniam) with fire and sword"; and under the year 932: "When they had burnt many cities of eastern France and Germany, they crossed the Rhine near Worms, and devastated the kingdom of Gaul even to the ocean, and returned through Italy".

If their wide spreading and long-continued ravages caused the Magyars to be described by more or less strictly contemporary authors as a people who were "greedy, audacious, ignorant of God, acquainted with every crime, and keen only for slaughter and plunder", and as "most fierce in war", their appetite for raw flesh made even these coeval writers lay to their charge that they drank the blood of the slain. To later writers they were known as men with dark countenances, and deep-set eyes, small of stature, barbarous and ferocious in their language and morals, so that "fortune must be blamed, or rather the divine patience admired, which exposed this beautiful earth not to men, but to such monstrosities of men". So wrote the good Bishop Otho of Frising in the twelfth century. Of these latter exaggerated descriptions the popular imagination took hold, and

in the ogres of our childhood we did but shudder at the wild doings of the Ungari in the tenth century.

The Hungarians, however, were not destined to have all their own way. Neither the science nor the art of war had been altogether lost in the West, and at length the Germans broke the power of the Magyars. A great defeat was inflicted upon them at Mersebourg by Henry the Fowler in 933, and another by the Saxons in 938. A final crushing overthrow was sustained by them at the hands of Otho the Great in 955, on the Lech, near Augsburg. Despite these reverses, it was not till the death of their great chief Taksony (947-972) that their ravages practically ceased. How much they contributed to help the confusion of the tenth century can easily be imagined. "The Hungarians", says Gibbon, "promoted the reign of anarchy by forcing the stoutest barons to discipline their vassals and fortify their castles. The origin of walled towns (becoming later on, we may add, the nurseries of our modern liberties) is ascribed to this calamitous period". The empire in the West was being broken to pieces for ever. It was at the same time being pulled down by its children from within, and battered by the barbarians from without. Out of its debris were to spring the nations of Modern Europe. But painful was their birth. Terrible were the throes of Christendom in the tenth century. And while the churches of the North rang with the mournful litany : "A furore Normanorum libera nos Domine", those of the South resounded with the tearful supplication : "Nunc te rogamus, licet servi pessimi, ab Ungerorum nos defendas jaculis".

The result of all these fierce incursions, and of the intestine wars waged by kings and nobles fur the name of emperor or for personal independence, for rivalry or for revenge, was, of course, widespread anarchy, ignorance, and immorality among all classes, both among the clergy and the laity. The bonds of civil and ecclesiastical law and discipline were cut by the sword, and all — at least the powerful — did what they considered right in their own eyes. Taking every advantage of the troubles which had come upon the fallen empire of the West, the nobles generally made themselves absolute masters in their own dominions, and did just as they thought fit. The canons of the councils of these unhappy times furnish a clear insight of what those deeds were which "they thought right", and of their results. The synod of Pavia (889), held for the election of Guido as king of Italy, decreed that the palatines of the king must refrain from plundering, and that, in coming to a diet (*placitum*), they must not rob the places they pass through, but pay for what they needed. The people, moreover, must not be unduly taxed nor violently oppressed (can. 7). Another synod, that of Ravenna in 898, under Pope John IX, calls on the Emperor Lambert to repress the arson, the robberies, the brutalities of all kinds which were rampant in the empire (can. 5). The council of Trosle, held under Heriveus, archbishop of Rheims, in 909, bewails at once the devastation of cities and country and the decay of virtue, and proceeds to lay the blame of the latter on the bishops. They have kept silent when they ought to have spoken out.

Certainly, in this unhappy period, the Church had not much influence for good, as she was in most parts suffering from the most grievous oppression. Candidates the most worthless and unfit were forcibly intruded into her most important offices — even into the chair of Peter. The wealth of some of the larger monasteries and episcopal sees caused them to be much coveted by the powerful. Greedy nobles seized on them by force or contrived to intrude into them some members of their family. The council last spoken of, besides regretting the destruction of many monasteries by the barbarians, deplores the absolute want of all discipline in many others. Some of them cannot be brought to order, as they are under the power of bishops different from those in whose dioceses they are situated. Others have laymen for abbots, who have taken up their abode in the monastic cloisters with their wives and children, soldiers and dogs! And

whereas in some monasteries there was luxury and pomp, the direst poverty forced other monks to turn to worldly employments to gain a livelihood. So that, if the somewhat caustic Ratherius of Verona (d. 974) gives us a striking picture of Italian prelates of the tenth century, eating and drinking out of vessels of gold, entertained by dancing girls, hunting, and travelling in gorgeous carriages, it must not be forgotten that it was with those in the Church as with men in the State in the tenth century.

Luxury was for the few, poverty and oppression for the many. Bishops who were nobles, in many cases violently intruded into the sees they held, lived like the nobles. The interior clergy lived like the mass of the people, sure neither of their bread nor of their lives. Of this there is more than evidence enough in the fact that, even during the ninth century, councils in their decrees, and kings in their capitularies, found it necessary to be constantly legislating for the protection of Church property; and an author of the last twenty years of the tenth century speaks of the Emperor Otho I's restoring churches throughout Italy (Lombardy) and Tuscany which had been brought to desolation by the barbarity and wantonness of former princes.

Needless to say that the grossest simony was practised, and that matters went from bad to worse. St. Peter Damian has left on record the depth of ignorance, simony, and intemperance to which the clergy had sunk by the days when the brave Gregory VII began to put into action the moral lever with which he was to raise the Christian world into a higher groove.

The recital of a concrete case or two of lawlessness will serve better than anything else, perhaps, to put in clear relief the condition of the Church, in Italy especially, in the tenth century.

An historian who flourished under S. Gregory VII informs us that Hugh of Provence, king of Italy, finding that he could not succeed in getting his son consecrated archbishop of Milan on account of his extreme youth, had him tonsured (935). He then procured the election of Ardericus, from whose advanced years he anticipated that a vacancy would be sure to occur by the time that his son would have come of age. But as the venerable Ardericus lived longer than he wished, he resolved to put him to death. Accordingly he was invited, along with other magnates of Milan, to Pavia. There, in the midst of a royal entertainment, the followers of King Hugh fell on the archbishop and his friends. Ninety of the Milanese were murdered; but, as if by a miracle, the aged prelate escaped.

For a pecuniary consideration, this same king appointed as abbot of Farfa the murderer of the preceding abbot Ratfredo. This wretch, whose name was Campone, had an accomplice, one Hildebrand, who went to Pavia and paid the money to the king. The new abbot appointed Hildebrand to the richest of the "cells", or subordinate monasteries of the abbey. But before a year had passed, these precious monks, both noblemen, are at open war, with bands of armed men on both sides. Success is at first with Hildebrand, for he hired the banditti and free-bands of Camerino. The monastery of Farfa is carried by storm. But, by a judicious distribution of treasure, Campone wins over the marauders who had secured the victory for Hildebrand; his rival is expelled, and Campone is once more abbot of Farfa.

We will tell one more story of these times from the same annals, as Hildebrand figures in it also. Again in the days of King Hugh, writes the author of the chronicle of Farfa, there were savage wars between Ascarius and Sarilo for dominion over the March of Firmo. Sarilo slew Ascarius and obtained the March. On this, King Hugh broke out into a great fury against Sarilo, and pursued him with vengeance, because Ascarius was his brother. Sarilo, driven to the last straits in a small place in Tuscany, where he had taken refuge, put on the cowl of a monk, and with a halter about his neck came out from

the town gate just at dawn, and threw himself at the feet of the king. Hugh, moved to compassion, forgave him the murder of his brother, and placed him over all the *royal monasteries* within the confines of *Tuscany* and the *March of Firmo*. All the abbots submitted to Sarilo except Hildebrand, the rival of Campone. He was accordingly attacked in the castle of St. Victoria, and forced to surrender it. Hildebrand returned with recruited forces, attacked the castle, and compelled the new abbot to retire ignominiously. He, however, returned to the charge, and with success the second time. With abbots such as Hildebrand, Sarilo, and Campone, ecclesiastical discipline might well have been at a discount.

It must not be thought from our reference to councils held in this period that these invaluable aids to order were then regularly celebrated. The fact is, as we have it on the authority of the ablest historian of the councils, Bishop von Hefele, this period, especially in comparison with the ninth century, was very poor in synodal gatherings; and those that were held were of no importance. Their action was purely local, and had no ameliorating influence on the sad condition of the Church in general.

As might be expected, the period of which we are writing was not distinguished for the cultivation of learning in any of its branches. "In the midst of such universal desolation", asks the illustrious author of the History of Italian Literature, Tiraboschi, "was the pursuit of learning possible? If the peace which Italy enjoyed under Charlemagne and Lothaire, and the measures taken by these princes to make learning flourish once again, were not enough to rouse the country and make it turn afresh to the 'bell arti' so long neglected, what must we suppose to have been the effect of disasters so terrible that they would have spread barbarism and ignorance even among more cultured provinces?". The effect may easily be estimated not only from the considerations set forth by the modern scholar, but from what a quasi-contemporary tells us of the appalling dearth of teachers, even to some extent in his own time. The philosophic abbot, Guibert of Nogent (d. 1124), writing particularly of the state of things just before his own days, tells us that a teacher in a small town could not be found, and that even the large cities could produce but few. The learning of such masters as were forthcoming was, he says, but very scant, and not to be compared with that of any wandering cleric of modern times. Both a cause and an effect of the prevailing ignorance of the times was a scarcity of books. No doubt there were other causes of this want of books, such as their destruction when monasteries, their chief repositories, were destroyed. Another cause was the dearth of paper, "For since Egypt, the ancient home of the papyrus, had fallen into the power of the Arabs, the scarcity of writing material had been keenly felt in Italy, and to this cause Muratori in part ascribes the intellectual barbarism of the tenth century". But we must be on our guard against forming exaggerated ideas of the book famine of this epoch. It was not so much that there were then no books, or but few, in Italy at any rate, as that, owing to the troubled state of the times, new ones were not so frequently written or old ones copied. We have the positive assertion of an author, viz. Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II (999-1003), who knew more about books than any other man of his period, that there were a great many books to be found in all parts of Italy, as well as in Germany and in the "Belgic" provinces, *i.e.*, the duchy of Lorraine. And we read of a Spanish priest stopping a whole year at the court of Pope John X (914-928), and collecting "a multitude of books" with which he returned "with joy" to his own country. If, too, it be the fact, as Richer avers it was, that music and astronomy were unknown in Italy in these dark and inharmonious days, there was light enough to prevent the brush of the artist from quite losing its cunning. The "prince of painters" had still his residence in Italy, and when the emperor, Otho III, in all things most eager for the glory of the

empire, needed an artist to decorate the cathedral of Aix-la-Chapelle, he summoned the pious Italian John to do the work.

During this hundred and fifty years of bloodshed and gloom, how fared it with the city of Rome? A poem on a manuscript of the period supplies us with an answer not wholly wide of the truth. "Alas! unhappy Rome, thy power was built up by great rulers; now, a servant of thy former slaves, thou art rushing to thy ruin. Thy princes have long abandoned thee; thy name and thy glory have fled to the Greeks. Prosperous Constantinople is known as the New Rome. In thy walls and in thy morals, O worn-out Rome, thou art falling to thy ruin. Empire has left thee, Pride alone remains. The worship of avarice has completely possessed you. A mob torn from the ends of the earth, the slaves of thy slaves are now thy lords. Not one of thy old nobility remains with thee; thy free-born sons are reduced to tilling the soil. You who once cruelly put the saints of God to death, are now wont to sell their sacred remains. Were you not nourished by the merits of Peter and Paul, long ago would you have quite shrivelled away."

Taking the evidence of invective verses for what they are worth, we are driven to form our ideas on the state of Rome at this period rather from conjecture from what we know of it in the ninth century, and from a few passing references to it in the records of the following age, than from the extremely little which contemporary docu- ments have to say regarding it.

Were we to confine our gaze to the legal documents of this epoch which have come down to us, we might be tempted to suppose that all was as usual in Rome. We find that the Prefect was still judging criminal cases (in the name of the Pope) both in the city and in its immediate neighborhood, and that there were *Consules Romanorum* and *Duces* and other papal officials exercising various executive functions during the whole period of these obscure years. Still was justice in civil cases administered by the seven great officials of the papal court, the *primicerius*, the *secundicerius*, the *arcarius* (treasurer), the first of the *defensors*, the *nomenclator*, the *saccellarius* (paymaster), and the *protoscrinarius*. Indeed, fairly complete lists of these functionaries during this age have been compiled. Assisting these seven *judices ordinarii* were certain subordinate judges, known as *judices dativi*, who, though usually exercising no other than judicial functions, were not competent to decide cases apart from the clerical *judices ordinarii*. And these palatine judges themselves, under increasing pressure of business, gradually ceased in the course of the eleventh century to exercise any other than purely judicial duties.

In theory, then, no matter how "imperfectly known the administrative organization of Rome before the middle of the twelfth century may be, it rested wholly on the sovereignty of the Pope. It is from him that all authority emanated, and it is in his name, and in virtue of powers which he had delegated to them, that the different officials issue orders, levy taxes, and administer justice". Further, if the *schola cantorum*, which was also known as the Orphanotropio— the ecclesiastical seminary of preceding ages, whence had issued so many Pontiffs who had graced the See of Peter— was still in existence, it is very certain that many who sat in his chair in the tenth century had never been inside its walls, or been subject to any kind of ecclesiastical training John, "the venerable subdeacon of the Roman Church", who was its primicerius in the days of Pope John XI (934), may easily have lived to wish that John XII had experienced a little of his disciplinary care.

Hence, as a matter of fact, if certain outward appearances connected the Rome of the Iron Age with the Rome of the Carolingians, it was really a changed thing. Not merely were its ancient fourteen imperial and seven ecclesiastical regions, which had

hitherto existed side by side, replaced by twelve divisions corresponding fairly well to the modern *rioni*, but both the papal and the imperial power were reduced there to a shadow. No longer was there a permanent imperial *missus* in Rome; and if an emperor did come there in person or by an envoy, his authority was barely respected during the time of his visit. If the dignity of the emperor, who normally lived at a distance from Rome, was regarded there as of no account, even the authority of the Pope who resided in its midst was often but as little respected. All real power was at this time in the hands of the great families who, through their connection with the local militia, had become a practically independent feudal aristocracy. These families were all jealous of one another, and were perpetually fighting for supremacy. The aim of each party, pursued by every resource of violence and intrigue, was to get control of the chair of Peter. Its occupant must be one of theirs at all costs. And what a price had Rome to pay for their ambitions! Its law and order, its morals, even its very buildings were sacrificed to them.

Peering through the historic gloom, we catch sight of the fierce retainers of the different families feverishly converting into robber strongholds the monuments of antiquity, the Septizonium, the triumphal arches, and the temples of the ancient gods. By degrees the Forum and its immediate vicinity became a nest of castles, from the castellated arch of Septimius Severus in the north-west to the embattled arch of Titus in the south-east. From these fortresses issued forth men who neither feared God nor regarded man, and to whom were sacred neither the canon nor the civil law, neither the vestment of the priest nor the cloak of the citizen, neither the gold of the sanctuary nor the mite of the widow. And, as though these were not troubles enough for Rome, it was, to use the rather exaggerated language of Raoul Glaber, almost wholly the prey of fire towards the close of the tenth century. Moreover, whilst violence was the order of the day within the city walls, it was equally rife in their immediate neighborhood. Robber nobles beset the highways, plundering merchant and pilgrim with equal impunity; while quaking watchmen on the walls of Rome, at least during the first half of the tenth century, must have been ever afraid lest the wild Hungarian archer, whom they beheld spreading desolation around and discharging his arrows in impotent rage against its lofty towers, might yet stable his horse in the atrium of St. Peter’s, and transfer his barbarities to the already blood-dyed streets of the city. Often must they have encouraged one another to untiring vigilance; and often must they have prayed —for faith did not die in Rome during the tenth century—that God would deliver them from the darts of the Hungarians.

But again must the note of warning be sounded. Rome was not under a Pornocracy, as some writers would have us think, for a century and a half; nor was it an utter stranger to the arts of peace throughout that long period. There were books there, as we have seen, in plenty; and thither we know went men to consult them. It was at Rome also, as texts to be quoted in the course of this volume will show, that ecclesiastics purchased ornaments for their churches, both textile fabrics and articles in metal or marble. Charters of the tenth century have preserved the names of certain Roman artists (*exigui pictores* as they modestly style themselves); and it must be borne in mind that even during the sad days of that darkest age of Rome, the tradition of Roman art was never lost. It survived to a happier time, and passed on its principles to Florence, to be by that more fortunate city so gloriously expanded. But, considering the grinding poverty with which so many of the Popes of the Dark Age were oppressed, and the turmoil into which their city was so often plunged, an epoch of artistic development is not to be expected. On the contrary, it is matter for congratulation that the arts of painting and sculpture did not perish altogether in Rome. And it is remarkable that it was during this period of artistic depression that the Roman artists were "called upon to

produce some of the most extensive works in the history of their school," *viz.* the redecoration of St. Peter's and the Lateran. Though their work may show "less of artistic quality than at any other time", their school "seems to have been pre-eminent in Europe". Nor was their work confined to Rome itself. Frescoes of the tenth century still adorn the walls of the monastic church of St. Elia near Nepi, and the artists who painted them have inscribed their names beneath the feet of the figure of our Saviour whom they have depicted in the apse. The brothers Stephen and John, and their nephew Nicholas, were the three "Roman painters" who executed the frescoes of St. Elia. When about the year 990 Otho III wished to decorate the imperial palace of Aix-la-Chapelle, he showed "the high esteem in which the Roman school of painting was held" by employing, as "his chief court painter, the Italian artist John". Finally, in this connection, it is worth noting that modern authorities assign to this age and to a Roman artist the little work *De coloribus et artibus Romanorum*, one of the very few technical productions of the early Middle Ages. It was the work of one Heraclius, who, while lamenting the decay of Roman genius and Roman institutions, and sorrowfully asking who is now capable of understanding and explaining the noble arts of the ancients, bravely made an attempt himself, and issued his practical manual "for painters, with all necessary receipts and directions for mixing and using colours, and for making mosaics".

In the second half of the tenth century, too, a religious reform was being carried out within the walls of Rome. The "terrible" tyrant Alberic was to a considerable extent under the civilizing influence of St. Odo of Cluny (879-942). Under him he became "a pious frequenter of the cloisters", and to him he gave the care of all the monasteries of Rome. Many of them were in consequence led to embrace the Cluniac reform, and some new ones were founded, — one on the Aventine by Alberic himself.

Among the other monasteries which were built at the time just mentioned was that of S. Maria in Pallara, on the Palatine, which was at the same period adorned with frescoes.

There are not wanting authors who maintain that there was no place in Italy in this unhappy time where learning was so conspicuous by its absence as in Rome. One of them cites in proof the words of "the Gallic bishops at Rheims" — "There is no one at present in Rome who has studied the sciences, without a knowledge of which, as it is written, a man is incapable of being even a door-keeper. The ignorance of other bishops is in some degree pardonable if we compare their position with that of the Bishop of Rome. In the Bishop of Rome, however, ignorance is not to be endured, since he has to judge matters of faith, mode of life and discipline, the clergy, and, in short, the universal Catholic Church". The weight of a man's words as evidence depends to a very large extent on the circumstances, such as the condition of body and mind, etc., under which he speaks. The words of a person in anger are not accepted without question. And in connection with the statement just cited, *viz.*, "that, *as report* hath it, *hardly any* one at present in Rome has studied the sciences", it must be explained that the Gallic bishops were engaged in arbitrarily deposing Bishop Arnulf, and in substituting Gerbert (afterwards Sylvester II) in his stead. Hence they were endeavoring, by decrying the Pope's intellectual capability, to deprive his expected condemnation of their conduct of all force. When this is explained, the testimony of the Gallic bishops as to ignorance in Rome does not count for much. It is not equal to the testimony of Ratherius of Verona, which is quite to the opposite effect. He categorically asserts that there was no place where ecclesiastical science was better taught than in Rome; and Gerbert himself lets us know that, even towards the close of the tenth century, it was one of the cities to go to for books. No doubt for Rome there was a great falling off in learning in this unhappy

period; but we must beware of taking it for granted that its light was there quite extinguished.

But how fared it with Rome's rulers, the Popes, during this calamitous epoch? In the same way, though to a much worse degree, as it fared with so many other European rulers. Just as the power of other Western sovereigns was curtailed by the practical independence which so many of their nobles won for themselves, so that of the Popes was hampered by the Roman nobles. With the fall of the imperial authority the curb was removed from them. They soon seized all power in Rome, and oppressed both the Pope, the clergy, and the people. Some among them endeavored to make the Papacy an appanage of their families.

Foremost amongst the nobility was the house of Theophylactus, whose relations or descendants were the practical rulers of Rome during this period. Of this house, if we are to trust Liutprand, the most notorious members were a certain Theodora and her equally famous or infamous daughters, Marozia and Theodora the younger. As ambitious as they were beautiful, they obtained the greatest influence in Rome by a prodigal prostitution of their charms. The supreme power in Rome was for a while practically in the hands of these licentious women. "Rome", says a contemporary chronicler, "fell under the yoke of women. As we read in the prophet: 'The effeminate shall rule over them' (Isa. III., 4). Creatures such as we have described would naturally not stop at anything which would serve their ends. Nothing was sacred to them. Popes, at times members of their own families, and consequently not of a race calculated to produce saints, were made and unmade at pleasure. Sometimes even laymen were intruded into the chair of Peter. For the advantage of the party anything was lawful. That men sprung from a family of debauchees, and without any clerical training, should be a scandal to the Church, is no matter for astonishment. The great wonder is that there were not more really bad Popes in this miserable era. Guided by the expressions of the great Cardinal Baronius, many seem to imagine that *all* the Popes of the tenth century were bad. His language is, no doubt, strong enough. "The greatest monsters of cruelty and injustice", he writes in an oft-quoted passage, "arrogated to themselves, during that period, the election of the Roman pontiffs. And, oh, shame! oh, heartbreaking! what monsters did they not force upon that throne of the Apostle which angels regard with reverence! What woes originated from this source; what dark and bloody tragedies! Alas! alas! for the age in which it was reserved for the spouse purchased by the Redeemer in His blood, the spouse without stain or blemish, to be so defiled with the filth thrown upon her as to be made (like her Divine founder) the object of scorn and the laughing-stock of her enemies". With the documents at his disposal, Baronius was, no doubt, justified in making these reflections. But since his time sources have been brought to light which, had the cardinal known them, would have caused him to modify his strictures. Were we, however, to allow that the Popes of this period were as bad as ever they have been painted, what has been said above, which we will now in part repeat in the words even of Gibbon, must be borne in mind : "These Popes had been chosen, not by the cardinals, but by lay-patrons" ... and "were insulted, imprisoned, and murdered by their tyrants; and such was their indigence, after the loss and usurpation of the ecclesiastical patrimony, that they could neither support the state of a prince nor exercise the charity of a priest". Further, as there is no question that in any case the Church was in great danger, it may be pointed out, again with Baronius, that the fact that the Church (which he compares to the ark of Noah) did not then perish is a striking fulfillment of the promise made to St. Peter that "the gates of hell should not prevail against it".

In fine, all who reflect on the lives of the Popes of the tenth century, especially if they be such as are content with the present position of dependence which has to be endured by the Holy Father in Rome, must ever remember that the history of the Popes of the tenth century "is the history of the Popes deprived of their temporal power.

Deprived of their temporal power, the Popes of the tenth century lost the patrimonies which had hitherto enabled them "to support the state of a prince and to exercise the charity of a priest". Some of their patrimonies were seized by the powerful, some were freely given away by the Popes themselves to their supporters; while, with regard to others, the supreme pontiffs were, so to speak, forced to fall in with the feudal ideas in vogue at the time, and to grant them to be held in feudal tenure, very often receiving but scant service in return. Hence we see Gregory V (998) granting to the famous Gerbert, archbishop of Ravenna, and to his successors, not merely the counties of Comacchio and Cesena, but even the city of Ravenna, with its district and all its dues, along with the right of coining money. And when, in the eleventh century, the Popes recovered temporal dominion, it was as Princes, and not, for the most part, as proprietors. Their territories became the "Patrimonium beati Petri" in a new sense, and yielded them only what was their due as ruler, and not as owner.

Without here going into any detail on the subject, we may note that one point cannot fail to impress itself deeply on the mind of the historian as he studies this period. That one point is, that the historical sources for it in general, and particularly for what relates to those who occupied the chair of Peter during its progress, are most unsatisfactory. Not only have the contemporary papal biographies, which for three centuries have provided us with a reliable source of information, ceased to be forthcoming; not only have even inscriptions, much less collections of inscriptions, ceased to be produced, but during the whole of the tenth century no remnant of the pontifical "registers has come down to us. Indeed, it may be questioned whether they were ever compiled. In Rome men would seem to have been so much occupied in trying to preserve their own lives or the smallest semblance of order, that they had no time to devote to the production of literary works of any kind. Hence, apart from the one-line contemporary notices which form, as it were, the continuation of the *Liber Pontificalis*, information on many of the Popes of the tenth century can only be procured from writers who were neither strictly contemporary nor had any intimate acquaintance with Rome. Hence authentic information about the Popes of this epoch is of the very scantiest, and it may be emphatically laid down that at least the vices attributed to some of the Popes of the tenth century are nothing like so well authenticated as the virtues of those of the ninth. Much of what is said against some of them may be true, but the evidence forthcoming to substantiate it is not enough to bring conviction to a judicial mind.

There is another important point to be borne in mind in this connection, and it is this : the essence of the Papacy, according to the Catholic point of view, is spiritual authority. No promise, it is pointed out, was made by our Lord that St. Peter and his successors should be either good men or temporal rulers. According to Catholic teaching, the line of the Popes was given to the world that through the ages there might be those who could always direct men aright in their spiritual necessities; who could always point out to them the right paths they must follow in their belief and conduct. To the Alpine traveller it is not the virtue of his guide that is to him of the first importance; it is his knowledge of the mountain paths. And if, in the period under discussion, it be proved that the sovereign pontiffs lost at once their virtue and their temporal authority, it is certain that they never failed in their office as spiritual guides to men through the mists and darkness of the mountainous desert of life. With regard to some at least

among the Popes of this period it was a case of doing, not as they did, but as they said. Fortunately, among the troubles of this weary period heresy was not one. Neither heresy nor schism added to the difficulties of the Roman pontiffs. They were not called upon to give any important guidance to the Church in what it had to believe or practise. No doubt the spiritual influence of the Papacy decreased during the century and a half of which we are speaking, but its spiritual prerogatives, unlike its temporal, did not fail; and at the close of this disastrous period it was to give abundant evidence of its undying life by suddenly manifesting the most astounding vigour in both the spiritual and the temporal spheres. Hence when writers freely speak of the growth or fall of the Papacy, the distinction between its temporal and spiritual side must never be lost sight of. As in a man the body may flourish, pine away, or die while the soul lives on, the Papacy in temporal matters may, as it often indeed has done, show every sign of life, decay, or even death, whereas its spiritual prerogatives always endure. And not only do they merely endure, but, speaking broadly, it would appear that the exercise of these prerogatives, even in non-essentials, has gone on steadily increasing since they were first bestowed on St. Peter. At any rate there can be no question that, at the present day, when the Pope is deprived of the temporal power so necessary for the full and free use of his authority, the exercise of his spiritual power is more far-reaching in its effects than ever it has been before in the history of the Church.

Though at this period but comparatively slightly connected with the West in matters either spiritual or temporal, the Eastern Empire, if perhaps better governed than the West, still resembled it in many unfortunate particulars. Its Church, united with the See of Rome more in name than in fact, was in a very unsatisfactory condition. Greatly distracted, owing, among other causes, to the fourth marriage of Leo VI, the Wise, it has been truly said of it that, by the year 963, "the Eastern Church had entered on that period of stagnation in which it lies at the present day. And the synods held at Constantinople during this dreary age only prove the sad state of the Eastern Church." With regard to the temporal affairs of the Eastern Roman Empire, we find the historian of Byzantine history in the tenth century making the same complaints about the scarcity of documents as the historian of the Papacy, and equally regretting the impenetrable darkness which covers many of the events he would elucidate.

Even the Far East shared the depression of the West; and the continent of Asia suffered in sympathy with that of Europe. "It is not a little singular", writes Mr. Beazley, "that at the very same period when the expansive energy of Western Europe, even in pilgrimage, seemed to have become practically exhausted, or at least unfruitful, both the Caliphate and the Celestial Empire should have suffered so severely from social and governmental disorder. The whole world seemed to receive about this epoch a certain lowering of its tide of life".

The annexed tables may well serve as a conclusion to this introduction, wherein we have seen "the more powerful oppress the weak, and men, like fishes of the sea, devouring each other". It may be hoped that they will be of use to the student who wishes to traverse the mazes of the tenth century.

Shadowy Kings of Italy and Nominal Emperors from the End of the House of Charlemagne to the House of Saxony.

Berenger I., duke of Friuli, 888-924
Guido, duke of Spoleto, 889-894
Lambert, son of Guido, associated with Guido, 891-898
Arnulf, king of Germany, descended into Italy, 894-899

Louis III, the Blind, king of Provence, 900-c.923

Other very Fugitive Kings of Italy.
Rodolf II., king of Transjurane Burgundy, 921-926
Hugo, king of Provence, 926-abdicates 945
Lothaire (son of Hugo), associated in the empire, 931-950
Berenger II, marquis of Ivrea, grandson of the emperor Berenger; Adalbert his son, elected with his father, 950. Both deposed in presence of Otho I. 961

Kings of Germany and Emperors of the Romans.
Carolingians
Arnulf, 887
Louis IV, the Child, 899
The Saxon dynasty
Conrad I., 911.
Henry I., the Fowler, 918
Otho I., the Great, 936.
Otho II., 973.
Otho III., 983.
Henry II., the Lame, 1002

The Franconian dynasty
Conrad II., the Salic, 1024.
Henry III., the Black, 1039.
Henry IV., 1056.
Henry V., 1106.
Lothaire the Saxon, 1125-1138.

Eastern Emperors.
The Macedonian dynasty
Leo VI., the Wise, 886.
Constantine VII., Porphyrogenitus, 912-958
Joint rulers, Alexander, 912-913. Romanus I., Lecapenus, 919-945.
Romanus II., 958-963.
Basil II., Bulgaroctonus, 963-1025.
Joint rulers, Nicephorus II., Phocas, 963-969.
The Macedonian dynasty
Joint rulers, John I., Zimisces,969-976.
Constantine VIII., 1025-1028.
Romanus III., Argyrus, 1028-1034.
Michael IV., the Paphlagonian, 1034-1042.
Michael V., 1042.
Constantine IX., Monomachus,1042-1055.

Kings of England.
Alfred the Great, 872.
Edward the Elder, 901.
Athelstan, 925.
Edmund I., 941.
Edred, 946.

Edwy, 955.
Edgar the Peaceable, 958.
Edward II., the Martyr, 975.
Ethelred II., the Unready, 979.
Edmund II., Ironside, 1016.
Canute the Great, 1017.
Harold Harefoot, 1035.
Hardicanute, 1040.
S. Edward III., the Confessor,1043-1066.

Kings of France.
Charles the Fat, 884.
Charles III., the Simple, 893.
Louis IV., d'Outremer, 936.
Lothaire, 954. Louis V., 986.
Hugh Capet, 987.
Robert, 996.
Henry I., 1031-1060.

FORMOSUS.
891-896.

Of the early career of Formosus (born 816), bishop of career of Porto, the successor in that see (864) of the deposed Radoald, a Roman and the son of one Leo, enough has already been said in the previous volume. There mention was made of his embassy (864) to Constantinople on the subject of the election of Photius, and of the great work he performed in converting the Bulgarians to the faith of Christ.

Formosus seems to have erected, during his pontificate, a memento of this latter episode of his life, in the shape of a painting in a little oratory beneath the temple of Claudius, near the church of SS. John and Paul. In this picture our Lord was represented in the midst of SS. Peter, Paul, Lawrence, and Hippolytus. At His feet were depicted a barbarian chief on one side, and Formosus on the other. The painting was discovered in 1689, and a copy of it was published by De Rossi. Even then, though the name was visible, the figure of Formosus himself had faded; and for some time past this interesting monument has become quite obliterated.

Formosus enjoyed the confidence of Hadrian II as he had that of Nicholas I; and, at first, seemingly, that of John VIII also. Then, suddenly accused (876) of ambitious scheming with Bogoris, king of Bulgaria, and of aiming at the Papacy, he fled from the face of the angry John, and afterwards swore never to return to Rome. Recalled, however, by Marinus I, and by him absolved from the oath he had unwillingly taken at the council of Troyes in 878, he was reinstalled in his position as bishop of Porto, consecrated Stephen VI, and was pressed to succeed him.

"Stephen, the son of Hadrian, having gone the way of all flesh, says Vulgarius, or whoever was the author of the *Invectiva in Romam*, "thy bishops and nobles, O Rome, thy clerics too, and the classes (*populus*) and the masses (*vulgi manus*) came together, and going to the episcopal church of the See of Porto, situated within the city, they acclaimed its bishop (Formosus) Pope". The same authority tells us how Formosus refused the high honor which was thus thrust upon him, and fled to the altar of his church, from which he had to be dragged clinging to the altar cloth. The date generally assigned to this event is October 6, 891; but neither the day nor the month are known with certainty.

As Formosus was a bishop already, he was not consecrated again; but, amid the greatest demonstrations of joy, was simply enthroned, and received the homage of all. He was, at any rate, the genuine choice of the Romans. He was chosen spontaneously by them without any pressure from without, and simply on account of his merits — his high birth and the nobility of his character. He was also seemingly chosen without opposition; for what Liutprand relates about a counter-election of Sergius is the result of utter confusion on his part of data persons. Sergius opposed John IX in 897.

Translations from see to see were at this time certainly regarded as uncanonical, but exceptions to the law against them had always been tolerated. A good cause had

always been held to be sufficient to justify a translation; and, in the case of Formosus, the Roman council of 898 declared that the satisfactory reason was present.

As the sequel proved, Formosus had many enemies. Some were hostile to him because they were opposed to translations from see to see under any circumstances; others because they thought that he ought to have kept to his oath and not returned to Rome; some, again, because they supposed he had been guilty of intriguing for the archbishopric of the Bulgarians, and others simply because he was not of their faction. Among these last was especially, as we shall see, the ducal, now imperial, house of Spoleto. But none of these parties made any decided move on the death of Stephen (V) VI. The election of Formosus was unopposed.

On the deposition of Charles the Fat (887) the Carolingian empire finally went to pieces. Arnulf, an illegitimate descendant of Charlemagne, possessed himself of Germany and aspired to be recognized as emperor, but had to recognize as kings, Odo, count of Paris, over the West Franks; Boso of Provence or Cisjurane Burgundy; Rodolf of Transjurane Burgundy (*Regnum Jurense*, the Juras and Switzerland); Berengarius of Friul, and Guido, duke of Spoleto (889), in Italy.

Guido, successful at first over his rival Berengarius, had had himself crowned emperor by Pope Stephen (V) VI (891). In the following year, in order to strengthen his hands in his unceasing struggle against Berengarius, who was still unsubdued in his Duchy of Friuli, he associated his son Lambert with him in the empire, and caused him to be crowned by Formosus in 892 (April 30?). But though the Pope had at one time written to Fulk, archbishop of Rheims, and a relative of the house of Spoleto, that he had a father's love for Lambert, and wished to keep an inviolable peace with him, he afterwards found it necessary (893) to invite Arnulf to come and free "the kingdom of Italy and the belongings of St Peter" from "bad Christians," i.e. from the oppression of the two emperors. As emperors the representatives of the house of Spoleto continued to act towards the Popes as they had done when they were merely dukes. They strove to further their interests at the expense of the Holy See.

Fighting, too, had begun again between Guido and Berengarius; and there was no one to check either the Greeks or the Saracens in South Italy. Formosus believed that the presence of a stronger monarch like Arnulf was necessary for the peace of the peninsula. He would be able to curb the grasping ambition of the house of Spoleto, and perchance prevent the further advance of Saracen or Greek.

With the Pope's *missi* to Arnulf went *primores of the kingdom of Italy*, some of them at least of the party of Berengarius. Arnulf received the envoys graciously, dismissed them with presents, and promised to enter Italy. This he did in the early part of 894, before the close of a very severe winter. Success attended his march at first, but fever, which invariably overtook the German armies during their descents upon Italy, fell upon his troops and forced him to return without reaching Rome.

The death of Guido (894) did not alter the situation which, as Duchesne notes, was almost that of the year 754. Formosus, Arnulf, and Guido or Lambert stand to each other as did Stephen III, Pippin, and Aistulf. Lambert, now sole emperor, seems to have again forced the Pope to place the imperial diadem on his head. But he could not prevent him from a second time sending (895) earnest entreaties to Arnulf to come to Rome. "By the advice of his bishops", the German king complied with the Pope request, and set out for Italy in the October of the same year. After overcoming the greatest obstacles, Arnulf at length appeared before the walls of Rome. Here a new and unexpected difficulty presented it. Instead of finding Rome in the power of the Pope, and its gates thrown open to welcome him, he discovered that the city was in the hands of Ageltruda, the mother of the emperor Lambert, that the gates were all closed against

him, and that the Pope was a prisoner. Ageltruda, the daughter of that Adalgisus, duke of Beneventum, who in 871 had seized the emperor Louis II, was one of the many Italian women of this period who distinguished themselves by their daring, if not always by their virtue. Astounded at this unexpected resistance, Arnulf turned to his troops to know what was best to be done. With courageous unanimity they all cried out that the city must be carried by assault. The storming was begun at once. The defenders were driven back from the walls with showers of stones, the gates were battered in with axes, and the walls shaken with rams, and scaled with ladders. By the close of the day "the Pope and the city were freed from their enemies".

There went out then to the Ponte Molle to meet the king, and to escort him into the city, "the whole senate of the Romans" and the "school" or colony of the Greeks with banners and crosses. Escorted into the Leonine city with the customary hymns and acclamations, Arnulf was honorably received by the Pope on the steps of the basilica of the Apostles. Formosus then led the king into the church, and "after the manner of his predecessors, anointed and crowned him, and saluted him as Augustus" (Feb. 22? 896). After arranging various matters, Arnulf received the homage of the Romans in St. Paul's. The oath of allegiance, which is inserted in the annals of Fulda, shows clearly that the obedience of the Romans to the emperor was to be second to that which they had to pay to the Tope. It runs as follows: "By all these holy mysteries of God, I swear that, saving the honor, obedience (*lege*), and fealty I owe to the Lord Pope Formosus, I will be faithful to the emperor Arnulf all the days of my life; and never will I to his detriment ally myself to anyone, nor ever afford any help to Lambert, the son of Ageltruda, or to his mother herself, towards worldly honor (imperial power); and never will I do anything in any way to hand over this city of Rome to Lambert or his mother Ageltruda".

Ageltruda escaped to Spoleto; but two of the chief nobles of the city were accused of high treason for having aided her to seize the city, and were exiled to Bavaria. Leaving one of his vassals, Farold, to guard Rome, Arnulf advanced towards Spoleto; but, attacked apparently with paralysis, as his father, Carlomann, before him had been (877), he had to withdraw into Bavaria. He never recovered from the stroke, but died on November 29, 899. Before the emperor reached Bavaria, the aged Pope he had come to aid had also died (April 4, 896).

Nothing could have been more unfortunate for Italy, and especially for Rome and the Papacy, than the departure and death of Arnulf. When his, the only arm capable of keeping anything like order, was withdrawn, not only was the whole country torn with intestine war, but the representatives of moral power in the world became the sport of petty Roman barons. Nothing more strongly justifies the efforts of Formosus in his endeavours to procure the active interference of Arnulf in Roman affairs than the sad events that happened in Rome immediately after his death.

Nine Popes succeeded one another in eight years. Raised to the papal throne by factions, several of them suffered a violent death at the hands of factions. It is and has been the fashion with some authors to blame John VIII and Formosus for imploring imperial protection, and much is said about their faithlessness to "Italy" by so doing. Much is written not only about the aspirations of national churches, but about the state of national parties at this time. It would, however, all seem to be beside the mark. It presupposes the playing of too high a game of politics for the period. Politics there were, and parties there were, but they were on a petty scale. To introduce our present ideas of European national politics into the tenth century is to convey a total misconception of the then existing state of affairs. Politics and parties were not then affairs of nations, but of individuals grabbing for power, and ready to ally themselves

for their own ends with any one, Christian or heathen, or whether he spoke the same patois as they did or not. As yet there were no more formed nations than there were formed languages. Europe was then aristocratic, feudal, and local, not national.

Before we turn to relate what is known of the ecclesiastical doings of Formosus, there still remains something to be said of his political action. On the death of Charles the Fat, the nobles of France, passing over a posthumous son (Charles IV, the Simple) of Louis the Stammerer, elected Count Eudes or Odo, the valiant defender of Paris against the Normans (885), to be their king. He was supposed to rule over the country between the Meuse and the Loire. But in the reign of this Pope certain of the nobles, probably as much to make head against the power of Eudes as from loyalty to the Carolingian dynasty, chose the boy, Charles the Simple, king (893).

Fulk, archbishop of Rheims, was the chief supporter of Charles, and succeeded in attaching to him the interest of Arnulf, an illegitimate Carolingian, and of Pope Formosus. The sympathies of a Pope were naturally with a scion of the house of Charlemagne; and Fulk did not fail, by drawing a strong picture of the vices of Eudes, to endeavour to arouse them in behalf of his protégé. He obtained from Formosus in Charles's interest several letters, of which Frodoard has preserved the outlines; and that too, though at the time he had his hands full with the house of Spoleto. Besides writing to Fulk to instruct him how he was to behave towards Eudes, the Pope adjured that prince no longer to molest King Charles in his person or property, but to grant a truce till Fulk could come to Rome. The bishops of France were at the same time invited to warn Eudes not to usurp what belonged to another, and to grant the truce. The young Charles was congratulated on his elevation to the throne, and on the devotion which he had expressed to the Holy See. He was also instructed as to how he was to rule. And as a pledge of his affection Formosus sent the young king the blessed bread which he had asked for.

At first no success attended the efforts of Formosus. Not only did the fighting between Charles and Eudes continue, but Arnulf took advantage of these troubles to harry that part of the country which was in the hands of Charles. Robbed by both Arnulf and Eudes, Fulk implored the Pope to order Arnulf by his apostolic authority not only not to harass Charles, but, on the contrary, to help him as one relative ought to help another. He also prayed Formosus to threaten Eudes with ecclesiastical censure, but pointed out to him that, in the present disturbed state of the kingdom, he could not come to Rome. The one thing which the archbishop had at heart was peace — not, as he told the Pope, because Charles's party was the weaker, but lest the resources of the kingdom should be so exhausted by war that it would become an easy prey to the Normans. The efforts of the Pope and the archbishop were at length crowned with success. First a truce was concluded between the two rivals, and then a final peace on the basis which Fulk asked the Pope to suggest to Eudes and the great ones of the kingdom. Charles was to succeed, on the death of Eudes, to the kingdom which was his by hereditary right, and meanwhile a partition of the kingdom was to be made, and a suitable portion assigned to Charles (896). Becoming sole king in 898 by the death of Eudes, Charles distinguished himself, as we have seen, by granting Normandy to the Northmen (911), kept the semblance of kingship till 923, and died in 929. The share of Pope Formosus in bringing about this peace, so important for France, is often passed over.

From the very first months of his pontificate, Formosus turned his attention to the Church in France. He nominated as his vicar, in accordance with occasional precedents, the archbishop of *Vienne*, Bernoin (Barnoinus), the brother of King Boso, and did what he could to remedy evils which seemed to be on the increase. Everywhere among both clergy and laity was the spirit of personal aggrandizement rampant. Simple bishops

were striving for the honor of using the pallium, while lay nobles were seizing the property of the Church. To put some check on the rapacity of the nobles, Formosus issued a sentence of excommunication against the powerful Richard, duke of Burgundy, brother of Boso, and one of the supporters of Charles the Simple against Eudes, and against Manasses, count of Dijon, and others. At the same time he ordered Fulk of Rheims to repeat the sentence against them. They are denounced by the Pope for having, amongst other crimes, been guilty of putting out the eyes of Theutbald, bishop of Langres, and of casting Walter, archbishop of Sens, into prison (896). For the same purpose, Formosus had already sent two bishops, Paschal and John, into France. By the order of the Pope, these legates presided at a council held at Vienne (892), where various canons were issued, condemnatory of the usurpations of Church property, and of the outrages offered to clerics. To restrain the ambition of certain bishops, on the other hand, Formosus authorized Fulk to convoke a synod and pass suitable decrees on this subject in the Pope's name. But whether such a synod was ever held, or another one which the Pope himself had ordered to meet at Rome in March 893, is not known. Fulk of Rheims had been summoned to the latter, which was to be held to avert the ruin with which the Roman Church was threatened, to take measures concerning the troubles in the Eastern Church, and to deliberate concerning a schism among the bishops of Africa, in connection with which deputies had come to Rome to seek a decision.

The following extract from Neale will show how it is that we are unable to furnish any details about the embassy from Africa here spoken of; though, at the same time, it furnishes a reason why such an embassy might well have been sent. “Of Chail II, the Catholic Patriarch (of Alexandria), history has preserved no particulars after the legation of Cosmas to assist in the re-establishment of Photius. He departed this life after an episcopate of more than thirty years (903), and the see remained vacant. He had been long preceded to the grave by his namesake (Chail III), the Jacobite Patriarch (899), and that see also remained vacant. This double vacancy seems to point to some persecution or affliction which both communions equally shared; but such is the ignorance or carelessness of the historians of the period, that we are unable to detail its nature, cause, or duration”.

Despite the difficulties and dangers of getting to Rome at this period, it was the pressure of similar difficulties and dangers at home that caused men to betake themselves thither, and to appeal for the protection of the Pope. Although at this time there were many whom no fear of God or of man would restrain, there were still left some who, if they feared not man, yet reverenced God, and the one whom they regarded as His vicar on earth, the Pope of Rome. Everything that was under his protection was sacred in their eyes. At all times, even during the darkest hours of this dark night of the Papacy, even when the occupant of the papal throne was personally unworthy of anyone's honor, men came to Rome to beg the Pope to cast his protecting mantle over them and theirs. Octavian might be despicable, but Pope John XII was the Vicar of Christ. In the reign of Formosus several abbots came to Rome to beg him to take their monasteries under his special protection. One, the abbot of Gigny, took the precaution of offering to the Pope the monastery which he and a relative of his had founded out of their own resources, "in order that it might remain immune". Servus Dei, bishop of Gerona in Spain, came to Rome to beg Formosus "to confirm by a privilege of his apostolic authority" the goods of his church.

In connection with this bull, it is interesting to note with Omont that it is still in existence. The most ancient papal bulls actually extant date only from the beginning of the ninth century. Up to the commencement of the eleventh century they were all written on papyrus, of from one to several yards in length. Their great size, and the

fragile nature of the material on which they were written, are enough to explain how it is that only twenty-three such bulls have come down to us. While Spain boasts ten of them, France eight, Italy three, and Germany two, it appears that England does not possess a single one.

Amongst the fragmentary correspondence in connection with his church which Frodoard has preserved for us, he has left enough to show that even Fulk of Rheims, who was generally on the right side, striving hard for reform along with the Popes, could be guilty of tyranny, and stand in need of papal correction. Heriland, bishop of Térouanne, presumably a friend of Fulk, driven from his diocese by the ravages of the Normans, fled to the archbishop of Rheims. Fulk temporarily placed him in charge of a diocese which at the moment happened to be without a bishop, and wrote to ask the Pope to confirm Heriland in its possession. He at the same time asked Formosus to give as successor to Heriland a man who from his birth and knowledge of their tongue would be more acceptable to the barbaric people who occupied Heriland's late diocese. When, however, it came to the Pope's ears that Fulk had, in giving the see, "like a benefice" *(beneficiali more*), to Heriland, set aside a lawfully elected candidate, and had even sent the said candidate into exile when he wished to turn to Rome for justice, Formosus sent him an order, "peremptory indeed, but fraternally expressed", to appear before him. With the issue of this, as of so many other affairs at this period, we are unacquainted.

England

Similarly, though we know that this Pope had relations with this country, the unsatisfactory nature of the historical data of the period leaves us very much in the dark in connection with them. Among a number of documents which Eadmer, the disciple and friend of S. Anselm (d. 1137), describes as in part obliterated through age, and, in part from the material on which they were written (papyrus), quite worn away, he found a letter of Pope Formosus to Plegmund, and he has cited a few lines of it.

Rome was at this period very well acquainted with the condition of things in England. Each year from 887 to 890 the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records the sending of alms or letters to Rome. The country, owing to the ravages of the Danes, was in a sorry plight, whether looked at intellectually and morally or physically. But in his kingdom of Wessex the great Alfred was making heroic exertions to improve the state of affairs. Doubtless with a view to seconding his efforts, Formosus made persistent efforts to rouse the bishops of the country to more energetic action. That he was well supported by Plegmund, one of the able and good men whom Alfred had gathered round him, appears from the following letter of the Pope to the bishops of England, which Malmesbury has preserved for us (895): — "When we had heard that the abominable rites of the pagans had revived in your country, and that like dumb dogs you kept silent, we were minded to cut you off from the body of the Church. But, as we have learnt from our beloved brother, Plegmund, that you have at last aroused yourselves .... we send you the blessing of God and St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and beg you to persevere in the good work you have begun ... Suffer not the flocks entrusted to your charge to be any further injured by a dearth of pastors. But when one dies, let another fit candidate be forthwith canonically elected to replace him on the motion of the primate. And he, as you well know, is our venerable brother Plegmund, whose dignity we will not suffer to be in any way lessened, but nominate him our vicar .... and by the authority of God and of blessed Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, we command all to obey his canonical dispositions".

What was the result of this letter is not satisfactorily known. The issue of the affair, as stated by Malmesbury, is clearly, to say the least, inaccurate, as he makes Formosus write in 905 to Edward, the son and successor of Alfred. However, out of the chaos of the statements on the subject two facts may be plucked. The Pope's recommendations relative to the bishoprics were carried out at last, somewhere about 909, in the reign of Sergius III, and about the same time Plegmund went to Rome "and took the alms for the people and for the king", says' the nobleman chronicler, Ethelwerd. No doubt he also went to confer with the Pope on the "bishopric question", though the action which Malmesbury attributes to Formosus must, with our later historians, be assigned to Sergius. At a council called together by Edward, and presided over by Plegmund, five new bishoprics, making seven in all, were established among the West Saxons. After the council Malmesbury tells us how "with splendid presents" Plegmund went to Rome (evidently the mission spoken of by Ethelwerd) and "with great humility pacified the Pope. He then read to him the decrees of the king, with which the Pope (i.e., Sergius) was greatly pleased". They were then duly confirmed by him, and such as should attempt to interfere with them were condemned.

Incidents such as this let us see how the unceasing exhortations, threats, and praises of the Roman pontiffs greatly helped to preserve the nations of the West from sinking back into the barbarism from which their ministers had first drawn them.

Germany

Formosus had also to intervene in the ecclesiastical affairs of Germany, in a case which had been begun under his predecessor. When Hamburg had been burnt by the Danes (845), Pope Nicholas I had joined its see to that of Bremen, and exempted the combined see of Hamburg-Bremen from the jurisdiction of the archiepiscopal see of Cologne. The loss of Bremen had never pleased the archbishops of Cologne; and Herimann made an attempt to recover the former rights of his see over it. This was during the episcopate of Adalgarius, who, according to a later writer, "received the pastoral staff from King Arnulf, and the pallium from Pope Stephen" (VI). The dispute was referred in the first instance to Pope Stephen, who ordered (890) both parties to send delegates to Rome. As only the representatives of Adalgarius, and then Adalgarius himself, presented themselves at Rome, Stephen decided not to settle the matter out of hand himself, "lest the affair might spring up again and the quarrel wound fraternal charity". But he ordered Fulk, archbishop of Rheims, to convoke in his name a synod to meet at Worms, "in the month of August, on the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the forthcoming tenth indiction" (892). At this synod both Herimann and Adalgarius were commanded to present themselves, and the Pope engaged to settle the question once for all on the report of Fulk. Before the time fixed for the holding of the synod, Stephen was no more. Formosus, however, adhered to what had been decreed by Stephen, and ordered Herimann to present himself at the council, and then, along with Adalgarius and delegates from the council, to come to Rome for the apostolical decision; for the council had only "to hear and discuss, and not to pass sentence". No synod was held at Worms, but a meeting of bishops, presided over by the archbishop of Mayence, took place at Frankfort. Of this assembly word was sent to the Pope, and he was assured that the suffragans of the diocese of Cologne unanimously declared that, up to the time of Adalgarius, the bishops of Bremen had always acknowledged their dependence upon the See of Cologne. The bearers of this information were priests who were sent by Herimann to represent him, and to plead his cause before the Pope. For some reason or other, Adalgarius on this occasion neither came himself to Rome nor

sent representatives. The consequence was that, for peace' sake, Formosus compromised. He decided that till such time as the city of Hamburg had recovered itself, the See of Bremen should remain united to that of Hamburg; and that in important ecclesiastical affairs the archbishop of Hamburg, not as a subject, but as a brother, should assist at the deliberations of the archbishop of Cologne. On the complete re-establishment of Hamburg, Bremen was to revert to Cologne. "Even among men of the world", concludes the Pope, "it is regarded as altogether unwarrantable to interfere with the rights of others; how much more unwarrantable is it that most holy bishops should transgress the boundaries laid down by the Fathers, and that those should quarrel who ought to set an example of peace to those subject to them". This decision of the Pope was upheld at the council or diet of Tribur (895), at which were present, besides the bishops, King Arnulf and many of the nobility. A "brotherly" subjection, however, was not calculated to satisfy either party — certainly not Adalgarius; and about the year 905 he obtained from Sergius III a bull annulling the decision of Formosus, and declaring the See of Hamburg-Bremen independent, in accordance with the decree of Nicholas I.

As we have said already, Formosus died (April 4, 896) soon after his coronation of Arnulf. It may be readily believed that it was with no regret that the octogenarian pontiff laid himself down to die. For though full details of his life are lacking, we know that trouble was his lot not only for some time before he became Pope, but even whilst he was wearing the tiara. The party which so outraged his memory after his death was no doubt actively working against him while he lived.

Frodoard praises the Pope for his chastity, for his nearness to himself, and for his generosity towards the poor. He tells how Formosus sowed the seeds of faith among the Bulgarians, and how he cheerfully suffered many trials, giving an example as to how adversity should be borne, and how no difficulties need be feared by the man who leads a good life.

Among the other good works placed to the credit of Formosus by his ardent anonymous defender, is mentioned his care for thw churches of Rome, some of which he either built, rebuilt, or adorned. And in this connection Benedict of Soracte, whose chronological arrangement of the Popes of this period is as extraordinary as his Latin, tells us that Formosus decorated the Church of St. Peter with paintings. Part of this decoration, of which a description has come down to us, was in existence till the demolition by Paul V of the eastern portion of the old basilica. According to tradition, the portraits of the Popes, which also adorned the old basilica, were the work of Formosus, and formed a portion of his adornment of the walls. According to Lanciani, there were in the old basilica of St. Peter two sets of portrait heads of the Popes, a lower set "on the freize above the capitals of the columns, the other on the walls of the nave above the cornice". The lower series was painted, or rather restored, by order of Nicholas III; the upper and more important series "seem to have been painted at the time of Pope Formosus, as were also the fresco panels which appear in the drawings of Ciampini". Needless to say, all this work, though important, was executed in very poor style. Benedict XII thought of restoring it with the aid of Giotto; but death prevented him from effecting any very extensive renovation.

In view of the suspicion as to his character, which must attach itself to the name of Formosus, because of the charges levelled against him by John VIII, and of the treatment his dead body received at the hands of his successor Stephen (VI) VII, it may be pertinently asked how those who knew him judged of him. It might not inspire us with much confidence in his virtue to find that his professed partisans, Auxilius, Vulgarius, and whoever was the author of the *Invectiva*, speak highly of him. And yet it must be acknowledged that they do so in a way which shows they feared not

contradiction in what they said in his praise. To his nameless defender, he is "a most excellent teacher (*doctor egregius*); and if he is raised to the Papacy, it is due "to his upright character" (*dignis ejus moribus promerentibus*). And if, on the contrary, he is degraded from his episcopal rank, the *Invectiva* knows not whether to attribute the deed to excessive (or ill advised) zeal, or to spite. Auxilius declares that, with the exception of his rivals, it was acknowledged by all that he was most devoted to fasting, prayer, alms-deeds, and good works of every kind; that his chastity was remarkable and showed itself in his angelical countenance. Vulgarius dwells equally on the abstemiousness and conspicuous purity of Formosus. These authors extol the success of his mission among the Bulgarians, and call attention to the splendid reception given to him by the people of Rome on his return at the close of 867 or the beginning of 868. As further evidence of his sound character, they point to the favor with which he was regarded by Nicholas I and by Hadrian II, to the unanimity of his election to the chair of Peter, and to the fact that nothing was said against him by his immediate successor.

But the praises of Formosus are sounded not merely by declared partisans. The librarian Anastasius, or whoever was the author of the *Life of Nicholas* in the *Liber Pontificalis*, testifies to his "great sanctity". In the preface to the Latin translation of the acts of the eighth general council, of which Anastasius was certainly the author, " "the holy life" of Formosus is spoken of, and in the letter at the head of his translation of the Greek biography of St. John Calybite (876), which the librarian addressed to Formosus, he cannot praise him enough. He extols even his physical beauty, and adjures the Romans not merely to cease to attack such noble sons of theirs, but to embrace them with the sincerest love. It was his "holy life" which won for him the confidence and praise of no less a person than Hincmar of Rheims. Even to the slanderer Liutprand, Formosus was "a most religious Pope". And he was all in all to the Bulgarian king Bogoris.

Against all this there is his condemnation by John VIII. By that pontiff he was accused of intriguing with Bogoris to be made bishop of the Bulgarians; of wishing to pass from his own see to a greater (viz. to that of Rome); and of treason against the emperor, Charles the Bald. The profound esteem which the Bulgarian monarch had conceived for Formosus might easily give rise to the first charge. What force there was in the last accusation may be gathered from the fact that it was to the kingdom of Charles that he fled for refuge. And his unfortunate association with many of John's enemies would furnish grounds enough for the suspicion that he was aiming at the Papacy. By Stephen (VI) VII, who so outraged his memory, the only accusation made against him to justify the vile treatment to which his body was subjected was his translation from the See of Porto to that of Rome. That Stephen acted as he did towards the corpse of Formosus from such a reason, is the less to be believed since he himself was a bishop when he became Pope. And as there is no indication that Formosus was an ardent politician with views acutely opposed to those of Stephen, it is hard to suppose that the action of the latter was caused by any fanatical attachment of his to the imperial pretensions of the house of Spoleto, or by any opposite devotion on the part of Formosus to those of the Franks. It is quite possible, however, that, as some suppose, Stephen was a mere tool in the hands of the empress-mother Ageltruda, that he was merely the instrument she employed to manifest her hatred of the man who had brought trouble on her house. If this is not the case, Stephen must have been a personal foe of Formosus; and in any case, his outrageous conduct with regard to him need not lessen our good opinion of that pontiff.

To account for the attitude of John VIII towards him, it may perhaps be fair to suppose that, with all his learning and piety, Formosus may have been devoid of a

sufficient share of "the cunning of the serpent". He may have lacked worldly astuteness enough to keep himself sufficiently aloof from the set upon whom fell the well-merited wrath of John VIII. If he was not simply a victim of calumny, it is more than likely that he was regarded by John as an enemy because he was seemingly being made a tool of by the unscrupulous party with which, by some bond unknown to us, he was connected. Formosus was condemned by John more owing to the faults of others than to his own. He had been chosen Pope "on account of his genuine piety and knowledge of divine things". But if he did not fulfil the expectations raised by his election, it was not because he ceased to be good and pious, but because he had always been somewhat deficient in character, and in ability to form a correct estimate of the character of others.

BONIFACE VI.
April? 896.

With Boniface VI, a Roman and the son of one Adrian, a bishop, we enter upon the gloomiest portion of the gloomy period of which we are treating. From the death of Formosus to the accession of John X, a period of eighteen years, we shall have to write the history, or rather we shall have to name, no less than eleven Popes. And if there is "nothing in a name", we shall certainly not have much to record to interest the reader in many of the Popes whose names will now be brought before him. And as we are dealing with a period of violent turmoil, it should not surprise anyone to find scum occasionally rising to the surface.

Of Boniface, who was certainly the successor of Formosus, and who reigned but fifteen days, and was carried off by the gout, it is sometimes said that he has no right to a place among the Popes, and that "the council of John IX of 898 pronounced his election null". It is urged that his election was due to a popular commotion and that before his election he had shown himself so vicious that he had been degraded from the subdiaconate and afterwards from the priesthood. This assertion is based on the third canon of the council just quoted. There it is decreed that, though Formosus was transferred from the See of Porto "from necessity and on account of his merits", no rule must be drawn from an exceptional indulgence. "Nor may anyone", it continues, "who has been degraded by a synod from any ecclesiastical rank, and not canonically restored to it, presume to advance higher, as Boniface, who had been deprived first of the subdiaconate and afterwards of the priesthood, was enabled to do by the aid of the arm of the people". As several most distinguished historians have inferred that the case here stigmatized is that of Boniface VI, it would perhaps be bold to say that the third canon of the council of John IX does not refer to the successor of Formosus. But it certainly may not; and several reasons make one hesitate to believe that it does. The Boniface of the canon is not styled Pope, nor is he connected with the See of Rome by any title whatever, while there is no doubt that Boniface VI was recognized as Pope by his contemporaries. Boniface VI would surely not have seemed to the council so deserving of condemnation as Stephen (VI) VII, who is nevertheless described (can. 1) as "of pious memory". It would appear then that, if the Boniface of the canon were the successor of Formosus, his name would have been qualified by some official addition, or by some description connecting him with the See of Rome. The more so that he was acknowledged as Pope, not only by his contemporaries, as we have remarked already, but also by later pontiffs, who quote a privilege of his in favor of the Church of Grado. Finally, if Boniface VI had been a degraded priest foisted by a mob into the chair of Peter, Frodoard would never have set him down as "almus", bountiful or gracious, and assigned him heaven as his reward.

The sepulchral monument of Boniface, whose pontificate of fifteen days was spent apparently in the month of April 896, seems to have been still standing "in the portico of the Popes" when Peter Mallius copied inscriptions in the days of Eugenius III.

STEPHEN (VI) VII
896-897

Stephen VII, called VI by such as do not include in the list of Popes the Stephen (II) who was elected Pope but not consecrated, was, according to the Catalogues, a Roman and the son of a priest John. Taking it for granted that Stephen was born before the said John was ordained priest, the reader cannot fail to be struck by the number of those who at this period became Popes, and counted a priest or bishop as their father. It must have been, even to married men, an object of ambition to be enrolled in the ranks of the Roman clergy. Hence, no sooner were they free from their matrimonial engagements, than many at once became priests.

The same Catalogues inform us that, before he became Pope, Stephen had been one of the Campanian bishops; and, more precisely, Auxilius says that Pope Formosus consecrated him bishop of Anagni, and that he had occupied that position for five years when he was elected Pope.

He was chosen to replace Boniface, if not at the beginning of May, at least before June 11, 896, as there is extant a diploma of the latter date which shows that Stephen was then Pope. It is frequently asserted that he was a violent partisan of the house of Spoleto, and bitterly opposed to the German Arnulf. But if that were the case, the agents of Arnulf, who were in power in Rome at the time of Stephen's election, cannot have known their man; and certainly at first Stephen dated his privileges by the years of the reign of Arnulf, and seemed to be in sympathy with him.

His pursuing the *History of the Church of Rheims* led Frodoard in due course to analyse the correspondence between Archbishop Fulk and Pope Stephen. After expressing his devotion to the See of Rome, and assuring Stephen, as he had already assured Formosus, that he was most anxious to visit "the threshold of the Apostles", but that various difficulties had interfered with the accomplishment of his wishes, Fulk informs the Pope that he has at length succeeded in bringing about peace between Eudes (Odo) and Charles the Simple. In his reply Stephen expresses himself as dissatisfied with Fulk’s excuses for not coming to Rome — others have contrived to come — and bids him present himself at the synod which he is going to hold in September 896. Unfortunately, we are not told for what end the Pope had determined to summon a council to which distant prelates were to be invited. It cannot have been for the purposes for which the infamous synod of the beginning of 897 was held. Stephen would never have dared to bring bishops, over whom he had no civil control, to witness the gruesome sight on which the assembly of 897 gazed. If a dignified council of many bishops from all parts had been held in September, perhaps the wicked farce of the following year would never have been perpetrated.

In sending an answer to the reprimand of the Pope, Fulk showed that he felt it; and felt it the more that he knew it was undeserved. He therefore begged the Pope not to listen to what uncharitable people might say against him. He renewed his protestations of loyalty "to the glorious See of the Prince of the Apostles and its holy rulers", informed the Pope he was sending to Rome a bishop to represent him, and assured him that, as soon as he really could, and Zuentibold (Arnulfs bastard son and king of Lorraine) ceased to block the roads, he would certainly" set out for Rome. In

conclusion, he begged the Pope "by his apostolic authority" to repress the tyranny of Zuentibold. We also find Fulk recommending his cause to a prelate at Rome. The result of all this was that Stephen granted his request to remain in his diocese for the time, but instructed him to send Honoratus, bishop of Beauvais, and Rodulf of Laon, to take part in a synod to be held at Ravenna. It would certainly seem, from these different allusions to the holding of synods, that Stephen had, at least in the beginning of his pontificate, a strong wish to promote the general good.

Except that he confirmed the privileges of the archiepiscopal church of Narbonne, and those of the monastery of Vezelay (Yonne), and deposed Argrim, to wh Formosus had granted the use of the pallium, from the See of Langres, we know no more of Stephen VII but what he did at the Roman synod of 897, which covered his name with lasting infamy, and brought about his death.

As an augury of the terrible events of which the year 897 was to be a witness, it opened with the complete collapse of the venerable basilica of the Lateran. This untoward event, mentioned in the Catalogues, is placed before the holding of the synod by the author of the *Annales Alamannici*. "Negligently built", writes Lanciani, " with spoils from earlier edifices, as were the other churches of the time of Constantine, the basilica had long since begun to show signs of decay. The walls of the nave rested on columns of various kinds of marble, differing in height and strength. These yielding under the pressure of the roof, bulged outward so far that the ends of the 'beams of the roof-trusses came out of their sockets, and the building collapsed".

The ghastly synod we have now to describe, fortunately unique in the history of Christendom, took place probably in the month of January 897. Our account of it may well be opened with the words with which Auxilius begins one of his pamphlets: "'Who will give water to my head, and a fountain of tears to my eyes? (Jer. ix. i); and I will weep, not as Jeremias, not simply for those slain in body, but, what is worse, for the loss of souls, and for the dire deeds which have been publicly wrought in the head of all the churches ... by whose blessings the whole Church fructifies, and by whose judgment the faults of all the world are corrected". But with the same Auxilius we may console ourselves that though we shall see "the floods descend and the winds howl, the same Lord comforts me who deigned to promise the Prince of the Apostles: 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (S. Matt. xvi. 18).

Unwillingly and in fear a number of the Roman clergy were gathered together in synod by the Pope's orders. As the emperor Lambert and his warlike mother Ageltruda had entered Rome "a few days before", it is very probable that Stephen himself also acted as he did in fear of the imperial pair.

No sooner, indeed, had Arnulf left Italy than his authority there came to an end. Berengarius and Lambert at once asserted their sway over sections of Italy, and put to death such of the imperial officials as opposed them. Ageltruda and Lambert, as we have just said, made themselves masters of Rome, and found there a willing or unwilling instrument of their spirit of revenge against the man who had favoured their rival Arnulf.

The body of the unfortunate Formosus, still more or less entire, but of course half corrupt, was disinterred, and dragged before the assembly. Clad in full pontificals, the corpse was placed on a seat, and a deacon was assigned to defend the accused pontiff. A formal charge was brought against him. "When once deposed he ought not to have performed the functions of his office; and if he did, he ought not to have passed from one see to another". On these counts Formosus was condemned. "If the Bishop of Rome", urges the *Invectiva*, "is not to be judged by any one during his life, after his

death is he to be judged by anyone? When put to the question, what reply did he make? Had he made answer, that horrible assembly would have broken up in abject terror, and fled from the place one after another. And the Lord God would have said : 'Formosus, who hath condemned thee?' To this he would have said: 'No man, Lord'; and the Lord would have added : 'Neither will I condemn thee".

However, by the synod of Pope Stephen, Formosus was anathematized and his ordinations declared null and void. Then was his dead body subjected to the most barbarous violence; it was stripped of its sacred vestments down to the very hair-shirt with which the unfortunate pontiff had mortified his body in life. Clad then in the garments of a layman, the body, after two fingers of the right hand had been cut off, was buried (c. February 897), by the order of Stephen, in some place reserved for the burial of pilgrims. It was even said that, when the body was being dragged forth for burial, fresh blood flowed out of its mouth on to the pavement. At this point our authorities, among whom up to this there has been an awful agreement, part company. While some, as Auxilius, state that Stephen himself, after a short time, ordered the body of his predecessor to be once more exhumed and then thrown into the Tiber, the ninth canon of the council (an. 898), so frequently cited, makes out with greater probability that this last outrage was due to treasure-seekers, who some time later had violated the tomb in the hope of finding valuables therein.

When this terrible synod was over, Stephen took measures to carry into effect what had been there decreed with regard to the ordinations performed by Formosus. He did not, however, interfere with any prelates at a distance, who had been consecrated by Formosus; nor, indeed, did he reconsecrate any who had been so ordained. But he made them sign and hand over to him a paper in which they declared that they resigned their offices.

But Stephen's career of violence was destined to be short-lived. He was seized, clothed as a monk, loaded with chains, thrown into a dungeon, and, somewhere about the close of July or the beginning of August, strangled. This much we know on good authority. It is so stated not only in his epitaph, composed by Sergius III (907), who, of the same faction apparently as Stephen, speaks rather approvingly of his conduct towards Formosus, but also by Frodoard and Auxilius.

But of the causes which brought about such a terrible termination to the life of a Vicar of Christ we have no information from reliable authors, or even from the gossip of Liutprand. We may conjecture that Lambert, unable or unwilling to care for the tool he had used, left him to the vengeance of a righteously indignant people; or what, under the circumstances, seems more likely, we may suppose that the faction of the nobility unfavourable to him got the upper hand, and took away his life lest he might ever be in a position to punish them for their rebellion.

In passing under review the conduct of Stephen towards Formosus, it is hard to resist the conclusion that it is to be ascribed, at least in part, to the evil influence of the house of Spoleto, which, from the time of John VIII, had shown itself capable of perpetrating any act of violence against the Popes. But the seemingly whole-hearted manner in which Stephen lent himself to serve what we suppose to have been the ill-will of Lambert, makes one fear that he had a share of that bitterly revengeful cruelty which has appeared but too often in the Italian from the days of the emperors Tiberius and Nero to those of Ezzelino de Romano and other tyrants of the later Middle Ages, and which has reappeared in the Italian assassins of kings and rulers of our own days. In every Christian century the hot hearts and cool heads of Italy have produced models of wickedness, side by side with men who have proved themselves masters in every

material art, and models in the science of the saints. Italians are the authors of hymns to the Living God and to Satan of well-nigh equal merit.

ROMANUS.
897.

Gallese, a town of some importance during the Middle Ages, nearly midway between Orte and Civita Castellana, which had already given one Pope (Marinus I) to the Church, was the birthplace of the short-lived successor of Stephen (VI) VII, Romanus. Pope in August, he was dead in November. From the Catalogues it appears that he was the son of Constantine, and priest of the title of St. Peter, *ad vincula*. One of them also adds that "he was afterwards made a monk". But as the same is said in other Catalogues of his predecessor Stephen, it is not unlikely that some ceremony of degradation was performed on that pontiff before he was strangled, and that the notice refers to him, and not to Romanus at all. Duchesne calls attention to the fact that St. Silverius and Christopher, who were both deposed, are also said to have been made monks.

Of the circumstances of his election, or of his attitude towards his immediate predecessor, nothing is known. It is possible, at any rate, that he was freely elected, and that he was no creature of the house of Spoleto; for Lambert must have left Rome soon after the trial of Formosus in order to make heal against Adalbert, marquis of Tuscany, the most powerful noble in Italy, who had thoughts of rendering himself independent. Romanus reigned long enough to grant the pallium to Vitalis of Grado, to confirm to the Spanish bishops of Elna (Rousillon) and Gerona, who had come to Rome for the purpose, the various possessions of their sees, and to coin money.

That he was a virtuous man may be inferred from the words of Frodoard : —

"Post hunc (Stephanum) luce brevi Romani regmina surgunt.
Quatuor haud plcnos tractans is culmina menses,
Aethere suscipitur, meritos sortitus honores."

THEODORE II.
897.

As this Pope only reigned for twenty days, it is very probable that the month of December saw the beginning and the end of his pontificate. But he did important work during that brief period, and deserved to receive high praise from Frodoard not only for his virtues, but for the efforts he made to quench the faction fires which were burning so fiercely in Rome. He was the son of Photius, and the brother of Bishop Theosius. He had been ordained priest by Stephen (V.) VI.

As soon as he became Pope, he showed that he disapproved of the action of Stephen (VI) VII in deposing those within the city of Rome who had been ordained by Formosus. He allowed them to resume their rights at once, returned to them and ordered to be burnt the written acts of resignation which Stephen had exacted from them, and caused them even formally to be restored to their functions in a synod·

Besides thus doing justice to the authority of Formosus,he did justice also to his outraged body. When writingthe *Life* of Stephen VII, we left the body of Formosus inthe Tiber. Of its recovery and subsequent treatment by Theodore, Auxilius has giventhe following account : "The same night that the body of Formosus was thrown into the Tiber (viz, by the treasure-seekers, as we suppose) a terrible storm broke over the city. The Tiber, as usual, was soon in a flood. Carried along by the rushing river, the corpse was freed from the weights which kept it down, and finally thrown up on to the bank near the Church of St. Acontius at Porto. Three days after this, Formosus appeared to a certain monk in a vision, and bade him go and bury his dead body which had been cast up on shore. The monk did as he was bid, but in fear buried the body secretly. Word, however, of what had happened was brought to Pope Theodore. By his orders, the body, still entire, was brought back to the city with the greatest pomp, with the singing of psalms and hymns, with lights and incense. Clad once more in pontifical vestments, it was conveyed to the basilica of St. Peter, and placed beside the *confession.* There, in presence of the Pope, Mass was said for the unhappy pontiff, and his body was restored to its tomb. Liutprand assuresus that he had it "from most religious men of the city of Rome" that when the body was brought to St Peter's, it was "reverentially saluted" by certain of the images of the saints.

Like his predecessor, he granted a *privilege* to the See of Grado. The one silver coin of his which is known, and of which Cinagli gives an illustration, bears on its obverse, like the coins of his two predecessors, the name of the emperor Lambert. On the reverse we find "Scs. Petrus" and the monogram "Thedr".

As his epitaph we will cite the words of Frodoard. He speaks in such high terms of this Pope as to make it matter for regret that he did not reign longer. To account for the very short pontificate of many of the Popes of this period, who are not known to have died by a violent death, it has been suggested that the faction leaders, who then controlled the pontifical elections, of set purpose placed upon the throne men who were either infirm or even older than were most of their predecessors at the time of their election :

Quo (Romano) rapto breviore subit fastigia sorte
Dilectus clero Theodorus, pacis amicus.
Bis denos Romana dies jura gubernans,
Sobrius et castus, patria bonitate refertus,

Vixit pauperibus diffusus amator et altor.
Hic populum docuit connectere vincula pacis.
Atque sacerdotes concordi ubi junxit honore,
Dum propriis revocat disjectos sedibus, ipse
Complacitus rapitur, decreta sede locandus.

According, then, to the canon of Rheims, Pope Theodore was beloved of the clergy, a friend of peace, temperate, chaste, affable, and a great lover of the poor. He was taken to his throne in heaven whilst he was working to promote peace and harmony both among clergy and people, and was restoring to their rights those who on earth had been robbed of them.

SERGIUS III.
904-911.

ORDAINED subdeacon by Marinus (882 - 884), and deacon by Stephen (V) VI, Sergius, a Roman, the son of Benedict, was consecrated bishop of Cere by Formosus. He was apparently one of those deacons who had been consecrated bishops from some motives of jealousy, says Auxilius, and against their wishes, but who had afterwards ceased to act as bishops. Ambitious of the Papacy, they would be deacons again. According to the same authority, whose interest, it must not be forgotten, was to depreciate Sergius, inasmuch as he had proclaimed the ordinations of Formosus null, Sergius declared himself that he had been consecrated against his will. And it is certain that he did not act as bishop of Caere for more than three years, i.e., most likely not after the death of his consecrator. Bishops returning to the rank of deacons to become Popes proves clearly enough that the ambition of men can scarcely be restrained by regulations.

Of the exact circumstances of his election at the time of the death of Theodore (898), of which we have already spoken, we have no information. He was doubtless elected by the party unfavourable to Formosus. At any rate it is certain that his party was not then "the larger and saner", and that he spent seven years *in* exile "among the Franks". Here we may follow Liutprand, though his utterly confused statements about Sergius cannot generally be accepted, and say that he betook himself to the court of Adalbert II of Tuscany. During his exile "among the Franks" Sergius made not the least attempt to act as an antipope. We may then emphasize the fact that, because he was chosen by a party to be Pope during a very factious period, it does not follow in the least that he was stained with any unholy ambition. He made no effort to be again chosen Pope till the violent usurpation of Christopher. And even then, if we ought to follow the authority of Frodoard, John the Deacon, and his epitaph, he waited till he was invited by the people, who could not tolerate the conduct of Christopher.

Sergius accepted the invitation of his friends, but took care not to come to Rome helpless. He advanced with a force of Adalbert's men at his back. This gave occasion to Auxilius and Liutprand to say that he obtained the Papacy "by the aid of the Franks". However, the usurper Christopher was in prison before Sergius entered Rome, and the latter became Pope, January 29, 904.

During the seven years of his pontificate he displayed no little energy. Unfortunately, however, he was too much of a party-man to try to extinguish the fires of faction. He at once showed himself attached to the memory of Stephen VII, and a bitter opponent of Formosus and his friends. In the epitaph which he wrote for the former, he expresses his approval of Stephen's action against "the haughty intruder Formosus". In his own epitaph his rival John IX is described as a "wolf"; and the bishop of Uzès is blamed for designating the intruder Formosus as a bishop (sacerdos).

Unfortunately, too, he did not confine himself to words. In a synod he procured the assent of the Roman clergy to the rejection of the orders conferred by Formosus, and, as a consequence, to the rejection of those given by such as had themselves been ordained by Formosus. This consent was, according to Auxilius, wrung from the clergy

by threats of exile to Naples and other evils, and by violence and bribery. Many, therefore, submitted to reordination.

The ecclesiastical world of Italy was at once thrown into a ferment. Such as had been ordained by Formosus, and were at a safe distance from Rome, did not fail to let their indignant cries be heard. Pens were set going, some to make inquiries, and some in defence of the work of Formosus. The question of the validity of ordinations performed by bishops illegally holding their sees was not thoroughly understood at this period; and the opponents of Formosus, or, what is much the same, Sergius's defenders, of whom unfortunately no writings are known, did not fail to put forward arguments against such ordinations. Hence Leo, bishop of Nola, endeavored to collect the opinions of learned men on the subject. Among others he consulted Auxilius. Though, as he expressed himself, "he was sitting in Peter's barque", Auxilius declared that he felt the tempest. He had been summoned to the synod by Sergius, but had declined to go. He contended that no one was bound to obey unjust commands; and, taking no notice of the excommunication pronounced against him by the Pope, continued to say Mass. To justify his contumacy, he went the length of distinguishing between the respect due to a see and to its occupant. "Due honour", he wrote, "must be paid to the different sees. But if those who occupy them deviate from the right path, they are not to be followed, *i.e.*, if, as has often happened in the case of the sees of Constantinople and Alexandria, they act against the Catholic faith, no heed must be paid to them". He would await, he said at the conclusion of one of his tracts, the just judgment of a general council, which, it is more than hinted, is superior to the Pope.

Whilst reading the words of Auxilius, we seem to be in the midst of the controversies of the Great Schism. As Saltet, whom we have here been following, very pertinently observes, it is most dangerous for authorities to drive their subjects to distinguishing between just and unjust commands. They will soon make other distinctions which are much less innocuous.

In compliance with the request of Leo, Auxilius issued one pamphlet after another showing that consecrations performed by a bishop, whether lawfully occupying his see or not, were as valid as baptisms performed by Catholic or heretic.

Vulgarius too entered into the fray in a less scientific but correspondingly more fierce manner. He would have the more important concerns, the *cause majores*, settled by the common consent of all the bishops, and not "by any pomp of domination"; and he called on the primates to check the pride of the Romans (*Romanicos fastus*). But Vulgarius was very far from always writing in this strain. Both in prose and in verse, some of which was of a highly artificial character, Sergius, "whose fair face", he declared, he would venerate as long as "the bright stars ran their course", was proclaimed by Vulgarius as "the glory of the world, the incomparable, the harbinger of all good", etc. This Would be after he had been summoned to Rome to explain or justify his wild writing. For we find him dispatching letters not only to the Pope, but to the officials of his court, begging that he might be allowed to remain in peace where he was. To the former he writes that, though raised to the seventh heaven by the Pope's gracious letter, and though regarding the Pope as a god among men, he fears the gods when they show themselves too kindly disposed (*nimium faventes*)! And because he has reason to lament, he continues, that morality, and all other good with it, has perished, he is afraid of everything, and begs the Pope to grant him one only favour, viz. his absolution and benediction on the one hand, and leave to stay in his cell on the other. Bishop Vitalis, "the apocrisiarius of the supreme see and first senator", is asked to use his influence on his behalf that he may not have to go to Rome, "as the anger of the drawn sword is not easily repressed", but that he may get the Pope's forgiveness. His

request was no doubt granted. And if, as seems to some very likely, he was the author of the *Invectiva,* he managed in that work to defend the cause of Formosus without attacking Sergius. What was the upshot of this ordination controversy there is no means of knowing. Very little historical light pierces the darkness of this period. Some writers, however, from the words of the epitaph of Sergius, which tell how he loved all ranks of men alike, conclude that before he died he mitigated the severity of his judgments, and ceased to trouble such as had been consecrated by Formosus.

As the theological bearings of historical facts are not the concern of an historian, this is not the place to inquire whether the action of Stephen (VI) VII and Sergius III in declaring the ordinations of a bishop null shows that they at any rate were not infallible. We may, however, be permitted to remark that, though it was not till the thirteenth century that the doctrine of the Church on the transmission of the power of order reached its full development, and came to be definitely formulated and generally understood, it is certain that there never was any doubt that an ordination validly conferred could not be repeated. Whatever erroneous views certain medieval Popes may have held as to the circumstances which may invalidate an ordination, or whatever faulty lines of conduct some of them may have followed in consequence of the theories they held, nothing more can be deduced from their action than that, in the words of the great Gallican historian, Natalis Alexander, their errors were those of private men, and not those of the heads of the Church. Not one of the pontiffs who are known or are believed to have held false views on the conditions which invalidate ordinations ever attempted to impose his ideas on the Church. And the Popes, according to Catholic belief, are only infallible when they proclaim; what is revealed truth to the Church at large.

Other discoveries, besides those of pamphlets of Auxilius and Vulgarius, have in comparatively recent times given a further insight into Sergius and his times. A *rotulus*, discovered in the archives of Prince Antonio Pio of Savoy, lets us see that Sergius was a man at least of strength of will. John of Ravenna, grievously oppressed by Albuinus, count of Istria, appealed to Sergius for protection. This the Pope at once promised, and wrote (c. 907) to the count bidding him refrain from harassing the property of the archbishop. As might be anticipated, it required more than letters, in these times of violence, to bring nobles to order. Albuinus continued his depredations. But Sergius was not at the end of his resources. Berenger of Friuli was anxious to wear the imperial crown, and had approached the Pope through his ambassadors with that end in view. Sergius, therefore, not only wrote (91o) to the bishop of Pola, the most important bishop in Istria, begging him to exhort Albuinus to cease his evil conduct and make amends to the archbishop, but made it known, through the medium of the same letter, that "he would never bestow the (imperial) crown on Berenger till he promised to take the (Istrian) March from Albuinus, and give it to some better man". We may be sure that, if it rested with Berenger of Friuli, Count Albuinus did not continue his depredations much longer.

While what we have said about the firmness of Sergius will have served to show both his views as to his rights with regard to the imperial crown and the aims of Berenger;what we shall proceed to say about the Pope’s kindness and sympathetic feeling will call our attention to the continued ravages of the Saracen in the south of Italy and of the Hungarian in the north. Among other places devastated by the terrible ravages of the Saracens was the Church of Silva Candida, one of the suburbicarian bishoprics which developed into the sees of the six cardinal-bishops in the immediate neighborhood of Rome. Silva Candida, which was united to the See of Porto by Pope Calixtus II, was at this time ruled by Bishop Hildebrand. Unable of his own resources to

repair the damage done to his episcopal see, Hildebrand turned to the Pope, and the assistance he asked for he received "in the current eighth indiction", i.e., in 905.

Another of his bulls shows Sergius rejoicing that the church of the great abbey of Nonantula, burnt by the Hungarians, had been rebuilt. In an old catalogue (eleventh century) of the abbots of Nonantula, published by Waitz, there is the following entry :— "In this year (899) the Hungarians came into Italy. On September 24 the Christians met them in battle on the river Brenta. There the Hungarians slew many thousands of the Christians and put the rest to flight. They then advanced as far as Nonantula, slew the monks, set fire to the monastery, burnt many books (codices), and devastated the whole country. The venerable Abbot Leopard, however, with a few of his brethren, managed to escape, and for some time remained in concealment. At length they thought it safe to return. The monastery and its church were rebuilt, and the abbot sent to consult with Pope Sergius, who then ruled the Roman and Apostolic Church, regarding the reconsecration of the (abbey) church and the losses the monastery had sustained at the hands of the barbarians and other wicked men". The Pope in his reply gave the abbot a choice of one out of three bishops, whom he named, to whom he might apply to have the new church consecrated, and confirmed the privileges of the monastery.

Passing over the privileges granted by Sergius to the famous monasteries of St. Gall in Switzerland, Vezelay in France, to the churches of Vienne and Lyons and to the chapter of Aste, as these records are somewhat monotonous; and equally neglecting his dealings with William, the good bishop of Turin, and with the Church of Cologne on the Hamburg-Bremen question, for the simple reason that our knowledge of these transactions is of the haziest; and, after what has been already said on the subject in the Life of Formosus, saying no more about Sergius and England, we may now turn our attention to the East.

At this period there was peace and union between the Catholics under the Emperor Leo and those under the among the various rulers of the West. But the causes which were to bring about the great separation between them were gaining strength. Of these the most insidious, because the least comprehensible, and because it was the only one which had at least a seeming dogmatic basis, was the alleged difference in belief among the Greeks and the Latins on the doctrine of the Descent of the Holy Ghost. That the Latins had deviated from revealed truth on this difficult question was an assertion which had been frequently repeated among the Greeks since the days of Photius. Finding that it was being propagated with renewed vigour, Sergius took steps to combat it. And so the council of Trosle, in the diocese of Soissons, presided over by Herveus, archbishop of Rheims, decreed (June 909) in their fourteenth canon : "As the Holy Apostolic See has made known to us that the blasphemous errors of a certain Photius against the Holy Ghost are still vigorous in the East—errors which teach that the Holy Spirit proceeds not from the Son but from the Father only—we exhort you venerable brethren, together with us, in accordance with the admonition of the ruler of the Roman See, after a careful study of the works of the Fathers, to draw from the quiver of Holy Writ arrows sharp enough to slay the monster which is again springing into life." We may be sure, however, that the "fury of the Normans," though soon (911) to be lessened by the grant of Normandy to them, prevented the Fathers of the council from being able to turn their attention to any *arrows* but those of a very material nature.

One consequence, however, of this action which Sergius caused to be taken by the synod was that his name was struck off the diptychs by the Patriarch Sergius II of Constantinople (999-1019). This we learn from a Greek document of the first half of the twelfth century. Another similar document of the last half of the preceding century, apparently not so well informed, declares that Pope Christopher was the first Pope who,

in his profession of faith, which he sent to Sergius, then (?) patriarch of Constantinople, asserted that the Holy Ghost proceeded "from the Father and from the Son.'"

While the canon of Trosle is an indication that the poison brewed by Photius is slowly weakening the religious union between the East and West, another intestine commotion in the Church of Constantinople reveals the fact that as yet the Catholic Church among both the Greeks and Latins is still one. The Emperor Leo, misnamed the Wise, though he had himself in this particular brought the civil law into harmony with Greek canon law by causing it also to subject to penalties those who elected to marry a third time, not only married a third wife, but, when her death left him still without male issue, introduced into the palace as his concubine Zoe Carbonospina, a grand-niece of the historian Theophanes. By her he had a son (905), afterwards the literary Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus. On condition that he ceased to live with a concubine, the patriarch, Nicholas the Mystic, or private secretary, solemnly baptized the child. Leo fulfilled his promise to Nicholas by breaking his father's law which forbade fourth marriages. He married Zoe, and crowned her himself! The indignant patriarch, who showed himself of very different mettle from the average occupant of the See of Constantinople, excommunicated the priest who had performed the nuptial ceremony, and interdicted Leo from entering the Church. Both parties turned to the Holy See; and the legates, whom Sergius at once dispatched to Constantinople, declared the marriage valid, as fourth marriages had not been condemned by the Church at large. Nicholas, however, though he acknowledged the supremacy of Rome in words, would not give way. He was accordingly banished, and Euthymius, the emperor's confessor, was named patriarch in his stead. Without expressly approving of third or fourth marriages, Euthymius recognized Leo's marriage as necessary for the public good (for an heir to the throne was very desirable), readmitted the emperor to ecclesiastical communion, and crowned Constantine. A schism among the clergy of Constantinople was the immediate result of this compliance on the part of Euthymius, and of the obstinate opposition of Nicholas. Before he died, Leo repented of what he had done, and reinstated Nicholas. But the latter had to reckon with the party of Euthymius, who showed themselves very hostile to him. Hence, during the reign of Alexander, a joint-ruler with the young Constantine VII, he wrote to Pope Anastasius III, not, as he said, to ask him to condemn his predecessor or the repentant Leo, but to condemn those still alive who were causing their patriarch such trouble. "This both your dignity and the honour of the Roman See require of you". Of any action taken by Anastasius in response to this letter we have no knowledge. Some nine years after Nicholas had written to Anastasius, a synod *(silentium)* was held at Constantinople (92o) in which fourth marriages were utterly condemned. The patriarch hastened to inform John X that, after fifteen years of trouble, peace had come to the Church of Constantinople. "But because we seek your fraternal love, the good offices of which towards us have been hindered by the disorders of the times, and desire the customary union of the churches, we have hence decided to send you this letter that, all memory of offence being laid aside, we may win your Holiness to that sincere friendship and union of minds which is proper among pastors of souls. This will be brought about when legates have been sent on both sides, and when it has been harmoniously decreed that the fourth marriage, which brought such dissensions and scandal into the Church, was permitted not for itself but for the sake of the person. The occasion required that a more indulgent treatment should be meted to a prince, lest, irritated by a refusal, he might do worse. And hence your name will, as of old custom, be celebrated with ours *in* the sacred diptychs of the Church of Constantinople". The emperor is set down as making the same request, and as sending to the Pope the protospathar Basil, while the patriarch sends a priest with him. John is asked to send a

legate in return, "who with us, in accordance with the canons of the Church, may by his learning and advice correct anything which may still stand in need of correction".

From a letter of Nicholas to Simeon, the powerful king of the Bulgarians, it appears that John sent two legates, both bishops, Theophylactus and Carus. "By their coming", wrote the patriarch, "an end was put to the scandals which the fourth-marriage question caused amongst us, peace was restored to the clergy, and synods were held with marvellous unanimity of minds. In a word, the Churches of Rome and Constantinople were so welded together in one united faith that there was nothing to prevent us from enjoying that communion with them we have so ardently longed for."

Without pausing to note how this marriage difficulty showed on the one hand the greater breadth of view of the Roman Church, and, on the other, that at this period East and West were united under the primacy of the See of Rome, it remains to add that the schism among the Greeks themselves was not healed, as Nicholas had fondly hoped. After his death (925), the party of Euthymius was to the fore till the very end of the century.

In connection with the deposition of Nicholas, it may be noted in passing that the tenth century saw well-nigh as many patriarchs arbitrarily deposed by emperors at Constantinople as Popes by factions at Rome.

While endeavouring to close a schism in the living Church of Constantinople, Sergius III., of whom for some little space we have lost sight, was engaged in repairing a very important material church at home. This was the famous basilica of the Lateran, which, as we have seen, went to ruin in the days of Stephen (VI) VII, and which, by all the chroniclers of his time, Sergius III is credited with restoring.

From inscriptions which he found in various parts of the basilica, and of which copies are to be seen either in the body of his work on the Lateran basilica or in an appendix to it in the Sessorian MS. 290, and from other sources, John the Deacon has put on record the following account of the work of Sergius. After recounting the building of the basilica by Constantine in honour of our Saviour and in commemoration of St. John the Baptist, and its fall in the time of Stephen (VI) VII and its remaining in ruins till the time of the recall of Sergius, John continued: "Whilst the intruders occupied the Apostolic See, they took from the basilica all its treasures, all its ornaments of gold and silver, and all the vessels which had been presented to it from its foundation. Divine service was no longer celebrated within its walls, but it was abandoned to thorns and briars. Sick at heart at the desolation of this most glorious building, Sergius entirely rebuilt and refurnished it", at the same time covering its walls with frescoes. A long inscription in prose, which John quoted, not only set forth that Sergius accomplished what he did though "placed in the midst of many disorders", but also enumerated the different objects, images, crucifixes, etc., of silver "and most pure gold" with which he supplied the basilica. "All these things has the devoted lord Sergius III offered thee; nor will he cease to make offerings to thee as long as his soul rules his body". In yet another inscription it is proclaimed that the basilica was like Mount Sinai: from the latter was the old Law given; from the former laws are issued to elevate everywhere the race of men.

There would appear to be a little exaggeration in some parts of the language of the worthy Deacon, or of the inscriptions from which he quotes. It is quite impossible to think of any other "intruder" who could have robbed the basilica but the antipope Christopher; and we can have no reason to doubt that the fallen church occupied the attention of all the successors of Stephen (VI) VII, for we have actual evidence of one of them, Pope John IX, endeavouring to prepare the way for its repair. The new building, at any rate, seems to have become very dear to the Popes, for “henceforward,

during a course of two hundred years, it served, instead of St. Peter's, as the burial-place of the greater number of the Popes"

By such as are prepared to yield full credence to party pamphleteers, to the party pleadings of Auxilius, and to Vulgarius, who at one time accuses Sergius of murder of his two predecessors and at another calls him "a god among men, the glory of his country, on whose life Rome depends for her happiness"—by such, no doubt, Sergius will be regarded as ambitious and cruel. But we imagine that not even these will be too ready to accept the story told by Liutprand which impugns the chastity of Sergius in addition. In fact, the more importance one attaches to the pamphlets of Auxilius and Vulgarius, the less importance can he attach to the accusations of Liutprand. It cannot be doubted that, had these writers known anything against the moral character of Sergius, they would not have failed to record it. But if, on the contrary, a preference should be felt for the authority of Liutprand in estimating the character of Sergius, such preference, it would appear, can only be entertained by a violation of the dictates of sound historical criticism; for, by his hopeless confusion of Sergius with Stephen (VI) VII, Liutprand shows that he did not know about whom he was talking. And such an authority as Muratori declares repeatedly that Liutprand is a very second-rate witness for what did not occur in his own time.

His evidence then, whatever it may be worth concerning the immorality of Sergius, is as follows :—Theodora, the grandmother of Alberic II, *i.e.* Theodora I, whom he designates as a shameless harlot, obtained, "in no unmanly way", supreme power in the city of Rome. She had two daughters, Marozia (I) and Theodora (II), women more abandoned than their mother herself. By their marriages, legitimate and illegitimate, with various distinguished persons, popes, dukes of Tuscany, and kings of Italy, they were enabled to work their will in Rome. By Pope Sergius, Marozia, so says Liutprand, had a son, afterwards Pope John XI; and with John X, both before and after he became Pope, she is said to have had illicit intercourse. Hence various writers have described the government of Rome at this period as that of *a Pornocracy.*

That these women had great influence in Rome at this period can scarcely be doubted. Benedict of Soracte, quoting the words of Isaias (III. 4), "the effeminate shall rule over them", is at one with Liutprand as far as that statement goes. And we have already seen the husband of Theodora I described by Vulgarius as "the lord of the city". The faction of Theophylactus and his family were certainly dominant in Rome in the days of Sergius, and of the Popes that succeeded him during some sixty years; and if the *Patricians* Crescentii were indeed, as we have supposed, descended directly from Theodora I through her daughter Theodora II, then it may be said that the house of Theophylactus swayed the destinies of Rome till the accession of the German Popes. The title of this volume, therefore, might well have been, "The Popes and the House of Theophylactus".

Theodora and her daughters, then, may easily have had great influence in Rome, and yet not have been the abandoned women that Liutprand would have us believe they were. Wives and daughters of the heads of a dominant faction, especially if endowed with grace of body and mind, would naturally occupy an influential position; and such a proud position Theodora and her daughters may have acquired without that wholesale prostitution of their charms and persons of which speaks that indecent gossip and imperial partisan, Liutprand. And unless Vulgarius was one of the most audacious flatterers that ever disgraced mankind, Theodora I cannot have been the disorderly creature that Liutprand paints her. Vulgarius addresses her as a most holy, venerable, and God-beloved matron, the odour of whose piety is spread everywhere, and says that he has heard *from many* of her holy life and conversation; and he rejoices that God has

set her as a shining example to the world. Especially does he praise in her a virtue which he declares to be greatly wanting in the world, *viz.* her chastity. Marozia and Theodora could, then, have been much worse than their mother, and yet still have been good.

Returning to the subject of this biography, we may ask: Was John XI the son of Pope Sergius by the abandoned Marozia? Liutprand says he was, and so does the author of the anonymous catalogue in the *Liber Pontificalis* in his one-line notice of John XI. But the catalogue by no means deserves at all times the respect which Duchesne seems disposed to allow it. It is certain that the notice of Sergius himself in the catalogue was not written down during the lifetime of that pontiff; nay, apparently not for some time after it. For, speaking of the inscriptions set up by him in the Lateran, the author of the catalogue says that they can be read "to this day". Men do not write in that way of an inscription erected a few years before. Liutprand's assertion was not written down till about fifty years after the supposed criminal intercourse. While, then, authors anything but strictly contemporary call John XI the son of Sergius, the careful, respectable, and contemporary author Frodoard twice describes John XI as "the brother of Alberic". What more natural than to believe that, as Alberic was confessedly the son of Alberic (I) and Marozia, so also was his brother, John XI? Besides, what is left on record of the deeds of Pope Sergius certainly suggests a man "in the midst of troubles" indeed, as he said himself, but a man devoted to work, and not to luxury. When Duchesne speaks of him as "revengeful, cruel, and mischievous", he evidently regards as true all that Auxilius, and especially Vulgarius and Liutprand, have said about him; and, with regard to Liutprand especially, it must be repeated that he is wholly unworthy of credence with regard to Sergius III and John X. He confuses, as we have seen, this very Sergius whom he so freely accuses, with Stephen VII. In referring to John X he makes mistakes of all kinds about his See of Ravenna; and, when speaking of his death and of his successor, apparently knows nothing of the two pontiffs who immediately succeeded him. Sergius was, unfortunately, a pronounced party-man, and anxious for the supremacy of his party, but the charges of revengeful cruelty and lust brought against him by Vulgarius and Liutprand must be pronounced "not proven"; for the charge of his having murdered his two immediate predecessors rests solely on the authority of a wretched sycophant (Vulgarius), and that of his illicit intercourse with Marozia rests chiefly on the word of a careless, spiteful retailer of indecent gossip. Men of that stamp may tell the truth about a personal or political opponent, but their character causes a judicial mind to hesitate about believing what they alone say to his deep discredit. We may then hold with Muratori : "Had the biography of this pontiff been written, and come down to our times, I firmly maintain that his character would have appeared in a very different light from that in which the father of the ecclesiastical annals (viz. Baronius) was too easily led to present it."

When he says that "the denarii of Sergius III are not marked with the name of the Emperor Louis", Gregorovius must have been following the mistake made by Cinagli, who, as was noticed in an earlier volume of this work, assigned to Sergius II a coin bearing the names of both Sergius and Louis, which seemingly could only have belonged to Sergius III. It is true, however, that most of the extant coins of Sergius III were struck after the year 905, and bear only the names of the Pope and St. Peter. On the reverse, besides the name of St. Peter, some of them have a figure of the saint wearing a mitre. One couples the name of Sergius with the significant epithet "Salus patrie".

That Sergius died in 911 is certain, but whether on April 14 (Duchesne) or about June (Jaffé) is not so clear. Mallius, who has preserved this Pope’s epitaph, confusing

him with Sergius I, says he was buried in the Church of St. Peter, between the Silver gate and that of Ravenna. His epitaph he gives thus:

Limina quisque adis Papae metuenda beati
Cerne pii excubiasque (exuviasque) Petri.
Culmen apostolicae Sedis is, jure paterno
Electus, tenuit, ut Theodorus obit.
Pellitur Urbe pater, pervadit sacra Joannes,
Romuleosque greges dissipat ipse lupus.
Exul erat patria septem volventibus annis ;
Post populi muftis Urbe redit precibus.
Suscipitur, papa sacratur, Sede recepta
Gaudet, amat pastor agmina cuncta simul
Hic invasores sanctorum falce subegit
Roman ecclesiae judiciisque patrum.

It tells of his uncanonical election *(jure paterno)* on the death of Theodore, of his expulsion from the city, of the usurpation of John IX, of his seven years of exile, of his recall at the prayer of the people, of his love for all his flock, and of his condemnation of the usurpers of the Holy See. That he was, moreover, worthy to be ranked with bishops who were saints, is not said by his epitaph, but by his contemporary, Nicholas, patriarch of Constantinople.

ANASTASIUS III.
911-913.

OF the two successors of Sergius III, it may be said that nothing is known except that it appears from their epitaphs and from Frodoard that they were good men and were an honor to the See of Peter. Anastasius, a Roman, and the son of Lucian, became Pope in some month, perhaps in April (Duchesne) or June (Jaffe), in the year 911.

In the following year he granted Ragembert, bishop of Vercelli, the use of the pallium; and besides renewing the privileges of the Church of Grado, he is credited by Sigonius, who as usual gives no authority for his statement, with granting various distinctions to the bishop of Pavia at the request of King Berenger. The bishop was to be allowed to have a canopy (*umbella*) carried over him, to ride a white horse, to have the cross borne before him, and in councils to sit at the Pope's left hand.

Little as we may know now about many of the Popes of certain periods, various striking pieces of evidence have sometimes survived which show that, though to us Rome and the Popes may at times look obscure enough, they were often at those very times bright and lightsome to their contemporaries. This is not unfrequently true of Rome and the Popes of the tenth century. While Anastasius III sat in the chair of Peter, little Wales was ruled by a wise king called Howel Dda, or *the Good*. Dissatisfied with the existing state of the laws, the king, with some of his bishops and nobles, betook himself to Rome "to consult the wise in what manner to improve the laws of Wales". On the strength of the information there obtained, the king, after his return to Wales, drew up a new code of laws; "and after that Howel went a second time to Rome, and obtained the judgment of the wise there, and ascertained those laws to be in accordance with the law of God and the laws of countries in receipt of faith and baptism". According to the ancient Welsh document whence the above quotations have been taken, Howel went to Rome to get his laws confirmed sometime between the years 920 and 930. But the preface to the Laws themselves, according to the Dimetian Code, assigns the date of Howel's visit to the pontificate of Anastasius, though it gives the year as 914. It says: "After the law had been all made ... Howel the Good ... went to Rome, to Pope Anastasius, to read the law, and to see if there were anything contrary to the law of God in it; and as there was nothing militating against it, it was confirmed ... The year of Christ, when King Howel the Good went to Rome to confirm his laws by papal authority, was 914". Rome must indeed have been "a city on a mountain" when, even amid the darkness and confusion of the tenth century, it was looked up to from the deep valleys of Wales as the abode of light and learning.

While in Rome the political situation, which left the Pope in situation subordinate to a dominant faction, remained unchanged, elsewhere events were in progress which were soon to have a marked effect on affairs in Italy and its chief city. The influence and power of the Greek emperor was steadily increasing in south Italy. This state of affairs was so far fortunate that it furnished John X with an additional resource when he gave his great blow to the Saracen power in that quarter. In Germany the terribly disastrous reign of Louis the Child came to an end in 911. His was a reign during which contemporaries tell us that every man's hand was against his neighbour's; that the nobles, who ought to have been promotors of peace, set an example of strife; that the

law was trampled underfoot; and that the common people murmured and were completely out of hand. With the death of Louis the Child the Carolingian dynasty in Germany, strictly speaking, came to an end. However, as his successor, Conrad the Franconian, was a Frank, and was thought to be connected with the family of Arnulf, he is reckoned with the Carolingian sovereigns of Germany. On his death (918) the royal power passed, in the person of Henry I, to the house of Saxony, a house which, especially under the Othos, was to exercise an extraordinary influence on the Papacy. It was also during the reign of Anastasius that Rodolf II succeeded to the throne of Transjurane Burgundy. We shall soon see him fighting in Italy for its iron crown.

At least two coins of this Pope, bearing his name and that of St. Peter, are known. Anastasius was buried in St. Peter's about the middle (in June or August, following Duchesne or Jaffé respectively) of the year 913. We are indebted as usual to Mallius[1] for his epitaph:—

Vatis Anastasii requiescunt membra sepulchro
Sed numquam meritum parvula claudit humus.
Sedem apostolicam blando moderamine rexit
Tertius existens ordine pontificum.
Ad Christum pergens peccati vincula sperat
Solvere clementer omnia posse sibi.
As given in Watterich (iI. 86), it has the following two lines in addition : —
"Undique currentes hujus ad limina templi
Ut praestet requiem, poscite corde Deum

The epitaph tells us that the tomb enclosed indeed the bones of Anastasius III, but could not contain his merits, and that he ruled the Apostolic See right well. He died trusting that his sins would be forgiven him. "Do you who from all quarters come to this temple, pray God to grant him rest".

LANDUS.
913-914.

SOME twelve years ago there was discovered in the neighbourhood of Rome a bronze coin of this Pope. On the obverse were the words, "Landus P. P.", and on the reverse were the heads of SS. Peter and Paul, with the letters "S. PA. S. PE". This coin serves, among other purposes, to prove that this Pope's name was Lando (in Latin Landus) and not Landone (Lando).

Concerning Lando, then, a native of the Sabina, and the son of Taino, we know, from Frodoard, that he was a worthy man who sat on the chair of Peter for some six months. A Ravennese document proves that he was still alive on February 5, 914. He reigned, then, from July (Duchesne) or August (Jaffé) to February (Duchesne) or March (Jaffe) in 914, and is credited with having granted a privilege to the Church of St. Saviour's in Forum Novum in the Sabina.

The words of Frodoard about him are as follows. Jaffé corrected the initial *Quando* of the text as we now have it into Lando, and would also have the *ut* of the second line changed into *un*:—

Lando (quando) dein summam Petri subit ordine Sedem,
Mensibus hanc coluit sex undenisque (ut denisque) diebus
Emeritus Patrum sequitur quoque fata priorum.

JOHN X.
914-928

IF history in general repeats itself, so certainly does its biographical department. In reading the life of John X, the mind instinctively adverts to that of John VIII. In the hope of putting a term to the existing state of chaos, and of promoting the sacred interests of peace, both pontiffs strove to impart new life to the imperial idea. Both of them brought about leagues, and fought in person against the savage hordes of the Saracen in Italy. For their political freedom at home both of them had to contend against an unbridled nobility. If there was intestine strife in the Church of Constantinople, reference was made to both John VIII and John X, that peace might be restored to it. Both strove, though in different ways, to attach the Slavs to the Roman Church. And if a threat of excommunication was thought necessary to bring kings to a sense of their duty, neither of them was afraid to employ it. In all countries, both in the East and in the West, were heard the names of John VIII and John X when there was peace and order to be promoted. Of both of them it may be said that their energy in the promotion of good was untiring. And, if the Annals of Fulda have told truly of the end of John VIII, as a reward for all their zeal for the general welfare, both perished by a violent death. Hence, as in the case of John VIII so in that of John X, most writers are of accord that he is "unquestionably entitled to respect"—at least for the sum of his qualities. "For however the archbishop of Ravenna might be no example of piety or holiness, as the spiritual head of Christendom, he appears to have been highly qualified for the secular part of his office. He was a man of ability and daring, eminently wanting at this juncture to save Rome from becoming the prey of Mohammedan conquest." Gregorovius goes so far as to give it as his opinion that, in vigour and independence of character, John X was superior to John VIII, and was the foremost statesman of the age. And at the conclusion of his account of this pontiff he writes "John X, however, the man whose sins are known only by report, whose great qualities are conspicuous in history, stands forth amid the darkness of the time as one of the most memorable figures among the Popes. The acts of the history of the Church praise his activity, and his relations with every country of Christendom. And since he confirmed the strict rule of Cluny, they extol him further as one of the reformers of monasticism."

That which caused Baronius and earlier authors, who were not cognisant of many documents which have since been brought to light, to execrate the memory of John, and that which makes even modern writers speak in his praise with a certain amount of reservation, is the account of him to be read in the pages of Liutprand. That writer, who may be said to be solely responsible for the charges of immorality brought against Sergius III, was only born during the pontificate of John X, and makes as many mistakes in his story of that Pope as he did in that of Sergius III. However, he relates that whilst a certain Peter, the second in succession from Romanus, was archbishop of Ravenna, he had occasion frequently to send John, who was then his procurator *(minister suae ecclesiae),* to Rome on business. Captivated by his handsome appearance, Theodora I "compelled" him to sin with her repeatedly. In the meanwhile, the See of Bologna falling vacant, John was chosen its bishop, but before his consecration as bishop, Peter of Ravenna died. By the influence (*instinctu*) of Theodora,

John, against the canons, usurped the archiepiscopal see. Then, as the Pope who consecrated John at Rome died soon after he had performed that act, Theodora, unable to bear the thought of the distance that separated her from the object of her affections, "compelled" John to desert the See of Ravenna and usurp that of Rome.

In this short narrative there is a complete confusion of time and person. Of time : according to Liutprand, the Pope who consecrated John died shortly *(modica temporis intercapedine)* afterwards, and was succeeded by John. Now, it is certain from authentic documents that John was archbishop of Ravenna as early as the year 905, and consequently, that he did not succeed his consecrator, who must have been Sergius III; nor was the interval between his consecration as bishop of Ravenna and his enthronization as Pope merely a trifling one. Of person : the bishop Peter, mentioned by Liutprand, if anybody at all, must have been Peter, bishop of Bologna, who ordained John deacon. The bishop of Ravenna at that time was Kailo. Leaving, then, to such as prefer to accept it, the story of Liutprand, "who was born during John's pontificate, and the value of whose statements is diminished by the frivolity of his character", John's early career will now be sketched from more reliable sources.

Though it might be argued from the catalogue of Peter William that the subject of this biography, the son of another John, was a native of Ravenna, there seems to be a reliable tradition that he was really born some seven miles from Imola, at a place on the Santerno, whence the appellation "of Tossignano" is added to his name. Ordained deacon by Peter, bishop of Bologna, he was elected in 905 to be archbishop of Ravenna. According to Liverani, he had, whilst archbishop, to vindicate his rights both against a would-be usurper of his see, and against the abbot of the famous monastery of Nonantula, who was anxious to free it from the control of the archbishops of Ravenna.

From the ancient chronicle of Monte Cassino, just cited, it appears that John was invited to be bishop of Rome *by the nobles; i.e.*,by a faction of them probably. Of this party Theodora may very well have been one, if not the head. It is generally agreed that John of Ravenna took possession of the Roman See in March 914. That he is called an intruder into the Holy See by various historians more or less contemporary, is due to the fact that they disapproved of translations from see to see, and called all such as left one see for another intruders.

From whatever motive John was summoned to be the head of the Church, whether it was the one assigned by Liutprand; whether it was because he was known to be an opponent of the ordinations of Formosus; or whether it was because he was thought to be qualified for the position, certain it is that he at once showed himself the man whom the times imperatively needed.

Great defeat of the Saracens

Casting his glance round the Church to ascertain what called most urgently for his attention, John soon saw that no good could be done by him until the terrible ravages of the Saracens on the Garigliano and in the Sabina were stopped. These marauders had been the scourge of south Italy from before the middle of the preceding century; and, from 882, when they established themselves on an eminence above the right bank of the Garigliano which separated the petty principalities of Gata and Capua, they were constantly ravaging the surrounding country even up to the walls of Rome. The famous abbeys of Monte Cassino, of Farfa, and of St. Vincent on the Volturno had all been sacked by them. To no purpose had Pope Stephen (V) VI brought about an attack on them. Equally fruitless was the assault conducted in 903 by Atenulf I, prince of Capua. The Saracens replied by desolating the patrimony of Silva Candida.

Urged on as much by indignation against the people of Gaeta, who had basely allied themselves with the enemies of Christendom, as by hatred of the Saracens themselves, Atenulf had already been endeavouring, before the accession of John X, to obtain the aid of the Greek Emperor Leo against the infidels. Accordingly, when the Pope consulted him as to what was best to be done against them, he bade him seek help from Byzantium, and from Camerino and Spoleto. "If we conquer", he concluded, "let the victory be imputed to God and not to our numbers. If we are defeated, let our discomfiture be set down to our sins, but not to our want of effort"

John took the proffered advice, and vigorously seconded the efforts of the princes of Capua. His legates were dispatched in all directions. Ships were asked from Constantinople to prevent aid from coming to the infidels by sea; and, realizing the importance of deepening the idea of Christian unity, the Pope sent, with many presents, legates to Berenger to offer him the imperial crown in exchange for his help. Where John VIII failed, John X succeeded. A Christian league was formed. Owing especially to the diplomatic address of the Greek Admiral Picingli, even the various petty princes of southern Italy for once acted in harmony. With the forces of King Berenger, *i.e.*, with the troops of the northern parts of Italy, and with those of the south, and supported by the Greek fleet, the Pope took the field in person, along with the Marquis Alberic I, in the spring of 915. After some preliminary engagements at Baccano and at Trevi, the Saracens were driven to their fastnesses on the Garigliano. A three months' blockade ensued. At the end of that period, reduced to despair by hunger, the Saracens, burning their homes behind them, endeavored to cut their way through their besiegers. Animated by the presence of the Pope, who freely exposed his person, the allies met them with the greatest courage, pursued those who succeeded in cutting their way through the Christian lines, "and in this way, by the help and mercy of God, utterly eradicated them from those parts in the year of our Lord's incarnation, 915, the third indiction in the month of August." For this victory the Pope had to pay, just as his namesake John VIII had had to do on a similar occasion. The duke of Gaeta was induced to abandon his Saracen allies only on condition that the grant of Traetto, etc., made him by John VIII, was secured to him by John X. At any rate, it was confirmed to him, “because, for the love of the Christian faith, he had fought hard to drive the Saracens from all the territory of the apostles”. For long years after, the place where this most important engagement was fought was known as “The Field of Battle”; and an extant inscription shows that local buildings served for a considerable time to keep fresh the memory of the happy day when the Saracens were expelled from their fortress on the Garigliano.

Although this campaign of John is called by Muratori “a glorious undertaking”, the appearance of the “Vicar of Christ, the Pacific”, at the head of an army seems to have shocked that pious and learned ecclesiastic. For our own part, however, remembering that our Lord was not always “The Pacific”, but that He could become angry, make a scourge, and drive men before Him by means of it, we are content to regard the warlike achievements of John as a “glorious undertaking”, simply and unreservedly. Good work had to be done, and John did it. The influence of the Pope alone was then powerful enough to bring together into harmony, even for a short space, the discordant elements which then composed the ruling powers in Italy. What his influence alone could bring together, his presence alone could keep together. John's appearance in the Christian camp on the Garigliano gave courage to the soldiers and unity to their leaders. And this was the view of his action which Rome took of his deeds at the time. Benedict of Soracte tells us of the magnificent triumphal reception accorded by the Romans to the victorious pontiff and to the Marquis Alberic, who had fought against the Saracens “like the bravest of lions”. Be all this as it may, an act of no little

importance, for the advancement of the cause of law and order in Italy, had been accomplished by John X. In proceeding to place the imperial crown on the brow of King Berenger, the same sacred cause was again furthered by him.

Blind, and so confined to his ancestral kingdom, it was obviously impossible that Louis of Provence could exert any influence which would make for the regeneration of the peninsula. The only man in it calculated, from his power and nationality, to command any respect at this period was King Berenger. To him, then, had John naturally turned. And though such historical records as we possess have not left us any precise account of the share that Berenger had in the league against the Saracens, it cannot be doubted that he did promote its ends, and that he received the imperial crown as the promised reward of his services. The details of his coronation are furnished us by his anonymous panegyrist. With such troops as he could muster, Berenger marched to Rome. Great was the joy of the populace when the king's heralds announced his approach. Looking forward to an amelioration of the existing state of things, the people streamed forth to meet and welcome the king, who, as usual, passing beneath the Mons Gaudii, or Monte Mario, encamped in the Neronian Field, about a mile from Rome. Thither to greet him proceeded the Senate and the different Scholae of the foreigners, all chanting the usual laudes, and bearing banners ornamented with the heads of eagles, lions, wolves, and dragons. Each nation acclaimed the emperor-elect in its own language. First the Romans, then the Greeks, and then the other nationalities in order. The procession was closed by the son of the consul (Theophylact), and by the brother (Peter) of the Apostolicus (John X), who, in token of submission, kissed the feet of the king. Riding on one of the Pope's horses, Berenger advanced through the surging masses of the people anxious to see the new emperor to the vestibule of St. Peter's, where at the top of the steps the Pope was awaiting him. Dismounting from his horse, Berenger ascended the steps with no little difficulty, so demonstrative in its greetings was the pressing crowd. After he had been greeted by the Pope with kiss and hand-shake, both stood before the gates of the basilica, while Berenger renewed all the promises made by his imperial predecessors to the Roman See. The gates were then thrown open, and, as the Pope and the king entered the basilica, the clergy intoned the "laudes" in their honour. After praying before the shrine of St. Peter, the Pope and the king adjourned to the palace adjoining the basilica. On the following Sunday, probably December 3, amid the excited shouts of an easily aroused crowd, who called on the Pope "by the chains of the Master (St. Peter)" not to delay the coronation, Berenger was anointed and crowned. Again were raised the "laudes", praying for long life for the new emperor, and that he might have strength to free the empire from the burdens under which it was groaning.

... Imperiumque gravi sub pondere pressum
Erigat.

But for the evil times, sighs the panegyrist of Berenger, John and Berenger might have been Sylvester and Constantine the Great.

The donations of previous emperors to the See of Peter were then confirmed by Berenger, and forbidden to be alienated; while, in accordance with precedent, no small sum of money was distributed among the people.

But the work accomplished by John, which might have been productive of so much good for Italy, was destined not to last. As we have frequently remarked before, while at this period the great nobles of Italy were thinking of nothing but their own personal gain, only the Popes had at heart the advantage of the whole country. "It must

candidly be admitted," says Gregorovius, writing of this period, "that during a long period the Papacy was the sole power in Italy, even in a political aspect, and that in its absence the country would have sunk into yet deeper distress". In the present case, finding that in Berenger they would soon have a master, Adalbert, marquis of Ivrea, Berenger's own son-in-law, Odelricus, count of the palace, Lambert, archbishop of Milan, and others conspired against the emperor, and summoned to the throne of Italy Rodolf II, king of Transjurane Burgundy. He came at the end of 921 or at the beginning of 922; and about the same time too came the dread Hungarians. Whether summoned by Berenger or used by him as they chanced to be in Italy, the Hungarians, or some of them, fought for the emperor. The condition of Italy may be more easily imagined than described. Despite his Hungarians, the tide of war set in steadily against Berenger, and in the midst of it he fell by the knife of an assassin (March 924).

But, true to their plan of keeping themselves independent, while they played off one foreign ruler against another, certain nobles now invited into Italy Hugh, king of Provence, the successor of Louis the Blind, and the grandson of Lothair II by his mistress Waldrada. This time the fickle jade Fortune turned against Rodolf, and he had to return to his ancestral kingdom (926). In the summer of the same year, "God, whose will it was that Hugo should reign in Italy, brought him by favouring gales to Pisa", according to the expression of his protégé Liutprand. This unworthy monarch, who showed that he had fully inherited all his grandfather's lust, as even Liutprand allows, and whom Muratori stigmatises as "un picciolo Tiberio, una solennissima volpe, ed un vero ipocrita", is set down by the former as a man of equal learning and bravery, of no less boldness than skill, as a man who honored God and those who loved religion, who looked carefully after the poor, who was eager for the honour of the Church and religion, and who loved and honored learned men.

It would seem that John had been largely instrumental in bringing Hugo into Italy. Not only does Frodoard say that it was arranged at *Rome* that Hugo should be king of Italy, but the Pope's envoy was among the first to welcome him at Pisa. And soon after he had been acknowledged king of Italy at Pavia, he had an interview with John at Mantua, and concluded some treaty with him. The terms of the agreement are not known, but it has been conjectured that John stipulated for aid against the growing power of Marozia. If so, it will be seen that he did not get it.

So far, the events themselves and their sequence are certain. We have now to treat of a state of things of which some of the issues are known with certainty, but not the events that led to them. Being in the dark, we can but walk carefully, feeling our way. In 925 died Alberic I (the Upstart); and, to strengthen her position, his widow Marozia married Guido (Wido or Guy), marquis of Tuscany. Later writers, such as the author of the Greek chronicle of the Popes, Martinus Polonus, and other thirteenth century authors, speak of a difference having arisen between Alberic and the Pope. They are so far in harmony with the contemporary evidence of Benedict of Soracte that what he attributes to Peter, the Pope's brother, they attribute to Alberic. Later writers then, as confusing Alberic with Peter, had better be left aside, and the narratives of Frodoard, Benedict, and Liutprand followed. Alberic, who had fought and triumphed side by side with the Pope, we therefore suppose remained true to him. After his death, and her marriage with Guido, the ambition of Marozia had freer scope. A struggle for power soon commenced between the newly married pair and the Pope. They first directed their hostilities against John's brother Peter. Compelled to fly the city, Peter entrenched himself in Horta, and invoked the aid of some of the bands of Hungarians, who, as we have seen, had as early as 922 penetrated as far as Apulia. And it is precisely in this year

(926) that Romuald of Salerno, only a twelfth century writer, it is true, chronicles the presence of Hungarians in the neighbourhood of Rome.

At length, presuming, no doubt, that the terrible ravages of the Hungarians, who had laid waste the whole of Tuscany with fire and sword, had sufficiently tamed its marquis and his wife, Peter returned to Rome. But Guido was as crafty as his half-brother, King Hugo. He contrived secretly to collect a body of troops, and with them made an attack (928) on the Lateran palace when Pete was off his guard, and had but few soldiers with him. He was cut to pieces before his brother's eyes, while John himself was thrust into a dungeon. How long he lingered in prison, or how exactly he died, cannot be stated with any certainty. The most trustworthy of our authorities, Frodoard of Rheims, makes him live on in prison till the following year (929), where he died, according to the general belief, from grief. “Pope John”, he records, “was deprived of his temporal authority (*principatus*) by a certain powerful woman named Marozia, and, whilst confined in prison, died as some say by violence, but according to the general opinion from grief (929)”. Benedict of Soracte also implies that John did not lose his life by any act of violence. Liutprand, the Annals of Beneventum, and other authorities of less weight assert that John was either choked or suffocated with a pillow. According to a tradition, noted by Liverani, John was seized whilst saying Mass, was hurried off to precipitous Veroli, nearly midway between Frosinone and Sora, and incarcerated in a cruel dungeon in the castle of St. Leucius. A movement of the people in the Pope's favor caused his enemies to take him back to Rome and put him to death. While therefore it is probable that John X died a natural death, it is possible in his case, as in of his great namesake John VIII, that he died by violence.

The circumstances attending the death of John X show us in the first place that Hugo, in whom the Pope seems to have placed hopes, was unable or unwilling to help him, and that we have certainly reached the times spoken of by Bishop Bonizo of Sutri (d. 1091) in his hopelessly confused jottings regarding the Popes of the tenth century, when "the Roman nobles seized the supreme civil power", and the days over which the monk Benedict laments that Rome had fallen beneath the yoke of women.

John and the Slavs

Whilst all these important political events, which terminated so disastrously for him, were in progress, John was watchfully attending to matters ecclesiastical both in the East and West. What he accomplished for the peace of the Church of Constantinople has been already narrated. But not with the Greeks only had he dealings in the east of Europe. He was in communication with the Slavs also, though at what period of his pontificate is not known with certainty. However, if John never thought of them before, he must have done so during the last two dread years of his pontificate; for, if the so-called Lupus Protospata and Romuald of Salerno have not made any mistake, the south of Italy was harried in the year 926 not only by Greeks, Saracens, and Hungarians, but also by Slavs.

Despite the prohibition of Stephen (V) VI and of later pontiffs, the Slavonic tongue continued to be used in the Mass and the Liturgy of the Church generally, not only among the more Eastern Slavs under the influence of the Church of Constantinople, but also among those of Dalmatia, where the Latin rite had long been in more or less general use. SS. Cyril and Methodius had introduced the use of the Slavonic liturgy among them because, as they told Pope Hadrian, they found them so utterly rude. Very wisely, then, had their action been approved by Hadrian II and John VIII. These pontiffs naturally concluded that it was not absolutely necessary that Mass

should be said in Latin or Greek, and that it would be a mistake to alienate men from the Church for the sake of something which was not essential. Other Popes, however, with less wisdom it would seem, did not take the view of Hadrian and John VIII. Of a surety, in order to draw closer the bonds of unity, it is desirable that the great sacrifice of the New Law should be offered up everywhere in the same language; and so, no doubt, it was the proper thing for John X to prevent the Slav liturgy from replacing the Latin without reason. To this end, in response to a request from the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of the country, he sent two bishops into Dalmatia, and with them various letters. The first (c. 924) was addressed "to our brother John, archbishop of Salona (Spalatro), and to all his suffragans". In it John expressed his astonishment that they had so long neglected to visit the Roman Church, the rock of the faith; and said he had learnt with sorrow that a doctrine which was not contained in Holy Writ, but in Methodius, was being preached in their province. He exhorted them boldly to correct "throughout the Slavonic land" what stood in need of amendment, but in such a way that they presumed not to deviate from the doctrine of his envoys, and he told them to follow the custom of the Roman Church, and say Mass in Latin, because a good son should speak as his father dictated; and, as the Slays are "most special sons of the Holy Roman Church," they must remain in the doctrine of their mother. Another letter to the same effect was addressed to Tamislaus, king of Croatia, and to Michael, most excellent duke of Zachulmia (Herzegovina), "to our most reverend brother John, archbishop of the most holy Church of Salona, to all his suffragans, to all the Zupans, and to all the priests and people throughout Sclavonia and Dalmatia". In addition to repeating what he had already said to the archbishop, the Pope gave them an important piece of instruction when he begged them to have their children trained in the science of God from their very tenderest years, so that by their exhortations they might themselves be drawn away from the allurements of sin.

The Pope’s words were not without their effect. A council was assembled at Salona. Besides vindicating the primacy of Dalmatia and Croatia for the bishop of Salona, and passing various disciplinary canons, the synod forbade the ordination of anyone ignorant of Latin, and forbade Mass to be said in Sclavonic, except in case of a dearth of priests, and with leave from the Roman pontiff. In conclusion, the assembled bishops decided that all the decrees they had drawn up were to be sent to Rome for the confirmation of the Pope, in accordance with the ancient custom of the Church in their country. In due course John wrote back to inform the Dalmatian bishops that he confirmed "whatever our legates have with you decreed in synod", with one exception. This had reference to the jurisdiction of Spalatro over the Croatian bishop of Nona. The council had asserted that jurisdiction, and *Nona* had appealed to Rome. John reserved to himself the decision of the question of jurisdiction, and summoned the parties to Rome. No doubt in this matter of the dependence of the Croats, through their bishop, on the archbishop of Spalatro, political questions were involved. However, in any case, through the contumacy of Gregory of Nona, as Liverani supposes, the disputants did not go to Rome. Death prevented John X from completely finishing the affair; but he lived long enough to send fresh letters (now lost) and more legates to settle it. The new embassy, of which Bishop Madalbert was the head, first made its way to Bulgaria to negotiate a peace between the Croats and Bulgarians. When this task had been successfully accomplished, Madalbert presided at a synod in Spalatro (926-927), at which, besides various bishops, the king of Croatia and his nobles were also present. After a careful examination of the ancient customs of the province, it was decided that Spalatro must keep the primacy; but that, as of old there used not to be a bishop in Nona, Gregory might select one of those ancient sees, like Scodra, where there used to

be a bishop, and preside over it. Then, with a grim humour which is not often found in synodal decrees, the council further decided that if Gregory was enamoured of the burden of the episcopate, and was not content with one diocese, he might take two more of the extinct dioceses "to his own loss and theirs", as the difficulties of the country prevented easy communication between its parts.

These decisions were first solemnly confirmed by Madalbert, and then by John's successor. Perhaps the only document of Leo VI which has come down to us is the one in which he announces that he has granted the pallium to Archbishop John, orders all the bishops of Dalmatia to obey him, and bids *Nona* to be content with Scodra, and the other bishops to confine themselves to the limits of their dioceses.

But the legates of John X were seen not only among the southern Slavs. They were to be found among a people (the Bulgarians), Slav in fact if not in name, whose power at this period stretched almost to the walls of Constantinople. When John became Pope, the Bulgarians, under their great Tsar Simeon (892-927), the younger son of Bogoris the correspondent of Nicholas I, reached the height of their power. A man of great ambition, Simeon was ever striving to increase his sway. And as he was ever at war with Constantinople, he caused the Bulgarians to renounce spiritual obedience to its patriarch, and began merely for his own ends to make overtures to Rome. John responded, and exerted himself in the first place to try to bring about peace between the Bulgarians and the Eastern empire. When he sent bishops Theophylact and Carus to bring the Greek Church to peace on the "fourth-marriage" question, he gave them instructions to visit Simeon on their return. Much of this is made known to us by a most interesting letter of the patriarch, Nicholas I, to "Prince Simeon". This letter also shows the respectful views—views we have already noted—entertained, at times at least, by Nicholas on the position of the Pope in the Universal Church. After complaining that Simeon had ceased to display towards him proper filial obedience, the patriarch went on to say that he was impelled to approach him again not only by his former love for him, but also by the authority of the Pope, which is very weighty among all good men and whom it is wrong not to obey. When the Pope had heard of the sufferings of the people of the empire, he sent Theophylact and Carus, two bishops, "to induce you (Simeon) to make peace, or, if you refused, to excommunicate you". He (the patriarch) had not sent the bishops to him, because report had it that he was wont to maltreat even ambassadors. He had, therefore, persuaded the legates to stop with him, and had forwarded him the Pope's letters, which he trusted Simeon would obey. "For do not imagine that you can behave towards the Roman pontiff in the same contemptuous manner as you have behaved towards me". Simeon was then assured that the Princes of the Apostles regarded injuries done to the Pope as done to themselves, and reminded him that they had inflicted death on Ananias and Sapphira, and blindness on Elymas.

Peace was concluded between the Bulgarians and the Eastern empire in November 932. "One of the stipulations of the treaty was the public acknowledgment of the independence of the Bulgarian Church, and the official recognition of Damian, archbishop of Dorostylon, as Patriarch of Bulgaria both by the emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople". What influence the letters of the Pope may have had in promoting this useful peace it is impossible to say, but they show how utterly baseless was the supposition, noted by Finlay, that Simeon formed "an alliance with the Pope, who sent him a royal crown to reward his hostilities against the Byzantine empire and Church." We have recorded elsewhere what evidence there is that royal crowns were sent to the Bulgarian rulers Simeon, Peter, and Samuel by the Popes about this period. Whether they ever were sent or not, they were never bestowed as rewards for their barbarous acts of war.

The Bulgarian Tsar Peter (927-968), however, who, like his father the great Tsar Simeon, is presumed to have been crowned by the Pope, is said to have again become subject to Rome, along with his *autocephalous* patriarch, in 967. In any case, Greek influence resumed its sway in Bulgaria after the fall of the first Bulgarian empire in the beginning of the eleventh century.

But Theophylactus and Carus were not the only legates sent by John to the Bulgarians. Negotiations between the Pope and Simeon continued. A Bulgarian envoy appeared in Rome, and returned to his master with Bishop Madalbert as the Pope's legate. Again the work of the Pope was peace. The exertions of Madalbert put an end to the war which was being waged between the Bulgarians and the Croats. The deaths both of John X and the Tsar Simeon, within a few months of each other, closed negotiations between them.

Germany, the synod of Altheim, 916

While Franks, Germans, Slavs, Bulgarians, and Greeks were tossing the torch of battle from one end of Europe to the other, from West to East and East to West, and striving to sever with the sword every bond that bound them together, there was, fortunately for the future, one chain that linked them at least indirectly together. One and all of them turned with hope to Rome. And among them all went the legates of John, preaching the blessings of peace and order. As among the eastern peoples of Europe, so among the western were to be found envoys from Rome. And if from Germany there was soon to come redemption, dearly bought it is true, but still redemption for the Papacy, so now we find the Papacy itself helping to fashion its redeemer. The troubles of Germany had not ended with the death of Louis the Child and the accession of the bold and energetic Conrad I of Franconia (911-918). He had to face serious difficulties at home and abroad. Though king in name, he was in fact hardly more than ruler of Franconia, hardly more powerful than the dukes of Saxony, Swabia, and Bavaria, which with Franconia itself and Lorraine or Lotharingia constituted Germany. He was in perpetual conflict with the young Duke Arnulf of Bavaria and his two uncles Erchanger and Berthold. To add to his difficulties Henry, duke of the Saxons, who was destined to succeed him, abandoned him, and went over to one of his external foes, Charles the Simple. Charles, as a descendant of the Carolingian emperors by the male line, was indignant that he had not been chosen to succeed Louis, but had been rejected for one connected with them only on the female side. He seized Lorraine by force of arms, perhaps invited so to do by its nobles. Conrad's rivals, quite in the selfish style of those times, brought another external foe down upon him, viz. the terrible Hungarians. Amidst all these troubles the clergy stood by Conrad; and cruelly did many of them suffer for their loyalty. Their knowledge of ecclesiastical unity, their own connection with the centre of religious unity, naturally made them desire a national unity. To further this end, they met together at Altheim (now Hohenaltheim) in September 916, "in presence of Peter, bishop of Horta and apocrisiarius of the Pope", as the preface of the acts of the council declares. The preface went on to say : "The Pope's legate has been sent to destroy the seed sown in our country by the devil, and to make head against the machinations of wicked men.... He has laid before us a letter of exhortation sent us by the Pope. This we received with all due respect, and after tearfully recognizing our faults and our unworthiness, we have, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, drawn up the following decrees for our own amendment and that of our people". Bishops, according to them, were to show themselves the salt of the earth, and devote themselves to preaching. Both clergy and laity were to take care to have no

relations with excommunicated persons. The clergy are not to be judged by laymen. Whoever is condemned by the bishops of the province can appeal to Rome, in accordance with the law from the earliest times. After the publication of these and other similar decrees regarding clerical and general discipline, the bishops and clergy, with the concurrence of the people, passed resolutions condemnatory of those who swore loyalty to the king with their lips only, and affirmed their own devoted attachment to their sovereign. Erchanger and his accomplices, who have dared to act against their king, the anointed of the Lord, and treacherously to seize Bishop Salomon, must do penance in a monastery for the rest of their lives. The followers of Erchanger and the other traitors, who, summoned to the synod, did not come, were commanded, if they would avoid the excommunication decreed against them in the Pope's letter, to go to their own bishops, and accept from them the penance prescribed by the synod. The bishops of Saxony, rebellious like their duke, did not come to the synod when summoned. If they do not obey a second summons to a council at Mayence, the legate and the synod, "by apostolic authority", forbid them to say Mass until they have justified themselves before the Pope at Rome (can. 30). The synod treated (can. 29) in the same way Richevin, bishop of Strasburg, on the ground of his being an intruder into that see. It has been suggested, with no small degree of probability, that Richevin's only crime was that he was devoted to the interests of Charles the Simple in Lorraine, and so hostile to Conrad. John X, at any rate, was a loyal supporter of Conrad, and evidently did all he could to further the formation of a strong monarchy in Germany.

Many of John's letters are addressed to Herimann, archbishop of Cologne, a city at this period in the power of Charles the Simple. Several of them contain replies to various moral difficulties which the archbishop had proposed to him, while others were on the subject of the bishopric of Liege—a subject quite on the same lines with that of Strasburg, and connected with intrigues between the Franks and the Germans for the possession of Lorraine. In May 92o, Stephen, bishop of Liege, breathed his last, and Charles, exercising a right sanctioned at least by ancient custom, nominated as his successor Hilduin, a priest of that church. As far as he himself was concerned, Charles seems to have made a bad selection. Hilduin straightway allied himself with Gilbert, duke of Lorraine, who was in open rebellion against him. Naturally indignant, the Frankish king cancelled the appointment of Hilduin, and nominated Richer, abbot of Prum and successor of the chronicler Regino. Supported, however, not only by Gilbert but also, as Charles declared, by Henry I, the Fowler, the successor of Conrad, Hilduin forced Herimann, under threat of loss of life and property, to consecrate him; and, again according to the capitulary of Charles, rewarded his supporters from the plunder of churches. The Frankish king and Richer then turned to the Pope. Herimann was soon (921) in receipt of a letter from the Pope, in which he was blamed for acting as he did through fear, "as ancient custom" required that no one except the king should nominate a bishop for any diocese—a custom resting "on the authority of our predecessors". The archbishop, with both Hilduin and Richer, was summoned to Rome, and in the interim the new bishop was suspended from saying Mass. Charles was also informed of what the Pope had done, and of the good-offices used in his behalf by the Emperor Berenger. Richer (922) not only won his case, but was consecrated by the Pope himself, while his rival was excommunicated. However anxious John may have been for a powerful German monarchy, he would not have its power increased at the expense of the king of the Franks. In fact, in the midst of all his troubles it was only on John X that Charles could rely.

Charles the Simple treacherously seized, 923

We have already seen how Charles began to reign in face of an opposition from Eudes, count of Paris. In this very year (922) he had to fight for his crown against Robert, the brother of Eudes, whom some rebels had caused to be crowned king. Though Robert lost his usurped crown with his life in 923, the troubles of Charles were not over. Raoul or Rodolf, duke of Burgundy and brother-in-law of Robert, was called to succeed him. In these confused and wretched times no king could rely upon any one. Charles was treacherously seized (923) by a relation, Heribert, count of Vermandois, and kept under restraint till his death (929), in order that Heribert might have a weapon with which, if necessary, to fight Rodolf, whom he had himself helped to the throne. Against the treason of Heribert John alone raised his voice. He threatened the count with excommunication unless he restored Charles to freedom. But with such men as he had to deal with John could effect little, and had to be content with the assurance of Heribert that he would do his best to fulfil the Pope's wishes, but that he himself had not conspired against the king, though he had had to yield to circumstances. With these written assurances Heribert sent envoys to Rome begging the Pope to order the restitution of Charles. The envoys found John in the same straits as they had left Charles, *i.e.*, in the power of an enemy.

Whilst these negotiations were in progress, the archiepiscopal see of Rheims became vacant, and Heribert forced the election to it of his son Hugh, a child of five years old. Among those who suffered in their goods or bodies for opposing this scandalous affair was our worthy historian Frodoard. Whether it was because John hoped to get some influence over the ruffian, and so move him to release his king, or because he thought that opposition would only breed greater evils, he at any rate confirmed the child's election. But, to minimize the mischief as far as he could, he entrusted the spiritual management of the diocese to the bishop of Soissons till the child was anything like old enough to be consecrated. When Heribert had thus gained his will, he flouted both Pope and king, bestowed the spiritual administration on another bishopal together, and did with the temporalities of the see just whatever he had a mind to do. We shall hear of Hugh of Vermandois again.

However, not all the great men among the Franks were unfaithful to God, or traitors to their king. Of the loyal few was Heriveus, archbishop of Rheims, successor of the murdered Fulk. Not only was he true to Charles to the end, but like a faithful steward he labored hard for his Divine master among the pagan Normans. Frodoard tells us how "he often held synods with the suffragan bishops of his archdiocese, in which with wisdom and profit he worked for peace, for the spread of the faith of God's Holy Church, and for the well-being of the kingdom of the Franks. Nobly did he toil for the civilization and conversion of the Normans ... until at length they received the faith of Christ ... On this matter he was careful to consult the Pope of Rome ; and on his advice he ever decided what had to be done for their conversion". There is extant a letter of John X in reply to some of the difficulties which presented themselves to the mind of the archbishop. He was much perplexed as to how far he ought to treat with rigour those who were constantly relapsing into idolatry. He received in answer (914) the following admirable letter, often by mistake assigned to John IX:— "Your letter has filled me at once with sorrow and with joy. With sorrow at the sufferings you have to endure not only from the pagans, but also from Christians; with gladness at the conversion of the Northmen, who once revelled in human blood, but who now, by your words, rejoice that they are redeemed by the life-giving blood of Christ. For this we thank God, and implore Him to strengthen them in the faith. As to how far, inasmuch as they are uncultured, and but novices in the faith, they are to be subjected to severe canonical

penances for their relapsing, killing of priests, and sacrificing to idols, we leave to your judgment to decide, as no one will know better than you the manners and customs of this people. You will, of course, understand well enough that it will not be advisable to treat them with the severity required by the canons, lest, thinking they will never be able to bear the unaccustomed burdens, they return to their old errors". No doubt the wise and temperate counsel of the Pope was followed, for the conversion of the Normans seems to have gone steadily forward.

Before proceeding with the narrative of the career of John X, enough has been said, we may note, to justify an adverse criticism of a remark made by Mr. Tout in his admirable little work, *The Empire and the Papacy.* Speaking of the period between 914 and 96o, he remarks: "For more than a generation the Popes had almost ceased to exercise any spiritual influence". No doubt the want of anything like an easily accessible full biography of John X may excuse Mr. Tout's remark, but it will not justify it, at least for the period during which that pontiff occupied the See of Rome.

Of all the relations of John X with France, or the land of the Franks, certainly not the least important is his connection with the famous monastery of Cluny, which was to be one of the most potent of the forces that were to bring about the revival of order, learning, and morality in the eleventh century. A few years before John X became Pope, William, count of Auvergne and duke of Aquitaine, founded (91o) the monastery of Cluny near Macon. This he did, as the charter of its foundation beautifully expresses it, first for the love of God, then for the spiritual and temporal welfare of himself, his wife, relations, and dependants, for the preservation of the Catholic faith, and for all the faithful. It was to be a refuge for the poor, who on leaving the world would bring nothing into *religion* but a good will. It was to be under the special protection of the Pope, who was entreated to be its protector, and to sever from the Church and eternal life such as should usurp its goods. Of the work of reform effected by the Benedictine monastery of Cluny and its dependent houses, it may suffice to state here with Tout :"As ever in the Middle Ages, a new monastic movement heralded in the work of reformation. As the Carolingian reformation is associated with Benedict of Aniane, so is the reformation of the eleventh century with the monks of Cluny". It was to protect the property of this important home of virtue and learning that Pope John wrote to King Rodolf, and various bishops and counts. He instructs them to restore to Cluny the property of which Guido, abbot of Gigny, had, pending a judicial sentence, violently possessed himself, and to take under their special protection that monastery which had been placed under the direct jurisdiction of the Holy See.

It is interesting to find that John's patronage was sought by other of Christendom's most famous monasteries not only in Gaul but in Germany (Fulda), Switzerland (St. Gall), and Italy (Subiaco). He even increased the possessions of the last-named monastery on condition that each day the monks should repeat the *Kyrie eleison* and the *Christe eleison* one hundred times "for the salvation of his soul". From such conditions some argue that the authors of donations of that sort must indeed have felt themselves in need of intercessory prayer. But it must be borne in mind that the strange fact is that it is the good who are anxious to secure prayers for themselves, and not the bad. Hence, from his deed in favor of Subiaco (926), it may be concluded that, at least at this time, John was striving after virtue.

Passing over other relations of John with France, *e.g.*, with Geraldus, the forger of papal letters, we may mention one more of his "confirmations", viz. that in which he grants certain possessions to the bishop of Adria, the town which gave its name to the Adriatic, a few miles north of the point where the Po divides to flow by many mouths into the sea. He also gives him leave to erect a fort "in the place called Rhodige" (which

brought the modern city of Rovigo into being), in order to protect his people "both against the pagans and the false Christians". Similar permissions which we find granted at this period by kings and bishops were fruitful in great results. They called into existence the walled towns which became centres and strongholds of freedom.

Spain.

Such intercourse as we know that John X had with Spain points in the same direction as his grant to Subiaco. It has long been the tradition in Spain that the apostle St. James, known as the Greater, preached for a time in that country, that his sacred remains were brought back there by his disciples after his death, and interred near Iria Flavia in Galicia. Lost sight of in the troubles which fell upon the peninsula in the break-up of the Roman Empire in the West, the saint's relics were discovered during the beginning of the ninth century, in the days of Alfonso II, the Chaste, and of Bishop Theodemir. By the king's orders a small church was built over the body of the apostle, and the episcopal See of Iria was transferred to the place, a few miles from that old city, afterwards known, from the apostle's name (Giacomo Postolo), or from the lights seen where his body was discovered, as Compostela. It was by virtue of two bulls of John VIII, addressed to Alfonso III, the Great, that the first substantial church which had been erected there to the apostle was consecrated. And thither it was that, in the beginning of his pontificate, John x sent a legate who was the bearer of letters to the saintly bishop of the place, Sisenand. John had heard of his sanctity, and sent to beg his constant prayers to St. James in his behalf. Sisenand in return sent a priest to Rome with letters from himself, and letters and presents from King Ordoflo II.

It is said that the Romans were as much astonished at the liturgy followed by the Spanish priest as he was at the one in use amongst them. Returning to Spain with books from Rome, he told what he had seen and heard about the ceremonies of the Mass. The liturgy question was at once investigated in a council, and, while it was decided that the Spanish rite was not out of harmony with the Catholic faith, it was agreed to alter its form of consecration *(secreta misso)* to that of the Roman liturgy. Whatever truth there may be in this story about the liturgy, there is none in the statement put forth and accepted by Burke in his *History of Spain*, by Liverani, etc., that John X gave at least a qualified approval to the so-called Mozarabic liturgy (924). This assertion, as Hefele points out, "rests on a single document which is certainly not genuine"; and whatever of fact a supposititious document may preserve incidentally, that particular *fact* which it is its object to establish is certainly not true.

England.

So tempestuous was the confusion of this period, that its contemplation might easily lead one to think that all communication between England and Rome must have been suspended. Every now and then, however, the sun of truth, faintly illuminating some small spot, enables us to see that in even the darkest days of the tenth century our countrymen turned to Rome for purposes of piety, and for guidance in things both spiritual and temporal. Undeterred by the fact that in 923 the Saracens of Fraxineto had murdered "a multitude of English who were going to Rome to pray at the shrine of St. Peter", Wulfhelm, archbishop of Canterbury, made his way there in 927. Thither too was sent, about the year 924, the English noble Elfred, under the following circumstances. The election of Athelstan, the grandson of Alfred the Great, as king of the English was opposed by one Elfred. The story of Elfred is thus told by Athelstan

himself in one of his donations to the abbey of Malmesbury : "Be it known to the sages of our kingdom that I have not unjustly seized the lands aforesaid, or dedicated plunder to God, but that I have received them as the English nobility, and, moreover, John, the apostolic Pope of the Roman Church, have judged fitting, on the death of Elfred. He was the jealous rival both of my happiness and life, and consented to the wickedness of my enemies, who, on my father's decease, had not God in His mercy delivered me, wished to put out my eyes in the city of Winchester. Wherefore, on the discovery of their infernal contrivances, he was sent to the Church of Rome to defend himself by oath before Pope John. This he did at the altar of St. Peter; but at the very instant he had sworn, he fell down before it, and was carried by his servants to the English *schola* or quarter, where he died the third night after. The Pope immediately sent to consult with us whether his body should be placed among other Christians. On receiving this account, the nobility of our kingdom, with the whole body of his relations, humbly entreated that we would grant our permission for his remains to be buried with other Christians. Consenting, therefore, to their urgent request, we sent back our compliance to Rome, and with the Pope's permission he was buried, though unworthy, with other Christians." Stories of this kind show in what a thoroughly paternal light the Pope was at this epoch regarded by the nations of the West, and how such temporal power and influence as he acquired in the later Middle Ages had their source in spontaneous acts of submission offered to him by them, when they were in the days of their youth, and stood more in need of a father's guidance.

John and the See of Hamburg-Bremen

But when his eyes were turned to the North, John saw even far beyond the isles of Britain. Before the close of the ninth century, the enterprising long-ships of the Northmen had not only discovered Iceland and Greenland, but had even conveyed colonists thither. These events must have made some sensation even in the tenth century, and John so far provided for the future establishment of Christianity there as to put those distant countries, more or less romantic even now, under the spiritual care of the archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen. On the death of Bishop Reinward in 917, King Conrad, who did not end his days till just before Christmas Day in 918, "by divine inspiration" selected to succeed him not the elect of the clergy and people, but the elect's chaplain, Wenni or Unni. At least so the story was told to the good canon Adam of Bremen in the following century. To Wenni, as the papal bull proves, did John X send the pallium (October 29, 917). The *privilege* of John X confirmed the bulls of Gregory IV, Nicholas I, etc., and granted Wenni the pallium and jurisdiction over the bishops in Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Iceland, Scandinavia, Greenland, and in all the northern parts and in certain Slav localities. The privilege further subjected to the bishops of Hamburg *all the countries they might bring to the faith.* No doubt this final concession explains the subsequent introduction into the bull of "Iceland and Greenland", which had no bishops in 917. When these countries had been brought to the faith of Christ, some scribe who made a copy of the original bull after that event, would add their names to it; for he would regard them as clearly subject to the archdiocese of Hamburg. In conclusion, the privilege declared that the jurisdiction of the bishops of Hamburg was not to be interfered with either by the bishop of Cologne or by any other bishop. The date of the bull should be the fourth year of Pope John and the fifth indiction", and not the first year of the Pope and the eighth indiction, as it appears in the printed editions. By such as question the authenticity of this document, it must be ever remembered that a bull is not shown to be invalid when it is shown that its date, as it is read in such

copies as have weathered the storms of time, is not properly expressed; that the existence of *a* bull of John X is vouched for by Adam of Bremen, who had evidently examined it; and that nothing conclusive can be urged against the genuineness of the particular one which has come down to us.

Amid the din of battle and the turmoil of faction John found time to beautify the Lateran, though in what precise manner we know not. Benedict of Soracte simply speaks of paintings and inscriptions placed by him in the Lateran palace.

This notice, however, is of value, as it apparently fixes the Pope's place of burial. For John the Deacon, in hisoft-quoted description of the Lateran, speaks of the tomb of a Pope John in the atrium of the basilica near the principal entrance; and, relying doubtless on some subsequent verses of the epitaph of which he quotes the first line only, adds of this Pope John that he renewed the basilica. Now, as John X is the only Pope of that name of whom we read that he repaired the Lateran basilica, we may reasonably conclude that the tomb spoken of by the deacon was that of John X.

Correcting Cinagli and others, Liverani maintains that there are only two and not three extant coins of John X, both bearing the names of the Pope and St. Peter, Rome and Berengarius, *M.P.* for *imperator*. Since the time of Liverani, however, other similar coins have been found.'

To show the good opinion of John entertained byFrodoard, and that too though he had to suffer for John's action in the matter of the young son of Heribert of Vermandois, and to serve as his epitaph, we quote the words of that careful historian

Surgit abhinc decimus scandens sacra jura Joannes.
Rexerat ille Ravennatem moderamine plebem.
Inde petitus ad hanc Romanam percolit arcem.
Bis septem qua praenituit paulo amplius annis.
Pontifici hic nostro legat segmenta Seulfo.
Munificisque sacram decorans ornatibus aulam,
Pace nitet, dum patricia deceptus iniqua
Carcere conjicitur claustrisque arctatur opacis.
Spiritus at saevis retineri non valet antris,
Emicat immo aethera decreta sedilia scandens.

In these words Frodoard tells how John was brought from Ravenna to Rome, and was Pope for rather over fourteen years. He tells of his gifts to his own archbishop, and of his decorating the Lateran. Whilst he was working for peace, patrician guile cast him into prison; but its black vaults could not enchain his soul, which ascended to the bright realms above.

While the anonymous panegyrist of Berengarius, not unnaturally perhaps, praises the friend of his hero, extolling his zeal and wisdom, Benedict of Soracte, who knows how to be very severe on a Pope when he likes, has no word to say against the moral character of John X. Finally, it is to be noted that not even John's one detractor, Liutprand, brings any charge directly against him after he became Pope. Even if, therefore, that inaccurate and slanderous historian is to be believed, and John must be set down as of loose character before he became Pope, his many glorious deeds are an indisputable testimony of his worth when Pope. If, according to Liutprand, he was the slave of Theodora while archbishop of Ravenna, he was not infatuated by Marozia when Pope of Rome.

LEO VI.
928 or 928-9.

THE two immediate successors of John X are mere shadows of whom we barely know "their exits and their entrances". The first of them was Leo, a Roman, the son of Christopher who had been primicerius under John VIII, and whose name appears in several papal documents belonging to the year 876. When Leo became Pope he was serving the Church of St. Susanna. Practically all we know of him, viz., his action in Dalmatia, has been already told under the pontificate of John X. Ages ago Ptolemy of Lucca (*d.* 1327) declared that he could find nothing recorded of this Pope but that "he exercised no tyranny and died in peace, and that according to most writers he was buried in St. Peter's". Almost the same confession has to be made now.

Frodoard simply says of him :

Pro quo celsa Petri sextus Leo regmina sumens,
Mensibus haec septem servat, quinisque diebus,
Praedecessorumque petit consortia vatum.

Those who say he was placed on the papal throne by Marozia say what is perhaps probable; while those who say he died in prison say what is certainly improbable.

If with Jaffée we suppose he became Pope in June 928, he must have died in February 929; but in December 928 or January 929 if with Duchesne we hold that he was consecrated somewhat earlier than June.

STEPHEN (VII) VIII.
929-931.

THE shadow of Stephen VIII, a Roman, the son of Teudemund, and formerly cardinal-priest of St. Anastasia, the second successor of John X, is scarcely any better defined than that of Leo VI; and that too though he reigned longer. He was Pope for over two years and a half. While Ptolemy of Lucca could find nothing more to say of him than that "his pontificate passed in peace, and in death his body to St. Peter's", the diligence of such moderns as Pflugk-Hartung has brought to light a few of his bulls in favour of monasteries in France and Italy.

A silver coin with the name of Stephen, coupled withthat of St. Paul on the obverse, and on the reverse that of Rome along with that of St. Peter, is assigned by Cinagli to this Stephen. Other authors, however, suppose it to be the work of some other Pope Stephen. There seems nothing about the coin to enable its ownership to be decided definitely. Of this Pope Frodoard writes :

Septimus hinc Stephanus binos praefulget in annos,
Aucto mense super, bisseno ac sole jugato,
Disposita post quod spatium sibi sege locatur.

Those who believe that in a verse each word is the unshackled choice of the poet himself, and do not imagine the exigencies of the line itself have anything to do with the matter, will conclude from the word "praefulget" that our pontiff was illustrious by his shining virtues. It may be so; but they have failed to pierce the gloom of the period and to shed any light on posterity. If, however, we can put faith in a twelfth century Greek document, we must believe that Stephen VIII was "the first Pope who was shameless enough to shave himself, and to order the rest of Italy to do likewise!". In their anxiety to justify their position of schism, any charge was good enough for the Greeks to bring against the Roman pontiffs.

JOHN XI
931-936

To two shadows there succeeded, in the person of John XI,a puppet, a man without authority, destitute of all worldly dignity, and who merely performed the sacred duties of his ministry. For all civil power had been seized by his brother (Alberic), the Patrician. So writes our best authority, Frodoard. But as the natural qualities of John are highly praised by that rigid upholder of ecclesiastical discipline, Ratherius of Verona, it is no doubt correct to suppose that his subordinate position was due not so much to any marked want of virtue or ability in himself as to the force of circumstances, to his youth, to the natural tendency to submission to parental authority, and to the masterful character of his brother Alberic II. The latter's admirer, Benedict of Soracte, who "thinks that his memory will endure for ever", gives us to understand that his character was in keeping with the fierce and gleaming countenance which he had inherited from his father. He was simply terrific—a type of a ferocious Italian bandit. When such a man was lord of Rome, little wonder that others had not much authority.

As John XI is always spoken of by Frodoard as the brother of Alberic I I and the son of Marozia, and as it is certain, not merely from Liutprand but from Benedict, that Alberic I I was the son of Alberic I, we may well be permitted to believe, despite Liutprand, that John XI also was the son of Alberic I. In addition to what was said on this subject in the life of Sergius III, it may here be noted that the letter of Theodore Daphnopata—the importance of which as historical evidence cannot be over-stated—makes it plain that John himself had spoken of his mother and his sister in a way that could not be looked for in a mere bastard. It can scarcely be believed too that John would have entered into negotiations with the punctilious emperor of Constantinople, with the object of allying his sister with the son of Romanus, if his own relationship to her was not that of brother in the strictest sense. No doubt the reason why John is so generally spoken of as the son of Marozia and the brother of Alberic is that his father, Alberic I, was dead when he became Pope, and his brother made himself so famous by becoming tyrant of Rome.

However, be all this as it may, Marozia, who, through the influence of her husband Alberic and the possession of the castle of St. Angelo, had acquired immense power in Rome, in order to increase that power, caused her son John, of the title of S. Maria in Trastevere, to be elected Pope about the month of March 931. Both Benedict and Liutprand err in making John XI the immediate successor of John X.

Not content with the increased importance which accrued to her from being the mother of the Pope, or perhaps already fearing her son Alberic, Marozia determined to advance her authority still more by marrying for the third time. She made choice of Hugo of Provence, the king of Italy, a man who, if "gifted in no common degree ... (was) the most dissolute voluptuary of his time", and was, moreover, her brother-in-law; for he was the stepbrother of her late husband Guido of Tuscany. But neither Hugo nor Marozia paid any regard to canonical impediments that stood in the way of their ambitions. She wished to be queen of Italy; he, to hold Rome.

Accordingly, if one can believe that gross flatterer Liutprand, who has the brazen effrontery to upbraid Marozia for ruining such a holy man as Hugo, the king accepted the invitation of Marozia and advanced on Rome. Whether it was because he trusted in the strength of the castle of St. Angelo, or because he found there was an indisposition on the part of the Romans to have an army within their walls, Hugo followed the usual custom, left his troops without the city, and entered Rome merely with a bodyguard. He met with an honourable reception from the Romans, and his marriage with Marozia was duly celebrated. Safe, as he imagined, within the fortress by the Tiber, Hugo determined to reduce the city under his complete control, and to this end to seize his stepson Alberic and to put out his eyes; for in him he rightly beheld the one obstacle to the accomplishment of his designs. According to the narrative of Liutprand, an accident brought matters to a crisis before the plans of Hugo were quite ripe. Chancing carelessly to pour out the water with which the king was to wash his hands, the young Alberic received a blow in the face from the irate Burgundian.

With cheek and passion alike in flame, the youth rushed from the castle. Soon the whole city was ablaze with his fiery words: "To such a depth of degradation", he cried, "has Rome been brought, that it obeys the rule of harlots. Burgundians, once the slaves of the Romans, now rule over them. If though but newly come amongst us, he (Hugo) has struck the face of a son-in-law, what will he not do to you when his position is secured? Are you ignorant of Burgundian haughtiness and voracity?". All this is, of course, merely Liutprand. The fact is, that Alberic realized quite as well as Hugo that Rome was not big enough for both of them, and he succeeded in stirring up the people (*i.e.* his own particular party) against his rival. To the sound of trumpets and bells *a* men flew to arms, and moved towards the Mole of Hadrian. Fearing for his life, Hugo contrived to escape before the castle was stormed, Master of St. Angelo and Rome, Alberic imprisoned his mother and confined the Pope,

These events probably took place at the close of the year 932, and certainly not later than the beginning of 933. And, in the words of Benedict, Alberic's yoke pressed heavily as well on the Romans as on the Apostolic See. It continued to press heavily for over twenty years. Hence we may be sure that when Frodoard in his verses on John X. assigned him only two years of a reign, he did so because he would not reckon the years he was in confinement. To this period of the imprisonment of Marozia and the keeping of her son in durance vile, Muratori assigns the dissemination of those baseless stories against Marozia and her family which Liutprand repeated with such gusto. The spread of such reports would facilitate the usurped rule of Alberic, and may well have received his countenance.

It is of moment to form a correct idea both of the agents and of the results of the usurpation of the son of Marozia. Writers who speak of the Romans rejoicing over the action of Alberic because they "had shaken off at one stroke the monarchy, the empire, and the temporal power of the Pope, and had attained civic independence", must surely be attaching undue importance to some words of Liutprand, and neglecting not only other words of that same writer, but the far more weighty ones of other more reliable authors. The Romans under Alberic had as much "civic independence" as they had under the sway of Marozia, *i.e.*, practically none at all, and John XI had still less power than he had under his mother. Already for some ten years or so the Popes seem to have lost all civil control over Ravenna and the exarchate. And now, by the usurpation of Alberic and his adherents, John XI lost not only all civil power in Rome, but practically his own personal independence. Rome was, in fact, under a *tyranny*. It was in a similar position to Florence, Milan, and the other great cities of the northern half of Italy at the close of the Middle Ages when under the sway of the Medici, the Visconti, and the rest.

That section of the Roman nobility which had been striving for more power since the days of Pippin and Charlemagne, when increased temporal authority came to the Popes, had now, in the person of Alberic, gained the upper hand. And the titles of *Senator, Patrician, Prince of all the Romans,* which Alberic affected, were in no sense bestowed on him by the Romans at large; they were assumed by Alberic himself, as was the power they expressed. The women of his family assumed the title of *Senatrix*. But the power of the *Senator of all the Romans* was very limited; it was practically restricted to the city of Rome. If the Popes had no temporal jurisdiction within its walls, Alberic had none outside them. Hugo was frequently in arms before the gates of the Eternal City.

After laying waste the Campagna, Hugo appeared before Hugo the walls of Rome the year after he had been driven from it. After having in vain attempted to carry the city by storm, he had to raise the siege. However, in three years' time he was back again. On this second occasion, after peace had been made by the exertions of the saintly Abbot Odo of Cluny, Hugo tried the fox's skin as the lion's had failed. Trusting by its use to get Alberic into his power, Hugo offered him his daughter Alda in marriage. Alberic accepted the daughter, but would have nothing to do with the father-in-law. On the contrary, he received his enemies with great kindness. For a second time Hugo had to retire discomfited.

Alberic no doubt accepted Alda to pacify Hugo. But he had formerly hoped to effect a marriage which would have strengthened his hands against him. If Benedict has not confused Alberic's wish to espouse his sister to the son of Romanus I with a desire himself to marry a daughter of Romanus (who at this time was ruling in Constantinople with Constantine Porphyrogenitus), it would seem that the Prince of the Romans had at one time thought of securing his position by a double matrimonial alliance with Constantinople.

At this time the Greek Church generally was in as bad state as the Roman. Of the Church in Constantinople in particular, Finlay thus writes: “The attachment of the people had once rendered the Patriarch almost equal to the emperor in dignity, but the clergy of the capital were now more closely connected with the court than the people. The power of the emperor to depose as well as to appoint the Patriarch was hardly questioned, and of course the head of the Eastern Church occupied a very inferior position to the Pope ... Both religion and civilization suffered by this additional centralization of power in the imperial cabinet. From this period we may date the decline of the Greek Church”. Its decline was helped by the dissolute patriarch Theophylactus. For some twenty years this imperial nominee scandalized the Church of Constantinople. He was at once simoniacal, profane, and extravagant. He introduced dances into the most solemn services of the Church, kept two thousand horses, and could not wait to finish Mass if he was informed that a favourite mare was about to foal! This hippomania, which Schlumberger is pleased to observe “is worthy of a great English gentleman”, brought about his death. He died (956) from a fall from one of his horses.

To make way for the promotion to the patriarchate of this unworthy son of his, a eunuch of but sixteen years of age, the legitimate patriarch Tryphon had been deposed (September 931) by the Emperor Romanus, and negotiations had been opened with Rome to obtain the confirmation of the youthful Theophylactus. Judging from the length of time which elapsed between the deposition of Tryphon and the consecration of his successor (February 933), it would seem that whilst John was free he would not grant the required confirmation. But when Alberic had seized the reins of civil government, and had the Pope in his power, he realized that he might profit by compliance with the desires of Romanus. The price of the confirmation was to be the

double matrimonial alliance of which we have just spoken. Liutprand, indeed, says that Romanus bought Alberic with money. It is, no doubt, likely enough that the “Prince of all the Romans” received money as well for his share in the transaction. At any rate the letters of confirmation were sent by the hands of papal legates (one of whom was Bishop Madalbert, whose former missions to the East have been already noted), and the furthering of the matrimonial projects of Alberic were no doubt entrusted to them at the same time. The youthful patriarch was duly installed by the papal legates (February 2, 933), who then turned their attention to the question of the alliances. As far as Alberic himself was concerned, we have already seen how the action of Hugo more or less forced him to take to wife Alda, the daughter of his enemy (936). However, the negotiations for the marriage of his and the Pope's sister with a son of Romanus continued; and it is in connection with that subject that there arrived in Rome the oft-mentioned letter to the Pope from the secretary of the Greek emperor.

It opened with the bestowal of great praise on the Pope's legates. John himself is then thanked for having acknowledged Theophylactus, and for having caused him to be installed as patriarch by his legates, through whom becoming homage was paid to him (John). The letter went on to deprecate the conduct of some who had opposed the consecration of Theophylactus on the ground that privileges ought not to be given up, and that it was within their right to manage the affairs of the Church of Constantinople without the interference of the bishops of Rome. Of course, they contended that, when there was question of any difficulty with regard to "our orthodox faith", the bishops of Rome and of the other thrones must be summoned to give their assistance. But where there was only question of making a patriarch, the bishop of Rome had never been called in, except in a friendly way to rejoice with them. These talkers, continued the emperor, had soon fallen into line, and all was now in harmony. This desired consummation was the work of the Pope, and to him, “the most revered of bishops”, thanks are again due. Romanus next apologized for detaining the Pope's legates so long, but the business was important. To accompany them on their return, he is sending two apocrisiarii of his own who will give additional explanations. Further, that matters may not go against his son after his (the emperor's) death, “as a suppliant of your supreme pontifical power”, he begs the Pope, his father, to assemble all the clergy of the Roman Church that they may hear the explanations of the imperial envoys concerning the consecration of Theophylactus; to cause a decree to be drawn up confirming the young patriarch's ordination; both to sign it himself and see that it was signed by all the rest; and to add at the end of the document : "If anyone should not acknowledge and confess as proper and lawful the consecration of the lord Theophylactus as patriarch of Constantinople, but should attempt to carp at it, let such a one, whether emperor, senator, priest, or man of low degree, be subjected to the ban of the Most Holy Spirit and of the Princes of the Apostles and be rendered amenable to eternal anathema". Romanus then begged that this document might be sent to Constantinople to be there kept; and assured the Pope he would be ever grateful to him, and would help him. In conclusion, he declared how pleased he would be to be connected with the Pope by the proposed matrimonial alliance. Owing to distance and reasons of state, his son indeed could not well go to Rome to fetch his bride, but perhaps the bride's mother could bring her, availing herself of the vessels in which the Pope's legates have left for Rome; or, if preferable, faithful servants could bring her. Or, in fine, if the present were for any cause an unsuitable time, the emperor would, on hearing from the Pope, send ships and proper persons to conduct the maiden to Constantinople, and by the will of Heaven "conclude the matrimonial alliance"

As Constantine Porphyrogenitus, with whom Romanus was then reigning, has left on record, in his work on *The Government of the Empire*, the various devices to which Byzantine rulers were wont to have recourse to prevent foreign princes from marrying into the imperial family, it is hard to say whether Romanus was in good faith in this marriage question. At any rate the young couple were never wedded. But it is not from matrimonial affairs that this letter is so interesting and valuable. It is because it shows the East and West still at one in matters of religion, and both as yet acknowledging the Pope as the head of that united whole. At the same time unmistakable mutterings of the coming storm are audible in it. In it may be noted the existence of those narrow spirits who are to be met with in every age of the Church, and who are ever trying to make the universal truths of which the Church is the guardian subservient to views merely local and temporal, and to subordinate the soul and its aspirations to the material advancement of the body.

Theophylactus was not the only one for whom Alberic arranged that the pallium should be sent. We have already seen how the powerful count, Heribert of Vermandois, had secured from John X the confirmation of the election, as archbishop of Rheims, of his youthful son Hugh. But when, in the course of a quarrel between King Rodolf and Heribert, the former seized Rheims, he placed by force on the episcopal throne of that city the monk Artaud; for the clergy and people refused to accede to his request to elect another archbishop, as Hugh was still alive. However, according to Artaud himself, he was accepted by the whole people of the city after his consecration (932), and a year afterwards received the pallium from Pope John, "the son of Maria, called also Marozia, or rather from the Patrician Alberic, brother of the Pope, who kept John in his power". With one bishop thus actually consecrated for the See of Rheims and another (Hugh), though not consecrated, long ago nominated for it, we may be sure that trouble would soon arise for the Church of Rheims; and it did. The further course of the history of the relations between Hugh and Artaud will be related in the life of Agapitus II.

Like his namesake John X, this Pope is also connected with the famous monastery of Cluny, the abbot of which, the famous Odo, did much good in Italy during his pontificate. John confirmed the privileges not only of Cluny itself—on the condition of a payment of ten solidi every five years—but also of various of its dependent houses, at the request of Odo. With the exception of the granting of a few similar privileges to other monasteries, we know no more of the actions of John XI during his period of bondage to his brother "the Prince of the Romans". Than the biographies of some of the pontiffs of the tenth century, no further argument can surely be necessary to show the necessity of the absolute freedom of the Pope from all local civil control, if he is to be able to fulfill adequately his duties as supreme pastor of the Universal Church.

The extant coins of this Pope show clearly the days both of his independence and dependence. Whilst he was free, his coins bore only his own name, that of St. Peter and Rome, if indeed the coin assigned by Cinagli to this Pope does not belong to John XII. His state of subjection is shown by a coin discovered somewhat over twenty years ago in the Tiber. On the obverse it not only bears the name of Alberic "Princeps", but sets forth that he ordered it to be struck. On the reverse appears the monogram of the Pope.

John XI died either towards the close of 935 (Duchesne, December) or in the beginning of 936 (January, Jaffäe). Of his overshadowed career Frodoard wrote:—

Nato patricae hinc cedunt pia jura Joanni;
Undecimus Petri hoc qui nomine sede levatur.
Vi vacuus, splendore carens, modo sacra ministrans,
Fratre a patricio juris moderamine rapto,

Qui matrem incestam rerum fastigia moecho
Tradere conantem decimum sub claustra Johannem
Qua dederat, claustri vigili et custode subegit.
Artoldus noster sub quo sacra pallia sumit;
Papaque obit nomen geminum ferre nactus in annum.

Duchesne tells us there was a contemporary gloss on the last verse to the effect that John was Pope in name indeed but not in fact.

In these verses Frodoard tells how John XI, the son of the *Patricia*, was stripped of all power by his brother, who placed his mother under the same confinement under which she had placed John X, when she attempted to make over the supreme power in the city to Hugo. It was from John XI that Frodoard's archbishop obtained the pallium. He died after having been Pope really only two years.

LEO VII.
936-939.

WITH regard to the dates of the consecration and death of Leo VII, a Roman by birth, and priest of St. Sixtus, we are on surer ground than we are for the corresponding dates of many of the other pontiffs of this period. In assigning January 3, 936 as the date of Leo's consecration and July 13 as the date of his death, Duchesne is in practical agreement with Jaffé. And both authors have sound documentary evidence to rest upon. Other evidence we have concerning Leo is not so easy to interpret. From the fact that Frodoard calls him "a servant of God" and that in a letter regarding the abbey of Fleury he himself alludes to St. Benedict as "a worthy father" and speaks of "our lord the most blessed Benedict", many authors conclude that Leo was a Benedictine monk. This contention may be said to be strengthened by the fact that Alberic, "the most glorious Prince and Senator of the Romans", was very much devoted to monasteries and monks, and hence may well be supposed to have selected a monk to succeed John XI. Besides, he was sure to have argued that a simple and pious monk would not be likely to question his usurpation of papal temporal power. It was during the pontificate of Leo VII that our worthy historian Frodoard came to Rome, so that what he tells us of the Roman pontiff of 936 he had first learnt by his own eyes and ears. The last of the good canon's verses tell of Leo VII. By them Leo is put before us as one whose thoughts were fixed only on God, and who had no care for the things of earth. Pressure had to be brought to bear upon him before he could be induced to accept the supreme pontificate, of which he showed himself to be thoroughly worthy. His elevation made no change in him; he remained devoted to prayer. Learned was he too, affable in manner, gracious in speech and countenance. Speaking of his kind reception by Leo, Frodoard fails not to tell us how the good Pope refreshed at once his temporal and spiritual needs, and sent him on his way rejoicing at the honorable treatment he had received. Naturally enough does Frodoard close his long poem on the Popes with the prayer that God will bestow temporal and eternal blessings on the amiable Leo.

It was during the first year of Leo's pontificate that King Hugo, as we have already related, besieged Rome for the second time; and it is generally believed that this was the occasion when the famous Odo of Cluny used his influence with the king of Italy to induce him to raise the siege. No doubt thoroughly well acquainted with the respect with which this loose-living monarch regarded the saintly abbot of Cluny, Leo sent for him to come into Italy to act as peace-maker. As we may well imagine from his position in the city, and as we are, in fact, directly informed, Alberic also had his share in this invitation to Odo to come to Rome. Hugh, abbot of the monastery of Farfa among the Sabine hills, in his *Destructio Farfensis*, records that Alberic, "the glorious prince, was so anxious to bring back the monasteries under his dominion to the due observance of their rule, which had fallen into abeyance during the ravages of the heathen, that he caused the holy Abbot Odo to come from Gaul, and constituted him archimandrite (or abbot-general) over all the monasteries in the neighborhood of Rome. Moreover, he gave the house on the Aventine in which he was born to be turned into a monastery in honor of Our Lady. It may be seen to this day". And on this day too of the twentieth century a church of Our Lady (S. M. Aventinense or S. M. del Priorato) still occupies the site of the house of Alberic

When Odo reached the Eternal City the troops of Hugo were encamped before its walls. “By Pope Leo was he sent”, writes Odo’s disciple and biographer, John the Italian, of his master, “as peacemaker between Hugo, king of the Lombards, and Alberic, prince of the city of Rome”. To effect a treaty between them, and "to save the city the horrors of siege, the abbot passed backwards andf orwards between the two rulers in his endeavours to soothe the rage of the king". The efforts of the saint, helped by famine among the besiegers and the loss of their horses, were, as we have already seen, crowned with success, and the investment of the city ended like many another tragic prelude with a marriage. Alberic took to wife Alda, Hugo's daughter, and for the time, at least, there was peace between the two rivals; and Alberic, with the aid of Odo, devoted himself to the founding and reforming of monasteries.

Massacre of Pilgrims to Rome, 936

From Rome and the Pope, however, no wars nor rumours of wars, no difficulties nor dangers of any sort have ever been able to keep the devout pilgrim. And in the tenth century the dangers were anything but imaginary. In 923 Frodoard chronicled the slaughter of many of our countrymen on their way to Rome by the Saracens of Fraxineto; and in this year (936) he tells of the same marauders making a plundering expedition into Germany, and on their return killing a number of people who were on the same errand. These scraps of information are worth recording because they show that, despite any disreputable deeds which may have been enacted even in the palace of the Popes during the tenth century, Rome was then to the Christian world still the centre of its religion, and the Pope of Rome still in its eyes the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

And again we may remark that many more or less isolated facts of this age, which are occasionally brought to the surface, prove that the prestige of the Papacy in Europe in the tenth century was not so utterly dimmed as many are disposed to believe. In the reign of Leo VII events were in progress which were to cause this truth to be illustrated under his successor by affairs in Gaul. In January 936 died, without issue, Rodolf of Burgundy; and the great nobles of France invited from England Louis, hence called d'Outre-Mer (from beyond the sea), the son of Charles the Simple, to be their king. His mother had carried him as a child to England when his father had been seized by Heribert of Vermandois. Though only sixteen when he came to France, he showed himself a worthy descendant of Charlemagne. Finding him determined to rule, we shall see the great nobles who had summoned him from England deserting him, and Stephen (VIII) IX, true to the papal tradition of friendship for the Carolingians, effectively standing by him.

In Germany, too, during the pontificate of Leo VII, events were taking place which were destined in their sequel to have the deepest effect on the Papacy, and on which the Popes in turn were to exercise an equal influence. It was in this same year (936) also that Henry I, the Fowler, died, who by his wise policy at home and gallant deeds in the field did so much to form a strong and united Germany, a stout barrier behind which the states of Europe might advance in safety along the road of civilization. He was contemplating a journey to Rome—whether as a pilgrim, to bring Italy also to some semblance of order, or for the imperial crown, is not clear—when he was seized with a mortal illness. His son Otho I, as famous in the annals of the Papacy as of Germany, was elected "with the consent of the nobles of the kingdom."

With the great political events of his age Leo had but little connection. To judge at least by the documents of his reign which jealous time has suffered to survive till now, he was mostly occupied in issuing bulls in favour of monasteries. The great monastic

development at this time, attested by the decrees of Leo VII, is at least a good augury for the future. A new monastery then meant not merely a harbour of peace for such as were sick at heart at the violence and lawlessness they met with all round them, but a centre of learning, order, and peace. But while these bulls are of the first importance for purposes of chronology and local history, it will serve no useful end to go into them here in any detail. It will be enough to note that most of them are concerned with that grand centre of monastic reform, Cluny; and that some are granted at the request of Alberic, "most glorious Prince and Senator of all the Romans", thereby testifying in their silent way to the piety of the *tyrant*, and perchance to the dependence of the Pope. Others again had been petitioned for even by "Hugo, glorious king, along with his son King Lothaire", associated with himself on the throne of Italy in 931.

One letter at least of Leo VII, of no little importance, has reached us. It is addressed to Frederick, archbishop of Mainz (Mayence). Leo did not limit himself to groaning over the state of the world. It is true he said that, "in these our days, times full of danger have come upon us, and whilst charity has grown cold, iniquity so abounds that well-nigh the whole order of things is upset, and there does not seem a place whereon religion may rest". But at the same time he endeavored to make a home for religion. What he had heard of the work for law and order accomplished by Henry the Fowler, and what he had been told of the energy of his son, Otho I, naturally made him turn his eyes to Germany. To co-operate with the enlightened efforts of these two great princes, he appointed Frederick his vicar and missus throughout all the regions of the whole of Germany, so that, wherever he found any bishops, priests, deacons, or monks failing to do their duty, he was not to omit to correct them, and to bring them back to the way of truth. But while, in response to the archbishop's question as to whether it was better to baptize the Jews by force, or drive them out of the cities, he would not allow him to baptize them against their will, he so far yielded to the spirit of the age as to allow him to expel them from the cities unless they embraced the Christian religion. Whether Leo lived to see any of the fruits of his labours for reform in Germany we do not know. He died July 939.

Little as we know of his life, we know enough of it to say that he did what very many in high places fail to do. He dignified the lofty station he held with at least many of the virtues which became it; though Milman, with what must be stigmatized as his usual inaccuracy, classes Leo VII with his three successors as Popes who gave "hardly a sign of their power in Rome, no indication of their dignity, still less of their sanctity."

STEPHEN (VIII) IX
939-942.

To supplement the little that they found recorded of Stephen IX by reliable authors, Bower and others have fallen back upon fables derived from Martinus Strepus, generally known as Martinus Polonus. This Dominican, who did not compile his famous *Chronicle of Popes and Emperors* till the latter half of the thirteenth century, is now universally allowed to have been destitute of critical ability and to have freely inserted fables for history. As his Chronicle was very popular, Wattenbach, in his well-known work on the *Sources of History*, has to regret the loss which accrued to historical studies by the wide circulation of such an uncritical production. On the authority of such a late and untrustworthy source, Stephen IX, is described as a German, and as elected Pope by the power of his relative Otho I, who set aside the rights of the cardinals. Hated as a Teuton, he was seized, and so disfigured by the partisans of Alberic that he could not appear in public. But that Stephen, who was attached to the Church of "SS. Silvester and Martin", now S. Martino ai Monti, was a Roman, is the testimony of the contemporary or quasi-contemporary catalogues; and it is needless to point out that Otho's influence on the affairs of Italy and the Papacy had not as yet made itself felt. In the earlier years of his reign he was too much taken up with endeavours to secure his own ascendancy over German dukes almost as powerful as himself, and to extend his sway westwards at the expense of Louis d'Outre-Mer, to have been able to concern himself with Italian interests, civil or ecclesiastical

Elected on July 14, 939, Stephen seems to have been largely taken up with the affairs of Gaul, as the country of the Franks was still frequently called. In the *Life* of Leo VII reference was made to the crowning of Louis d'Outre-Mer as king of France. He had been offered the crown because it had been fondly imagined that he would not attempt to wear it effectively. But when it was found that Louis wished to be king in reality as well as in name, several of the more powerful nobles, chief among whom were Hugh the Great, duke of the Franks, whose authority extended over the territory between the Loire and the Seine, and Heribert of Vermandois, combined against him. Hugh was the representative of the line which was soon to oust the Carolingian dynasty from the throne. He was the son of King Robert, and father of Hugh Capet, the founder of the Capetian line which ruled in France till the beginning of the fourteenth century (1328). To strengthen their hands against Louis, the malcontents made overtures to Otho I of Germany. Unable to make headway against such a powerful combination, the youthful monarch was, by the beginning of the year 942, reduced to the greatest straits. At this juncture Stephen decided to intervene in his behalf. He accordingly dispatched as his legate to the opposing parties one Damasus, "an illustrious man", whom he had consecrated bishop for the purposes of this embassy. He was the bearer of letters from the Pope to the nobles, "and to all the inhabitants of France and Burgundy", to the effect that they were to acknowledge Louis, and to cease their hostility against him under pain of excommunication. Aroused by this action of the Pope, the bishops of the diocese of Rheims met in synod and sought to induce Heribert to prevail on Hugh the Great to submit to Louis. Except that it tended to draw the bishops from the party of the nobles, this first attempt of Stephen to make peace was unsuccessful. One failure, however, only encouraged him to make a second attempt. Perhaps with a view to putting the

youth's father (Heribert) and his uncle (Hugh the Great) under an obligation to him, Stephen granted (942) the pallium to Hugh, who, as we have seen, had been elected archbishop of Rheims in his fifth year. With the bearers of the pallium was dispatched another embassy from Rome "to the princes of the kingdom." Again were they exhorted to submit to Louis. This time they were told that, if before Christmas they had not sent envoys to Rome to make their submission known to the Pope, they would be excommunicated. The king's cause improved at once. Many of the great nobles rallied around him. "This movement in favour of the king seems to have been the result of the menaces from Rome; for the Papacy still enjoyed a considerable amount of prestige despite the disorders which had preceded the pontificate of Leo VII." Before the close of the year (942) Louis was at peace with Otho, and had received the submission of the great nobles of his kingdom. "None had dared to brave the sentence of excommunication. It was a victory for the Carolingian royalty in its decline. (But) it was almost entirely owing to the intervention of that Roman power which, in its heyday of prosperity, the decaying dynasty had done so much to establish". Even in the darkest hours of the tenth century the Papacy was not that *negligible quantity* in the political affairs of Europe which many have so long been wont to suppose.

The influence which the Popes then exercised was exerted when communication with Rome was, from one cause and another, most difficult. In 940 Frodoard has again to record another massacre, in the passes of the Alps, of Englishmen (Transmarini) on their way to Rome, by the Saracens of Fraxineto. And in the very year (942) which witnessed Stephen's intervention in behalf of Louis, there was a renewal of the fierce war between Hugo and Alberic, which seriously interrupted communication with Rome, and which was once more only brought to a close by the successful intervention of the saintly Odo.

Perhaps it is in connection with these efforts from without which Hugo made to overthrow the power of Alberic that ought to be placed the conspiracy against the latter in Rome itself narrated by Benedict of Soracte. In alliance against the Prince of the Romans were not only bishops, but the *senatrices*, Alberic's sisters. One of these latter, however, betrayed the plot to her brother, and he was enabled to triumph over his foes both within and without the city, whether they were in league or not. The conspirators were scourged (*berberati* as Benedict calls it), beheaded, or imprisoned. And a diet or placitum held by Alberic at this time (August 17, 942) shows him supreme in the city and, for the purposes of administering justice, employing in such assemblies both the officials of the papal court, such as the primicerius and secundicerius of the notaries, and the chief nobles of the city, the Vestararius Benedict, Crescentius, and others whose names are of frequent occurrence in Roman affairs of this period.

It would seem that it was about this time also that he renewed his efforts to secure the aid of the Greeks by means of a matrimonial alliance. He felt the necessity of making a counter-move to that of his powerful foe Hugo, who in 942 was himself negotiating for a Greek alliance on a matrimonial basis. Hugo's aim was to marry one of his bastard daughters to the grandson (afterwards Romanus II) of the Emperor Romanus. Alberic was not a little alarmed when he heard that the emperor was preparing to place at his enemy's disposal ships furnished with the dread Greek fire, and had already sent great presents to the Lombard king. Accordingly, as his wife Alda was dead, he again demanded the daughter of Romanus in marriage. As usual, a favourable hearing was seemingly granted to the request.

According to the prescribed etiquette of the Byzantine court, when Alberic's ambassadors arrived at Constantinople, they first offered to the emperor the respects of the Pope and clergy, and then the faithful service of "the most glorious Prince of Old

Rome, of his nobles, and of all the people submitted to him". Then the logothete, who received them in the first instance, asked about the health of the most holy Bishop of Rome, the spiritual father of the emperor", and about that of the Roman clergy; and brought to a conclusion this formal part of the reception of the Roman envoys by polite inquiries about "the most glorious Prince of Old Rome".

Altogether his embassy was so favorably received that Alberic, regarding the matter as settled, made extensive preparations for the reception of his expected Greek bride. To attend upon her he gathered into his palace all the most lovely young ladies of the noble families both of Rome and the Sabina. But Alberic and his fair companions waited in vain.' The Greek princess never came; no doubt because it was never intended that she should come. The wily Greeks had no intention of offering substantial support to either party. The longer Alberic and Hugo fought, and the more they weakened each other, the better would their interests in south Italy be served.

In the little that history has to tell of the career of Pope Stephen, there is certainly no sign that he exercised anymore civic authority in Rome than his immediate predecessors or successors. He was released from his state of dependence by his death, which took place apparently in the month of October 942.

MARINUS II
942-946.

SHADOWY and still more shadowy are now growing the successor of St. Peter. Although a nominee of Alberic "without whose orders he durst not put his hand to anything", Marinus was a most worthy man. Indeed, there is this to be said in favour of Alberic's otherwise tyrannical domination, viz., that he seems in every case to have appointed to the papal throne men who, if weak, were at any rate good. Marinus, a Roman of the title of St. Ciriacus, was no exception to the rule. He became Pope in October (October 3o, according to Duchesne) 942.

Among the pilgrims who are said to have come "to the threshold of the apostles" during the pontificate of Marinus was the famous Udalric or Ulric, sometime bishop of Augsburg. But as the visit of Ulric referred to took place in the year 909, it is plain that his biographer must either have inadvertently written Marinus for Sergius, or have called Marinus Pope in 909, because he afterwards acquired that dignity. It is generally supposed that the latter is the correct explanation.

When Ulric reached Rome, he was well received by Marinus, who asked him of what nationality he was. Told that he was a German of Augsburg, and attached to the household of Adalberon, the bishop of that city, Marinus at once assured him that that prelate was dead, and that he was destined to succeed him. The saint expressed his profound astonishment at what he had heard, and his disinclination to become bishop. "Well", replied Marinus, "if you will not accept the bishopric now, when it is intact, you will have to take it when it is in ruins, and you will have to restore it". And so it happened. The diocese was laid waste by the terrible Hungarians, and, on the death of Adalberon's successor, Hiltinus (d. 923), Ulric succeeded him. Three visits of Ulric to Rome are recorded, but only the second could possibly have fallen in the actual reign of Marinus as Pope.

Like his predecessor Stephen IX, Marinus, in a quiet way indeed, but steadily, worked for the reform of the fChurch. He continued the appointment of Frederick, archbishop of Mayence, as "vicar and missus" of the Apostolic See throughout Germany and Gaul, "so that he had papal power, if he found any persons whatsoever deviating from the right path, to summon them to him wheresoever he pleased, to warn and correct them, and to hold synods". Frederick, like most of the great bishops of his day, was deep in all the great political movements of his age; but how far he found time to attend to the discipline of his clergy and to the improvement of the moral tone of the people "throughout Germany and Gaul" is a question not easily answered. At any rate, maintaining that it was better to have a few really good monks than many negligent ones, he made a dead set first against the smaller monasteries and then against the larger ones. But there is a suspicion that he did this out of resentment, because he had for a time been imprisoned in the monastery of Fulda on account of some conspiracy against Otho. Despite his intrigues against Otho, however, it may be fairly concluded from the fact of his meriting the confidence of two good Popes, that, for the times at least, he was a useful bishop, and contrived, in some way or other, to find opportunity to work for the good of souls. And so the Annals of Hildesheim (an. 954), in recording his death, speak of him as a man "of the greatest abstemiousness, and as of tried faith and morality". Even to his successor, who was an illegitimate son of Otho himself, he seems to have

been regarded as a worthy man. The last entry in the *Annates Augienses* (954) records the death of Frederick, "of happy memory", and goes on : "The same year, I, William, unworthy to succeed such a great man, was elected in his place with the consent of the clergy and people of the same holy see," viz. of Mayence.

While endeavouring to improve discipline in distant lands through his vicars, Marinus in his own person strove to amend it nearer home. Sicus, bishop of Capua, had seized a church which his predecessor had given to the Benedictines that they might build a monastery alongside it, and had bestowed it as a benefice on a deacon who was as unworthy a cleric as the bishop himself. When the affair was brought to the Pope's notice, he took occasion from the incident to upbraid the bishop not only for this act of injustice, but also for his ignorance both of sacred and profane literature, and for the company he kept. For Sicus preferred not merely the company of laymen to that of clerics, but even that of the lowest of laymen and the most ignorant of clerics. The Pope decided that the bishop must restore the church forthwith, so that it may no longer be used for disorderly purposes. Sicus must also cease to make a companion of the said deacon. If he does not obey, he will be deprived of his dignity and excommunicated. Whether Sicus had anything to urge against the accuracy of the information, which had been forwarded to the Pope by a certain learned man", is not known, but the church was no doubt restored.

The interest felt by Marinus in the great monastic development which was then in progress is shown by the bulls he issued in favour of various monasteries. Of some of these documents the contents have come down to us. One of the *privileges* of Marinus deserves to be mentioned, as it serves to show that, though the Popes had at this time no civil power in the more distant parts of what was once their dominion, they had not lost all their property there. It is a *privilege* addressed to the archbishop of Ravenna "in connection with a portion of the county of Ferrara."

Whether Marinus ever lived in it or not, it is interesting to know that modern archeological research has revealed the fact that the palace built by John VII out of palace on the ruins of the north-eastern section of the *Domus Guiana*, which overlooks the Forum and the Sacred Way, was still apparently habitable in his time. The latest bit of evidence regarding the real or nominal occupancy of the Palatine episcopal residence by the Popes came to light November 8, 1883, during the excavation of the house of the Vestals. At the north-eastern corner of the peristyle the remains of a modest mediaeval dwelling were discovered, belonging to a high official of the court of Marinus II ... This official must have been in charge of the Pope's rooms which were placed among the ruins of the Domus Gaiana.

From what has been already narrated of Marinus, we can have no difficulty in accepting what is said of him by of Marinus. Cardinal Baronius, though the authority he adduces is no more definite than "an ancient Vatican MS". According to that document, "Marinus gave himself up wholly to the inner life of the Church. He strove to reform both the secular and regular clergy, and devoted himself to the repair of the basilicas and the care of the poor. And by his letters he did all he could to promote the sacred cause of peace amongst Christian princes."

Marinus died in April (Jaffé) or May (Duchesne) 946.

In the middle of the twelfth century, and seemingly by Otho, who was bishop of Tivoli in 1160, a collection was made of the chief documents regarding that church. The quarto volume into which they were formed is remarkable for the number of illuminated miniatures with which it is adorned. It was presented to the Vatican archives by Mario Orsini, who was bishop of Tivoli from 1624 to 1634, and it was first completely edited by Bruzza.

One of the miniatures represents Pope Marinus II, seated, and giving a *privilege* to Hubert, bishop of Tivoli. The Pope is represented as clean-shaven and wearing the tonsure. He is clad in a red robe over which is a tunic of a brick-red. A blue chasuble, edged with green lace, completes his costume. He wears the pallium on his shoulders. His feet, shod with red sandals, rest on a yellow cushion. The circular nimbus round his head shows he was dead when the miniature was painted.

AGAPITUS II
946-955.

WHAT we do know of the work of the Roman Agapitus and what we are told of his "wondrous sanctity" can only make us regret with Muratori that no biography of him has come down to us. However, that he was consecrated Pope on May to, 946, is a point on which both Jaffé and Duchesne are agreed, and which is established by documentary evidence.

No doubt that which helped Agapitus to accomplish more than some of his predecessors was the fact that during his pontificate Rome and its neighborhood were left free from the visits of armed enemies. But when Gregorovius writes that under him the Papacy "reappears as taking part in matters connected with foreign countries, matters in which, under the immediate predecessors of Agapitus, it had had no share", he is robbing Peter to pay Paul. What has been recorded in the foregoing pages is more than sufficient to show that at no period of the tenth century up to this has the influence of the Papacy been unfelt in the affairs of Europe.

Before the accession of Agapitus, King Hugo was in serious difficulties. Berenger, marquis of Ivrea, the grandson of the Emperor Berenger, who had married Willa, the niece of Hugo, appeared in arms against his uncle (945) . Some five years before, dread of Hugo's jealousy had forced Berenger to fly to the court of Otho. However, no sooner did he descend the Alps with a small army than the lascivious and avaricious Hugo found himself abandoned by all. As a last resort he resigned the crown of Italy to his popular son, Lothaire, and with his money-bags went back to Provence (94 6), where he died the following year. Among the jottings of news entered by Frodoard under the year 946, we find recorded the return of Hugo to his Transalpine kingdom, the accession of Agapitus, and the fact that "peace was concluded between the Patrician Alberic and Hugo, king (of Italy)."

For a year or two, with the consent of Berenger and the nobility, Lothaire retained the title of king, while Berenger held its power. This unsatisfactory state of things was terminated in November 95o by the death of Lothaire, poisoned, as some relate, at the behest of Berenger. The next month Berenger and his son Adalbert were proclaimed kings of Italy. But the lawlessness of their rule soon raised a hornet's nest about them. The young widow of Lothaire was treated by them with the utmost indignity, and then imprisoned (April 951); justice was sold, and papal property seized in the most brigand-like style. By Liutprand Berenger is lashed in unmeasured terms. Quoting Job (xxxix. 13, 18) he says : *The wing of the ostrich is like the wings of the heron and of the hawk ... When the time comes, she setteth up her wings on high; she scorneth the horse and his rider*. Whilst Hugo and Lothaire were still to the fore, that great and voracious ostrich was not good, indeed, but it had the semblance of good. But on their death ... how he raised his wings and despised all of us, I have to tell not so much in words as in sighs and groans". Were the words of the evil-tongued Liutprand not supported by those of more reliable men, not much weight could be attached to them; for he was once in the service of Berenger, and for some cause had left it for that of his enemy Otho.

However, when Adelaide contrived to escape from the clutches of Berenger, all who had a grievance, real or imaginary, against the two kings of Italy turned their eyes to Otho, and to him directed their prayers for help. And Otho was nothing loath to give

it. He determined to free Adelaide altogether from the power of Berenger, marry her, and with her to obtain possession of the kingdom of Italy. What he resolved to do, he accomplished. When he entered Italy, opposition melted away before him. In October (951) he was proclaimed king of Italy, and at Christmas he married the attractive Adelaide. But his ambition was not satisfied. He would be emperor. He had given out before he started on this, his first expedition into Italy, that Rome was his goal. And so when he found himself so easily master of the north of Italy, he sent the bishops of Mayence (Mainz) and of Coire or Chur to Rome to negotiate for his reception there (952). Through the influence of Alberic, no doubt, who did not want a master, Otho was given plainly to understand that he was not wanted at Rome. With Berenger still at large in Italy, and with his own position at home not too secure, owing to rebellious dukes on the one hand and Hungarians on the other, Otho did not at the time feel justified in braving a new foe. He returned to Germany (952), with his own hopes of the imperial crown and those of the Pope for liberty alike temporarily frustrated.

Alberic then, meanwhile, was left in undisturbed possession of his usurped power, at least in so far as external interference was concerned; and he knew how to put down conspiracy at home with a strong hand. His name continued to take the place of the emperor's on the papal coins, and it was he who, in conjunction with St. Odo, abbot of Cluny, took the leading part in promoting monastic reform in Rome and in its immediate neighborhood. And if, as throughout the ninth century, the hall in the Lateran palace, to which the presence of the bronze she-wolf, popularly known as the "mother of the Romans", gave the name of *ad Lupam*, continued to behold the judicial assemblies of the clerical and lay nobility, we may be sure that any decisions they came to were in accordance with the wishes of "the Prince and Senator of all the Romans".

Soon after the departure of Otho from Italy, Berenger submissively placed his pretensions in the hands of Otho, and received back from him, as his vassal, the kingdom of Italy, less the marches of Verona and Aquileia, which were entrusted to Henry, duke of Bavaria.

Meanwhile, the miseries of Italy continued. Seeing that Otho was fully occupied at home, Berenger wreaked his vengeance for his humiliations on the nobility of Italy, both clerical and lay, thereby simply laying up further trouble for himself. And while the Hungarians made a practice at this period of returning from their plundering expeditions by way of the north of Italy, the southern portion of the peninsula was still kept at fever-heat by the warlike struggles of Greek, Saracen, and native prince.

However, as we have said, during all this turmoil in north and south Italy, Rome remained at peace under the strong arm of Alberic II. But at length, in the words of Benedict of Soracte, "the glorious prince began to languish". And so, summoning the nobles of Rome before him in St. Peter's, he made them swear, by the side of the Confession of the apostle, that on the death of Agapitus they would elect his son Pope. "We do not doubt the statement", writes Gregorovius "Alberic's clear intellect must have recognized that the separation of the temporal power from the Papacy in Rome was impossible for any length of time. In the hope of the intervention of Germany, however, the Papacy had attained a new power under Agapitus, and sooner or later Otho the First must seize the reins of government in Rome. Alberic understood this ... He therefore secured dominion to Octavian in thus inducing the Romans to invest him with the papal crown". In the absence of any direct evidence as to Alberic's intellect, and as to the political theories which he adopted, we may take it that these are the views of Gregorovius himself; and we may pause to note that it is as true now as Gregorovius declared it to have been in the tenth century that “the separation of the temporal power from the Papacy in Rome” is impossible.

"Though a cleric" says Frodoard, "his son Octavian obtained the princedomin succession to his deceased father Alberic, the Patrician of the Romans". And as Princeps he awaited the death of Agapitus to become head of the Universal Church as well as head of the State of Rome.

The death of Alberic was in many ways a misfortune. During his reign, the Popes, if powerless, were virtuous; and, if he himself ruled absolutely, he would appear to have ruled justly and firmly. Under his sway the good were free to perform the works of virtue, and the lawlessness of the barons was kept in check. No sooner was his strong arm taken away than violence again stalked abroad, and we find Leo, the abbot of Subiaco, complaining to the Pope "of the great wrongs they had endured since the days when the Lord Alberic, of good memory, departed from this life"

Now that we have reviewed the general political situation in as far as it affected Rome and the Pope, we may direct our attention to the more particular actions in which Agapitus was engaged. Perhaps the most important of these was the question of the See of Rheims. It has been already told how the powerful Heribert, count of Vermandois, got his child-son elected to the See of Rheims, and how King Rodolf, after he had obtained possession of the archiepiscopal city, forcibly placed Artaud on its ecclesiastical throne. Though somewhat weak in his attachments, Artaud was, in the main, true to the Carolingian line, and supported Louis d'Outre-Mer against his recalcitrant nobles. Naturally, therefore, on every count had he to face the enmity of Heribert. In the struggle between Louis and Heribert with his allies, not a few of the possessions of the See of Rheims fell into the hands of the count of Vermandois. In the presence of Louis and the bishops who remained true to him, Artaud solemnly excommunicated Heribert for retaining the property "of St. Remy" (939). Next year, however, Rheims fell into the hands of the king's enemies, and Artaud found himself incarcerated in a monastery. Attempts were made to force him to resign his claims to the archbishopric; and, according to Richer, report had it that he did so on oath. Hugh, his rival, now aged twenty, was ordained priest; and at a council held at Soissons (940), was declared duly elected to the archiepiscopal see and immediately consecrated. Artaud appealed to Rome. Whether or not he had any opportunity of getting his case brought properly before the Pope, certain it is that Hugh procured the pallium from Stephen (VIII) IX (942). But the fortune of war again turned in favour of Louis, and Artaud was once more in Rheims (946). He was reinstalled by the archbishops of Trier and of Mayence, for Otho was now in alliance with Louis. Hugh, however, took good care that his rights to the See of Rheims were not lost for want of making them known. In accordance, therefore, with instructions received from Rome, a council was held in November 947 at Verdun, under the presidency of Robert of Trier. As Hugh would not present himself before this assembly, another synod was assembled early the following year at Mouzon itself, where he was residing. But after an interview with Robert, Hugh refused to appear even before this council. He forwarded, however, to it by the hands of a deacon a letter, which purported to come from the Pope, and which, without more ado, ordered that the bishopric should be given to Hugh. The assembled prelates, however, decided that it was not the proper thing to pass over a regular commission received by Robert of Trier from Rome in favour of a letter presented by an enemy and rival of Artaud, and that what had been begun in due form, should be also finished in accordance with the canons. They further decreed that, till a general or national council could be called, Artaud was to retain the see, and Hugh to be regarded as excommunicated. While the latter set the decrees of the council at naught, they were forwarded to Rome. Agapitus at once authorized the calling of such a council, and sent as his legate to Otho to arrange for its convocation Marinus, bishop of Bomarzo, and

librarian of the Holy See. He also wrote himself to various bishops, charging them to be present at the council. Its proceedings show, further, that the Pope wished it to be a means of helping the unfortunate Louis d'Outre-Mer.

In presence of both Louis and Otho, the famous synod of Ingelheim was opened in June 948. Ingelheim, which we have met with before as a *villa* of the Carolingian kings, was on the left bank of the Rhine, some eight miles from Mayence. Not to count the priests and abbots, over thirty bishops, mostly Germans, were present at the council, which, as its Acts and the Annals of the period proclaim, was presided over by the papal legate Marinus. It was the power of Hugh, duke of the Franks, the enemy of Louis, which prevented the presence of many bishops from the dominions of the latter. The proceedings of the council were opened by the reading of the gospel and by prayer. Then Marinus produced his commission, in which it was stated that he had been sent "by the universal Pope" to Germany in order that in every canonical discussion which might arise, he might "by apostolical authority" bind what ought to be bound and loose what needed loosing. Both kings and bishops proclaimed their adhesion to the papal mandate.

In connection with the first object of the synod, the restoration of Louis, Marinus pointed out that the Pope had written to the people of France to induce them to be loyal to Louis; and it was decreed (can. I) that in future no one was to dare to assail the royal authority, and that Hugh was to be excommunicated if he did not present himself at the appointed time before a synod and make reparation to Louis. Artaud was then (can. 2) declared lawful archbishop of Rheims, and Hugh excommunicated. After these two most important affairs had been dealt with, the council passed various decrees for the amelioration of discipline with the approval of the papal vicar.

Through the armed support of Otho, Artaud was restored to his see, and Hugh the Great was summoned to appear before a synod at Trier (Troves), September 948. Here again Marinus presided, and as Hugh did not appear, he was excommunicated, on the initiative of Otho, till such time as he should make satisfaction before the papal legate. If he failed to do this, he would have to go to Rome for absolution.

To give greater solemnity and effect to the decrees of these two assemblies, Agapitus, in a council held in St. Peter's, confirmed the condemnation of the youthful archbishop, and excommunicated "Prince Hugh till he should make atonement to Louis". This settled both questions. Finding his nobility, clerical and lay, falling away from him, Duke Hugh submitted once more to his sovereign (950). "This change in the relations of the duke of France and of the Carolingian (king) was, as in 942, the result of the intervention of the Pope and the mediation of the king of Germany."

The death of Artaud, towards the close of 961, caused the whole question to be reopened again to the great danger of the Carolingian line. The representatives of the house of Vermandois, Albert and Heribert, demanded of Lothaire, who had meanwhile succeeded his father Louis, that their brother Hugh should now be placed in possession of the vacant See of Rheims. Their demand was backed by the powerful support of Hugh Capet. Naturally Lothaire did not wish to have the most important see in France in the hands of a hostile faction. To counteract the alliance of Hugh Capet with the family of Vermandois, Lothaire sought the aid of Otho I, and meanwhile caused a synod to discuss the question of the restoration of Hugh. The partisans of the king maintained that a smaller number of bishops could not remove from Hugh the excommunication which had been imposed upon him by a greater number at Mouzon, Ingelheim, etc. It was finally decided to leave the matter in the hands of the Pope. John XII, influenced perhaps by Otho, renewed the excommunication against Hugh, first at Rome and then at Pavia (962). A papal legate brought word of the Pope's action to France. Within a brief

space Hugh died of chagrin. Through the influence of the famous Archbishop Bruno, Lothaire's brother-in-law and the adviser of Otho I, Odelric, a canon of the church of Metz, a man both acceptable to Lothaire and endowed with wealth, nobility of birth, and learning, was elected to the vacant see. Thus was another source of danger to the successors of Charlemagne removed by Rome. If anything could have preserved the Carolingian line from political extinction, the support of the Popes would have done it. But, despite the continued goodwill of Rome, the Carolingians could not resist the pressure of the Robertians, but had to yield to them the pride of place.

The other relations of Agapitus with Louis and Otho were of a character more strictly ecclesiastical. He granted a bull in favour of the church of Macon, at the request of the "pious" King Louis, "his dear son" and, in response "to the intervention of our lord the glorious King Otho", he does the same for the nunnery of Essen, now famous for something very different to nuns. We also find him subjecting another monastery simply to Otho himself and to the abbot elected by the monks. Agapitus seems to have had great confidence in Otho. This he showed not merely in the last-mentioned bull, but also in the ready way in which he gave him permission to arrange certain bishoprics as he listed. However, the protest of William, archbishop of Mayence, the papal vicar, whose jurisdiction would have been curtailed by the carrying out of the schemes of Otho, seems to have rendered this concession abortive. Further, to Bruno, archbishop of Cologne, the king's youngest brother, and the *Alcuin* of the court of Otho, he not merely granted the pallium, but the exceptional privilege of wearing it when he chose. As far as Bruno was concerned, he well deserved honour at the Pope's hands; for his one desire was to be united in word and deed "with those who preserve the sound doctrine handed down from Blessed Peter the apostle". But if Agapitus had foreseen that Otho's dreams of universal dominion would lead him to try to enslave the Church, he would probably not have been so considerate towards him.

Denmark and Hamburg-Bremen.

Before leaving Otho, a word or two must be said of the spread of the jurisdiction of the See of Hamburg-Bremen. In his efforts to drive back the pagans, the Danes, the Slavs, and the Hungarians, who pressed him on all sides, Otho in due course came into collision with the Danes under Harold Bluetooth, the son of Gorm the Old. The Danish monarch was defeated. With a view to humbling and elevating him at the same time, Otho insisted that he should become a Christian, as Charlemagne had done in the case of Widukind the Saxon, and our own Alfred with Guthrum. The result was in every case satisfactory. Harold remained true to his new faith. "At that time", says Adam of Bremen, "Cismarine Denmark (Dania), which the natives call Jutland, was divided (presumably by joint agreement between Harold, Otho, and the Pope) into three bishoprics, and subjected to that of Hamburg. There are preserved in the church of Bremen diplomas of Otho which show that he held the Danish kingdom beneath his sway, so that he even appointed *(donaverit)* its bishoprics. And among the privileges of the Roman See there may be found a bull in which Pope Agapitus renewed the privileges granted by his predecessors to the church of Hamburg, and conceded to Adalgar, its archbishop, the right of consecrating bishops in the Popes' stead as well for Denmark as for the other northern countries" (948).

Before this, another Danish ruler had been in communication with Agapitus. Among those vice-kings whom Gorm the Old (883-941) had striven to bring into subjection to the king of Denmark was Frode VI, vice-king of Jutland. He had been baptized by Unni, and at the suggestion of Archbishop Adalgar had sent to Rome for

missionaries for his country. We will give the account of this embassy in the quaint words of Saxo Grammaticus.

After speaking of Frode's success in war, Saxo continues: "He also came forward to be baptized with holy water in England, which had for some while past been versed in Christianity. But he desired that his personal salvation should overflow and become general, and begged that Denmark should be instructed in divinity by Pope Agapete, who was then Pope of Rome. But he was cut off before his prayers attained their wish. His death befell before the arrival of the messengers from Rome; and indeed his intention was better than his fortune, and he won as great a reward in heaven for his intended piety as others are vouchsafed for their achievement".

Affairs of Italy.

Some of the letters of Agapitus to different princes of Italy, with which Germany was to be so closely connected for many centuries, shed no little light on the state of the country. When he had to admonish the princes of Beneventum and of Capuato restore to certain monks their monasteries or their freedom, or to send back to their monasteries such monks as had fallen away from monastic discipline; and when he had to condemn simoniacal intruders into the sees of Termoli and Trivento, he evidently found South Italy in as unsatisfactory a condition ecclesiastically as it was politically.

In attending to reform nearer home, following the policy of his predecessors in showing well-deserved honor to the monks of the Cluniac reformation, he determined to place St. Paul's, *outside-the-walls,* in their hands. Accordingly he wrote to Einold, the abbot of Gorze in Lorraine, to send him some religious. The request was duly attended to.

It is, perchance, to go beyond our premises directly to connect the monks of Gorze, an abbey originally founded by St. Chrodegang, bishop of Metz, with the reformation of Cluny. At any rate, Agapitus was bent on drawing his supply of monks from a particularly pure source. And how hard it was to find a pure source may be estimated (allowing for a little exaggeration) from a remark of the biographer of Blessed John of Gorze, that "there was not a monastery in all the Cisalpine countries, and scarcely one in Italy, in which there was due observance of rule". At the beginning of the tenth century Gorze was almost in ruins. Adalberon, bishop of Metz, restored it, and put it into the hands of some pious ecclesiastics (933), among whom were Einold and the Blessed John de Vendiere. He soon gave them the religious habit, and their house, in a very short time, acquired a great reputation for virtue.

The position of the Pope in Rome is very plainly, if incidentally, shown by the contemporary author of the *Life* of Blessed John (t974), from whom we have these particulars, when he says that Agapitus proposed to introduce the monks from Gorze, "with the help of King Alberic."

Two coins of this Pope, preserved in the Vatican Cabinet, tell the same tale of the Pope's loss of supreme temporal authority in Rome. Though both coins bear the name of Agapitus, that of Alberic is equally prominent upon them.

Both Duchesne and Jaffé are agreed that Agapitus died in December 955. His tomb was in the Lateran basilica, "behind the apse", and close to those of Leo V and Paschal II, as John the Deacon tells us in his description of the Lateran. Though it is thought that from the time of John X the Popes were buried, not in the Vatican as formerly, but in the Lateran, no express mention of the place of burial of those between John X and Agapitus II is to be found.

JOHN XII.
955-964.

IT is unfortunate that the principal data from which a judgment has to be formed of the character of John are supplied from sources either actually German, as the *Continuation of the Chronicle of Regino* of Prum, or written in the interests of Germany, as the productions of the "malicious Liutprand", to use a correct expression of Gregorovius. There cannot be a doubt that John XII was anything but what a Pope, the chief pastor of Christendom, should have been. Between the vindictive Liutprand, who recorded all that he had picked up from the gossip of the spiteful or of the ignorant, and Frodoard, who has recorded practically nothing to the detriment of John, there are other contemporary authors who have said enough to let us see that John was far from being an exemplary pontiff. Such are the catalogues, Benedict of Soracte, and the anonymous author of the Chronicle of Salerno. John is supposed also to have fallen under the lash of Ratherius of Verona. If that zealous bishop really did scathe John XII for immorality, he certainly respected him as head of the Church. To Ratherius John is: "The archbishop of archbishops, and, if any man ought to be so designated, Universal Pope". And if towards the close of John's reign Ratherius could not refrain from denouncing him, he at any rate did not do so by name. Perhaps this was because he had been kindly treated by John. He wonders, however, at the general contempt of the canons displayed by all, "from the laymen, up, unfortunately, to the supreme pontiff". This expression of his occurs in a work, *De contemptu canonum*, published in the beginning of the year 964. And again, in order to show that the possibility of reform depended largely on the moral character of those in power, he asked what improvement could be looked for if one who was leading an immoral life, who was bellicose and perjured, and who was devoted to hunting, hawking, gaming, and wine, were to be elected to the Apostolic See.

However, whether this picture was drawn from life or not, it is certain that those who brought the most definite charges against John XII were partizans of Otho and the Germans. Hence their stories to his detriment have been viewed with suspicion, and that not merely in modern times, but in the Middle Ages, when historical criticism was not much in vogue, and, moreover, by Germans themselves. The worthy bishop, Otho of Frising (d. 1158), even though disposed somewhat to favour the Empire in its struggle with the Papacy, remarks in his Chronicle : “I have found it stated in certain chronicles, but in such as were written by Germans, that John XII lived in a blameworthy manner, and that there were frequent meetings of bishops and others on this subject”. This Otho goes on to declare it hard to believe, on account of the privilege bestowed on St. Peter of resisting the gates of hell. While realizing that our Lord's promise to St. Peter bestowed upon him not impeccability but infallibility, we may agree with Otho that what he read in the German chronicles is hard to believe, not because any impeccability was granted to St. Peter or his successors, but because it was written by German authors anxious to make out the best case for Otho.

While it is certain that John was the son of Alberic, it is supposed that Alda, daughter of Hugo of Provence, was his mother. Alberic married Alda in 936, as we know from the Annals of Frodoard, and the same is thought to be established from some

words of Benedict, if anything can be deduced with certainty from his barbarous phrases.

If, then, John was the son of Alberic and Alda, he was only eighteen when he was elected Pope. But if the words of Benedict have to be strictly interpreted, and he was the son of some concubine of Alberic, then he was probably older. A contemporary painting, indeed, represents him as quite a middle-aged man in the year 96o; for it was in that year we are assured that was painted the picture which formerly adorned the old sacristy of the Lateran basilica, and which was copied by Cardinal Rasponi, and then inserted by him in his history of that church. The Pope, who is represented as bearded and as clad in cassock, tunic, and dalmatic, is being invested with a large chasuble covered with small Greek crosses.

Alberic's ordinary residence was near the basilica of SS. Philip and James, known as that of The Apostles, and appears to have been situated where now stands the Palazzo Colonna. And so in the catalogues John is spoken of as belonging to the region of the Via Lata, the aristocratic quarter that was situated between the Quirinal Hill and the Campus Martius.

We have already seen how *Prince* Alberic, on his death-bed, made "all the Roman nobles" promise that on the death of Agapitus they would elect his son, the young Octavian, to succeed him. They were as good as their word, and the youth was consecrated on December 16, 955, taking the name of John XII. From the *Sigeric* catalogue it appears that he had been cardinal-deacon not of the *title* but of the *deaconry*, S. Maria *in Dominica* or *Domnica* (or *in Ciriaca*, its Greek equivalent), so called from its occupying the site of the house of S. Ciriaca. It is on the Celian Hill, not far from S. Stefano Rotondo. In temporal concerns the new Pope made use of the signature *Octavianus*, and in spiritual of *John*. This custom of using sometimes their family, and sometimes their assumed, name is still observed by the Popes.

Octavian is generally credited with being the first Pope who changed his name on his election to the pontifical throne. Though to take a new name on their accession became more or less customary soon after the time of John XII, he was not the first Pope so to alter his name. It had already been done by a namesake of his, John II (533-535), who when a simple priest had been known as Mercury.

Apart from grants of privileges, among the first acts recorded of John is the dispatch of a letter to William of Mayence, the papal legate in Germany, in reply to one which had been sent to his predecessor. John sympathizes with the archbishop in his troubles, declares that he will have a care of the honor due to him, and exhorts him boldly to assail those who contumaciously wish to lead a bad life, and devastate the churches of God. He expresses a great wish to be informed of all that was going on "in the parts of the Gauls and Germany."

Writing (657) to another German archbishop, Henry of Trier, while granting him the use of the pallium, he exhorts him to a good life. Equally significant is his confirmation (958) of the possession of the monastery of Subiaco. Thishe did on condition "that every day by priests and monks should be recited, for the good of our soul and the souls of our successors, a hundred Kyrie-eleisons and a hundred Christe-eleisons, and that thrice each week the priests should offer the Holy Mass to Almighty God for the *absolution* of our soul and those of our successors". If John was bad himself, he had no intention of letting others do wrong, and showed himself fully alive to the value of prayer.

But a quiet life was not for John XII. For some cause, unknown to us—no doubt to recover the property or territory at one time belonging to the Holy See —he took up arms, and led an expedition against the princes of Beneventum and Capua. Not perhaps

unnaturally, as a southerner, the author of the Chronicle of Salernum, from whom alone we have these facts, and who, moreover, was *not* very *discerning,* puts the blame of the war on the Pope, "a youth, and given up to the vices thereof". John marched south at the head of a body of Tuscans and Spoletans, as well as Romans. To strengthen their position the attacked princes contrived to secure the support of Gisulf, prince of Salernum, who is highly praised for his valour and military skill by our anonymous chronicler. The mere rumour of the approach of this renowned warrior was enough to put the papal army to flight, and to make it return to its own territories. Struck by the power of Gisulf, the Pope decided to make an alliance with him. The chronicler tells us how the two met at Terracina, and how the Romans, astonished at the display of power made by Gisulf, exclaimed that the sight showed them that his greatness was even in excess of what report had declared it to be. Though we are informed that a treaty was made between John and Gisulf, nothing is known as to its terms. However, from the fact that, whereas in the Donation of Louis the Pious (817) mention is made of the papal patrimony of Salernum, but in those of Otho I and Henry II (1020) it is not alluded to, Fedele infers that the sacrifice of this patrimony was the price paid by John for an understanding with the strong prince of Salernum.

About this time (viz. 96o) John took a step which very materially altered the state of things. By his cruelty and the avarice of his wife, Willa, Berenger, the vassal king of Italy, made himself odious to Pope, bishop, and noble alike. Accordingly a general appeal for help against him was made to Otho. He was not only approached by legates of the Pope, by Walpert, archbishop of Milan, and others, "but almost all the counts and bishops of Italy, by means of letters or envoys, begged him to come and free them." The papal envoys bade Otho either give up his *patriciate* or protectorate of Rome altogether, or come and help them.

Free now, after his many wars against enemies at home and abroad, to attend to the affairs of Italy in person, Otho, the warlike soldier of the Church, accepted their invitation and entered the country (961). He had previously taken the precaution of associating his little son Otho with him in his kingdom. This time also, just as on the occasion of his former entry into Italy, no resistance was offered him. Berenger and his adherents fled, and shut themselves up in strong castles, and the victorious German marched to Rome. There he arrived on January 31, 962. He had sworn that, if received in the city, he would not interfere with the Pope's rights therein. According to the form preserved by Bonizo of Sutri, the oath he had taken ran thus : "To thee, the Lord Pope John, I, King Otho, promise and swear, by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, by the wood of the life-giving cross, and by these relics of the saints, that, if by the will of God I come to Rome, I will exalt to the best of my ability the Holy Roman Church and you its ruler; and never with my will or at my instigation shall you lose life or limb or the honour which you possess. And without your consent never, within the city of Rome, will I hold a *placitum* (plea) or make any regulation which affects you or the Romans. Whatever territory of St. Peter comes within my grasp, I will give up to you. And to whomsoever I shall entrust the kingdom of Italy, I will make him swear to help you as far *as* he can to defend the lands of St. Peter."

Encouraged by these promises, and, no doubt, like the rest of the Romans, duly impressed by the king's fierce soldiery, John bestowed "the glory of the imperial crown" upon Otho and his wife Adelaide in St. Peter's on February 2, 962.Though Frodoard and others speak of the cordial reception accorded to Otho, a German chronicler tells a story, and it is probably no more than a story, to the effect that Otho on this memorable occasion thus addressed his sword-bearer Ansfried :—"When this day I pray before the sacred shrine of the Apostles, do you hold your sword over my head all the time. For I

know that my ancestors have often had good reasons to suspect the good faith of the Romans. And it is for the wise man by forethought to anticipate difficulties while yet they are afar, that they may not overwhelm him by taking him unawares". True or false, the story illustrates the fact that at the time of their imperial coronation in Rome, the German monarchs had always to show that they possessed the power of the sword. There was always in the Eternal City a very strong party which objected to the presence of the German king in their midst, and it seldom, if ever, failed to make its power felt, either at the time of the coronation itself or soon after. And on the present occasion we shall see that no sooner was Otho's back turned on Rome than it made its influence manifest at once.

Meanwhile, however, the act of John had renewed the The Holy Roman Empire in the West. Through him "the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation" came into being, and that chain was forged which was to bind Germany and Italy together for centuries. Once more the affairs of Christendom were regarded as in proper hands. In theory at least, all acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope in matters spiritual, and that of the emperor in matters temporal. And though in practice turbulent bishops or nobles did not hesitate, as before, to oppose the authority of either or both; and though, indeed, the "two swords" themselves, i.e., the spiritual weapons of the Pope and the civil might of the emperors—were often crossed, still there can be no doubt that the grand idea of Pope and emperor, a supreme spiritual and a supreme temporal head of the Christian commonwealth, had an immense effect in the uplifting of Europe. With such ideals, narrow views could not but broaden; and it was difficult for such as put themselves in opposition to them to avoid not merely being regarded as in the wrong, but, in secret at least, thinking themselves in the wrong. It was the common possession of one grand ideal in religion and in politics that knit Europe together, and not only made possible such enterprises as the Crusades, but deepened such important fundamental conceptions as the brotherhood of nations and of man.

But to return to John and Otho; for with Otho of Frising I may say that it is my object rather simply to relate the facts of history than to unfold their causes and results. The need of an accurate narration of them as far as the Papacy is concerned can scarcely be questioned; for, on the basis of a very imperfect knowledge of the facts of the history of the Popes, new theories are constantly being erected. And it is hard to see how a building can be stronger than its foundations.

The donation of Otho.

The coronation of Otho was accompanied by mutual concessions on the part of the Pope and the emperor. John and the whole nobility of the city promised on oath, "over' the most precious body of St. Peter, "to remain true to Otho, and never to help Berenger and Adalbert; while the emperor not only gave the Pope many splendid presents, but “restored his own” to him; *i.e.*, by special deed of gift, of which a contemporary copy is still extant, he renewed the Donation of Charlemagne. This contemporary document, whether original or a copy, has been made the subject of what has been rightly called a “magisterial inquiry” by Professor Sickel of Vienna—the same author who made the searching investigation into the *Liber Diurnus.* With the permission of Leo XIII, of glorious memory, he was allowed to examine the diploma, and to make a photograph of it. “It is written in italics of tenth-century character, with ornaments in harmony; and it is written with gold ink on purple vellum. The professor does not regard this document to be strictly the original, but a copy executed in the Imperial Chancery; but its lavishly splendid get-up suggests that it was made for a

special purpose. Hence he holds the Vatican document to be an official copy, intended to be laid on the Confession of St. Peter". Although this document is dated February 13, 962, Duchesne regards it as a copy of an original of that date drawn up a year later. To this he is moved by the mention in it of "our venerated lord and spiritual father Leo". With others he thinks that such a form of expression could only be used of a contemporary pontiff, and that consequently it must refer to Otho's Pope, viz. Leo VIII. However this may be, the authenticity of Otho's diploma may be said to be now completely established. It renews the grants of territory and patrimonies of the preceding donations; and among the patrimonies it may be noted that the ancient one of Sicily, "if God shall deliver it into our hands", is mentioned. By this donation there was guaranteed to the Popes all the land between a southern line, drawn from Naples to Capua and on to the mouth of the Trinius (Trigno), and a northern one drawn from Luna, to include Venetia and Istria, by Berceto, Parma, Reggio, and Monselice. This latter line is the one which we have quoted in a preceding volume from the *Liber Pontificalis* as showing the limit of the original grant of Pippin, and concerning which it has been noted "that the claims made by the Pope at different times never went beyond it. The diploma goes on to assure freedom of election to the papal throne, according to the pact of Pope Eugenius, but insists that the elect be not consecrated before he has made the promise to preserve the rights of all, which our venerated lord and spiritual father Leo is known to have done of his own accord, in the presence of our missi, of our son (Otho II) and of the generality *(universes generalitatis)"*. The remaining articles of this document treat of the administration of justice; and, though they are on the same lines as those in the pact between Eugenius and Lothaire, just mentioned, they can scarcely be reconciled with the terms of Otho's oath to the Pope. He had sworn not to interfere with the papal government of Rome; and yet the clauses of the *concordat* of 824, which practically limited the Pope's jurisdiction, were reintroduced into his privilege.

John XII was very far from entering into immediate possession of all the territories made over to him by the Donation of the emperor. Of some of them the Popes were never to have control; and it was to be long enough before they exercised jurisdiction, direct or indirect, even over the greater part of them. However, during the reign of an emperor at once well-disposed and powerful, there is no doubt that the Popes even of this age exercised control in the exarchate. The first of the letters of John XIII in Migne's collection of them, is a charter in favour of the clergy of Bologna, by which John confirmed a privilege in their behalf which they had obtained from Leo V, and which exempted them from the payment of all public taxes. He enumerated the dues they were to be free from. Some of these taxes were dues levied on vessels, others were feudal dues. In either case it is plain that they were taxes which only the civil ruler could remit. But when there was no powerful and friendly sword-arm to support the pacific arm of the Popes, their power at this period in the exarchate must have been even more nominal than in Rome.

Before Otho left Rome, he induced the Pope to fall in with his views in connection with various matters regarding the Church in Germany. To curtail the power of the archbishop of Mayence, or for the better propagation of the faith among the Slavs, as the Pope's bull states, he induced John to make Magdeburg into an archbishopric, and Merseburg into one of its suffragan bishoprics. Under the same influence the Pope granted the pallium to Archbishop Frederick of Salzburg, and threatened the deposed prelate Herold with excommunication if he did not refrain from saying Mass.

It would seem from the *Book of the Popes* that before Otho left Rome, he made strong representations to John ("who passed his whole life in vanity and adultery") to induce him to amend his life. But whether these expostulations were the same as some that Liutprand records he made later, they were equally without effect. At any rate Pope and emperor parted (February 14) apparently good friends; the one to see to the final crushing of Berenger and his party, and the other to the final crushing of Hugh of Vermandois. For on the death of his successful rival Artaud, Hugh had made another effort to secure the See of Rheims. But he again failed, and was excommunicated by John in a synod at Rome.

Ecclesiastical affairs, however, do not seem to have had much attraction for John XII. Pleasures and politics were more to his taste; and to both he gave himself up on the departure of Otho. Finding that the powerful emperor was going to prove a greater check upon him than Berenger and Adalbert could be, he opened negotiations with the latter, who was wandering about trying to get help from any quarter. At any rate it is Liutprand's version of the affair that it was the Pope who first began to treat with Adalbert. The more sober narrative of the continuator of Regino, however, would lead us to believe that it was rather the youthful inexperience of John which was prevailed upon by Adalbert. It is most unfortunate that for all the details of the relations between John and Otho we have to depend wholly upon the narrative of Liutprand, the latter's parasite. And one is disposed to believe that his partial narrative has not only almost necessarily affected modern historians, but has powerfully influenced those of his own time to the detriment of the truth.

Word of John's attitude could not fail to reach the ears of Otho. He at once sent to inquire into what was really the position of affairs in Rome. He was informed that the Lateran was a brothel; that respectable women of foreign nations were afraid to come to Rome on pilgrimage on account of the lascivious conduct of the Pope; that the churches were all falling to ruins; and, in order that he might continue to do as he listed with impunity, that John was in negotiation with Adalbert. Needless to say that all this is from Liutprand, and that if such things were ever told to the envoys of Otho, they must have been looking for gossip. The historians of foreign nations (always excepting those of Germany) say nothing about the infamies of John, and the churches must have gone to decay of set purpose, when such wholesale ruin was produced in some six years! When Otho heard these stories he remarked : “He is only a boy, and will easily be changed by the example of good men. When I have mastered Berenger, I will turn my attention to the improvement of the Pope”

Accordingly, Otho betook himself to Umbria to besiege Berenger in the castle of St. Leo, in the district of Monte Feltro. Thither too were sent to the emperor by John the protoscriniarius Leo, afterwards the antipope Leo VIII, and one of the most illustrious nobles of Rome. The ambassadors were instructed to assure the emperor that, if the Pope had sinned through youth, he was going to live differently, but at the same time to protest against his receiving into favour Bishop Leo and the cardinal-deacon John, who had proved unfaithful to the Pope, and against his action in causing certain cities to take the oath of fidelity to himself and not to the Pope. To these charges the emperor retorted that, before he could restore the cities to the Pope, he had first to get possession of them himself; that as for Leo and John, he had heard that they had been seized on their way to Constantinople, whither they had been sent by the Pope against the emperor's interests and that, moreover, others had been seized on their way to stir up the Hungarians against him (Otho). Liutprand himself, who tells us all this, and others were then dispatched to Rome to offer to prove the innocence of the emperor by oath or trial by battle. They met, however, with a cold reception; and, after a few days, were sent back

to Otho in company with two envoys from the Pope, John, bishop of Narni, and the cardinal-deacon Benedict, both of whom afterwards filled the papal chair.

They had no sooner left Rome than Adalbert was admitted into the city by John (963). This was more than Otho could endure, and as soon as the heats of summer were over he marched on the Eternal City. At first John thought of resistance, and appeared in helmet and cuirass. But the power of Otho was evidently irresistible, and, gathering together much of the treasure of St. Peter's, he fled with Adalbert, apparently to Tibur (Tivoli).

When master of Rome, the emperor resolved to reduce the Papacy to the same state of dependency on himself as his own German episcopacy. Though strong, the papal party in Rome dared not make resistance, and Otho exacted from all the preposterous promise that they would neither elect nor consecrate a Pope without his consent.

As the details of what followed the emperor's arrival in Rome are only to be found in Liutprand, it may be worthwhile to quote his exact words, so that the exaggerations of this author—who was one of John's would-be judges—may be the more easily noted.

"After three days, at the request of the Roman bishops and people, a large assembly *(conventus)* was held in the Church of St. Peter; and with the emperor sat the archbishops : from Italy the deacon Rodalph, representing Ingelfred, patriarch of Aquileia, whom a sudden illness had carried off, Walpert of Milan, Peter of Ravenna; from Saxony, Adeltac, the archbishop (of Hamburg), Landohard, bishop (of Minden); from France (Franconia), Otker, bishop of Spires; from Italy, Hubert of Parma, Liutprand of Cremona". Then follows a long list of Italian bishops, of cardinals, of officials of the papal court, and of Roman nobles, and Peter, who was called Imperiola (or de Imperio), representing the people *(ex plebe),* with all the Roman militia.

"These therefore being present, and keeping perfect silence, the holy emperor began thus : 'How right it would be that the Lord Pope John should be present at so distinguished and holy a council. But we ask you, 0 holy Fathers, who have had life and business in common with him, why he refused to join such an assembly?' Then the Roman bishops and cardinal-priests and deacons with the whole populace replied : 'We wonder that your most holy prudence should want us to inquire into this matter, which is not unknown to the inhabitants of Iberia, Babylon, or India'... The emperor answered : It appears to us just that the accusations should be set forth one by one; then what we should do can be decided on by common advice. Then the cardinal-priest, rising up, bore witness that he had seen him celebrate Mass without communicating. John, bishop of Narni, and John, the cardinal-deacon, declared that they saw him ordain a deacon in a stable, and out of the appointed times." Others accused him of simony, of consecrating a child of ten years as bishop of Todi, of adultery, of converting the Lateran palace into a bad house, of hunting publicly, of mutilating men, of arson, and of wearing armour. “All declared—clergy as well as laity—that he had drunk wine in honour of the devil. They said that, in playing dice, he had invoked the assistance of Jove, Venus, and other demons. Finally, they declared that he did not even celebrate matins or the canonical hours, nor bless himself with the sign of the cross”

Instead of proceeding to say that Otho did not understand Latin, the adroit flatterer, remarking that Otho knew that the others did not understand German, goes on to say that the emperor ordered him to remind the assembly in the emperor's name that the great are often defamed by the envious, and that hence they must not bring baseless charges against the Pope. Then the whole assembly exclaimed, "as one man", that they prayed they might be eternally lost if the charges brought against John were not true; and, at their request, a letter was sent to the Pope bidding him come "and clear himself

from all these things". The letter (dated November 6) offered John a safe-conduct, and received (according to Liutprand's version of the matter) the following curt reply: “John, the bishop, servant of the servants of God, to all the bishops. We have heard it said that you want to make another pope. If you do this, I excommunicate you by Almighty God, that you may not have permission to ordain anyone, or to celebrate Mass”. It may be here remarked, parenthetically, that the learned Cardinal Pitra wonders that the *Regesta* could ever for a moment have regarded such a document as the above as authentic; and he adds that all the injurious writings inspired by the struggle between the Papacy and the Empire ought always to be viewed with suspicion.

To this answer of the Pope the synod sent a reply (November 22). After some childish remarks, which could only have come from the flippant Liutprand, on a grammatical blunder in the Pope's letter, put there, no doubt, by the bishop himself, the bishops declared that, if John did not come to answer the accusations brought against him, they would set his excommunication at naught; nay, would retort it on himself. For he was in the same plight as Judas, who, though he had received from Our Lord the power of binding and loosing, after his treason had only power to bind himself, and that with a halter! If such coarseness really owed its origin to the council, it shows how competent it was to judge even such a Pope as John XII.

Those who had been entrusted with the delivery of this letter to the Pope returned to Rome to say that they could not find out whither he had gone. A later author tells us he was lurking in the woods like a beast. The emperor thereupon again laid before his assembly the *political* “perfidy” of the Pope towards him, and concluded: “Now let the holy synod pronounce what it decides upon this”. To this the Roman bishops, the rest of the clergy, and all the people answered: “An unheard-of wound must be cauterized in an unheard-of manner. We therefore beg your imperial greatness to drive away from the Holy Roman Church this monster, unredeemed from his vices by any virtue, and to put another in his place, who may merit by the example of a good conversation to preside over us”. Then the emperor replied: “Nothing will be more welcome to us than that such a one may be found'. When he had spoken thus, all with one voice exclaimed: We choose for our shepherd ... Leo the venerable protonotary; ... John the apostate being cast off on account of his reprobate conduct ... With the agreement of the emperor, singing the customary *laudes,* they conduct the said Leo to the Lateran palace; and, after a given time, raise him by holy consecration in St. Peter's Church to the supreme priesthood, and promise with an oath to be faithful to him” (December 6, 963).

Here the narrative of the bishop of Cremona may be again interrupted for a moment to point out that both the deposition of John and the election of a layman were illegal. This is acknowledged by authors as well non-Catholic as Catholic. Otho's act was, moreover, condemned at the time even in Germany. "The contemporaries of the Othos" notes Mr. Fisher, "were devout believers in the sacred pre-eminence, and even in the infallibility of the Popes, and there were doubts expressed in Germany as to the right of Otho I to depose a Vicar of Christ. When Burchard of Worms, in 3002, compiled a kind of canonical florilegium, he was, while recognizing the king's right to punish and correct clerks, concerned to point out that the Pope is a supreme judge, who may be asked to purge himself of an accusation, but who may not be judged by any mortal save himself."

Further, there is no doubt that the election of Leo had not, in fact, even the appearance of freedom given to it by Liutprand. Otho simply placed Leo in the Apostolic See. He was his nominee.

To resume the narrative of Liutprand : “When these things had happened in this way, the *most holy* emperor, hoping that he could remain in Rome with but few men,

gave permission to many to retire, that the Roman people might not be oppressed by the great number of the army".

And when John, who was called Pope, heard this, knowing how easily the minds of the Romans are bribed with money, he sent messengers secretly to Rome, and promised them the money of St. Peter and of all the churches, if they would fall upon the pious emperor and the Lord Pope Leo and impiously slay them. A street rising took place (January 964); but the trained soldiers fell upon the crowd "like hawks among a crowd of birds". At the request of Leo, however, Otho restored to the Romans the hostages he had exacted from them; and, commending his Pope to their good faith, left Rome (c. January 12) to pursue Adalbert, who was now abandoned by John, and reported to be in the neighborhood of Spoleto or Camerino. At once the Romans were in arms again, roused this time, so Liutprand would like us to believe, by the numerous lovers of the voluptuous John. With difficulty Leo escaped to the emperor, and John XII was once again master in Rome (February 964).

After severely punishing some of his enemies by mutilation or death, John assembled a council which met on February 26 in St. Peter's. There were present at it sixteen bishops, all from Italy, twelve cardinal-priests, and a considerable number of clergy of inferior rank. Though most of the distinguished members of the council had been present at the synod which had condemned John, they had now no scruple, in the three sessions which they held, in condemning Otho's assembly. They would probably have urged in defence of their conduct that in the first instance they were under compulsion.

John himself opened the proceedings: "You know, dearly beloved brethren, that by the power of the emperor I was expelled from my see for two months. I ask you then if, according to the canons, that can be called a synod which was held in my absence in my church on December 4 by the Emperor Otho and his archbishops and bishops?" The bishops replied in the negative; and the said synod was duly condemned. Next the action of Sico of Ostia in hurriedly ordaining and then consecrating the intruder Leo was also condemned, and he was summoned to come up for judgment at the third session. Sentence was then solemnly passed on Leo by the Pope himself: "By the authority of God Almighty, of the Princes of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, of the ecumenical councils and by the judgment of the Holy Ghost pronounced by us, may Leo, one of the employees of our curia, a neophyte (layman), and a man who has broken his troth to us, be deprived of all clerical honours; and if, hereafter, he should again attempt to sit on the apostolic throne, or perform any sacerdotal function, let him be anathematized along with his aiders and abettors, and, except in danger of death, not receive the sacred body of Our Lord Jesus Christ". Then those who had received any sacred orders from Leo were introduced before the council, and were made to sign a paper to the effect that as Leo had no spiritual power himself, he could not impart any to them. They were thus reduced to the rank from which Leo had raised them.

In the second session the bishops of Albano and Porto acknowledged their guilt in helping at Leo's consecration; and in the third session, as Sico did not appear, he was definitely degraded from his sacerdotal rank. At the conclusion of the synod laymen were forbidden to take a place on the sanctuary during the celebration of Mass.

Death of John

John did not long survive his return to power. But before he died he seems to have made some effort to come to terms with Otho. With that end in view, he released and sent to the emperor, Otger, bishop of Spires, whom he had scourged and imprisoned

when he took possession of the city. “But by the will of heaven”, says Regino's continuator, “his hopes came to naught. For he died on the fourteenth of May”

Though his death brought fresh troubles on the Roman See, there can be no doubt that the chair of Peter was the better for the death of John XII. His youth and want of special preparation for the exalted position he held have, however, caused most moderns, whether Catholic or not, to put forward pleas for a merciful judgment on him. “But perhaps the errors of John XII”, says one of the latter class, “however scandalous, were not greater than might have been expected from the education bestowed on the son of Alberic and grandson of Marozia, or from the natural struggle of impulse and passion against the unnatural restraints of a rank forcibly imposed in the absence of every qualification”

With all his faults, John XII has deserved well of England, if only because he approved of the election of St. Dunstan to the See of Canterbury, —of St. Dunstan whom our ancestors always spoke of with reverence and gratitude as of a man “of great power in earthly matters, and of high favour with God”, but whom some modern English writers, certainly not resting on the testimony of antiquity, have not hesitated to depreciate. The battle-axes of the Danes had shivered the bonds of society in this country, and their torches, by firing the monasteries, had destroyed the homes of learning in our land. The settlement and incorporation of large numbers of these fierce heathens among our people had not improved matters; nor had the plundering of such monasteries as had escaped the ravages of the Danes by the Saxon princes themselves, in their anxiety to replenish their coffers emptied by the wars. As a result of all these causes of national deterioration, the laity became well-nigh as savage as the pagan Norsemen who had harried them; and the clergy throughout most of the land had grown ignorant and undisciplined. The monks had well-nigh disappeared from the country along with their vanished homes. And—a thing which had been unheard of in England for two if not three centuries after the arrival of St. Augustine—the tenth century saw no small number of married priests in the land. Up to the very close of the ninth century, the great Alfred made the strongest efforts to apply remedies to these evils. But he left much to be done after him. It is the great glory of St. Dunstan that he continued the work of reform inaugurated by that enlightened monarch, and restored the monastic order and learning along with it. On the death of Elfsy or Elfsine, who was frozen to death in the Alps when on his way to Rome for the pallium, and on the retirement of Brythelm, Dunstan was translated to the See of Canterbury, and instantly set out “on the wearisome journey which the Primates are wont to make to Rome, on account of the vigour of the apostolic faith and authority. At length he reached the long-wished-for church of the Roman See, where he gloriously received the chief pallium, with the privilege of the archbishopric, and the apostolic blessing. When he had revisited the shrines of the saints, and given alms to the poor of Christ, the Pope sent him back to the English nation as it were the angel of the Lord of Hosts, to unfold the science of God, or as it were a column of fire to illumine the face of the earth”

The bull of John XII granting him the pallium and the primacy has been preserved by Eadmer and others. The new archbishop is exhorted to show himself a true pastor of souls, and the primacy is confirmed to him by the Pope, who tells him to act in the stead of the Apostolic See as his predecessors have done. “According to custom, we bestow on thy brotherhood the pallium, to be used at the solemn celebration of Mass. We grant it to thee to be worn only at Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension Day, and Whit Sunday, and at the Assumption of Mary the Mother of God, and at the feasts of the Apostles, as also at the consecration of bishops, and on thy birthday, and on the feast of the consecration of thy church”

The saint is told to let his life be as bright and spotless as the pallium itself, to be strictly yet mercifully just, and to defend the poor.

This is not the place to dilate on the work of that truly patriotic prelate St. Dunstan, "whose one object in life was never to cease working for his Divine Master". His biographer, Osbern, has done it most eloquently in the chapter (34) from which the last quotation was taken. The little leisure that public affairs allowed him, the saint employed in prayer, in reading the sacred Scriptures, and—a work of the utmost importance—in correcting their codices. Hislove of his country is frequently insisted upon, as is also his zeal in helping all in need, and pushing forward every good work, for which he took care to raise money. He practically governed the country. For, such faith did King Edgar place in him, that whatever Dunstan thought ought to be decreed, that the king ordered. But, as we have said, his great work was the reformation of the clergy, especially by the establishment of monks in places where the secular canons would not amend their lives. One of the principal difficulties that Dunstan had to contend against was the marriage of the clergy. During the times of trouble many had taken unto themselves wives, and had been allowed to retain them, or, at any rate, had kept them, if they had been married before ordination. And though we have absolutely no means of determining the proportion of the married clergy in the country, there were certainly enough of them to make a stand for their position.

An interesting entry in the *Brut y Tywysogion*, or*Chronicle of the Princes of Wales*, shows that the same state of things existed in Wales. “The same year (961) Padarn, bishop of Llandaff, died, and Rhodri, son of Morgan the Great, was placed in his room, against the will of the Pope, on which account he was poisoned; and the priests were enjoined not to marry without leave of the Pope, on which account a great disturbance took place in the diocese of Teilaw, so that it was considered best to allow matrimony to the priests”

But in England, under the firm hand of Dunstan, the case of the married priests had at length a different issue. He proclaimed that they must either live in accordance with the canons, or be expelled from their churches. Procuring the elevation to the episcopate of such men as St. Oswald and St. Ethelwold, he proceeded with the work of reform. And to effect it he had occasionally need of the assistance both of Pope and King. To Ethelwold his clergy of Winchester offered a desperate resistance—a resistance such as might be expected would be offered by men who made no scruple about “repudiating the wives they had married unlawfully in the first instance, taking others, and giving themselves up to gluttony and intemperance”. The bishop appealed to his Primate and to the king; and both primate and king turned to the Pope. An authoritative letter, not from John XII, but from his namesake John XIII, assigned by Jaffé to 971, was in due course dispatched from Rome. “John, servant of the servants of God, to the most excellent King Edgar, and to all the bishops, dukes, counts, abbots, and to all the faithful people of the English race, greeting in Christ and the apostolic benediction” ... “Wherefore, illustrious king and most dear son, what your Excellency has asked of this Apostolic See through our brother and fellow-bishop Dunstan, that we most willingly grant. With regard to those canons, who by their vices are hateful to God, to their bishop, and to all good Catholics, we approve, by our apostolic authority, of their being ejected from the monastery in Winchester which is dedicated to the Holy Trinity and to the apostles Peter and Paul. And, as your sublimity desires, let our most beloved brother and fellow-bishop Ethelwold therein establish monks living in accordance with their rule; and let the successors of the See of Winchester be in future chosen from them, or from some other congregation of monks where a suitable candidate may be found”. The monks were in due course properly installed.

With Pope, king, primate, and bishop working in harmony, suitable measures of reform could soon be established everywhere. But unfortunately those who wish to pursue their own courses know how to interfere with this harmony. Adelard and Eadmer have preserved a story which shows that Dunstan did not always secure the cooperation of the Pope, but that he knew when he might safely exercise a wise independence of character. He had had occasion to inflict a canonical penalty on an ealdorman who had refused to separate from a woman whom he had married within the forbidden degrees of kindred. The ealdorman contrived to influence King Edgar in his favour. But the king's interference only brought a more severe punishment on the offender. The ealdorman became furious. He would gain his ends cost what it might. With well-filled purses he sent his agents to Rome, and with these he won over “the hearts and tongues of certain Romans”. Through their help, it was not difficult to procure a bull ordering Dunstan to recall his sentence. But, even under this assault, the archbishop stood firm. He understood that the "singular sublimity of the Roman pontiff" had been deceived, and he told the noble “that he would obey the commands of the Pope when he saw him (the ealdorman) sorry for his fault”. The firmness of Dunstan was as successful in this case as in that of the refractory monks. The ealdorman did his duty, and submitted. When such men as Dunstan in England, and Bruno in Germany, were at work, there was hope, both for the despised laws of God and man, and for the down-trodden masses of the people.

All the coins, silver as usual, of John XII, of whom we have lost sight a little, proclaim his complete independence, bearing always the word “Dominus”. Those which were coined before the coronation of Otho bear his own name and that of St. Peter with “Roma”. The others show the name of Otho as well as that of the Pope; some having “Otto imperator”, and others only “Otto”.

While on the subject of coins, we may note that if John XII was as bad as he is painted by Liutprand, our ancestors must have thoroughly understood the difference between the man and his office. At any rate their Peter’s Pence was paid with becoming regularity. At least we may presume so from the severity of Edgar's laws with regard to it. “If anyone failed to pay his penny (denarius) by the feast of St. Peter, he had to take it to Rome with thirty more; and on his return with a receipt that he had paid it, he had further to disburse 12o solidi (shillings) to the king ... For the third offence all his goods were to be confiscated”. The attachment of the English to the See of Rome was then practical as well as theoretical even during the dreadful tenth century.

The Catholics of Spain also knew equally well how to distinguish the personal character of a Pope from the office which he held. This we learn from a fact preserved for us by the abbot Leo, the legate of John XV to France. Writing in connection with some derogatory remarks made at a council at Rheims (991) against certain Popes, the abbot say : “In the same way with regard to Spain. In the times of Pope John the son of Alberic, whom you (the kings and bishops of Rheims) have wantonly besmirched, Julian, archbishop of Cordova, sent (to the Pope) by envoys a letter on many difficult matters. He wanted guidance, and, not asking about the character of the reigning pontiff, but expressing his respect for the Apostolic See, he sought for what was useful for himself. From this incident”, concludes the abbot, “learn that the Roman Church is still honoured and venerated by all the churches”

BENEDICT V.
964.

FOR peace' sake it would have been very much better if the Romans had now made a virtue of necessity and elected Otho's nominee, Leo. But, by their prompt recall of John XII, the moment the emperor's back was turned on Rome, they had made it plain that they regarded Leo's election as the work of Otho, and not theirs; and so, on the death of John, they determined to show that they, and not the emperor, had the right to elect popes. They accordingly chose as the successor of John XII the cardinal-deacon Benedict, a Roman and the son of another John. Frodoard adds that he was a notary, and had taken part in the election of *John, i.e.,* of *Leo;* for, throughout, Frodoard or his copyist has here written John for Leo. According to a twelfth-century catalogue, Benedict belonged to the "region of Marcellus, de regione Marcello". This would appear to be the only mention of a region bearing this title. It may, perhaps, be presumed that the quarter was called after the theatre of Marcellus, which, at first, in the ninth region (Circus Flaminius), was in the Middle Ages included in the eleventh region (St. Angelo). Hence, if it be the fact that the tenth and eleventh regions are not mentioned in any contemporary document of the tenth century, it would appear that the region which was afterwards the eleventh, was then known as that "of Marcellus". On this occasion certainly their choice did the Romans credit, for Benedict was as remarkable for his prudence as for his learning. So learned was he that he was known by the name of *Grammaticus.*

The Romans at once sent to inform the emperor of their choice. Their envoys found him at Rieti, but in no mood to listen to them. He would, he said, as lief give up his sword as not restore Leo. Seeing there was no hope of any concession to the wishes of the Roman people, the envoys returned to Rome. Undaunted, the electors proceeded to the consecration of the object of their choice, and Benedict became Pope in May (possibly May 22) 964, "without the consent and will of the emperor", after having received a promise on oath from the Romans that they would never abandon him, but would protect him against the power of the emperor. Benedict had already had experience of the phenomenal fickleness of the Romans. He was destined to have more.

The indignation of the emperor at these events can easily be imagined, and “he swore by the power of his kingdom” that he would besiege Rome until he had Benedict in his power. He had already captured Berenger and his wife, and sent them into Germany. The forces of Adalbert and of the other sons of the late king of Italy had been scattered. He had now nothing else to attend to but the affairs of the Papacy. Accordingly, gathering together a large army, he advanced on Rome, and closely blockaded it. No able-bodied person was allowed to leave it. Famine soon made itself felt within the walls. A *modius* (peck) of bran cost thirty denarii. The whole country round about the city was devastated; its walls were ceaselessly battered by engines of war. It was to no purpose that Benedict mounted the walls, and endeavoured to inspire the Romans with courage; it was in vain he threatened to excommunicate the emperor and his army. Hunger soon extinguished the effervescent courage of the Romans. They gave up both their city and their Pope into the hands of Otho (June 23, 964). Leo entered Rome “with his Cesar”, as Gerbert well puts it; and at once, with the emperor's

co-operation, caused Benedict to be brought before him and his clerical and lay adherents. Clad in his pontifical robes, and with his pastoral staff in his hands, “the innocent Benedict” was shown scant courtesy. Asked how he had dared to aspire to the Papacy during the lifetime of Leo, whom he had himself helped to elect, he simply appealed for mercy. “Si quid peccavi, miseremini mei”, was his cry, if any faith can be placed in Liutprand, from whom alone we have these particulars. Assured by the emperor that, if he chose to acknowledge his guilt, he would find mercy, Benedict threw himself before the feet of Leo and acknowledged himself an intruder. Of all this abject humiliation the continuator of Regino says nothing; but he agrees with Liutprand in stating that Benedict was degraded with the consent of all, that by the hands of Leo himself his pallium was torn from him, and his pastoral staff broken in pieces, and that it was only through the intercession of Otho that he was allowed to retain his rank as deacon

Considering, however, the courage which, according to Liutprand himself, was displayed by Benedict during the siege, the story of his appeal for mercy related by that narrator or fabricator of myths may be dismissed, and we may take it as a fact that he was simply deposed by Otho by brute force. The latter’s high-handed conduct was condemned by the German historian Ditmar or Thietmar. “The mighty emperor of the Romans gave his consent to the deposition of the apostolic Lord Benedict, more powerful in Christ than he, whom no one but God can judge, and who had been unjustly, as I hope, accused. Furthermore, what I would that he had never done, he ordered that he should be sent into exile to Hamburg”. Whether or not Thietmar has here, as is thought by some, confused Otho's second expedition into Italy (961-965) with his third (966-972), it is clear enough that he wished to record his righteous disapproval of the emperor's violent methods.

After he had exacted an oath from the Romans over the body of St. Peter that they would be faithful to him and to Leo his Pope, Otho on this occasion took no further vengeance on the Romans, but left the city soon after the feast of SS. Peter and Paul' (June 29), with Benedict in his company. But he had delayed too long for the health of his army. And if Benedict imagined he had been unjustly used by Otho, he must have believed also that the heats of the Roman summer had thoroughly avenged him. "Henry, archbishop of Trier ... Godfrey, duke of Lorraine, and a countless number of others, both of high and low birth, perished by pestilence".

When Otho had recruited his strength with a little autumnal hunting in North Italy, and had regulated the affairs of that kingdom, he returned to Germany in the very beginning of 965, still with Benedict in his train.

What is known of the last days of the unfortunate Benedict may best be told in the words of Adam of 965. Bremen, who had learnt from “his fathers” what he says of him. Otho entrusted the custody of him to Adaldag of Hamburg-Bremen. “The archbishop kept him with great honor till his death; for he is said to have been both holy and learned and worthy of the Apostolic See ... And so living a holy life with us, and teaching others how to live well, he at length died a happy death just when the Romans had come to ask the emperor that he might be restored (to the See of Peter). His death is set down as having taken place July 4, at Hamburg” (965). It would seem, however, that if Adaldag was kindly disposed towards the poor exile, other Germans were by no means so considerate. Many regarded him as an antipope, as an insolent opponent of their mighty emperor and of the lawful Pope Leo VIII, their countryman. Scant courtesy did Benedict receive at the hands of these men, who endeavored to keep away from him such as wished to show him honor and goodwill. With many they were, no doubt, successful. But even among the rough Germans of the tenth century, there were men

with human hearts; and one such, Libentius (Lievizo, *d.* 1013), the successor of Adaldag, found consolation on his death-bed from the way in which he had behaved towards one who had borne the title of Pope. “My dearest brethren and sons”, said the dying archbishop to those around him, “that none of you may ever lose faith in the divine goodness, and that your long labor in nursing me may now be a little lightened, I would put before you my own career as an example. When the Lord Pope Benedict was an exile in these parts, I sought him out; and though every effort was made to prevent my going to him, I would never allow myself to be influenced against the Pope. But, as long as he lived, I closely adhered to him. After his death, I faithfully served my Lord Adaldag, who entrusted his poor to my care, and afterwards made me his treasurer *(camerarius)*. When that good man went to the heavenly country for which he had ever sighed, I succeeded him by your unanimous election and the royal favour. For the love of Christ let us put from our hearts any wrongs we may have done one another, that, parting now in peace, we may be joined together again at the last day”.

By the command of Otho III, Razo, his chaplain, who was afterwards elected to succeed Adaldag (*d.* 988), but died before his consecration, took back to Rome the bones of Benedict, sometime before the year 988. But where he laid them is not known. Thietmar, who gives us these particulars, says that this was done in accordance with a prophecy of Benedict himself. "Here", said the deposed pontiff, "must my frail body return to dust. After my death all this country will be devastated by the sword of the heathen and be abandoned to wild beasts. Nor will the land experience solid peace till my translation. But when I am taken home, I trust that, by the intercession of the apostle, the pagan ravages will cease". And all this, *we* are told, was exactly what happened.

The Bollandists have given us a description of Benedict's cenotaph which was to be seen in the old cathedral of Hamburg. Raised about a foot from the pavement, and somewhat over a yard broad and two and a half yards long, it was composed entirely of glazed bricks. The figures on it were in white on a green ground. Benedict was represented as a simple bishop without the pallium, but wearing the mitre, and with a crozier in his gloved hand. Figures of the apostles, and representations of the Crucifixion and the Annunciation, adorned the sides of the tomb, while the inscription on it stated to whom it belonged. Battandier says nothing about the age of this cenotaph, but from the illustration which he gives of it, it is obviously not of the age of Benedict himself. Indeed, a German author, writing in 1675, declares that it was not two hundred years old. It may, then, be safely set down as a fifteenth-century monument, erected, possibly, to replace an older one.

Of the three *denarii* which Cinagli assigns to this Pope, there is one which bears the names of the Pope and St. Peter only, and not that of the emperor. But even with regard to this coin, it is stated that there are traces of letters on it which cannot be made out. However, if it really never bore upon it the name *Otho, it* might have belonged to this Pope; but it would seem certain that the other two belonged to Benedict VI (972-973), who had more leisure and inclination to strike off coins bearing the emperor's name. With Promis, then, we conclude that not one of the extant denarii was coined by Benedict V

LEO VIII

Regarding John XII, and the good but unfortunate Benedict V, as lawful Popes, it is by no means easy to say what was the *status* of Leo VIII. Most modern Catholic authors describe him as an antipope; and such, till the deposition of Benedict V, he undoubtedly was. For as certainly as the deposition of John XII by Otho was illegal, the election of Benedict was legal. But, if Liutprand could be relied on, and we could thus be sure that Benedict acquiesced in his deposition, then Leo could be regarded as lawful Pope from July 23, 964, till his death. He was a Roman and the son of John, the protonotary. In the *Book of the Popes,* he is described as a venerable man, energetic and honorable; and when nominated to the chair of Peter by Otho, was himself "protonotary of the supreme Apostolic See". He belonged "to the region which is called *Clivus Argentarii"* (now the Via di Marforio, which connects the Corso and the Forum Romanum), and gave his name to a street or streets in the locality. For there were to be found there streets called "*the descent of Leo Prothus*", and "*de Ascesa Proti*", where the Prothus, etc., is evidently derived from Protoscriniarius.

The name of Leo VIII is most famous for its connection with bulls, in virtue of which Otho and his successors are alleged to have received the right of choosing their successors in the kingdom of Italy, and of nominating (*ordinandi*) the Pope, and the archbishops, and bishops, so that they were to receive *investiture* from him. Leo is also said to have given up to Otho all the lands that had been granted to the Apostolic See by Pippin and Charlemagne. Though it may be likely that Leo granted various concessions to his patron, it is allowed on all hands that the bulls in question were, if not wholly fabricated during the investiture quarrel, at least then so tampered with that there is now no recognizing their original form.

As the right of Leo VIII to be numbered among the Popes is so doubtful, the rest of his doings will here be passed over in silence. Besides, as a matter of fact, very little is known of them to tell. According to Cinagli and Promis, there are extant three silver coins of Leo VIII. But one of the three which does not bear the emperor’s name, is by some thought to belong to another Leo.

Leo VIII died about the month of March 965—certainly between February 20 and April 13, as is clear from the dates of various authentic documents which bear his name.

JOHN XIII.
965-972

ON the death of Leo VIII, the Romans for once put a curb on their impetuosity and did not complicate matters by flouting the emperor. They dispatched to Saxony Azzo the maimed protonotary, and Marinus, bishop of Sutri, to ask Otho "to nominate anyone he wished to the Papacy". This statement of the continuator of Regino, improbable in itself from what we know of the feelings of the Romans as to their rights of election, is in opposition to the account of Adam of Bremen. From him it appears that the Romans sent to ask that Benedict might be sent back to them; and that, had he not died in the meanwhile (July 4, 965), their request would have been granted by the emperor. Otho then proposed to the envoys as Leo's successor, John, bishop of Narni; and with them on their return sent Otger, bishop of Spires, and his trusted Liutprand to see that his will was carried into effect. His *missi* did their work well, and John, bishop of Narni, was unanimously elected to sit in the chair of Peter. He was consecrated on Sunday, October 1, 965.

Leaving out of consideration the manner in which John was elected, the choice of him was certainly creditable to Otho. The catalogues speak of him as "the most reverend and pious bishop of Narni", as "highly learned and skilled in the Scriptures and in canon law", and as, in short, "most holy". This no doubt was due to the fact that he had been properly trained for the sacred ministry. For in the same catalogues special stress is laid upon the fact that from his earliest youth he had been brought up at the Lateran palace in the *schola cantorum*, and had in due course passed through all the regular grades of "doorkeeper (*hostiarius*), reader, exorcist, acolyte, subdeacon, and deacon". After he left the *schola*, and entered on the battle of life, he took a distinguished part in public affairs. We find him in the Papal Chancery under John XII and Leo VIII; sharing in the condemnation of John XII, and in his restoration; and, in 961, signing himself "librarian of the Holy Apostolic See". Even in these dark times the light of learning was evidently not altogether extinguished in Rome. The care of the precious archives of the Holy See was entrusted to its most learned son. So that even that hard-hitter and learned bishop, Ratherius of Verona (*d.* 974), who, by the way, praises Otho for nominating John to the See of Rome, in his *Journey to Rome,* writes : “Where shall I learn better than in Rome? What is known concerning the dogmas of the Church which is not known in Rome? There it is that have ever shone the sovereign teachers of all the world, and the princes of the universal Church. There are the decretals of the Popes; there are the canons examined, and some are approved and some rejected. What is there annulled is never confirmed, and what is there established is never overthrown!”

To what is known for certain of the family of John XIII, who, according to some, from the white or light hair he had had from his childhood was known as the *White Hen*, something is generally added on more or less plausible conjecture. That he was a Roman and the son of Bishop John is told us by the Book of the Popes; and Hugh of Farfa, who became abbot of that great monastery in 998, is supposed by Gregorovius to add to our knowledge of him by informing us that John, "who is known as the Greater", exalted a certain nephew of his called Benedict, by making him count of the Sabina, and by giving him in marriage Theodoranda, daughter of Crescentius, of the Marble Horse. But the John "who is known as the Greater" may have been John XV, so called, no

doubt, to distinguish him from his immediate predecessor John XIV. Hence the editor (Bethmann) of the work of Hugh for the *Monumenta Germania* assigns the "exaltation" of Benedict to John XV, and to the year 985.

Two extant diplomas, one of the year 987 and the other of 970, show in the one case a Count Benedict and his wife, the Comitissa and Senatrix Stephania, making a grant to the monastery of S. Alessio; and in the other the Pope granting a lease of the ancient town of Praeeste for a rent of ten gold solidi to “his most beloved daughter in the Lord, and most dear Senatrix Stephania and her sons and grandsons”. Hence it is conjectured that this Stephania was the mother of the supposed favoured nephew and the sister of John XIII; that Pope John and Stephania were children of Theodora, the daughter of Theodora I, and that therefore John XIII was of the house of Theophylactus, and of that branch of it which produced the Crescentii. A genealogical table put forth *(sous réserves)* by Duchesne supposes that Theodora II was the mother of John XIII. Unable to reconcile this with some of the data at our command, I have supposed him to be the son of another Theodora (III), the wife of John, who first appears as consul and duke, and afterwards as bishop. But it is to be feared there is too much supposition about all the genealogical tables of the house of Theophylactus to make any of them quite satisfactory,

Doubtless feeling strong in the support of Otho, John promptly took in hand the task of curbing the Roman nobility. But he was not strong enough to carry into effect this very necessary undertaking. The emperor was far away in Germany, and Adalbert had again appeared in arms in Lombardy. Feeling that their liberties (i.e. their licence) were about to be checked, certain of the nobles, headed by Rofred, a Campanian count, and Peter, the prefect of the city, raised the cry of "Down with the foreigner". "The Saxon kings", they urged, "were going to destroy their power and influence, and were going to lead their children into captivity". This specious pretext was quite enough to rouse the Romans; the disaffected nobles procured the aid of the "leaders of the people, who are called *decarcones*. The Pope was seized, disgracefully maltreated, and thrust into the Castle of St. Angelo, "in accordance with the malignant practices" of the Romans. This was in the middle of December. Then, fearing that the knowledge that the Pope was a prisoner in his own city would give strength to his party, the rebels sent him into the Campagna, perhaps into some stronghold belonging to Rofred. However, they had not their own way for long. Rofred was killed by John, the son of Crescentius and perhaps the Pope's nephew, the Pope himself made his escape, and fled to Capua, and Otho entered Italy (August 966) with an enormous army.

Meanwhile the Pope, erecting Capua into a metropolitan see, and consecrating as its first archbishop John, the brother of its prince, Pandulf, gained the support of that ruler, and marched on Rome through the Sabine and Tuscan territories. After the death of Rofred, the supporters of the Pope had no difficulty in gaining the upper hand, and when he drew near to Rome, clergy and people went forth to meet and welcome him. After an exile of nearly a year, John re-entered the city, November 14, 966. He said Mass in St. Peter's, and then once again took possession of the Lateran palace. With the usual paternal weakness of the Popes, instead of vigorously punishing the turbulent Romans, John simply endeavored to gain their goodwill by showing them acts of kindness. There was one, however, who justly looked on the outbreak with different eyes. That was the Emperor Otho. When he entered Rome, he straightway hanged the twelve "decarcones", sent "the consuls of the Romans" beyond the Alps, dug up and scattered to the winds the bones of Rofred and of another rebel, Stephen, the *vestararius*, and handed over the chief offender Peter, the prefect, into the hands of the Pope. Perhaps to requite the culprit for the insulting treatment he had meted out to him,

John caused a punishment to be inflicted upon Peter that was at once ludicrous and painful. The prefect's beard was shaved off, and then he was hung by the hair of his head "to the horse of Constantine", that is, to the bronze equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius, which is still to be seen on the Capitol, "that those who looked upon him might henceforth fear to do as he had done". Taken down thence, he was placed, naked, upon an ass with his face to its tail, and his hands beneath it. A bag of feathers was placed upon his head and two more at his thighs. With a bell fastened round its neck, the ass was driven through the city with its strange burden. After being thus exposed to the ridicule of the people, Peter was cast into a dungeon, and finally sent by the emperor into Germany *(ultra montes)*.

While we may deprecate the manner in which, in some particulars, Otho administered justice, or allowed it to be administered, one cannot but feel that a little more of it, properly applied, would have tamed the turbulence of the Romans, and saved themselves as well as the Popes from much suffering and misery. For, though powerful in words, and against a ruler who *was* generally old and always merciful, the *Romans* were never a match for the Germans, and their childish violence was again and again severely punished. However, because the meed of justice was meted out by Germans, the patriotic indignation of the monk of Soracte was aroused, and his barbarous chronicle closes with a lament for the decay of Rome's might. “Woe to Rome, oppressed and crushed by so many nations! Even by a Saxon king hast thou been taken; thy people have been put to the sword; thy strength reduced to naught. Thy gold and silver have they carried away in their purses. Once wert thou a mother; now thou art but the daughter!” And here we may note that John XIII is the last Pope of whom anything is said by another author whose words in connection with the Popes of the tenth century have been up to this frequently quoted, viz. the bishop of Cremona. Both Liutprand and Benedict are interesting in their way. The very extraordinary Latinity of the monk of Soracte makes his short chronicle striking; and if the pages of Liutprand are scarcely historical, they are at least anything but dull. The kind of story he loves to tell, and the abusive language he uses so freely, make his writings resemble those of certain of the Humanists of the Renaissance.

In company with Otho and bishops from various parts of Italy and Germany, John held several synods at different times for the needs of the Church. Among other things it was decided in a council held at Rome in the beginning of 967 that Grado was to be the patriarchal and metropolitan church of the whole of Venetia. And in a similar council at Ravenna (April 967), Otho again "restored to the apostolic Pope John the city and territory of Ravenna and many other possessions which had for some time been lost to the Popes". But Otho had no intention that the granting should be all on one side. Now that he had a Pope after his own heart, he would have his own aims forwarded. He procured the extension of the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Magdeburg. In the bull which John published for this purpose, he was careful to call attention to the fact that, "Rome, the head of the whole world and the Universal Church", which in the past had been oppressed by wicked men, had been reverently restored to its former position by "our son, Otho", whom he designates as "great and thrice blessed," and proceeds to call "the third after Coystantine, who had very greatly exalted the Roman Church". Further to ensure the peaceful succession of his son to all his power, the emperor induced John to write to the youthful King Otho to invite him to come to Rome to receive the imperial crown at Christmas.

After this journey to Ravenua the Pope returned to Rome, while Otho went from one part of Italy to another, consolidating his power therein. He soon cast his eye on Southern Italy, still distracted by the rival pretensions of Italian counts, Greek emperors,

and Saracen robbers. He would also add that to his crown. At first he tried to effect his end by diplomacy; and, as was usual with him, his diplomatic efforts consisted in marriage negotiations. Envoys were sent to Constantinople to arrange a marriage between his son and the Greek princess, Theophania, the daughter of Romanus II and the step-daughter of Nicephorus Phocas, the reigning emperor. Whilst these schemes were in progress, the youthful Otho came into Italy, and was with his father most warmly received "on the steps of St. Peter's" (December 21, 967), after he had been welcomed with the usual *laudes* at the third milestone from the city" by a very great number of senators with crosses and banners (signa)". On Christmas Day, in presence of his father, "our son received the crown, which raised him to the imperial dignity, from the blessed apostolic lord", as Otho I proudly wrote, "from Campania, near Capua, on the 15th of the Kalends of February (January 18), to the dukes and the other prefects of our commonwealth."

Various synods were held before the emperors left Rome, in which, sometimes at their request, the Pope took several German monasteries under his special protection, or decided that in some cases they were to remain for ever "under the patronage of the kings or emperors". And, in order to further Otho's views with regard to the marriage of his son, he addressed (968) a letter to Nicephorus to urge the suit.

Before the dispatch of this document, Otho had sent Liutprand of Cremona to Constantinople in the hope that the astuteness of that prelate would win for him as a marriage portion with Theophania what he had failed in a first attempt to win by the sword, viz. South Italy. Liutprand reached Constantinople June 4, 968. The ill-feeling with which he was greeted was only deepened when Nicephorus received the Pope's letter addressed not to the Emperor of the Romans, but to the "Emperor of the Greeks". "Was it not unpardonable", it was said, "to have called the universal emperor of the Romans, the august, great, and only Nicephorus, emperor of the Greeks, and a barbarian, a pauper, emperor of the Romans?". Greek as they were, the emperors of Constantinople prided themselves on being the descendants of the Roman conquerors of the world, and on being emperors of the Romans. And when Liutprand ventured to ask for the hand of Theophania (or Theophano) for the young Otho, and to suggest that her dowry should be the provinces, or *themes* as they were then called, of Longobardia (Apulia) and Calabria, he was haughtily informed that for a *Porphyrogenita* to be allied to a barbarian was such an unheard-of thing, that it could only be entertained if instead of asking for a dowry, Otho were to restore to the emperor at Constantinople not only Rome and Ravenna, but all the country south of those places. If he would have simply the emperor's friendship, he must at least give up the city of Rome and its territory, and leave them free, *i.e.*, put them at the disposal of the *Basileus*. The Pope too was abused in the most unmeasured language not only because he had communicated with "the adulterous and sacrilegious son" of Alberic (John XII), but especially because he had not addressed Nicephorus as emperor of the Romans. And yet, retorted Liutprand, as you have changed your language, your manners, and your clothes, the Pope naturally thought you had no regard for the name of Romans! The mission of the caustic prelate failed completely. The emperor would not condescend to write back to the Pope with his own hand, but sent him a threatening letter written by his brother. Liutprand, on his side, when he had to leave Constantinople, consoled himself by wishing that the Pope, “to whom belongs the care of all Christians, would send to Nicephorus a letter like a sepulchre, white without, but full of dead men's bones within. Let him inside the letter reproach him for gaining the empire by perjury and adultery; let him summon him to a synod and excommunicate him if he disobey”

But Nicephorus, as well to annoy Otho and the Pope as to strengthen his influence in South Italy, endeavoured to extend the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople in that locality. It was during the iconoclast troubles that Leo the Isaurian forcibly withdrew the churches of Apulia and Calabria (with their metropolitan sees of S. Severina and Reggio) from the jurisdiction of the See of Rome, and made them dependent upon the patriarch of Constantinople. This usurpation did not cease with the image-breaking controversy. By the action of Leo V, the Armenian, the Latin rite was practically stamped out of Calabria in the beginning of the ninth century. And now, to further the same policy, Nicephorus "ordered the patriarch of Constantinople to transform the bishopric of Otranto into a metropolitan see, and no longer to tolerate the Divine Mysteries being said in Latin in any part of Apulia or Calabria, They were to be said in Greek only. The patriarch Polyeuctos accordingly addressed an order to the head of the Church of Otranto giving him authority to consecrate bishops in the churches of Acerenza, Tursi, Gravina, Matera, and Tricarico, all incontestably dependent on the Church of Rome". So at any rate writes Liutprand, and in this case there is confirmatory evidence of his assertions.

Thus baulked, Otho again had recourse to the sword before the close of 968. Supported by Pandulf, he reaped some slight successes against the Greeks in Calabria. To please his ally "the prince of Beneventum and Capua, and marquis and duke of Spoletum and Camerinum", as he is described in the papal bull, he induced John to make Beneventum into a metropolitan see (969). This, no doubt, the Pope and the Roman council which acted along with him were the more ready to do, since the position of the Latin Church in South Italy, which we have just seen attacked by the Byzantine basileus, would be thereby strengthened. All through this troublous period in South Italy conflicts in the realm of ecclesiastical jurisdiction between Greek and Latin churchmen were going on just as keenly as the struggles between the Greek and Latin races in the sphere of political organization. The Greeks endeavoured by every device to improve their military grasp of their conquests in Apulia and Calabria by increasing their ecclesiastical hold of those districts; with the result that, through the natural opposition of the Latins to their schemes, ecclesiastical difficulties added to the other miseries of south Italy during these unhappy times.

Whilst the war in south Italy was being prosecuted by Otho in a desultory manner, the Emperor Nicephorus was murdered (December 969), and his assassin, John Zimisces, became emperor of the East. Naturally anxious to make friends, Zimisces granted what Nicephorus had refused. The young Princess Theophania, or Theophano, who was about the same age (16) as the youthful emperor, and of remarkable beauty, was sent over (972) to Italy with a splendid escort and dowry. First crowned by the Pope (April 14), the youthful pair were then married by him, in St. Peter's, "to the great joy of all Italy and Germany".

Soon after the marriage, Otho I, with his son and daughter-in-law, returned to Germany after an absence of six years—years during which his presence had brought peace if not liberty to the successor of the Apostles. The Pope did not survive the emperor's departure many months (*d.* September 6, 972); nor did Otho I himself long outlive the Pope (*d.* May 7, 973). With him, says his epitaph with no little truth, died also the peace of the world.

The power of Otho I helped in no small degree the spread of Christianity among the Slavs. Among those of Bohemia it had entered in the ninth century from Germany and Moravia; and their duke, Borziwoi, had been baptized by St. Methodius. By the apostacy of some of his successors, the young Church had, as usual, much to suffer. It was in trouble when Otho forced the pagan Boleslaus I, the Cruel, who had assassinated

his brother, to give a free hand to the teachers of Christianity (95o). Under his son, the second Boleslaus (967-999), known as the Pious, and equally acknowledging the supremacy of Otho I, the Church made great headway. The anonymous *Annalista Saxo* gives us certain details of the relations of John XIII with the young Church of Bohemia. A sister of Boleslaus, a nun, or one at least who had taken a vow of virginity *(virgo sacra)*, of the name of Mada or Mlada, came to Rome on a pilgrimage in the days of John XIII, and was by that pontiff very kindly received. Whilst in Rome Mada studied the cloistral life; and the Pope, seeing that she was a woman of no ordinary type, made her an abbess of the order of St. Benedict, and, changing her name into Maria, sent her back to Bohemia with a bull in which he authorized the foundation of the bishopric of Prague in accordance with the wishes of Boleslaus. The Pope assured the duke that he was thankful to God for the spread of His Church, and "by the authority of Blessed Peter" granted the request which Boleslaus had made through his sister, and decreed that the church of SS. Vitus and Wenceslaus should be the new cathedral church. At the church of St. George a convent of nuns was to be established, over which the duke's sister was to preside. The Latin and not the Slavonic rite was to be followed and one who was well instructed in Latin literature had to be chosen as the first bishop. The instructions of the Pope were duly carried out. A Saxon priest and monk named Ditmar, distinguished for his eloquence and learning, was selected by Boleslaus, both because he was known to him, and especially "because of his perfect knowledge of the Slavonic language." Following the wishes of their ruler, the clergy and nobles elected Ditmar; and Otho, at the request of Boleslaus, caused him to be consecrated by the archbishop of Mayence. His diocese of Prague remained subject to the arch-diocese of Mayence till the middle of the fourteenth century. Despite the devoted work of Ditmar and his successor, Adalbert, it was not till the middle of the following century that the savage pagan manners of the Bohemians were to any considerable extent modified.

Poland.

Though it is true that Miecislas I. (or Miechko), the first Polish duke or ruler of whom any certain particulars are known, also acknowledged the suzerainty of Otho, became a Christian (966), and founded a bishopric at Posen, the statement that the duke, in conjunction with John XIII, founded two metropolitan and seven other episcopal sees, has a merely legendary foundation.

England

If John XIII is connected with this country by documents, if not certainly spurious, at least of doubtful authenticity, he is also connected with it by others the genuineness of which is undoubted. His bull supporting the action of King Edgar and Archbishop Dunstan against the canons of Winchester has been quoted under John XII. Edgar’s regard for St. Dunstan, who had been abbot of Glastonbury, moved that monarch, who, to the great utility of the country, showed special favour to monks in general, to bestow in particular great possessions on Glastonbury, “which he ever loved beyond all others”. “Recollecting, however”, continues William of Malmesbury, who has preserved these documents for us, “how great is the temerity of human inconstancy, and on whom it is likely to creep, and fearing lest anyone hereafter should attempt to take away these privileges from this place or eject the monks, he sent this charter of royal liberality to the renowned lord, Pope John (971), ... begging him to corroborate these grants by an apostolical bull. Kindly receiving the legation, the Pope, with the

assenting voice of the Roman: council, confirmed what had been already ordained, by writing an apostolical injunction, terribly hurling on the violators of them ... the vengeance of a perpetual anathema". Malmesbury then quotes the text of the bull, which sets forth that, at the request "of Edgar, the glorious king of the Angles, and of Dunstan, archbishop of the holy church of Canterbury", the Pope took Glastonbury "to the bosom of the Roman Church, and placed it under the protection of the Holy Apostles, and (promised) to support and confirm its immunities as long as it should remain in the same conventual order in which it now flourishes". The bull concludes by invoking the judgment of God on any unrepentant violator of the monastery's privileges. On this pronouncement Malmesbury thought fit to comment thus: "Let the despisers of so terrible a sentence consider well what a weighty sentence of excommunication hangs over their heads. To Blessed Peter the Apostle and Prince of the Apostles Christ gave both the power of binding and loosing, and the keys of the kingdom of heaven. But to everyone it must be clear and obvious that the vicar of this Apostle and chief heir of his power is the president of the Roman Church. Over this church John, of holy memory, presided in his lifetime, as he lives to this day in glorious recollection, promoted thereto by the choice of God and of all the people. If then the ordinance of St. Peter be binding, that of Pope John must be so likewise"

At the same time (971), according to the same historian, John dispatched, "from motives of paternal regard", a letter to the ealdorman (dux) Elfric adjuring him, by the love of SS. Peter and Paul and by reverence for his successor, to refrain from plundering Glastonbury, "which is acknowledged to belong solely to, and to be under the protection of, the Roman pontiff". "It would have been becoming, from the fact that you are its neighbour, that by your assistance it might have been enriched; but, shameful to say, it is impoverished by your hostility". Stubbs, with no small degree of probability, would refer this letter to John XV, as a West Saxon ealdorman named Elfric is known to have begun his official life *c.* 982, whereas no such noble is known in 971. However that may be, the letter shows the lawlessness of the times, and the hope that what could not be effected in the way of keeping order in the land by the local primate or sovereign, could be done by the far-off Pope of Rome.

Among the many privileges granted by John XIII to churches and monasteries (including several to places within the Spanish March) which we cannot stop to enumerate, is an important one in connection with the church of Trier. We have seen that by the decrees of former Popes the archbishop of Mayence was their vicar in Germany. But the bull in question provides that the archbishop of Trier, in synods of Gaul and Germany, shall sit next to the papal legates, proclaim the decision of the synods, and promulgate their decrees, as the vicar of the Apostolic See in those parts. If there is one thing which documents of this sort make very clear, it is that, while at this period there was no thought of anything but one Catholic Church in the East and West, of which the Pope was the head, his supremacy, because of his being Patriarch also of the West, was more *practically* manifest in the countries of his patriarchate.

Even of this dark age of Rome, papal bulls conferring privileges are anything but rare, and attention has been called to them under almost every biography. But of the letters sent to Rome to ask for those privileges but few have survived the ravages of time. The chronicle of the monastery of Novalisa (Nova Lux), near Susa, has, however, preserved one, directed apparently to John XIII. It merits citation on various grounds, as it shows not only the perils of monastic life in the tenth century, but the tyrannical power of the local "count", and the helplessness of imperial law when once the powerful emperor himself was absent.

Belegrimus, the lowly abbot, and all the monks of the monastery of St. Peter, Novalisa, near the confines of Italy, present their deferential respects and continual prayers to the Lord John, the illustrious guardian *(patronus)* of the whole Christian Church and the true faith, and the author of all true belief, whom, after Himself, "the Lord has deigned to raise to the most holy seat of Peter and Paul, the Princes of the Apostles." After reminding the Pope of the foundation of the monastery by the patrician Abbo *(c.* 739), of its destruction by the Saracens, and of its rebuilding by Adalbert, the father of King Berenger, the abbot goes on to say that, as the monastery was always under the immediate jurisdiction of the Popes, he must appeal to John, "the rector of all Europe", against the oppression of the Marquis Ardoin. If the Pope will not help them, they cannot live, as they are ever being plundered by Ardoin, who at first brought forward a forged deed to justify his conduct. However, the Emperor Otho, "the rector of many provinces", had caused that document to be burnt, and a new grant to be drawn up, which he had confirmed with his own hand; and he had warned the marquis to cease interfering with the rights of the monastery. But when Otho had returned "to the province of his nativity", Ardoin treated the monastery worse than ever. Hence the Pope is entreated to lay the matter before the emperor, and himself to excommunicate Ardoin. Their hopes are in the pontiff, because they have been assured that neither gold nor threats can make him leave the path of justice. In conclusion they add : "Nor would we keep from your knowledge, Holy Father, how one of our old monks, according to his custom, went one night into the church to pray, and was suddenly overcome by an unusual sleep. He assures us that then in a vision he saw a man clad in white robes, with a golden dagger in one hand and a silver cross in the other. After thrice striking him on the head, the apparition roused him from his slumber, and bade him tell all the brethren that they should implore the help of their Roman". How far the Pope was affected by this appeal is not known.

Mouzon

The history of the monastery at Mouzon, besides telling of the lawlessness of the times, tells also of the reforms which were being carried out by Adalberon, archbishop of Rheims, of whom we shall hear much in the sequel. The house was originally a convent of nuns dedicated to Our Lady. The prevailing anarchy—no worse, it would seem (to judge from recent events in the same country), in its effect on religious houses than a tyrannical democracy, the worst of all forms of government—made it impossible for the good sisters to maintain themselves in their convent. To the nuns succeeded a college of canons, whose lives do not appear to have been exemplary. Imitating the policy which St. Dunstan was carrying out in England, Adalberon resolved to replace them by monks. The canons were given the usual choice. They had to embrace the monastic life or go. Most of them preferred the latter alternative. In November 971 they were replaced by monks; and, in order that they might live, as the monastery was in a ruinous condition, the archbishop endowed the house with property he had inherited from his father. Anxious that what he had done, not only for Mouzon and other smaller monasteries, but particularly for his "archmonastery" of St. Remy, should receive the highest sanction; and not content with the diplomas granted in their behalf by Lothaire, he went to Rome (December 971) to obtain the protection of the Pope against the king himself. And "inasmuch as he was a man distinguished as well by the nobility of his birth and the energy of his character, as by the purity of his life, he was received with the greatest respect by Pope John, of blessed memory." Adalberon begged the Pope to confirm the property he had made over to the monastery of St. Remy, "in the intent that

there the poor might be cared for, and his own memory live among God's servants in the monastery." John readily complied with the archbishop's request, and Adalberon returned home with the drafts of the privileges he desired. The documents themselves, inscribed on the usual papyrus of the papal chancellary, and duly signed by John XIII, "known as the White Hen", were forwarded to France in due course.

Shortly before his death, John XIII met, and had the discernment to recognize the merits of the young Benedictine monk Gerbert, who was to prove himself the most famous scholar of his age, and was one day to sit on the chair of Peter as Sylvester II. Brought to Rome (970) by Borel, count of Barcelona and duke of the Spanish March, his industry and zeal for learning did not escape the observation of John; and, finding that the youth had a knowledge of mathematics, he recommended him to Otho as a teacher of that science, "because music and astronomy were then utterly unknown in Italy". To oblige the emperor, who promptly recognised the value of such a scholar as a professor, John obtained permission of Borel to allow his protégé to remain with Otho for a short time, on the understanding that the young man was then to be sent back with honour to his first patron. But of all this we shall speak again when we have to write of Gerbert himself.

John, who, as we have said, died September 6, 972, and who left behind him the enviable surname of "the Good", was buried in St. Paul's. His epitaph, says Duchesne, which used to be "between the Holy Door and the first column", is now in the museum of the abbey. It reads thus:

"Here, where in death the good pastor would have them placed, are the remains of Pope John. By the mercy of God and the merits of St. Paul, freed from the bonds of death, may he hence ascend into heaven, and share in the happiness of the blessed above. Do you who piously read this epitaph pray that Christ, who with His sacred Blood redeemed the world, may have pity on His servant and free him from his sins."

BENEDICT VI.
972-974.

The historical darkness which lies thick over the next thirteen years cannot be said to be lessened by the theories which many moderns have invented to illumine the darkness. They not only tell us of parties, aristocratic, plebeian, German, Greek, and Italian or national—parties which, indeed, no doubt existed—but they devise combinations of these parties which have no other foundation than the views of their authors. And so Ferrucci would make Benedict VI the candidate of the nobility, and (the antipope) Boniface VII the choice of the people, following the guidance of Constantinople. If actual evidence, however, is to be our light, it would seem that the centre of affairs in Rome was still the aristocratic party only. Their one object was to secure the election of a Pope after their own heart; that is, of a Pope under whom their own particular privileges would have the greatest latitude. Some, no doubt, of the nobles were attached to those among the clergy—probably by far the greatest section—who looked to the German emperors to curb the licence of their order. At any rate, on the death of John XIII, the choice of the majority, presumably anxious to suit the wishes of Otho, fell upon Benedict, a Roman, the son of Hildebrand, and cardinal-deacon of the round church of St. Theodore, at the base of the Palatine Hill, and not far from St. George, in Velabro. He belonged to the eighth region of the city, the region which used to be known as the *Forum Romanum*, and which, from the fact of its embracing the Capitol, is described in the catalogue of Est, whence we have this item of information, as *Sub Capitolio.* Although the division of the city into twelve regions seems to have begun in the tenth century, the old system of fourteen civil regions and seven ecclesiastical ones endured till the eleventh century. The eighth region here referred to was the old civil region.

As Benedict was not consecrated till January 19, 973, it is concluded that the delay was caused by the necessity of awaiting the approval of Otho.

After the decisive defeat sustained at Lechfeld (955) by the Hungarians, they entered into peaceful relations with the Christian nations around them. Among the zealous preachers who availed themselves of the opportunity thus afforded them to instruct the heathen Hungarians in the saving and civilizing truths of Christianity, was Piligrim, bishop of Passau. He was one of those great bishops who did so much for Germany in the tenth century. In dealing with the Hungarians, he followed the teachings of history, and made his arrangements for effecting their conversion on the lines laid down by St. Gregory the Great in the case of the English. So successful were his first efforts, that he was able to report to the Pope, whom he addressed as "the universal bishop of the Holy Roman See ... supreme bishop of bishops", that already about five thousand of the nobler sort of the Hungarians had embraced the faith. Moreover, the captives who had been taken to Hungary from every part of the Christian world were now allowed to practise their faith in peace. In a word, the whole nation of the Hungarians was ready to embrace Christianity. The necessity he was under of preaching the faith to them himself was the sole reason, continued Piligrim, which prevented him

from following his heart's desire, and in person communicating with the Pope on this important subject. It appeared to him that the time had come when the Pope should re-establish the hierarchy, subject to Lorch, which had existed in Roman times. He therefore begged the Pope to send him the pallium which his predecessor in the See of Lorch used to receive "from the glorious primates of the principal see". He will thus be able to proceed with his work in a canonical way, and the Pope will have the glory of receiving a new flock into the fold of Christ. Then, because there were heretics about who corrupted where they ought to have enlightened, he proceeded to make to Benedict a very clear profession of faith. In conclusion, he begged the Pope, "whose name is celebrated all over the Church", to let him know how he must deal with the converts.

Unfortunately, the document which purports to be an answer to this important letter, and which is variously attributed to Benedict VI and to Benedict VII, is regarded as a forgery, so that it cannot be stated what share, if any, either of those two Popes had in the great work so well inaugurated by Piligrim of Passau(971-991).

Although, *faute de mieux*, some bulls are assigned to Benedict VI which may belong to some other Benedict, still, a few documents, which certainly bear his name, have reached us. At the request of Lothair, the king of the Franks, and of his wife, Benedict took under his special protection the monastery of Blandin, between the Schelde (Scheldt) and the Lys, and confirmed the privileges of various other monasteries and churches. The authenticity of a bull in which Frederick, archbishop of Salzburg, and his successors are named vicars of the Pope in the provinces of Noricum and Pannonia, both Upper and Lower, is much debated.

The only thing of further interest that remains for us to tell of Benedict is his tragic death. The great Otho, whose iron hand had scarcely been powerful enough to crush out the turbulence of the Romans, died May 7, 973, and left the German and imperial crowns in the sole keeping of a boy of eighteen, Otho II. And although he had already been anointed king, and had been declared emperor by the Pope, the young Otho was again elected by all the people, and all swore fealty to him. All, however, did not keep their troth, and in 974 the youthful emperor had to uphold his rights in arms against his cousin, Henry II, duke of Bavaria

The emperor's youth and troubles were thought to be a favorable opportunity by a certain faction of the nobility, perhaps the party which was opposed to the influence of the emperors in the choice of the Popes. The heads of this party were Crescentius, or Cencius, the son of Theodora—Crescentius de Theodora—and the deacon Boniface Franco. The Pope was seized (*c.* June, 974) by one of the leaders of the party in opposition, *viz.* by Crescentius, and thrust into the Castle of St. Angelo, while the other, Franco, was proclaimed Pope in his stead as Boniface VII. The intruder *(invasor),* as he is justly called by one of the catalogues, was a Roman, and the son of one Ferrutio. Light has recently been thrown on the subsequent course of events by an historical fragment discovered at Ivrea, and published by Bethmann. Duly informed of what had taken place, Otho II dispatched Count Sicco to Rome. The imperial envoy at once demanded the release of the imprisoned Pope. Fearful of losing the object of his ambition, Boniface brought about the death of the hapless Benedict. He caused his rival to be strangled; and found a priest, a certain Stephen, base enough to do the terrible deed. But so awful a crime filled the whole city with indignation, and Sicco had no difficulty in gathering together a force large enough to besiege St. Angelo. The strength of the place enabled Boniface to set his foes at defiance for no little time. But he fell at length into the hands of the imperial missus, after between one and two months of usurped authority. Our brief fragment then concludes by saying that, in presence of the emperor's envoy, the Benedict (VII) who now occupies the papal throne was elected,

but was prevented from peaceably fulfilling the duties of his office by the machinations of Boniface.

To that "good or evil doer", to that Boniface or Maliface, as he is sometimes called, we shall recur when treating of Benedict VII. Meanwhile it will suffice to note here that, getting free in some way or other from Sicco, he returned to Rome, again seized the chair of Peter, and seems to have met with a violent death. But his fellow-robber apparently died the death of the repentant thief. A Crescentius, son of a Theodora—most probably the same who with Franco took part against Benedict VI—died, penitent, in the monastery of St. Alexius on the Aventine, which his family had enriched, and which still preserves his epitaph. After telling us of his renown, of his father, John, and his mother, Theodora, it says that Christ led his soul captive, so that he became a monk. It concludes by begging all who read it to pray that he may at length get pardon of his sins. He died July 7, 984.

No Pope Donus II

Attention must now be called to the fact that no Pope of the name of Domnus (or Donus II) had any existence at this time, though a Pope of that name is usually given as the successor of Benedict VI, not only in modern catalogues but in certain ancient ones. This conclusion would seem to be established by the following considerations :—No notice of any single performance of his has come down to us, although he is said to have reigned for a year and a half; those ancient authors who do mention Pope Domnus are not agreed as to his position in the list of the Popes; he is not known to some of the earliest catalogues (*e.g.* that of Sigeric), to the *Liber Pontificalis* of Peter William, nor to the best-informed ancient writers (e.g. Gerbert) and chroniclers. Finally, it is impossible to find time for the insertion of the year and a half's reign which is assigned to him, nor can his existence be reconciled with the data of the "Sicco fragment". Besides, the origin of the mistaken addition of such a Pope can be satisfactorily explained. Jaffé gives the explanation of Giesebrecht to account for the imaginary Domnus; that of Duchesne is fuller and is the one here adopted. No doubt, in some of the earliest catalogues, the name of Benedict VII would follow that of Benedict VI immediately—no notice being taken of the intruder Boniface. Now, as Benedict VII had been bishop of Sutri, he may have been written down in some contemporary papal catalogue as "Domnus de Sutri" simply. Later on, when some copyist thought that mention should be made of the antipope Boniface VII, that name was added to the Domnus de Sutri, and then the length of the reign of Benedict VI was repeated after Domnus de Sutri. Hence, as a matter of fact, in some of the catalogues after Benedict VI appears "Domnus de Suri, or de Sur"; then the addition dropped, and we find Domnus, Donus, or Bonus by itself. To make Donus II from such abundant data was easy.

Near St. Peter's is a *Campo Santo* in charge of a German confraternity. Not far from this cemetery, which has been in use since the days of Leo IV, its rector, Mgr. de Waal, who has formed a museum of Christian antiquities there, discovered a fragment of an inscription which, as far as all appearances go, may well have formed part of the epitaph of Benedict VI. The difficulty in the way of its belonging to him, however, is that at this period the Popes were generally buried at the Lateran, and that, if he had been interred in the Vatican, it is hard to suppose, as Duchesne urges, that it would have escaped the notice of Peter Mallius.

LICATA / SUB / ANTRO / IN (quo)
(se) XTI / BENEDICTI / C (orpus?)

(? sanctu) S / CLARUS / Q / DE / GE (nte)
(? se) PULTUS / ET / ACTU /P

The only statement that seems to stand out clearly from this fragment is that Benedict was a man illustrious by his birth and by his deeds.

BENEDICT VII
974-983.

A FIRST glance at the *Regesta* of Jaffé, and the sight of the comparatively large number of documents there assigned to Benedict VII, would lead one to suppose that no little information concerning that Pope and his doings was available. But as most of the documents are but *privileges*, our knowledge of Benedict VII is certainly not in proportion to the length of his reign. On the death of Benedict VI, the Emperor Otho II and his mother were most anxious that he should be succeeded by the learned and pious Maieul, the fourth abbot of Cluny. Maieul stood high in the opinion of both emperor and Pope. John XIII spoke of him as well known "as a religious man", and commended him and all the monasteries subject to his sway to the bishops of Gaul; and Benedict VII gave him the isle of Lerins, so famous in the early history of monasticism in the West, with a monastery, on condition of a payment "of five silver solidi to the sepulchre of St.Peter". When the emperor pressed, the saint begged time to consider. He did not wish "to leave the little flock which it had pleased Christ to commit to him, but desired to live in poverty with Him who descended from the height of heaven and became poor". He prayed for guidance; and his eyes by chance caught, on an open page of his New Testament, the words : "Beware lest any man cheat you by philosophy and vain deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ" (Col. II. 8). Taking this as the voice of God, he told the emperor that the virtues necessary for a Pope were not to be found in him, that he was not equal to so great a burden, and that he had nothing in common with the Romans, neither nationality nor manners. The emperor must look elsewhere; for he will not accept the pontifical dignity, nor leave the flock already committed to his care. From this the monk Syrus, Maieul's biographer, very properly argues the great humility of God's servant, who, when asked by the greatest of earth's princes, would not accept the papal throne. And he takes occasion to add that what Maieul, though entreated, refused to accept, many, his inferiors both in learning and virtue, would move heaven and earth to get, though unasked. What sort of Pope the humble Benedictine abbot would have made, it is impossible to say; but it may be doubted whether he had the necessary strength of character, or had had the sort of training which would have enabled him to cope with the difficulties of the times.

As he thus failed with Maieul, the emperor probably instructed his envoy, Sicco, to secure the election of Benedict, bishop of Sutri, a Roman, and the son of David. At any rate the *Sicco fragment* says that the imperial agent "substituted, in the place of the deceased pontiff Benedict, the Benedict who is now reigning, by the general election of all the Romans, supported by the authority of the presence of the emperor's envoy". This took place in October 974.

What exactly happened after this cannot be said to be well ascertained. If we are to follow the fragment, Boniface must either have been released by Sicco after his capture, or must have escaped from his hands, for he succeeded in maintaining himself in the city for some time, and in preventing Benedict from carrying on the work of the

Church at all peacefully. At length, however, the Pope proved too strong for the usurper, and he had to take refuge in flight. That before he fled he stripped St. Peter's of its treasures, and then carried them off with him, does not appear to be stated by any author before that retailer of unfounded stories, Martinus Polonus, in the second half of the thirteenth century. At any rate, after leaving Rome, Boniface betook himself to Constantinople,—a fact which has given occasion to some writers to suppose that the authorities at the Greek capital had promoted his interests. But it was only natural that he should fly there, as he could not be ignorant that, though Otho II was married to a Greek princess, the Greek emperors regarded the ambitious Othos with suspicion, and would probably welcome one of their opponents.

As the usurper had flouted the lawful pontiff, it was but proper that his pretensions should be formally condemned. Accordingly a numerous synod was convoked for the beginning of the year 975, and the ambitious conduct of Boniface therein denounced. The same assembly punished another usurper, viz. Theobald of Amiens, "who had appealed to the Holy See, and then failed to approach it".

Though its head had been forced to fly from Italy, the faction of Boniface was not altogether quashed. Still, for many years Benedict managed to maintain himself against it by his own power. And it was just as well that he was able to rely upon himself, for he could not hope for aid from the emperor, who had to establish his own authority against his cousin, Henry II, duke of Bavaria, and against the Danes and Slavs. He was also engaged with Lothaire of France in settling who was to be master in Lorraine. The peace of Margut-sur-Chiers, in the department of Ardennes, decided that question in favor of Otho (July 98o), and left him free to turn his attention to Italy, where some at least were as anxious to see him as he was to see them. On the one hand, Benedict now found himself very hard pressed, and begged Otho to come to his assistance; and the emperor himself, on the other, had inherited his father's designs on Italy, and was anxious to clear its southern portion of both Greeks and Saracens.

Accordingly, in the autumn he entered Italy with great pomp. There were with him, besides his mother, Adelaide, his wife, Theophano, with his newly born child, who was to be the famous Emperor Otho III, and the nobility of Germany, Conrad, king of Burgundy, Hugh Capet, and Adalberon of Rheims, with his protégé, Gerbert. After spending Christmas in Ravenna, Otho moved on Rome (981). Benedict was soon firmly established on his throne, and that too apparently without bloodshed. For the story, repeated by some modern French and Italian historians, that Otho caused some of the rebellious Roman nobles to be massacred at a banquet, is destitute of any trustworthy basis.

Council in Rome, 981

Before Otho and his distinguished company left Rome, where he celebrated Easter (March 27), various matters were settled in synod or otherwise, and various favors granted by the Pope to the emperor or his allies. A letter addressed to "all Catholic and orthodox archbishops, bishops, abbots, kings, princes, dukes, and counts, and to all the faithful all over the world", informs them that at a synod in St. Peter's, in presence of the most serene Emperor Otho, it had been solemnly decreed, in accordance with the sacred canons, that no money was to be exacted for the conferring of sacred orders from the lowest to the highest, "from the order of doorkeeper to that of the priesthood". And while the archbishops and metropolitans are urged loyally to carry out the provisions of the decree, those who are seeking episcopal consecration are told to come to Rome for it, if they cannot get it gratuitously from their metropolitans. We shall see many more

such solemn decrees issued by the Popes, before observing any practical diminution in the widely spread vice of simony.

Hugh Capet, duke of the Franks, who had come to Italy principally with the intent of forming an alliance with Otho against his sovereign, Lothaire, took advantage of his stay in Rome to obtain (April 1) from the Pope exemption for his monastery of St. Valery-sur-Somme from any but papal jurisdiction. About the same time the like exemption was granted to the renowned abbey of Corbey, and its abbot was granted the right of wearing, during Mass, on the principal feasts of the year, the dalmatic and sandals.

It does not seem that on this occasion Otho was in any hurry to push his own schemes with the Pope. The reason doubtless was that he was in no hurry to leave Rome or its neighborhood. It was to be his base of operations against the Saracens. Accordingly, he built a palace in the so-called *Campus de Cedici*, in the territory of the *Marsi; i.e.*, in the high ground round Lake Fucino. There he spent his time all through the summer heats during which nothing could be attempted.

In the autumn (981) we find the Pope legislating for the favors to Church in Germany. Already, in the early part of his reign, Benedict had issued various *privileges* for the benefit of several great ecclesiastics of the empire, or of different monasteries, "on account of love for the emperor". In return for the good work in the way of restoring monasteries done by Theodoric, archbishop of Trier, by the decrees of the Popes "primate of all Gaul and Germany", and for his devotion to St. Peter, Benedict granted (975) him and his successors "the cell of the *Quatuor Coronati"*. The first church dedicated to these four brothers, who were martyred in Rome in the fourth century in the persecution of Diocletian, seems to have been built in that same century. In the Roman council of 595 there is the signature of the presbyter, "Fortunatus, SS. Quatuor Coronatorum". Restored under Honorius I and Leo IV, burnt down by the terrible Robert Guiscard (1084), and rebuilt by Pascal II (1111) it still boasts colonnades which go back at least as far as the days of the first Honorius.

To one of the monasteries of Trier restored by Theodoric, *viz.* that of St. Martin, *ad Littus*, Benedict granted that its abbots might have the right of wearing *infulae* (a chasuble, or headgear) like a bishop. And in confirming the precedence of the archbishop himself, he decreed that a cross should be carried before him, as before the archbishop of Ravenna; that, again, like the same prelate, he should be entitled to ride to the *stations* on a horse covered with a white cloth; and that his "cardinal-priests" should be allowed, when Theodoric said Mass, to wear dalmatics, and that his deacons and priests might use "schandaliis" or sandals.

Another privilege (975) gives the first place in consecrating the king to the archbishop of Mayence. Benedict's "love for the emperor" procures (976) favors for the archbishop of Cologne and the bishop of Metz. And now, in the autumn of 981, the Pope held synods in Rome, in which, to the great indignation of our historian Thietmar, he abolished the See of Merseburg, one of those founded under Otho I, divided it between Halberstadt, Zeiz, and Meissen, and sanctioned the transfer of the bishop of Merseburg to the archbishopric of Magdeburg. According to Thietmar, who himself became bishop of Merseburg in 1009, and who cannot be supposed to have been well disposed to one who had brought about the suppression of the see which he afterwards held, the temporary abolition of the see was affected in this wise. On the death of Adalbert or Ethelbert (June 981), archbishop of Magdeburg, the clergy and people elected as his successor Ohtric, who was then in Italy with the emperor, and who, so Thietmar tells, according to the prophecy of his predecessor, was destined never to succeed him. A deputation was sent to make the election known to Otho; and, to

forward the end his electors had in view, they implored the help of Giselar, the bishop of Merseburg, who had no little influence with the emperor. But Giselar himself had designs on Magdeburg. He approached Otho and asked for a reward for his long services; he bribed the nobles, "and especially the Roman *judges*, who are always to be bought"; and he obtained from the Pope himself a promise that he would agree to the translation if it were sanctioned by the fathers of the synod. Benedict accordingly summoned a council, and asked the assembled fathers if it was lawful to transfer Giselar to the See of Magdeburg, as that prelate had declared that the bishop of Halberstadt had deprived him of his own see. Receiving a reply in the affirmative, Benedict sanctioned the translation of the ambitious Giselar, who treated his former see as "though it were a Slav family which is sold and dispersed". But that Thietmar is here relying on mere gossip there would seem to be little doubt; and that doubt is not lessened by a story with which he concludes this narrative, though he does declare that, if his betters were not ashamed to do such deeds, he is filled with shame at having to record them. "For the darkening of the truth", he says, Giselar had to give Theodoric of Metz, a great favorite of the emperor, "a thousand talents of gold and silver!". And he adds that on a certain occasion at matins, when by the command of the emperor the said Theodoric "jocularly" asked a blessing, a certain man replied : "May God be able to satisfy you in the future, whom here all of us cannot satiate with gold."

In the December of the following year (982), again at the request of Otho, we find the Pope taking under his protection the monastery of Lorsch, which has given its name (Laureshamenses) to annals we have had occasion to quote in a previous volume.

But Otho had come south not only for ecclesiastical but for political purposes. He had his father's wish to be master in the southern parts of the Italian peninsula, as well as in the northern and central. Besides, it was important, in the interests of Christendom, that some expedition should be undertaken against the increasing power of the Saracen. Though the infidel power had received a great check by being driven from Fraxineto by William of Provence (972), advance of authority on the part of the Fatimite Caliphs had brought a fresh Saracen expedition into south Italy, which attacked Greeks and Italians impartially (976). Otho was prepared to assail Saracens and Greeks with the same impartiality. He allied himself with the Italian princes of the South, and at first all went well with him; Greek towns fell into his hands, and Saracen forces were defeated in the field. But, falling into an ambush (July 982), his army was almost cut to pieces by the infidels, and it was with the utmost difficulty he escaped falling into their hands himself. "Stricken with the sword, there fell the empurpled flower of our country, the honor of fair Germany", laments a contemporary German patriot. This terrible disaster on the Basiento made such an impression on the imagination of men, that even in the middle of the following century it was still fresh in their minds. It everywhere gave courage to the enemies of the Empire, and it is credited with being the cause of a far-reaching revolt of the Wends which broke out at this time.

But, because he had lost a battle, Otho was not beaten. He at once began to prepare to take vengeance on the Saracens. Meanwhile other matters did not escape his attention. He sent his missi to assist at a council held in Rome in April (983) to decide a dispute between the monks of Subiaco and those of La Cava, which was under the protection of the emperor. The deed embodying the decision of the assembly in favor of Subiaco is interesting not only on account of the signatures of the judges in the case, but because it tells us, in language unusually barbarous for papal documents, in what partof the buildings attached to the basilica of St. Peter's the Pope was then wont to sleep, and lets us know that law-proceedings were not particularly brisk even in the tenth century.

The monks of Subiaco had been pleading theircause in the Lateran palace for three years.

And when the emperor himself again visited Rome both from motives of piety and to consult on matters of religion, he evidently thought best ways of advancing the cause of faith and civilization was to favour monasteries For we find, at this time, privileges granted to such institutions at Nienburg and Arneburg by Benedict at the request "of our beloved and spiritual son and most worthy advocate of the holy Apostolic See."

In June Otho met the nobles of Germany and Italy at a diet in Verona, where, to strengthen his position, his son by Theophano was elected to succeed to the throne, though he was not as yet four years old. When the arrangements to continue the war had been completed, Otho returned to Rome, where also the death of the Pope (July - October) called for his presence.

But, not long after he had nominated the new Pope (John XIV), Otho II, "whose little body held a great soul", and who was "in all things a most Christian emperor". died of dysentery (December 7, 983).

Though our knowledge of the intercourse between Benedict and the different Christian countries is of the slightest, what we do know is worth recording, if only to show that the various countries of the Catholic world were, despite the difficulties of the times, in communication with their head. The fact of his consecrating as their archbishop the priest James, "the elect" of the clergy and people of Carthage, proves Pope Benedict in touch with Africa. Most interesting and affecting is the extract on this subject from the letter to the Pope of the "clergy and people of Carthage" which the Abbot Leo has preserved for us in his fine letter to the kings of France, Hugh Capet and his son Robert. "We beg your Holiness", it runs, "to bring succour to the wretched and desolate province of Africa, which is so brought to naught that, where there was a metropolitan, there is now scarcely a priest. And as our predecessors used to have recourse to yours, so we, though miserable and lowly, turn to you. And hence to you do we send the priest James, that by consecrating him you may afford us some consolation". This, as we have said, Benedict did in Abbot Leo's monastery of St. Alexius, after he had made trial of the candidate's orthodoxy.

Giving the tonsure (975), as we may presume he did, to Dunwallon, king of southern Strathclyde (Flint and Denbighshire), would quicken his interest in the Church in Wales; and the arrival in Rome of Sergius, archbishop of Damascus, expelled from his see by the Saracens (977), could not fail to direct his attention to the East. To Sergius the Pope gave the ancient church of St. Alexius, which is still the highest point on the Aventine. In connection with the church he had thus received, the archbishop founded a monastery, placed it under the Benedictine rule, and became its first abbot. From the subsequent residence within its walls of St. Adalbert of Prague, it became quite a centre of work for the conversion of Slav countries, and received many favors at the hands of Otho III. Ragusa became another similar centre, and to its archbishop Benedict sent the pallium in 1022 (September 27).

The exact length of the reign of Benedict cannot be stated with certainty. The Liber Pontificatis and some catalogues assign him a reign of nine years. If that were, indeed, the length of his pontificate, he must have died October 983. But his epitaph expressly states that he died July 10, 983. This epitaph, however, which is still to be seen in the *Sessorian* basilica, now known as S. Croce in Gerusalemme, is only a cento of the epitaphs of Stephen (VI) VII, Benedict IV, Sergius III, and Leo IV. Hence some authors, who do not believe that a genuine epitaph would ever have been composed in such a weak way, do not attach any importance to the matter contained in the S. Croce

inscription. Still, if the want of scholarship of the time be taken into consideration, it does not, perhaps, seem quite incredible that an epitaph should have been drawn up in such a patchwork style by some scribe possibly more idle than incompetent.

The epitaph, after telling that the remains of Benedict VII lie within, adds that he expelled the intruder Franco who had cast his lord (Benedict VI) into prison, where he was strangled. He subdued the enemies of the Church, and founded a monastery at S. Croce. He comforted the widow, and nourished poor orphan children as though they were his own.

To Benedict VII Promis attributes those silver coins which, besides the name of Benedict, have the legend "Otto Imperator Romanorum". In addition to a doubtful *Benedict* coin, which he also allots to this Pope, he assigns to the last month of the life of Benedict VII another coin on which appear only "Ben PP" and Scs Petrus."

With the exception of the money struck by St. Leo IX and Paschal II, there is no proof that the Roman mint turned out any more coins for a hundred and fifty years. At the end of that long period coins were again minted in Rome; but then, for a considerable time, not by the Popes but by the Senate of the Roman people.

JOHN XIV
983-984

UNEASY, we are told, lies the head that wears a crown. The saying is certainly true of the head that wore the papal tiara in the tenth century. Peter Canepanova or Canevanova, bishop of Pavia (his birthplace), and, since 966, chancellor of the empire, closed a pontificate of less than a year's duration by a violent death. The trusted servant of Otho II, he was sent to Rome as his *missus* for the settlement of the dispute, already mentioned, between the monasteries of La Cava and Subiaco. With that of his brother imperial representative, his signature comes next to that of the Pope in the deed which set forth the rights of Subiaco. In his epitaph his administration of his northern Italian see is praised as well as his rule of that of Rome; therein is also set forth how dear he was to Otho, and how sweet and tender to all who came in contact with him, whether rich or poor. Such was the man whom the will of Otho placed on the chair of Peter towards the close (November or December) of the year 983.

That Peter of Pavia, who took the name of John XIV, should in later ages have been divided into two Popes, is quite typical of the obscurity which has ever hung over the papal history of the tenth century. The fact that the notice of this pontiff in the *Book of the Popes* gives two separate dates in connection with his life, has been enough for the compilers of papal catalogues to make one Pope John for the eight months assigned to the reign of John XIV, and another Pope John for the four months during which John XIV is said to have languished in prison. Whenever this blunder first saw the light, it did not affect the proper numbering of the Popes of the name of John till the thirteenth century, when the John who ought to have been called (1276) John XX took the title of John XXI. No doubt the error must have crept into catalogues drawn up after the death of John XIX in 1033.

The Emperor Otho II did not long survive his nomination of John XIV. His most Christian death, which took place in the imperial palace of St. Peter, close by the Vatican, is detailed for us at some little length by Thietmar. Feeling his end to be drawing nigh, he divided "all his money" into four parts; the first for the churches, the second for the poor, the third for his beloved sister Matilda, abbess of Quedlinburg, and the fourth for his sorrowing ministers and soldiers. Then, when he had made in Latin a public confession of his sins before the Pope and his bishops and priests, and had "received from them the desired absolution", he was removed from this light on December 7. He was buried in the atrium of St. Peter's, near the oratory of Our Lady, where "her beautiful image is to be seen blessing those who come in"; and, according to Bonizo of Sutri, he was thrice blessed in being the only one who, out of so many emperors and kings, merited to be buried with Popes and the Prince of the Apostles. In the crypt of the basilica of St. Peter may still be seen the tomb of Otho II. "It is about twelve feet long and four feet high, and is said to contain an ancient sarcophagus, for which the present font of St. Peter's is wrongly supposed to have formed the cover. It bears the simple inscription Otto Secundus Imperator Augustus". The mosaics with which his wife adorned the tomb have been dispersed; but one fragment at least, showing our Lord between SS. Peter and Paul, is still in the crypt.

On the day before the death of Otho II, the Pope issued the one document of his reign which we possess. From the superior style in which it is written, it is conjectured

that it was dictated by the ex-chancellor himself; and the high idea John had of his elevated position may be safely inferred from it. It was addressed to Alo, the archbishop of Beneventum and Sipontum, which latter place, we take it, must have been of some size even in the last quarter of the tenth century. "If in guarding their flocks shepherds are ready by day and by night to endure heat and cold, and ever keep watch and ward over the fold lest any of their flock stray away or be seized by wild animals, with what care and anxiety ought we not to watch, we who are the shepherds of men, for fear that, through our negligence, we may be arraigned before the Supreme Shepherd; and the higher we have been in honour here, the lower we may be thrust down hereafter". He sends the archbishop the pallium, and enumerates the feast-days on which he may wear it, names the cities for which he may consecrate bishops, and grants to him and his successors the Church of St. Michael on Mount Gargano—a famous sanctuary still standing on Mount Santangelo, one of the lofty spurs of the Gargano—and the Church of Sipontum itself (which is also still in existence), with all their appurtenances, with all the farm servants of both sexes, and with the churches and estates which are known to belong to the aforesaid two churches". The archbishop is then exhorted to let his life be in accordance with his dignity. "Let then your life be the rule of your subjects; for their progress depends on your example, so that after your day you may be able to say with safety—My heart was neither puffed up by prosperity, nor dejected by adversity. May the good find you kind, and the bad acknowledge you as discreet". He would have Alo judge just judgment; but at the same time strike like a Father. He will do all things well if charity be his guide; if he follow her, he cannot stray from the right path.

Through the good offices of a mutual friend, the Lady Imiza, the confidante of the Empress Theophano, the Pope was on friendly terms with the celebrated Gerbert, then abbot of Bobbio on the Trebbia. When John XIV was Peter of Pavia, though he and Gerbert spoke well of each other to their common patron Otho II, the abbot had occasion to write to him in rather a sharp style. Whether or not the chancellor had been driven to the action in order to find money for Otho's expedition against the Saracens, Gerbert wrote to him about the middle of 983 to complain that he gave the goods of Bobbio to soldiers as though the abbey were his own; and as "good faith was nowhere to be found", and, what was neither heard nor seen was imagined, Gerbert concluded by saying that he would only communicate his wishes to the bishop by letter, and would only receive those of the bishop in the same way. But, by the time Peter had become Pope, the two evidently spoke not only well of each other, but to each other. One of Gerbert's letters to John is worth quoting as, though short, like most of them, it sheds not a little light on the state of the times. It is addressed : "To the most blessed Pope John, Gerbert, in name only abbot of the monastery of Bobbio ... Whither can I turn, 0father of our country? If I appeal to the Apostolic See, I am derided. I can neither come to you on account of my enemies, nor am I free to leave Italy. It is equally difficult to remain where I am, seeing that neither within nor without the monastery is anything left me but my pastoral staff and the apostolic benediction. The Lady Imiza is dear to us, because she is devoted to you. Through her, by word of mouth or by letters, you will let me know your will; and through her I will let you know what I think will interest you in the general condition of public affairs". John would have Gerbert come to Rome about his difficulties; but the abbot was prudent. He begged the Pope to let him know what he was to hope for if he undertook the risk of a journey to Rome; and said he rather thought that it might be that, under existing conditions, it would be safer for him to attach himself to the party where physical force predominated, Whether Gerbert ever received any reply to this letter, or whether indeed Pope John was not a prisoner in the castle of St. Angelo before it reached Rome, is not known for certain. We may,

however, infer, from a comparison of two of Gerbert's letters (25 and 40), that he received an encouraging answer from the Pope, and that it was arranged that the abbot should come to Rome at the end of the year. At any rate the news of the Pope's imprisonment and death gave Gerbert a shock, and took away what hopes he had of help from that quarter. "All Italy seems to me to be like Rome; and at the ways of the Romans the whole world shudders. In what state is Rome now?" he asked at the close of 984. "Who are the Popes and the temporal rulers? What was the end of my dear friend (the Pope)?" This, as far as it can be ascertained, must now be told.

Unfortunately, the high character of John XIV could not save him from the ill-will of a section of the Romans; *i.e.*, the section which regarded the exile, Boniface VII, as the true Pope, and which is generally supposed to be the national party"—the party which resented the action of the German emperors in taking away from the Romans their right of electing the Popes, and in placing their own nominees on the chair of Peter. The death of Otho II had left the care of the empire in the hands of a child (Otho III) and a woman (Theophano). And there were not wanting those who thought that the time had come when they could take what they wanted at the expense of the empire. Slavs and Danes broke through its frontiers, Henry the Quarrelsome of Bavaria put forth an armed claim to the regency, and the Romans began to intrigue with Boniface for the overthrow of the Pope appointed by Otho II. Final success attended the last-named endeavor only. Assisted in all likelihood by the court of Constantinople, which, from the attacks made on their Italian possessions by Otho I and his son, must have been glad of an opportunity of lessening the ascendancy of the Othos, Boniface returned to Rome. His faction succeeded in securing the person of the Pope, whom they shut up in the castle of St. Angelo (April 984). There he died on August 20, as his epitaph informs us. Men stood aghast at these deeds of violence. "All Italy seems to be Rome", they cried "and at the doings of the Romans the world shudders!

As to the details in connection with these events, we are very much in the dark; and, in estimating the truth of such as have come down to us, we are again confronted with the difficulty that those authorities which are not anonymous are at once non-local and attached to the imperial party. According to the entry in the catalogue, which does duty as the *Liber Pontificalis*, after Boniface had seized John, he formally deposed him, and then shut him up in the castle. There he lay sick and half starved for four months; and, at the end of that period died, "it is said by violence". From other anonymous sources we gather that Boniface was enabled to accomplish his designs by the free use of money, whether acquired from the Church treasure, which late authorities say he carried to Constantinople, or from the imperial treasury of the East, and that John's death was directly ordered by him. The account thus given to us by more or less contemporary but nameless scribes is confirmed by the words of Gerbert, the friend of the Othos, and by those of the German monk Hermann of Reichenau. Hence, though the personal guilt of Boniface VII in the matter of the death of John XIV may have appeared more than doubtful to his modern namesake, with such evidence as is now available, it would seem that the probabilities are that the son of Ferrutius was responsible for the murder of Benedict VI and John XIV. Still, it must be borne in mind that the best local source, the continuation of the *Liber Pontificatis* , only gives the violent end of John as a report, *ut fertur,* and that probably even the notice in the *Liber Pontificalis* was not written down till some years after the event it chronicles.

Because on a coin bearing the names of a Pope John, and of "Otto Imperator", the title *Ap.* (Apostolus) is appended to "*Scs Petrus*", which follows the name of the Pope, it is thought by some that that coin was struck by John XIV. The reason they allege is the not very convincing statement that the *Ap.* was not placed after the name of St. Peter till

the time of Benedict VII. It is to be feared, however, that, as to many other papal questions of the tenth century, no answer can be given to the query as to who was the coiner of the said denarius. However, from the fact that John XIV and Otho II were only Pope and emperor together for a few days, it is much more likely that the coin in question was struck by John XIII.

John's John XIV was buried in the atrium of St. Peter's, next to John IX.

BONIFACE VII (ANTIPOPE ?)
984-985.

WE have now to deal with Boniface VII and his claim to a place in the list of Popes. Needless to say, he regarded himself as a legitimate successor of St. Peter; and there are extant a *few* documents bearing date “the eleventh year of Boniface VII, the thirteenth indiction 985”, etc. Moreover, he was apparently regarded as a true Pope by the Romans of the tenth century, as seems clear from his finding a place in the *Book of the Popes* and in the Sigeric catalogue. Archbishop Sigeric visited Rome only a few years after the death of Boniface, probably in July 990, and the list of the Popes which he has left us assigns sixty days to him after Benedict VI; and, after John XIV, it adds that "Boniface returned to Rome and sat nine months and three days."

Speaking generally, while most moderns class him as an antipope, most of the ancients seem to have recognized him as a true Pope. He is assigned a place among the Popes whose mosaics adorn the walls of St. Paul’s, *without-the-walls;* and the famous successor of St. Celestine V called himself Boniface VIII. Hence it is possiblethat, at least after the death of John XIV, Boniface became Pope by the general, if tacit, consent of clergy and people. But in the dearth of documents which unhappily distinguishes this period, nothing can be asserted positively on the subject.

Even if John XIV did not die a natural death in the castle of St. Angelo, but was therein done to death by the fury of faction, and if Boniface VII was personally implicated in his death, it is scarcely just to believe any story that is told to the detriment of the son of Ferrucius. Yet, on the flimsiest authority, we find Gregorovius writing: “The casual mention of the fact that he had caused Cardinal John's eyes to be torn out, gives us reason to suppose that other atrocities were probably committed in the desire for revenge fostered by his long exile”. It should have been stated that the earliest authority for this story about Cardinal John is that very Martinus Polonus who died in the last quarter of the thirteenth century (1278), and whose "monkish falsehoods and fictions" are denounced by Gregorovius himself.

Of what Boniface did whilst in actual possession of the chair of Peter we know very little. When we have said that he leased the stronghold of Petra Pertusa, which once used to guard the tunnel cut by Vespasian through the pass of Furlo, on the Flaminian Way, and that he permitted the consecration of a church in honour of St. Benedict, it is not possible to find much more to say of the acts which he accomplished whilst he held the See of Rome. Some time during his second occupation of the chair of Peter, he caused money to be struck bearing, as usual, his own name (S C S PEV BONIF PAPAE) and that of the emperor (OTTO IMPE ROM.).

Though we know so little of Boniface and his times, there are not wanting conjectures, more or less probable, which may serve to enlighten his reign. But as authors who approach the subject from different standpoints are not agreed as to the view to be taken of it, these conjectures cannot be regarded as altogether satisfactory. Ferrucci, who has devoted a work to the special study of Boniface, makes him out to be the representative of the popular party in Rome, which had the support of the clergy, and which was opposed to that of the aristocracy. On the other hand, some more recent authors regard him as the representative of the "national Roman" party, and hold that he

was restored by the hand of the same nobleman, Crescentius, who had raised him in the first instance, who died as a monk in the monastery of St. Alexius (July 7, 984), and whose inscription in its church tells us of the last resting-place of the "illustrious Crescentius, Rome's distinguished citizen and great Dux". Among the supporters of this view is the Abbé Duchesne, who adds : "The tradition continued; for thirty years power passed in Rome from Otho to Crescentius, from Crescentius to Otho. It was not always the same Otho nor the same Crescentius, but it was always the same conflict between the national chief and the foreign prince". But, as has been frequently insisted upon in these pages, it may well be maintained that the moving principle in Rome during all this period was not any feeling of nationalism, but simply the personal ambition of different members of the aristocracy. As long as an Alberic or a Crescentius could rule according to his own will in the city of Rome, he was ready to acknowledge the nominal supremacy of any distant ruler, whether German emperor or Byzantine basileus. But as soon as either Pope at home or prince abroad showed that he was going to be master in Rome, then the ruling aristocrat showed himself in his true colours.

This was experienced by Boniface. He incurred the mortal hatred of his own party because he showed he was going to be the ruler in Rome. He died suddenly; one of our authorities (Vatic. 134o) says by poison. However that may be, *his own party* showed their hatred of him by maltreating his dead body. They flayed it, pierced it with their lances, dragged it naked by the feet to the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius in the Campus before the Lateran palace, and there left it, and there it remained all night. In the morning, however, some of the clergy, touched at the sight of the body of one who had, at least, borne the name of Pope, in such a pitiable condition, buried it. This took place in the month of July 985.

JOHN XV.
985-996.

DURING the pontificate of John XV there occurred an important event of a certain importance in the annals of both Church and State, though its interest arises not from anything striking in its actual occurrence, nor from any great results that followed therefrom, but from its intimate connection with events of the utmost importance in the past. The event alluded to was the final extinction of the royal Carolingian line, whether that be reckoned from the death of its last sovereign Louis V (987), or from the imprisonment of its last representatives (991) by Hugh Capet. True to the papal tradition of devotion to the descendants of Charlemagne, John XV will be found loyal to their cause, even though it brought him into collision with such a powerful adversary as Gerbert, afterwards the famous Pope Sylvester II. Apart from "the last stand" of the Carolingians into which he was drawn, and of which, in the works of Gerbert, we have a certain fullness of detail, time has not preserved much more of any interest in the comparatively long reign of John XV.

John, the cardinal-priest of St. Vitalis (afterwards the titular church of another more famous John, our own illustrious martyr-cardinal, John Fisher, bishop of Rochester), was a Roman, the son of a priest of the name of Leo, and belonging to the region "Galline Albe". From St. Gregory the Great we learn that that place belonged to the *fourth* ecclesiastical quarter, and from the *regionnaries* of the fourth century that the locality known as Gallinas Albas was included in the sixth civil region (Alta Semita), which embraced the Quirinal Hill, the Baths of Diocletian, etc. John became Pope in August 985, and though there is really no authentic data to enable one to form any certain conclusions as to the circumstances of his election, there are as usual modern authors quite prepared to supply the deficiency. Accordingly, John figures as at once the friend and foe of the family of Crescentius. Likely enough his election may have been due to the clergy, for there is no certainty that the younger Crescentius had seized the civil power in the city at the very beginning of John's reign; *i.e.*, his election may have been brought about in a legitimate manner. But whether he was the nominee of Crescentius or the hope of the clergy, he apparently disappointed both, and had to rely on the support of the future emperor, the German king, Otho III.

If, even on such a simple question of fact as the authorship of a book, it is safe to follow such a late authority as Martinus Polonus, who is followed by the fourteenth-century papal biographers, John XV was learned even in military science, and was the author of many books. But if he was learned, he is said to have been stained with nepotism, and to have been avaricious; and, on that account, to have been odious to the clergy. He disliked the clergy, says the *Book of the Popes*, and was in turn justly disliked by them, as he handed over to his relatives all he could lay his hands upon. From the fact that we read (An. 99o) of a nephew of John occupying the position of *Dux* of Aricia, nothing can fairly be concluded, except perhaps that the Pope was of a good family. But it is thought by some that the imputation on his character made by the *Book of the Popes* is supported by the authority of no less a personage than St. Abbo, the learned abbot of Fleury, who visited Rome both under John XV and his successor Gregory V. His disciple, the monk Aimoin, the author of the *Historia Francorum*, wrote

the *Life'* of St. Abbo, sometime after the saint's death. Speaking of his journey to Rome to get the privileges of his monastery confirmed, his biographer says that the holy abbot "did not find the pontiff of the Apostolic See, by name John, such as he could have wished, or such as indeed the pontiff ought to have been; for he found him eager for filthy lucre andvenal in all his acts". "And", adds the biographer, "after *execrating* the Pope, the abbot offered up his prayers at the different shrines, bought various silken ecclesiastical ornaments of the very best kind, and then returned home". But that such were not the opinions of Abbo regarding John XV is certain from an extant letter of his to a legate sent by the Pope to Hugh Capet, viz. the learned abbot Leo of the Roman monastery of S. Boniface. In the course of that epistle, the saint told his friend that on the occasion of his last visit to Rome, before the election "of the scion of the imperial house" (Gregory V), he found the Roman Church "bereaved of a worthy pastor". Aimoin must simply on his own account, therefore, have ascribed to John's avarice his refusal to comply with the request of his master Abbo; or, more likely, he must have referred to the Pope the covetousness which really belonged to Crescentius. For, just as Alberic, "Prince of the Romans", had used the influence which his power over the Popes gave him to gratify his greed of gold, so did Crescentius *Numentanus*, "Patrician of the Romans". This we know from the testimony of Gerbert, or from that of the fathers of the council of Rheims as reported by Gerbert. At first sight, indeed, it would seem as if he confirmed the *Book of the Popes* in its charges against John XV. For he says, in connection with the case of Archbishop Arnulf of Rheims, of which something will be said in the sequel, that the envoys of the king (Hugh Capet) were favorably received by the Pope until those of the opposite side had presented him with a splendid snow-white horse and other gifts. But from another passage, where this matter is explained more at length, it is plain that it was Crescentius who got the presents. The bishops say that when their envoys reached Rome "the Apostolic See was not permitted to pronounce a free judgment, but only such a one as gold could procure from Crescentius, that limb of the devil ... Our envoys and those of the king were well received by the Pope; but, as we believe, because they did not offer presents to Crescentius, they were kept away from the (papal) palace for three days and then returned home without any answer. No doubt it is due to our sins that, owing to the tyrannical oppression of the Roman Church, which is the mother and head of all the churches, all the members are weakened."

Finally, as another contemporary author, the Roman monk John Canaparius, in his *Life of St. Adalbert of Prague*, has no hesitation in saying that on the Pope's death his soul went to heaven, and that his death itself was disastrous both to Otho and to Rome, there can be little doubt that the charge of avarice levelled against John XV is unfounded, and should be laid at the door of Crescentius. For, of this vice of the Patrician, the Burgundian monk too, Raoul Glaber, or Glaber Rudolphus as he is generally called, pointedly writes that, quite in the style of men of his sort in Rome, his extravagance was only matched by his avarice. And so, in the words of yet another of John's contemporaries, *viz.* the abbot Constantine (*d.* 1024), the author of the *Life* of Adalberon II, bishop of Metz, who came to Rome to see the Pope, it may no doubt be said with truth that John " most worthily filled the place of Blessed Peter."

If, however, John XV is the "John who was called the Greater" (and it seems to some that he was), he may have incurred odium on account of his elevation of his nephew Benedict, to whom he gave the county of Sabina and other honors, and whom he married to the noble lady Theodoranda, the daughter of Crescentius. But, as the last named is apparently the same person as Crescentius Numentanus, then it is perhaps more than likely that the marriage between his daughter Theodoranda and the Pope's

nephew was brought about not by the Pope but by the Patrician, who would, of course, insist that a suitable appanage should be granted to his son-in-law.

When precisely the Crescentius, who is distinguished by the appellation of Numentanus, assumed "the empty title of Patrician", and began to oppress the Pope, is not known. However, a document, dated January 3 (986), purports to have been drawn up in the first year of Pope John and of the patriciate of Crescentius.

But, like most of the petty Roman tyrants of the tenth century, he was great in nothing but greed and ability to crush the weak, and utterly incapable of offering any resistance to the Germans even when led by a woman. To look into the state of things at Rome, the regent Theophano (whose brothers Basil II and Constantine VIII were ruling at Constantinople), styling herself not merely empress but *emperor,* approached that city towards the close of the year 989. The Patrician made not the slightest show of resistance, and the empress-mother had no difficulty in securing the allegiance of Rome itself and its Duchy. What else occupied the attention of the empress in Rome except that she bestowed privileges on monasteries, and met St. Adalbert of Prague, is not known. She did not, unfortunately, attempt anything against the Saracens who were still engaged in successfully combating her country men in south Italy.

Whatever immediate limiting effect was produced upon the power and influence of Crescentius by the coming of Theophano, his wings were not completely clipped. The death of the empress (June 991), and the youth of Otho III, emboldened him. Once again all the material power of the city was in his hands, and once again justice was put up to auction. The situation was unbearable. John fled from the city and betook himself to Hugo, marquis of Tuscany, apparently in 995. With the approval of a large party of the Romans and of the Italians generally, the Pope sent envoys to Otho to implore him to come and rid the Church and city of the corrupt tyrant. The youthful Otho, who in his ideals (if somewhat Utopian, at least lofty) resembled the present German emperor, listened favourably to the story of the deputation. He began at once to make his preparations for an expedition to Rome, "to put a term to the tyranny of Crescentius". This was quite enough for the valiant Patrician. John was implored to return; and at his feet the senate, *i.e.*, the nobles and their leader, besought his pardon. Nevertheless the hand of Otho was not stayed. He entered Italy in the spring of 996; but before he reached Rome, John XV was no more. Worn out both by "the many good works which he had done, and by the great persecutions which he had endured in defence of the Roman Church", he died not long before Easter Sunday, 996.

There are authors who regard this turning to the German as the subjection of Italy to a foreign servitude. To do so is to transfer to the tenth century the ideas of a much later age. Ideas of nationality, such as they exist nowadays in Europe, had, it must be repeated, no existence in the tenth century; they came into being with the development of the separate languages of the West. The greatest and best men of the earlier Middle Ages ever regarded the "One Church, One State" idea as the only one worth striving to realize. Apart from them, where among the nobles there was ambition, it was for their own personal aggrandizement, and where among the people there was loyalty, it was to men, not to localities. To work or to die for a *country, i.e.,* for some section of what had been the empire whether of Rome or of Charlemagne, was an idea not entertained by men of the tenth century; and that for the simple reason that then no well-defined large sections or countries had been carved out of it.

What little knowledge we have of the political side of the pontificate of John XV has been given right up to his death, in order to leave the way clearer for the more purely ecclesiastical events of his reign. Of these, the most important was his encounter with the famous Gerbert in connection with the See of Rheims. It has been already

stated that, on the death of Louis V, the Carolingian line of sovereigns came to an end, and that Hugh Capet succeeded to the name of king (June 987). But descendants of Charlemagne, of one kind or another, legitimate or otherwise, were not yet wanting. One of these latter was Arnulf, the natural son of Lothaire, the predecessor of Louis V. With a view to attaching him to his interests, Hugh, against the advice of many of his friends, caused him to be elected to the vacant See of Rheims (December 988). This was certainly a very risky step to take; the more so that at this period the occupant of the See of Rheims was not only the first ecclesiastic in Western France, but had there a preponderating political influence. However, Arnulf was duly installed after taking an oath of allegiance to the new dynasty, and received the pallium from the Pope. Another member of the Carolingian line was Charles of Lorraine, the youngest son of Louis IV, d'Outremer, and consequently uncle of Arnulf. To make good his claim to the title of king, he took up arms. Before long the important city of Rheims was in his hands. Not unnaturally, Hugh conceived the idea that it had been betrayed to his rival by its archbishop, especially as Arnulf had confessedly already favored Charles. Accordingly the king dispatched (*c.* July, 990) a strong letter to the Pope to ask his aid in deposing Arnulf, "so that the royal power may not be brought to naught". "Arnulf", he writes, "who is said to be the son of King Lothaire, after perpetrating the greatest wrongs against me and my kingdom, was nevertheless treated by me as though he had been my son. He was presented with the See of Rheims, and then took an oath of fidelity to me, which cancelled all other engagements ... He made the soldiers and burghers of his city swear that they would remain faithful to me, if he himself should chance to fall into the hands of the enemy. And now, in face of all this, he has himself opened the gates of his city to the enemy, as I am most credibly informed ... He pretends that he is at the mercy of the enemy ... But if he is a prisoner, why does he refuse to be delivered? ... If he is free, why does he not come to me? ... He has been summoned by the archbishops and the bishops of his province, but he replies he owes them no service. Hence do you, who hold the place of the apostles, decree what must be done against this second Judas, that the name of God may not be blasphemed by me, and that, inflamed by a just resentment and your silence, I may not devise ruin against the city and province. You will have no excuse to offer to God, your judge, if you are not ready to comply with our request". There is no mistaking the tone of this letter. Threats are pronounced against the Pope, unless he does—what is just? No! unless he does the king's will. Writing to the same effect as their king, the bishops of his party, though they say they regard the Pope as "another Peter, and the defender and upholder of the Christian faith," finish their letter by giving him to understand that his condemnation of Arnulf will be the gauge of their loyalty.

With the traditional goodwill of the Popes for the Carolingian line, and after the reception of letters written in such a hectoring tone, there is no need to suppose that presents made to him by the opposite side were the cause of the king's envoys meeting with a cold reception from the Pope. Indeed, the abbot Leo, whom John sent as his legate into France, expressly declared that the accusation of taking bribes which had been levelled against the Pope was a mere calumny. The king's envoys displayed the same insulting kind of deference to the Pope as the letters they bore. They only condescended to wait three days in Rome for a favourable answer to their petition. They were back again in France in September 990.

The fortune of war, however, came to the help of Hugh Capet. In April 991 Rheims and its archbishop fell into his hands, and on June 17 he brought Arnulf to trial in the basilica of St. Basle at Verzy, near Rheims. There were present at the council bishops (no more than thirteen in all) from the provinces of Rheims, Bourges, Lyons,

and Sens. Siguinus of Sens, John's vicar in Gaul, was the president of the assembly; and Arnulf, the bishop of Orleans, because most learned and eloquent, was, as it were, the prosecutor for the crown. Among those present at the council was Gerbert, who had left the Carolingian party scarcely a twelvemonth before. It is from his pen only that our knowledge of the council of St. Basle comes. It is rather unfortunate that he did not draw up a verbatim report, for such a highly strung character as Gerbert could, under the circumstances, scarcely avoid producing a strongly coloured narration of what took place. The account given of this council in Labbe, from a continuation of the *Historia* of the monk Aimoin, is not worth much, as the said continuation is but a comparatively late compilation, containing, as it does, quotations from twelfth-century authors. However, from whatever source the continuation drew its material, it may be noted in passing that it is as favorable to Arnulf as Gerbert's account is unfavorable, and that it ascribes the action of the bishops in this council to fear of the king, and states that its decisions were opposed by Siguinus.

What told most against the archbishop in his examination before the council was the declaration of the priest Adalger. He affirmed that in opening the gates of the city to Charles he had but obeyed the express orders of his bishop, and, to prove the truth of his words, appealed to the *judgment of God* and offered to submit to the ordeal of fire, boiling water, or red-hot iron. To the surprise of many "who thought that Arnulf would be condemned simply by the prejudiced decision of the bishops", the president of the council invited anyone who thought fit to undertake the defence of the accused. The invitation was at once accepted by John, the scholastic of Auxerre, Romulf, abbot of Sens, and Abbo, abbot of Fleury, who are said by Gerbert himself to have been learned and eloquent men. They did not touch the question of the treason of Arnulf, but denied the competency of the synod to judge him. They cogently urged that the condemnation of a bishop was one of those more important cases which had to be reserved to the Pope. They quoted largely from the *False Decretals* to establish their contention.

But that the judgment of Arnulf should be left to the impartial tribunal of Rome was precisely what the king did not want. And consequently the abbots' contention drew from Arnulf of Orleans, naturally a man of overbearing temper, his famous invective against the See of Rome. It was such a speech as might have been looked for from such a quarter on such an occasion, but it was not the first time (nor will it be the last) that the legitimate authority of the See of Rome had been similarly assailed. The exercise of its lawful power called forth the *Pompifex Maximus* of Tertullian, and the vulgar abuse of Dr. Martin Luther. And no doubt to the end of time, seeing that we have had instances of it in every age up to this, our own days not excepted, the decisions of the Roman pontiffs, when adverse to the pride or sensuality of men, will be met with rhetorical outbreaks similar to that of Arnulf of Orleans in the tenth century. His harangue enunciated principles subversive of every central authority; principles which, strongly advocated by later Frenchmen at the time of the Great Schism in the West, would have subjected the head to the members; principles which, in still later ages, taking the delusive name of the "Liberties of the Gallican Church", made the Church in France the degraded slave of an impure monarchy. Unfortunately, however, we have no means of knowing how much of Arnulf's philippic was spoken boldly out before the assembly or how much of it was simply grumbled into the ears of those who were sitting beside him. For, in introducing the bishop's oration, Gerbert has had the candour to write : "On this subject our father Arnulf spoke at large before the assembled fathers; but much also that he said on the matter was only to those who were sitting beside him. Hence, fearing that to set down his thoughts in the disjointed way in which they were spoken would cause them to lose in effectiveness, I have preferred to bring them

together, in order that the connected discourse may be more advantageous to the careful reader". But the careful reader would be glad to know to how much of his diatribe Arnulf gave the added authority which comes from public utterance. "We indeed, most reverend fathers", he began," decide that, on account of the memory of Blessed Peter, the Roman Church must ever be held in honor; saving the authority of the council of Nice, which the Roman Church itself has always held in veneration. The decrees of the sacred councils too, made indeed at different places and times, but by the One Spirit, we decree must ever remain intact and be observed by all. Now there are two things which we must watch especially; *viz,* lest the silence of the Roman Pontiff, or some new decree of his, should destroy the authority of existing canons. For if his silence with regard to them takes away their force, then, when he is silent on them, all the laws arc without effect. Or if a new constitution is to have that result, what is the good of the laws already passed, if all are to be dependent on the will of one man? ... Would we then detract from the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff? Certainly not; for if, on the one hand, the Bishop of Rome be commendable for his learning and virtue, we need fear neither his silence nor his new decrees. And if, on the other hand, he be notorious for ignorance, timidity, or avarice, or if, as under the existing tyranny at Rome, his freedom is interfered with, then still less is his silence or fresh constitution to be feared. For he who is in any way in opposition to the laws cannot destroy their effect. But, oh, unhappy Rome, who to our fathers gave glorious lights, but to us has belched forth horrible darksome portents which will be infamous to the ages to come! Of old we received (from Rome) the illustrious Leos, the great Gregorys ... But what do we see (there) today?". Then follow the denunciations of John XII and Boniface Franco which we have already cited under their biographies. "To such wicked monsters, ignorant of all learning human and divine, are countless good and learned priests to be subject? That the head of the churches of God is so debased is due to our impiety, who seek the things which are our own, not those which are of Jesus Christ ... It would be better for us to seek for a decision from the bishops of Belgium or Germany than from that city where justice is measured by gold ... In Rome at present, *as it is reported (ut fama est),* there is scarce one with learning enough to be ordained doorkeeper *(ostiarius)* ... In comparison with the Roman Pontiff, ignorance in other bishops is to some extent tolerable; but in him who has to judge of the faith, life, and morals of bishops, and of the whole Catholic Church, it is quite intolerable". However, he contends, the case *was* referred to the Pope, who did not choose to take it up. Hence, if he will not speak, then existing laws must. "But unhappy indeed are the times, in which we have to suffer the loss of the guidance of so great a Church! To what city shall we be able to have recourse in the future, now that we see the mistress of all nations destitute of all resources whether human or divine? ... For this city (Rome), after the fall of the Empire, lost the Church of Alexandria; it has lost Antioch; and, to say nothing of Africa and Asia, now Europe itself is departing from it. Constantinople has withdrawn itself from its jurisdiction, and the interior parts of Spain know not its decisions".

Considering his guilt and utter helplessness, it is not to be wondered at that Arnulf publicly confessed his treason and abdicated. In deciding to condemn the archbishop and to deprive him of his ring, crozier, and pallium, the fathers of the council, evidently in doubt as to the legality of what they were about to do, were at pains to declare more than once that their action was in no way derogatory to the Pope, as Arnulf had not appealed to him, and the Pope himself had not responded to their advances. In virtue of their sentence, Arnulf had to surrender into their hands the insignia of his office and to read aloud a deed of renunciation of his see. In his stead was elected the author of the acts we have been quoting, viz. Gerbert, who thus, says a modern author, obtained

"what he had been aiming at for several years". And it must not be forgotten that he it is on whom we have to draw for our information concerning his predecessor's trial. It is only fair, however, to add that Gerbert himself, in writing to the Pope, indignantly denies having had any designs on the See of Rheims : "I did not proclaim the crimes of Arnulf. I simply abandoned the side of a public sinner. God and those who know me are my witnesses that I left him, not, as my detractors say, in the hope of obtaining his see, but that I might not become a partner in the sins of others."

If there is one thing of which the acts of the council of Rheims plainly give evidence, it is that the fathers of the synod fully expected that the Pope would attempt to revise their decision. And so we find them endeavouring to forestall his action. By the canons of the False Decretals, indeed, which were at this period universally acknowledged as authoritative, a bishop could not be condemned without reference to the See of Rome. But, in any case, acknowledging as they did that the primacy of the Bishop of Rome was a primacy of jurisdiction, they could not have logically called in question his right to reserve to himself such an important matter as the condemnation of a metropolitan. They elected, however, to take their stand on ancient decrees; and, acting more against the spirit than against the words of the old Canon Law, they maintained that it was with the bishops of the province concerned that the final decision on questions of discipline rested. Hence, while careful constantly to profess that they respected the rights of the Holy See, and while acknowledging that an appeal could be made to it by Arnulf, they declared that such appeal would be of no value when once they had passed sentence on the accused; and they endeavored, by throwing discredit on the private lives of some of the Popes of the period, to have it acknowledged that the possession of authority was dependent on the virtue of its would-be holder.

But bishops in a more independent position than those under the sway of Hugh Capet were not likely to allow such revolutionary principles to pass unchallenged.

Gerbert was not to be permitted to enjoy his new dignity in peace. Arnulf appealed to Rome, and the bishops of Germany made haste to beg the Pope to annul the irregular proceedings of the council of Rheims. John at once began to take to task the prelates who had had a share in it. To consider their position they met in synod at Chelles, under the direction of Gerbert and the presidency of King Robert (May 992?). The decision they arrived at was to stand to what had been settled at Rheims, and to regard as null and void anything the Pope might do "against the decrees of the fathers", as they phrased it. They accordingly took no heed of the invitation of the Pope to betake themselves either to Aix-la-Chapelle or to Rome to have the matter in dispute settled by a full council. The affair dragged on. In reply to a request from King Hugh that he would come to France to look into the whole question himself, John again sent the monk Leo, abbot of St. Boniface, in his stead. He had been sent before in response to the first embassy of Hugh Capet, but had got no further than Aix when he heard that Arnulf had been already deposed. The abbot, who proved himself to be as prudent as he was learned, was well received by the German bishops, and straightway opened negotiations with the French kings for the holding of a council. The choice of the place of meeting was to be left with them. They named Mouzon, in the department of Ardennes, on the Roman road from Rheims to Trier, and, though just in the territories of Otho, still in the diocese of Rheims.

The firm attitude of the Popeshowed Gerbert that his position was anything but safe. He must, therefore, inspire his friends with the same spirit of obstinate resistance that animated his own heart; they must be made to believe that their rights were being attacked in him, and that the voice of God was manifest in the decision they had come to at Rheims. Constantine, abbot of St. Mesmin (Loiret), is reminded of the proverb that

one's own house is in danger when one's neighbour's wall is on fire; and on Notger of Liege he urges that God knows His own (2 Tim. II. 19), and that if He is with us, who is against us? Coming strangely from one who had brought up all the engines of Canon Law to justify his conduct, he tells the monks of his old monastery of Aurillac that his enemies have brought the law to bear upon him, that he regards an armed encounter as more endurable than a legal contest, and asks their prayers. In the longest of all his letters he endeavors to prove to Wilderod of Strasburg that Arnulf had been legally and irrevocably condemned; and, like all others before and since his time who have not submitted to Rome when brought up for judgment and condemned, he complains that *now "*Rome, which *up to this* has been considered as the mother of all churches", curses the good and blesses the wicked. And to the Pope himself, again imitating the excuses of those who do wrong by not doing as they are ordered by proper authority, he puts forward that he has hitherto so conducted himself in the Church as to be useful to many and injurious to no one.

At some date unknown to us in the course of this affair, John had separated from his communion the bishops who had condemned Arnulf. Gerbert would have his partisans disregard the excommunication. What they had decreed was in harmony with the will of God, and therefore not to be set aside by anybody. Seguin of Sens must not listen to the mouth which has been opened at Rome to justify what had been condemned at Rheims, and to condemn what had there been called right. "If Pope Marcellus offered incense to Jove, must all the bishops do likewise?". The common law of the Catholic Church, he continued, must be the Gospel, the writings of the Apostles and the Prophets, the canons, inspired by God and consecrated by the veneration of the entire world, and the decrees of the Apostolic See, *which are not contrary thereto.* In conclusion, Seguin is urged to go on celebrating the Divine Mysteries as usual.

But all this plunging was of no avail. The meshes were being tightly drawn round the recalcitrant prelate. The synod of Mouzon was held June 2, 995. The acts of the council open thus : "In accordance with the mandate of Pope John, a synod was held in the diocese of the metropolitan See of Rheims. When silence had been proclaimed, Aymo (Haimo), bishop of Verdun, arose and in French told how the Lord Pope John had invited the bishops of the *Gauls* to meet in synod at the palace of Aix-la-Chapelle, and how they had been unwilling to go thither. He had then invited them to the city (Rome), and they had not come. Now, in his anxiety to meet their wishes, he had ordered the council to be held in the province of Rheims, and wished to learn from his vicar the case between Arnulf and Gerbert. Then he produced the papal bull with its leaden seal. This he broke before them all, and read the Pope's letter of authorization. It began : John, bishop and servant of the servants of God to all the archbishops of the Gauls, health and apostolic benediction".

Owing, it was said, to the discovery of intended treachery against the French kings on the part of the Germans, the Frankish bishops as a body absented themselves from the assembly. Gerbert, however, presented himself before the papal legate and the four German prelates, who, with various abbots and laymen, formed the council which was to hear his case. He endeavoured, in a speech of no little merit, to prove that he had not betrayed his lord (Arnulf), committed him to prison, nor usurped his see. And he assured his judges that if there had been anything irregular about his election, it was not due to any malice on his part, but to the needs of the time. But he failed to make any impression on them. No definite sentence was, however, passed; but it was decided to hold another council at Rheims itself on the first of July in the presence of Arnulf as well as of Gerbert. Meanwhile the abbot Leo declared Gerbert suspended. At once the fiery prelate denied the right of anybody so to treat him, innocent as he was. "But,

admonished in a fraternal manner by the modest and upright lord archbishop, Liodulf of Trier, not to give an occasion of scandal to his enemies, as though he wished to oppose the orders of the Pope, in the naive of obedience he consented to refrain from saying Mass till the time fixed (July I) for the next synod".

In the interval between the two synods, Gerbert's narrative of the council of Rheims was put into the hands of the legate, a narrative, as the abbot justly said, "full of insults and blasphemies against the Roman Church". He at once wrote to the two kings, Hugh and Robert, that he was so thunderstruck at the contents of that document that he would have at once returned with it to Rome had not they declared that they wished to have the affair settled in accordance with the canons. He pointed out to them that they were acting the part of antichrist; for he was antichrist who was in opposition to Christ. And whereas Christ had proclaimed the Church of Peter the foundation of all the churches, they had dared to speak of it as a marble statue and temple of idols. Then, hitting at the profane science of Gerbert (knowledge certainly useless for the end of man if not connected with the science of the soul), he said : Because the vicars of Peter and his disciples did not choose to take as their masters Plato, Virgil, nor Terence, nor yet the herd of philosophers who have written of the earth and sky, you say they are not fit to be *doorkeepers.* He reminded the kings that Peter was ignorant of the works of those authors, but was made the doorkeeper of the kingdom of heaven. He upbraided them for calumniating the Pope in the matter of taking presents, and for speaking against certain Popes who had passed out of this life. Asserting that it was characteristic of the Roman Church to aid the weak and condemn the wicked, he showed, by citing appeals made to it, that "the Roman Church is still honored and venerated by all the churches, and is by you alone insulted and outraged". It was owing to the oppression of Crescentius that he (Leo) had not been sent off at once to examine into the affair of Arnulf. The courageous legate finished his letter by denouncing the synod of Rheims: "Who could hear with equanimity of an archbishop, first deceived, then confined in a dungeon for a long time and afterwards led, half naked and bound, by a band of uproarious soldiers before a synod, and there condemned on the evidence of one witness?". As for Arnulf's confession, it was wrung from him; for he had been given to understand that his life depended on his conforming to the will of the synod.

Unfortunately, we are much in the dark as to what happened after the council of Mouzon. However, as it was there decided to hold a council at Rheims, we may suppose that that decision was carried into effect. Moreover, there is, at least, the authority of the continuator of Aimoin that the synod was there held, and that of Abbo also, who, in writing to the legate Leo and speaking of the flood of eloquence which fell from his lips *at Rheims,* would seem to allude to it. Further, it is generally supposed that it was at this council that was pronounced the apology for the acts of the synod at St. Basle which is known as "Oratio episcoporum habita in Concilio Causeio in praesentia Leonis"; and that too even though there is no certainty as to the meaning of "Causeio." From this last document it appears that the defence was pronounced before an assembly of the bishops "of all Gaul"; and that in the person of the abbot Leo "the Apostolic See presided over the assembly". The apologist brought forward authorities to prove that it had been already decided by the Apostolic See itself that traitors had to be removed from their sees. Hence he spared no pains to establish the treason of Arnulf.

But it was all to no purpose apparently. The sentence of the council seems to have been to some extent adverse to Gerbert. We find him at least asserting that the legate Leo had been able to get his way against him by approving of the marriage of King Robert with Bertha, his second cousin, and, moreover, joined to him by the bonds of spiritual relationship. However, while it is certain that Arnulf was not freed from

confinement till the pontificate of Gregory V, *viz.* till sometime after November 997, things became meanwhile very uncomfortable for Gerbert. He was regarded as excommunicated, and treated as such. As he tells us himself, neither his clerical nor lay dependants would eat with him or be present at his Mass. But he was not at the end of his resources. He betook himself to Rome (996), and endeavored by the force of his eloquence to bring the Pope (now Gregory V) over to his side. Richer, the devoted partisan of Gerbert, avers that he was so far successful that Gregory ordered still further inquiry into the matter. But Gerbert could not maintain himself at Rheims. His patron, Hugh Capet, had died October 24, 996, and Robert, his son, had ends his own to serve. The archbishop accordingly left France for ever about the early summer of the year 997.

And though he made a second journey to Rome, his cause was lost. King Robert released Arnulf, and the Pope confirmed him, temporarily at least, in his see (997). If, however, Gerbert's career in Gaul was at an end, there was still a great future in store for the learned prelate. His former pupil, Otho III, had the greatest esteem for his genius, and was most anxious to attach him to his person. He procured Gerbert's election first to the vacant See of Ravenna (994) and afterwards, as we shall see, to that of Rome itself.

St. Adalbert of Prague

There also came to Rome, more than once, during the pontificate of John XV, a bishop of very different mettle to Gerbert. That was the gentle St. Adalbert of Prague, the Apostle of Prussia. We are told that after he had been consecrated bishop of Prague in 983, "he never smiled again", so overcome was he at the thought of the responsibilities he incurred by taking upon himself the care of souls. A native of Bohemia—his Slavonic name, Voytiech, signifies the *comfort of the army—he* began his episcopal career by fervently urging on his countrymen the adoption of a higher standard of morality. The Bohemians had but recently taken the name of Christians; and though they had so far changed their name, their habits were still practically unchanged. It seemed to Adalbert that he was but casting pearls before swine. His hearers, thoroughly gross-minded, "would not follow their pastor". Their pastor therefore decided to leave his willful flock. "It was better", he thought, "to leave them than to lose his time with a people who, with obstinate blindness, were hurrying on to their own destruction". Three causes especially moved Adalbert to leave his people. Their practice of polygamy, the want of celibacy among his clergy, and the fact that with "accursed gold" a Jew had bought so many Christian captives and slaves that the good bishop could not ransom them all.

Adalbert fled to Rome (989), and with tears asked the Pope what he ought to do. John XV was not a man of the courage of Gregory the Great. He did not, therefore, in God's name, address Adalbert as Gregory had addressed Augustine; but, falling in with the saint's own wishes, he told him to leave the sheep who would not follow him. A student himself, he gave advice which he knew a student would welcome. "For if with others you cannot bring forth fruit, it is not worth while losing your own soul ... Seek quiet contemplation, and live among those who pass their time in retirement amid studies sweet and healthful". This advice Adalbert would follow. But first he would go on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. However, after giving to the poor all his own money and what he had received from the Empress Theophano (who was then in Rome) to help him on his journey, he went first to Monte Cassino. Thence he betook himself to the wild mountainous district of Barrea, not far from Castel di Sangro, where dwelt in the monastery of St. Michael, in the Bright Valley (Val-Luce), the famous Greek abbot Nilus. This Basilian monk, whose austerity of life was only matched by the sweetness

of his disposition, and of whom we shall have more to say in the next biography, advised Adalbert to return to Rome, and furnished him with letters of introduction to the famous abbot (Leo) of the monastery of SS. Boniface and Alexius. Whether or not because he thought he ought to go back to his diocese, Leo gave the bishop anything but a warm reception. Nothing, however, could damp the ardour of Adalbert; and at length, on Maundy - Thursday (990), with the concurrence of the Pope and the cardinals, he received the habit of a monk.

But he was not to be allowed to die carrying water for the community. The archbishop of Mayence sent an influential deputation to urge the return of Adalbert to his diocese (994). At the synod held to consider the matter, though the Pope himself and the bishop's fellow-monks wished to keep him in Rome, the eloquence of the head of the deputation—no less a person than the brother of the reigning duke of Bohemia, Boleslaus II—prevailed. Then the *Apostolicus* (the Pope), "influenced not by his own feelings, but by the justice of the case", consented that Adalbert should return to Prague, but on the understanding that, if the people would not hear his words, he should be free to leave them again.

After "an immense journey", Adalbert was received in his episcopal city with every demonstration of joy. But the gentle bishop could make little or no impression on the savage manners of the Bohemians. The cruel murder of a woman "taken in adultery", who had fled for protection to the bishop and the Church, and other deeds "even more barbarous", decided Adalbert once again (995) to seek "the walls of sweet Rome."

Unfortunately for our saint, his friend and protector, John XV, died (March 996) soon after his return to Rome. In connection with the election of his successor Gregory V, there came to Rome both Otho III, over whom Adalbert soon exerted a very great influence, and St. Willigis, archbishop of Mayence, who was as determined as ever that the bishop of Prague should return to his post. While at Rome he never ceased importuning Gregory, by word of mouth, and, on his return home, by letter, till the Pope ordered Adalbert to return to the North. When amidst the tears of all he left his "sweet monastery" for the last time, his only consolation was that he had obtained leave to go and preach the Gospel to the heathen if he failed to make any impression on his own people.

Arrived at Mayence after a journey of nearly two months, he there found the emperor. With him the saint stayed for some time, striving to raise his mind to things of heaven. That he was emperor, said Adalbert to him, was nothing. He must remember he was a man, and would have to die. Meanwhile he must be the father of the poor, the support of the good, the dread of evil-doers. Whilst in the imperial palace he showed himself so far the servant of all that he was discovered to be in the habit of "washing" the boots of king and porter alike! After a pilgrimage to Tours and to Fleury by the Loire, where was the body of "our father Benedict", adds the biographer, Adalbert prepared to return to his see. But this time his people would not receive him. There was too great a difference, they said, between his life and theirs. The saint accordingly availed himself of the Pope's permission and turned him to the heathen. After converting many of the Poles, he went into the land of the barbarous Prussians, "whose god is their belly, and whose avarice is strong as death", and whose fierce paganism was only crushed by the swords of the Teutonic knights in the thirteenth century. Among these cruel pagans did Adalbert sow the seed of the Gospel in the best way, viz. by his blood; for he soon obtained the martyr's crown he had longed for, and the title of the Apostle of the Prussians (April 23, 997). "His memory", writes Gregorovius, "was preserved in the monastery of S. Bonifazio, and from this abbey on the Aventine, as

from a martyr colony, other brave apostles, fired by Adalbert's example, went forth to the savage country of the Slavs."

This outline of the career of Adalbert, as drawn from the interesting biography of his disciple, brings out in clear light the character of John XV also. It represents him as the counterpart of the bishop of Prague, as a man fond of retirement and quiet study, and as sympathizing with those whose tastes were akin to his own.

The conversion of the Russians, 989

St. Adalbert, and, if sufficient reliance can be placed on the Russian Chronicle known as that of *Nestor*, Pope John also had relations with another Slav people, the Russians. Since the ninth century, when St. Ignatius and Photius sent bishops among them, Christianity had been making some little progress among the Russians. Political and commercial relations between them and the Greek Empire served to increase what knowledge of the revealed truth there was in the kingdom of Kieff. This knowledge was deepened by the baptism of the reigning Princess Olga (955), and by the intercourse kept up with their countrymen by those of the Russians who took service with the Greek emperor, and formed the commencement of the famous Varangian guard. St. Adalbert preached among the Tauroscythians, as Leo the Deacon *(c.* 989) calls the Russians, for about a year. But it was only under Vladimir (972-1015), the grandson of Olga, that the conversion of the Russians made any substantial headway. And if the change wrought in their king by the teachings of Christianity could be regarded as any sort of gauge of the improvement which the Gospel worked among the people, civilizing indeed must have been the effect of Vladimir's action in bringing into his kingdom preachers of "Christ, and Him crucified". From being a sanguinary debauchee, Vladimir under Christian influences became a saint. Most quaint is the story of his conversion as told in the pages of Nestor He was convinced that under paganism there was no hope of the elevation of his people

He must introduce some other faith among them. With that end in view, he sent envoys to seek for religious information among the Greeks, Latins, Moslems, and Jews. Accordingly there came to him Mohammedan Bulgarians (Finnish-Bulgarians of the Volga, or Black Bulgarians) who said to him :

Prince, you are wise and prudent, but you have no religion. Take our religion, and pay homage to Mahomet.

And Vladimir said : What is your faith?

They replied : We believe in God. And Mahomet has taught us to practise circumcision, not to eat pork nor drink wine, but after death to be happy with women.

Vladimir heard them with some pleasure, for he was a libertine; but he did not like the idea of circumcision and abstinence from wine and pork. So he said : Drink is the delight of the Russians; without it we cannot live.

"Then came the Niemtsy (Germans) from Rome, saying :

We have come from the Pope. He has ordered us to tell you that your country is like our country, but your faith is not like ours, for our faith is the light. We adore the God who has made heaven and earth, the stars, the moon, and all things, but your gods are of wood.

Vladimir said : What are your commandments?

To fast according to one's strength, to eat or drink always to the greater glory of God, according to the command of our master St. Paul' (I Cor. X. 31).

Vladimir said to the Germans : Begone, for our ancestors have not admitted such doctrines.

When the Jewish Kozares (Khazars, Kharaites) heard this, they came and said: The Christians believe in Him whom we have crucified. For ourselves, we believe in one only God, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob.

And Vladimir said : What are your observances?

They answered : Circumcision, abstinence from the flesh of swine and hares, and the celebration of the Sabbath.

He said to them : Where is your country?

They replied : Jerusalem.

He further asked : Do you live there now?

They responded : God was angry with our fathers, and has dispersed us throughout the world for our sins, and our country has been delivered to the Christians.

He said to them : How do you teach others, when you are yourselves rejected by God, and dispersed by Him? If God loved you and your law, you would not be scattered in strange lands. Would you have this evil to come to us also?

The chronicler then relates the coming of a Greek philosopher, and gives his arguments at great length. To produce a deep impression on the imagination of the rude barbarian, the "philosopher" spared neither dramatic eloquence nor the subtle use of kindred arts. By showing the king a picture on which the last judgment was painted with terrifying detail, "he made Vladimir sigh". "Be baptized", said the philosopher, "if you would be on the right hand with the just". "I will wait a little," naively replied the king, "for I wish to think over all the beliefs."

Vladimir then sent (987) ten wise men to study the various religions in the places in which they were practised. When they reached Constantinople the emperor spared no effort to make a lasting impression on the senses of the barbarians. "Prepare the church and your clergy," said he to the patriarch; "put on your pontifical robes, that they may see the glory of our God". The envoys were completely won. The transcendent beauty of the Church of St. Sophia was enough of itself to have won their hearts. But when its beauty was enhanced by the bright glow of torch and candle, by the sweet perfume of the incense, by the magnificent vestments of the priests, by the solemnity of the ceremonial, and by the majestic harmony of the music, its charm was irresistible. The envoys returned to their master, and reported that among the Moslem Bulgarians there was no joy in their services, but a frightful sadness and a horrible stench; among the Germans nothing beautiful; but among the Greeks everything that was lovely. "We saw many fine things in Rome, but what we saw at Constantinople makes a man wholly forget himself."

No doubt most of these details as related by *Nestor* are not in accordance with strict truth. But they are true in the spirit if not in the letter. They give the fundamental reason why the Russians preferred to accept their Catholicism — for the faith taught at both centres was then the same —rather at the hands of Greek monks from Constantinople than from Latin missionaries from Rome.

In 989, as a result of a successful campaign against the Empire, Vladimir secured the hand of a Greek princess. He was baptized by the priests who accompanied Anna, and became a saint.

Of the marriage of Vladimir with Anna, and of his subsequent baptism, there *is* no doubt. And we may take it as also true that, before deciding as to whether his people should be ecclesiastically subject to Constantinople or Rome, Vladimir entered into negotiations with the patriarch Nicholas II, the Emperor Basil II, and Pope John XV. Though immediately subject to the jurisdiction of the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, the Russians, of course, acknowledged the Pope of Rome as head of the Church Catholic. Hence for some considerable time after the definite schism between

the East and West under Michael Cerularius, the metropolitans of Kieff (Kiev) remained faithful in their allegiance to Rome. In fact, it was not till the middle of the fifteenth century that the metropolitans of Moscow definitely became schismatics, and not till the beginning of the sixteenth that those of Kieff followed their example.

Ethelred the Unready, 991

John showed his love of peace by his successful endeavors to prevent war between our wretched Ethelred the Unready or Redeless, and Richard I the Fearless, duke of Normandy. By Ethelred's marriage (too2) with Emma, Richard's daughter, there began that close relation between this country and the comparatively newly formed Norman Duchy which was destined to be so fateful for England. But in the year 991, of which we are now treating, Norman influence was vigorously repelled. For some unknown cause, perhaps because the Normans were helping their Danish kinsmen in their descents on our shores, symptoms of war between England and Normandy showed themselves. On his side, Richard proceeded against the English who were in his dominions, and Ethelred, on his, made preparations to avenge this treatment of his subjects. Hearing of the impending war, John at once dispatched Leo (who is described in our sources as bishop of Trier, but who is thought to have been a vice-bishop, because Egbert is believed to have then been bishop of Trier) to mediate between the two princes. The result of the Pope's efforts had best be set forth in a letter which Malmsbury describes as "epistola legationis".

"John XV, Pope of the Holy Roman Church, to all the faithful. Be it known to all the faithful of our Holy Mother, the Church, ... that word has been brought to us by many of the enmity between Ethelred, king of the West Saxons, and the marquis Richard. Saddened at these difficulties between our spiritual children I dispatched an apocrisiarius, Leo, bishop of Trier, with letters exhorting them to lay aside their dissensions. Crossing over vast tracts of country and over the sea, he presented our letters to the king on Christmas Day. After taking council with the wiser sort of both orders (with his Witan), for the love and fear of Almighty God, and of St. Peter, and out of regard for our paternal admonition, he granted a most firm peace to be observed without deceit by all his children and liegemen. On which account he sent Edelsin (Ethelsige), bishop of Sherborne, and two thanes to Richard. Receiving our words in a peaceful spirit and hearing of Ethelred's action, he ratified the treaty with his children and liegemen, on the understanding that, if any of their subjects or they themselves should break the peace in any way, due compensation was to be made. And neither party was to receive the subjects or enemies of the other without the production of a written permit *(sigillum).* Representatives of both princes swore to observe the treaty, which was signed at Rouen, March 1, 991". With Lingard, we must call attention to the interesting fact that the oldest treaty now extant between any of our kings and a foreign power is drawn up in the name of a Pope."

During the pontificate of John XV two archbishops of Canterbury came to Rome for their palliums. The first was Ethelgar (988-99o); the second, his successor, Sigeric, whose curious itinerary we have frequently quoted. Of him the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* records: "This year (99o) Sigeric was consecrated archbishop, and afterwards went to Rome for his pall." His itinerary, all too brief, shows us that the feverish eagerness of the Catholic Englishman of today when in Rome to see the Pope and the famous churches of the Eternal City was surpassed by the learned archbishop of Canterbury of the year 99o. One cannot but admire the systematic way in which he went to work, fearful lest he should lose a minute. The first day he was in Rome he made a circuit of

the whole city. His first visit was, of course, to St. Peter's, the saint to whom Catholic England had so deep a devotion. Then, only naturally, he went to see his countrymen in the English quarter and to pray in the church dedicated to Our Lady (S. Maria in Sassia) which had been founded by our King Ina—S. Maria Scola Anglorum, as the itinerary calls it; S. Spirito in Sassia as it is now called. Next, crossing the river, he made for the Via Lata (Corso); and, after visiting the Church of "St. Laurentius in Craticula" (S. Lorenzo in Lucina, where, as says the *Mirabilia,* is his gridiron, *craticula,* and the chain that he was bound withal), left the city by the Porta Flaminia. The first church, outside the walls, which he visited was the old basilica of St. Valentine, near the Ponte Molle, which, repaired by Leo III and John IX, afterwards fell into ruins. Its site was only discovered in 1886. It was one of the halting places of the procession of the "great litany" on St. Mark's day (April 23), which started from S. Lorenzo in Lucina. Then he made his way across the country to the lovely Church of St. Agnes, and, as does the traveller today, looked with wonder on the bright mosaics of Pope Honorius I, already in the days of Sigeric over 35o years old. Gazing ever, as he journeyed on, at the walls and churches of the city he had come so far to see, he reached the great basilica of St. Lawrence, outside-the-walls, near which is now Rome's Campo Santo. The tombs of heathen Rome along the Via Appia seem to have had no more attraction for our archbishop than the pagan monuments in the city. He had eyes only for the Church of St. Sebastian, of which the alterations of Cardinal Borghese (1611) have left not a trace behind. Moving on to the Via Laurentina, he came to the Church of St. Anastasius (known today as SS. Vincenzo ed Anastasio), near the now famous Abbadia delle Tre Fontane, and remarkable as a good example of the early Christian basilicas. The Via Laurentina soon brought him on to the Via Ostiensis, and that to the basilica of St. Paul, outside-the-walls. Perhaps it was the sight of the mosaic medallions of the Popes which he saw there that moved Sigeric's clerk to attach to his itinerary a list of the Roman pontiffs of the tenth century. Reentering the city by the Porta Capena (di S. Paolo), and passing the Monte Testaccio, he walked along the Via della Marmorata, and then ascending the Aventine, he inspected the churches of St. Boniface (S. Alessio) and St. Sabina. In the cloister of the former he may have read the epitaph of that Crescentius "de Theodora" who had murdered Benedict VI, and retired to the monastery of S. Alessio to die (984). Descending the hill and keeping by the river, he went into the church of the Greek traders from Sicily or Calabria, viz. S. Maria Scola Graeca (S. M. in Cosmedin). Recrossing the Tiber, he went to see the mosaics of Pope Paschal I in St. Cecilia's, and to ask the intercession of that great virgin and martyr. Finally, after naming three more churches to which the indefatigable archbishop turned his steps (St. Chrysogonus, S. Maria "transtyberi" and St. Pancratius), the clerk quietly adds : "Then we returned home!". And well they might, after such a day of sight-seeing! The next day the number of churches visited by Sigeric and his companion was not so great, for in the middle of the day "we dined with the Apostolic Lord John."

The acceptance of John's mediation by Ethelred and the duke of Normandy, and the respectful visits to Rome of our metropolitans, are enough to show that, despite the depressed state in which the Papacy was kept during this period, and despite the fact that some of the Popes at this time were a scandal to the Church, "reverence for the chair of Peter" was not extinguished "by the criminals who had filled it." And when to the conduct of the princes and prelates of the West we add the action of the whole Western Church turning to the Popes for grants of privilege, and of the Oriental Church looking for instruction in difficulties to the Holy See, it will be seen that the contrary assertion, which is that of Gregorovius, is not well founded. Some twenty grants of

privilege are known to have been conceded by John XV to various monasteries and churches in Italy, France, Bohemia, the German Empire, and the Spanish March.

Of these charters only one will here be noticed; and that because it brings us in contact with a man of especially remarkable attainments for the age in which he lived, and whose name is not often seen. The anonymous author, who about the year 1080 wrote a short notice of the bishops of Eichstadt, in due course treats of Bishop Regimbald (or Riginold, 996 -c. 991), "a man illustrious indeed by his noble birth, but still more by his learning. Not only was he imbued with Latin, Greek, and even Hebrew literature, but, what was very remarkable, he was the first musician of his age". His historical labors gained him his bishopric; and, if I rightly understand the passage treating of him, he composed a regular oratorio concerning the travels of his sainted predecessor Willibald. And it would appear that for this he wrote verses in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. This great bishop was a close friend of a powerful lady, Pia, who in her way was as accomplished as he was, for she far surpassed all her contemporaries in her skill at delicate needlework. After a life spent in working for the Church, she became a nun, built a convent at Bergen, endowed and beautified it, and "handed it over to the Roman Church in an especial manner." Pope John XV confirmed the gift "by his privilege, which we have still in our keeping."

Donation of Poland to the Pope

It would appear, however, that if John granted many things to others, there were not wanting some who made to the grants to him. In distant Poland the *Judex* Dagone, his wife, and their two sons, during his reign gave to “St. Peter the town of Schinesghe (Schinesne, Gnesen) and all its dependencies "within the limits carefully described in their deed of gift. The *Judex* Dagone has been shown by Fabre to be Duke Mieszko I (962-992), and Gnesen and its territory to be the Duchy of Poland, bounded by the Baltic, by Prussia, by Russia as far as Cracow, and by the Oder. It included, moreover, the country beyond the Oder to the mountains of Bohemia. Like most other similar donations of countries to the Popes, it was made with the object of ensuring its liberty against the encroachments of warlike and aggressive neighbors, in this case against the attacks of the Germans.

Africa.

In an interesting paragraph of the letter of the abbot Leo to the kings Hugh and Robert, we are informed that "last year (994) Theodorus, archbishop of Egypt, and Horestus of Jerusalem, sent legates to ask the Pope whether converts from Jacobitism might be received into the clerical state, and whether, as they could not, for fear of the Saracens, consecrate an altar in every church, they might consecrate some linen to serve the same purpose.

Though much of our knowledge, then, of John's relations with distant peoples is often very meagre, it is extensive enough to enable us to see that the essentially partisan invective of Arnulf of Orleans, of which enough has already been said, is not in accordance with fact.

The pontificate of John XV is memorable also from the fact that, as far as is known with any degree of certainty, it is in his reign that we find the first example of solemn canonization by a Pope. It is generally stated that Alexander III (1159-1181) was the Pope who first reserved to the Holy See the right of enrolling holy people after their death in the catalogue of the saints, and in proof thereof is quoted a bull which he

issued at Anagni (February 7, 1161) regarding the canonization of our St. Edward the Confessor. An examination of the bull, however, shows that in it, at least, he did nothing of the kind. It simply says, in the only passage that has any bearing on the subject, that the Pope will do himself what is not wont to be done except by solemn councils, viz. canonize King Edward. Perhaps, however, it may be safely argued that the manner in which "the Church of the English, which was most especially devoted to the Roman See", in the person of its bishops and abbots, begged Pope Alexander III to enroll King Edward in the catalogue of the saints, is enough to prove that by his time that important act could only be done by the Holy See. This is borne out by the story of Abbot Nordpert's obtaining from Clement II the canonization of blessed Wiborada, and by a fragment of a *decree* of Alexander III (1170) in which he forbids public veneration of a person as a saint without the authority of the Roman Church. It would seem, then, that the practice of canonization came gradually and naturally to be left solely *in* the hands of the Popes, who, by degrees, regulated its whole process.

In the early days of the Church popular acclamation seems not unfrequently to have been the *vox Dei* in declaring who were to be honoured as saints. In the eighth and ninth centuries this practice was forbidden by various councils, and the power of canonizing was reserved to the bishops. From the time when the right of solemnly adding to the catalogue of the saints was reserved to the Pope, whenever that was, the examination into the life of the person who is proposed for canonization has become more and more searching. Indeed, so close is the investigation that it has become a matter of wonder to non-Catholics that such solid proofs of virtue and miraculous power are exacted before a bull of canonization is issued by the supreme Pontiff.

It was in the year 993 that, after a careful examination into the life of Ulrich, bishop of Augsburg (*d.* 973), John XV, "servant of the servants of God", announced to "all the archbishops, bishops, and abbots of Gaul and Germany" that, on the motion of Luitolf, bishop of Augsburg, before a council in the Lateran palace, it was decreed that the memory of the holy Bishop Ulrich be venerated with pious devotion, because "we adore and worship the relics of martyrs and confessors, that we may adore Him whose martyrs and confessors they are. We honour the servants that the honour may redound to the Lord, who said : 'He that receiveth you, receiveth me' (S. Matt., X. 4o). And so we, who cannot rely on our own merits, may be continually helped by their prayers before the throne of God". The decree is witnessed by five other bishops besides the Pope, and by various *cardinal* priests and deacons.

In one of the catalogues it is stated that John "decorated with paintings the oratory of Our Lady in Gradibus", afterwards known as "in Turry". It had been built originally by Paul I at the base of the tower erected by his brother Stephen (II) III, which from this very oratory came to be known as the tower of Our Lady "ad Grada". The tower formed part of the *quadroporticus* which surrounded the atrium in front of the old St. Peter's.

When, centuries later, the portico was pulled down, the bright imperishable mosaics of Paul I, still bearing his name, were seen and described by the antiquarians of the time.

It was at the end of March or at the beginning of April996 that a violent fever caused John XV to give up "his body to the earth and his soul to heaven"; or, as a later author (Amalricus Augerius) expresses it, "After many labors and much pain of body, John departed to the Lord, and was by clergy and people honourably buried in Rome."

GREGORY V.
996-999.

COMPELLED by the violence of Crescentius Numentanus, John XV, had, as we have already seen, not long before his death, turned to the youthful Otho III for help. As soon as the German monarch had arranged terms of peace with the Slavs, he crossed the Alps in the spring (996) with a large army and, "long desired", entered Italy. After celebrating Easter (April 12) at Pavia, he advanced to Ravenna.

He was there met by envoys from Rome with letters from "the Roman nobles and the senatorial order". They informed him of the death of John, and expressed their sense of the great loss they had all therein sustained. Otho himself, they declared, they were loyally anxious to see in Rome; and they would be glad if he would let them know whom he would wish them to elect in place of John. The king at once suggested the name of one of his chaplains, the youthful Bruno, son of the duke of Carinthia. Through his grandmother Liutgarda, who was the daughter of Otho I, the young ecclesiastic was a relation of his sovereign. Though not five-and-twenty years of age, he was already distinguished for his learning and ability, and, according to the biographer of St. Adalbert, for a hasty disposition more in accordance with his age than his office.

All present approved of the king's choice. Accordingly, accompanied by Archbishop Willigis of Mayence and Hildebald of Worms, Bruno betook himself to Rome, and was presented to its people as pope-designate. After a most honourable reception, he was duly elected by the Romans and consecrated on May 3. If any Pope could have contented that ungrateful, cowardly self-seeker, Crescentius Numentanus, whom Gregorovius chooses to consider "a brave man" and "a patriotic Roman", Bruno would have done. He was of the best blood of Germany, rich, handsome, and learned. His father was Otho, duke of Carinthia and marquis of Verona; his mother's name was Judith. The emperor, Conrad II, the Salic, was his nephew. His grandfather, Conrad the Red, duke of Lorraine, who had married Liutgarda, the daughter of Otho 1I, had died gloriously in the battle by the Lech (955), where the power of the terrible Hungarians had been effectually broken. He gave practical proof of the learning he had acquired in his native city of Worms when he instructed the people in German, Italian, or Latin as the case might be. But Gregory had not merely the "sounding brass or the tinkling cymbal" of an eloquent tongue, he had the charity which covereth a multitude of sins. Of this twelve poor men, who every Saturday received a present of clothes from him, were witnesses. In a word, this first German who ever sat on the chair of Peter was, like the rest of his countrymen who were to come after him in the middle of the next century, an honor to his king and country, and certainly more worthy of the Papacy than not a few of those whom the nobility of Rome had forced into the Roman See.

The election of Gregory, "illustrious not only by the General nobility of his birth, but by the uprightness of his character", as Aimoin puts it, gave the greatest consolation to good men who were anxious for the uplifting of the Church. Abbo, the famous abbot of Fleury, whose learning and virtue mark him out as one of the most distinguished men of his age, gave expression to this feeling in a letter which he wrote to his friend Leo,

abbot of St. Boniface's in Rome, and, as we have seen, a man of great learning and piety himself : "I have just heard a piece of news which has rejoiced me more than gold or the topaz; viz. that the dignity of the Apostolic See has been raised by (the election of) a man of the imperial family and full of virtue and wisdom. May the same Holy Spirit who inspired St. Gregory I with all learning inspire the present venerable pontiff of the same holy Roman Church, and grant that you may be to him a most acceptable secretary to work for the reinvigoration of the apostolic authority"

Scarcely was Gregory seated on the throne of the Fisherman than the youthful Otho arrived in Rome to receive the imperial crown at the hands of his young cousin. In the presence of his mother and grandmother, of the Roman nobility, now all submission, and of a great number of his own countrymen, Otho was duly crowned by the Pope, and at fifteen years of age found himself emperor of the Romans and "advocate of the Church of S. Peter" (May 21).

Before Otho left Rome, not only was he engaged with the Pope in granting privileges to monasteries—for both of them had great faith in the Cluniac foundations as centres of civilization—but on May 25 he held a synod with him "to settle various ecclesiastical matters". Among the affairs treated of by this assembly was the unsatisfactory state of things in the Church of Rheims. It was perhaps at this council that Gregory ordered the restoration of Arnulf to his archiepiscopal see. At any rate, in a charter of privilege, soon to be cited, the Pope brands Gerbert as an intruder. The occasion of this grant was a request put forward by Herluin that the Pope would consecrate him bishop. He had been elected bishop of Cambrai; but, owing to the troubles between Arnulf and Gerbert, he had not been able to get consecrated. He also complained to the Pope of the manner in which the temporalities of his see had been plundered. Gregory not only consecrated Herluin, but addressed a bull to him in which he certified that fact, and forbade, under pain of excommunication, any noble to dare in the future to interfere with the property of the See of Cambrai, or, on the death of bishop or priest of that diocese, to plunder the goods they might chance to leave behind them. The fact that Gregory had no hesitation in denouncing the emperor's favourite as an intruder shows his love of justice and his independence of character; and that Otho did not demur lets us see the harmony which prevailed between the Church and the State. No wonder this synod was regarded as the beginning of a new era, and that men rejoiced to see Pope and emperor uniting in giving laws to the world.

Before this august assembly the turbulent Crescentius was naturally summoned. The youthful emperor very wisely wished that the rebel should be banished. But the feelings of the Pope, paternal no doubt but mistaken, led him to beg for mercy for the worthless noble. He unfortunately obtained his request. Crescentius returned to his liberty and to his plots, while Otho marched north to Germany (June).

No sooner had Otho turned his back on Rome than Gregory felt that his leniency towards Crescentius had been a mistake. He was soon made to feel that the pardoned noble had a great deal of power in the city, and that his fidelity could not be relied on. Conscious that his own influence among his new subjects was not enough to enable him to cope with Crescentius, should that unruly spirit again aspire to supreme power, and full of apprehension that such was indeed his intention, the Pope begged Otho to return to Rome at once. In reply the emperor expressed his grief that he could not do as his affection for his friend strongly inclined him. The climate was really more than he could endure. But he would be with the Pope in spirit. To encourage Gregory, Otho reminded him that he had commissioned the great ones of Italy, such as Hugh the Great (marquis of Tuscany from 970 to about 1001), who was the emperor's devoted adherent, and the count of Spoleto and Camerino, to be at once the Pope's consolation and protection.

Gregory had not misread the political situation; his fears were soon realized. But a few months elapsed after the departure of Otho ere Crescentius was again in arms. He would have no master if he could help it. He worked upon the feelings of "the Romans", *i.e.* of his own party, by reminding them of the way in which Otho had dictated to them. Gregory, though he seems to have dreaded it, was not prepared for such perfidy and ingratitude as were manifested by John Crescentius. Like the rest of the Popes for many a century, he took no effective measures for keeping in check the unbridled ambition of the more powerful of the nobility. He neglected to prepare those means of forcible repression which even a father of a family —much more a ruler of a state—must have at hand to be used in case of need. He was forced to fly from the city destitute of everything. This took place apparently in the early part of 997.

Expelled from Rome, Gregory made his way to Pavia, where he had ordered a synod to assemble. He wished to discuss other important matters as well as the usurpation of Crescentius. There were grave troubles in France. Gerbert had been to him to plead his cause in his own person before the supreme judge in the Church. And news had reached Gregory that King Robert, setting at defiance both the laws of the Church and the advice of the wise, had married Bertha, who was his second cousin, and moreover spiritually related to him as well. For he had been godfather to a child of Bertha by a former husband whose death he had contrived to bring about. Robert had married Bertha immediately after the demise of Hugh Capet, his father (1-October 996).

When, towards the middle of the year 997, the synod which Gregory had summoned met at Pavia, the first question to which the assembly addressed itself was the case of Gerbert. Here again things did not turn out favorably for the would-be occupant of the See of Rheims. The bishops who had taken part in the deposition of Arnulf, and who, though summoned to the synod, had not taken the trouble to be properly represented at it, were suspended from their office, whereas those who had been deposed without "the apostolical authority" were declared "to remain innocent."

It was next decreed that King Robert, who, "despite the apostolical prohibition," had married a relation, should, along with the bishops who had consented to his marriage, give satisfaction to the Pope. Excommunication was to be the result of refusal.

The doings of Crescentius, who, as we shall see presently, had meanwhile caused an antipope to be elected, were of course discussed by the council. In view of the election of the antipope, it was decreed that any cleric who, whilst the Pope was safe and sound, should take *any* steps without his knowledge for the election of a new pontiff, should be deprived of his dignity, excommunicated, and anathematized. Crescentius himself, "the disturber of the holy Roman Church", was excommunicated. The decrees of this synod, signed by thirteen bishops, are known to us through a letter which the Pope addressed to "our vicar" Willigis of Mayence, in which he asked him to secure the adhesion to them of the bishops subject to him.

The action of the synod of Pavia came as a rude shock Robert and to Robert, who, at this period at any rate, had no right to Bertha, the title of the Pious" which history has awarded him. Wishing to retain the object of his affections, and at the same time to avoid excommunication, he determined to try if submission in one particular would enable him to avoid it in another. Arnulf of Rheims, who had been deprived of his see "without a fair trial," according to the biographer of Abbo, was still languishing in prison. Decrees of Popes and councils in his favor had up to this availed him nothing. King Robert, however, now sent Abbo of Fleury to the Pope, who had meanwhile threatened to anathematize the whole kingdom of the Franks on account of the treatment of Arnulf. The abbot found his task a heavy one. The food and drink of foreign climes,

especially of old England, had had the effect of making the saint decidedly stout. But the weight of his body did not in his case drag down the aspirations of his soul. Eager for peace, he faced difficulties of every kind in his efforts to find him "whom report had represented as the one to look to for the restoration of the standard of religious life". When he reached Rome in the autumn of 997, he only found a figment of a Pope, the creature of the tyrant Crescentius. It was not to speak to such a man that Abbo had toiled many a heavy mile. It was the true Pope he wished to see. He had no desire to look upon Rome "subject to usurpers' rule" (that of Crescentius and his antipope); it was to approach "the fifth Gregory, the world's watchman" that "on his knees" he had crossed the mighty Alps. He must, then, find Gregory. Again, therefore, through many a deep and dusky vale, o'er many a rugged mountain—"per concava vallium, per prerupta montium investigans—he dragged his weary body. At length, in the district of Spoleto, "the two lights of the Church" met, and embraced each other. After the Pope had duly blessed him, he let the saint know how glad he was to see such an ardent champion of the Church and of truth. He had heard, he continued, of his learning, and knew that no claims of friendship whatsoever would make him swerve from the right path. He had long desired to see and to converse with him both on sacred and on profane subjects. It will be for you to ask, said Gregory, and for me to grant. For I know that you will not ask for anything I ought not to bestow upon you. Whether the Pope spoke in this way to prevent Abbo from pleading for Robert cannot be determined, as the saint's biographer says nothing definitely about any negotiations on the king's behalf. He tells us, however, that for eight days the pontiff kept Abbo by his side, and granted him all the favours he had come to beg for. One of these was a charter of privilege for his monastery. And so far was the Pope, says the saint's disciple, from wishing to extract any profit for himself out of his favors, that he made the abbot a present of vestments and other things used at Mass. We are told that among the other privileges conferred by this charter was exemption from episcopal visitation. Moreover, if the whole of Gaul were to be laid under an interdict by the Apostolic See, the charter proclaimed that it was not to be in the power of any bishop to lay the interdict on the abbey. A copy of this diploma of Gregory has been found comparatively recently, and has been published by Pfister. It contains the privileges mentioned by Abbo's biographer and others as well, and concludes with invoking on king or bishop the loss of their dignity, and threatening them with excommunication, if they contravene the papal grant. As the bull is dated November 15, 997, we must conclude that then Gregory was still in or near Spoleto.

Though, to argue from Abbo's letter to Gregory, soon to be cited, it would *seem* that the saint received from the Pope anything but a promise of any indulgence for Robert in the matter of his marriage, it was, nevertheless, arranged that Arnulf should be released and restored to his see. The abbot was to convey the pallium to the re-established archbishop, and to deliver an unpalatable message to the king. That Abbo faithfully fulfilled his commissions we learn from a letter which he addressed : "To the venerable prelate of the holy Roman and Apostolic See, and hence doctor of the universal Church, Abbo, the rector of Fleury, offers health in Christ". "It often happens", he wrote, "that the full purity of truth is obscured by the words of an unfaithful interpreter. To guard against such a danger, venerable father, I stated your will in terms at once faithful and simple, as you bade me. Nor do I fear in the least degree the animosity of the king, since I added nothing (to your words), nor did I diminish, change, or omit anything. Of all this, Arnulf, forgiven and freed from prison, is my witness, to whom I presented the pallium as with your own hands. My witness also is *my* lord Robert, the illustrious king of the Franks, who, as your spiritual son, has promised to obey you as he would St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, whose place on

the earth you now hold". In conclusion, while thanking Gregory for the vestments he had given him, Abbo declares he will never forget the Pope in his prayers, and will be ever obedient to him.

As a result of these negotiations, Arnulf (*d.* 1021) was released (November 997); but, whatever promises to the contrary Robert may have made, Bertha was not dismissed from his side. Accordingly, at a synod held in Rome at the close of the year 998 or the beginning of 999, after the re-establishment of Gregory, and when Otho was in the city, it was decided that, unless Robert discarded Bertha, and agreed to do penance for seven years, he was to be anathematized. The same penalty was decreed against Bertha; and the bishops who had assisted at the illegal wedding were declared excommunicated till such times as they came to Rome in a spirit of repentance. The first signature to these decrees after the Pope's was that of Gerbert, now archbishop of Ravenna, and formerly Robert's master.

For some time the king braved the condemnation of the—at least so says Pfister. But it is by no means easy, at the period of which we are now treating, to give either accurate facts as to Robert's deeds or precise dates to them. Relying on a diploma in which the king is said to have acted "at the request of his dear wife Bertha", the last-named author believes that on October 26, 999, Robert had certainly not taken any heed of the Pope's anathema. On the other hand, he thinks it clear that by September 1001 Bertha had lost her position as queen, and that before August 25, 1003, Robert had married Constance. Very few certain indications with regard to the chronology of the close of the tenth century can, however, be extracted from the charters of King Robert. The *notes of time* attached to them are so corrupt or so complicated that Pfister himself, who has devoted a close study to them, has declared that "each diploma must be examined separately, and above all with the greatest prudence and even with a certain amount of timidity". And so in the case of the document under discussion, we should get the year 998 if the indiction given (viz. the twelfth) be supposed to have begun in September. Besides, should the date 999 be accepted, it is necessary to reject a letter which purports to have been written by Gregory V (November 998) to *Constance*, queen of the Gauls (Galliarum), and to assert that a signature of Constance to a diploma, signed also by King Robert, "must have been added afterwards."

At any rate, certain it is that Robert repented sooner or later. "David and Robert", says the latter's panegyrist, "after the manner of kings, sinned; but, touched by God, they repented and bewailed their sins with their tears, which is not in accordance with the usual habit of kings". It is also certain that he went to Rome, in company with the bishops who had supported him in his opposition to the laws of the Church, and with them expressed his sorrow for his conduct, and accepted the penance which was imposed upon him. During the absence of the king, Constance had much to suffer from Bertha, who, owing to the encouragement she received "from certain courtiers", says Odorannus in his Chronicle (sub an. 1031), hoped for a fresh and, this time, for a favorable decision from Rome. Her disappointment when, on Robert's return, she found him "more devoted to Constance than before", may be imagined.

If it be the fact that Robert did not submit immediately, we are driven to ask what was the cause of his ultimate obedience. Following the testimony of St. Peter Damian and a fragment of an ancient chronicle, we should say it was on account of the disagreeable consequences which his personal excommunication and an interdict on his kingdom entailed upon him. Damian asserts' that Robert was abandoned by everybody except two servants who remained to prepare his food, and that even they afterwards threw into the fire the vessels from which he had eaten and drunk. It is a fragment of a history of the Franks which states that the whole of Francia was laid under an interdict

by the Pope. But, because the saint goes on to assure us that Bertha was the mother of a monstrosity which had the head and neck of a goose, and because the fragment is crammed full of legends, the evidence of both the one and the other is discounted by some authors. But when we reflect on the treatment which excommunication brought upon Gerbert, there would seem to be no reason to call in question the accuracy of Damian's statement, so far, at least, as it registers the fact that the king was shunned by many. And as it is known with certainty that Gregory had threatened to lay the whole country under an interdict, and that Abbot Abbo took measures to prevent the impending evil from affecting his monastery, we may well believe that it actually did fall on the land of Francia.

However all this may be, certain it is, as we have said, that Robert repudiated Bertha, became reconciled to the Holy See, and married Constance.

The affair of Robert of France has not allowed us to lose sight of Gerbert of Rheims. Sacrificed, as he believed, by King Robert for Bertha, and abandoned as excommunicated by his own partisans, Gerbert finally left France, somewhere about the month of May 997, and betook himself to the court of the youthful Emperor Otho III. Though received with open arms by that powerful and enlightened sovereign, the emperor's influence was not strong enough to preserve the See of Rheims for his favorite. On the contrary, Gerbert's rival Arnulf was, as we have seen, released by King Robert (c. November 997) and recognized as archbishop of Rheims by Gregory. Still, if Otho could not keep his honored tutor in his French metropolitical see, there was much that he could do for him. He not only bestowed ample domains upon Gerbert, but, when the violent doings of Crescentius caused him to set out for Rome towards the close of 997, he took his friend with him. Otho was determined to get some honor from the Pope for the man who had been the faithful adherent of three generations of his family. In the early part of the year 998 Gerbert was in Rome with the victorious emperor, and in April he succeeded to the archbishopric of Ravenna, the first see in Italy after that of Rome, and at that time vacant by the abdication (998) of its occupant, John XIII.

The bull by which Gregory conceded to Gerbert the use of the pallium is a very important document. It shows that the confirmation by Otho I of the donations of Pippin and Charlemagne to the Holy See had not been without effect. Under the powerful protection of the Saxon emperors, the sovereign pontiffs began to recover their temporal jurisdiction over the exarchate of Ravenna, which they had lost during the disorders of the earlier part of the tenth century. Owing to a mingling together of points of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the bull is unfortunately not particularly easy of comprehension. It runs : "Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to Gerbert, archbishop of the holy Church of Ravenna, and our spiritual son, and through you to all your successors. Moved both by good-will towards you: and by ancient custom, we have set your fraternity over the Church of Ravenna, and we think it right to bestow upon you the insignia of the prelates of that church, and among them the pallium to be worn just as you know was done by your predecessors. Strive to match the beauty of these corporal adornments by the internal perfections of the soul. To show you the warmth of our regard for you, we are glad gratuitously to bestow upon you, after the death of the empress (mother) Adelaide, the district of the city of Ravenna, with all the coast rights and the privilege of coining money, with the tolls and market dues, and with the walls and gates of the city all things to the contrary notwithstanding. Also after the death of the empress we grant you and your successors the county of Commacchio, to have and to hold it for ever. We, moreover, confirm to you and your church the *privilege* we granted to John, your predecessor, which submitted to him the bishoprics of Montefeltre and Cervia (Ficoclum), and the monasteries of St. Thomas the Apostle,

and St. Euphemia, martyr, with all their possessions as well in the city of Rimini as in the counties of Pesaro, Rimini, and Montefeltre. To these we add all that your predecessors have held for a hundred years, and of which you, by the mercy of God, are now in peaceful possession, viz. Ligabizzi and other *castelli*. And still further to display our paternal regard for you, we confirm, by virtue of the authority of God and of the Prince of the Apostles, the grant of the bishopric of Reggio made to you by the Emperor Otho. In fine, we grant you Cesena, all its dependencies, and all hunting rights between it and the sea, so that with full authority you may there manage everything". After the customary denunciation of anathema against anyone who should dare to contravene this papal *privilege*, it concluded thus :

"Written by the hand of Peter, notary and scrivener of the Holy Roman Church, in the month of April, the eleventh indiction. Bene valete. Given April 28 by the hand of John, bishop of Albano and librarian of the Holy Apostolic See," etc. Gregory had already (January 28, 997) bestowed similar powers on Gerbert's predecessor, John XIII, in order, as he said, that the Church of Ravenna "might not lose even the very name of metropolitan". In the territories which he conceded, the Pope is always careful to add that he grants John and his successors all judicial power", and proclaims that, apart from the archbishop, no other ecclesiastic may dare to collect any taxes throughout the whole of Emilia and the Pentapolis. It was enough for Gregory to know that the Church of Ravenna "was destitute of all things" to make him eager to stretch out a helping hand to it. But, of course, had it not been that he felt sure of the support of the strong arm of Otho, he could not have done much to restore either its spiritual or its temporal jurisdiction. These bulls anent Ravenna give us a clear insight into what Gregory and Otho could have accomplished together in the way of curbing the tyrannical petty princes who ground down the people of Italy, and of raising the Church both in spirituals and in temporals. Hence is there the more reason to regret the early demise of these two men—men undoubtedly of no mean order of ability, and of a well-defined strength of character.

Magna Grecia

We must now look into what was being done in Rome during the absence of the Pope. And to avoid interrupting the narrative of the thrilling drama therein enacted in which Crescentius was the chief performer, a word or two may be prefixed on St. Nilus, who also took part in it, and on the sequence of events which brought about that Greek influence in Italy of which his career was a vivid illustration.

During the palmy days of the Roman Empire, that important position which their famous colonies (Magna Griecia) had given to the Greeks in South Italy well-nigh disappeared. With the victories of Belisarius and Narses, however, Greek influence in the south of the peninsula revived; and, by the iconoclastic persecutions of Leo III and his successors, was fanned into vigorous life. The Mahometan invasions of the Eastern-Roman empire, and the edicts of the image-breaking emperors sent thousands of Greeks into the south of Italy; and the forcible transference (732) of the churches of Calabria and Sicily, from the jurisdiction of the Pope to that of the patriarch of Constantinople, was a factor of the first importance in preventing the immigrants from being absorbed by the native population. This tyrannical act of Leo III gave the Greeks of Italy organization. The Saracen trouble, which began in the ninth century (813), brought them under the direct jurisdiction of the Greek emperors. After the first descent of the infidels upon Sicily (827), their ravages in South Italy became so extensive that an excellent excuse was thereby given to that energetic warrior Basil the Macedonian for

endeavoring to recover the authority of his predecessors in Italy. He availed himself of it (876), and succeeded in so firmly laying the foundations of Greek rule in Southern Italy that it became paramount there till it was overthrown by the Normans at the close of the eleventh century. So far had the Hellenization of the southern extremity of the peninsula been carried in the tenth century, that our national chronicle could speak of Otho the Third's expedition into "Greek-land". In order to strengthen Greek influence, Nicephorus Phocas (963-969) resolved to extend the ascendancy of the Greek Church in Italy. Acting as though the Greek Church were autonomous, he ordered the patriarch of Constantinople to raise the bishop of Otranto to the rank of an archbishop, and to make him the metropolitan of Apulia.

Not content with this double usurpation of papal authority, in taking from it new territories, and in modifying the ecclesiastical hierarchy without the authorization of the Pope, he forbade Latin to be used in any of the Church services in Apulia.

The result of the continued and varied efforts of the Greek emperors to *Hellenise* Southern Italy was so successful that, despite the overthrow of their power in the peninsula by the Normans, Greek influence lasted even in Apulia —which is regarded as having been less *Hellenised* than Calabria— right down to the fifteenth century. In the thirteenth century we find Roger Bacon suggesting that, to increase the knowledge of Greek in this country, "some should journey to Italy, in some portions of which—for example, in Apulia—the clergy and the people were really Greeks", and that the rich, as Bishop Grosseteste had done, should "send to those parts in search of books as well as of persons acquainted with Greek". In the same century a papal envoy to Nardo, in the *heel* of Italy, writes to express his joy at finding himself, as it were, in Greece; and from Crotona, in the *toe* of Italy, we see the Popes drawing one Greek bishop after another to send as their legates to the emperors of Constantinople.

In the very last decade of the fourteenth century, Raimondello Orsini built the Church of S. Caterina at Galatina, "because the principal church, St. Peter's, was served according to the Greek rite, and all the priests were Greek, and so was the language, so that those Latins who understood not the Greek tongue could not pray to God in a language they comprehended. The great Benedictine traveller Montfaucon, who when in Italy made careful enquiries about Greek manuscripts, tells us that this difficulty of the different rites was brought to an end by Sixtus IV (1471-84), who "ordered all to say their office in Latin; for they endeavored quite to extinguish the use of the Greek tongue in those parts. Nevertheless in many parts of that kingdom (Naples) the common people speak Greek, but corrupted."

Even to this day, writes a modern author, "the peasants about here (Galatina) still speak Greek, with many Italian words intermixed". And, "in that part of the Terra d' Otranto called 'Il Capo', the people still speak Greek". Another English traveller, writing only a few years ago, tells of some peasants in a mountainous village near Catanzaro, who talk a corrupt Greek, and who are even called *Greci* by their neighbours. But it must be borne in mind that some, if not all, of these Greek-speaking people are descendants of Greeks who fled from Greece before "the unspeakable Turk."

From the sixth century, then, but especially from the eighth to the eleventh century, the remaking of Greece in South Italy went on; and from Tarentum to Reggium a country was formed which was Hellenic in language, manners, religion, and national sentiment!

It was in the chief town (Roscianum or Rossano) of this second Magna Graecia that, towards the beginning of the tenth century (910), was born Nicholas, who, as the abbot Nilus, was to be one of the most famous men of his time. With charming naiveté his biographer writes : "I know that everyone is acquainted with Rossano, not only

because it is the capital city of Calabria, but because, though the whole province has been laid waste and all its cities brought under the sway of the vile Saracens, it alone has hitherto escaped that disastrous fate." For some years Rossano beheld Nicholas leading the ordinary married life of one of its first citizens. But the thought of death caused him to conceive a distaste for the world (940). Abandoning his home, he changed his name and his mode of living. As the monk Nilus, Nicholas soon became famous for his virtues. While declining honors such as the bishopric of Rossano, he did not refuse his services to anybody. He was as much respected by the ravaging infidel as by his own countrymen; and, though a Greek Basilian monk, he was regarded by the Benedictines of Monte Cassino "as the great Anthony come to them from Alexandria, or as the great Benedict, their own divine Legislator and Master, risen from the dead". After having been driven from place to place by the ravages of the Saracens, Nilus and his companions settled down for fifteen years *(c.* 98o-995) in the neighboring mountainous monastery of S. Angelo di Vallelucio, given them by the abbot of Monte Cassino. But at the time of Otho's second coming to Rome to restore Gregory (997), Nilus was living in a monastery near Gaeta, known, from a temple of Serapis, which had once stood on the spot, as *Serperi.*

When Crescentius had expelled Gregory from Rome, hehad leisure to reflect on the probable consequences of his act and the best means of averting them. His deliberations were assisted by the arrival in Rome of ambassadors from Constantinople. Wishing to follow the example of his father, and to enhance his imperial position by a matrimonial alliance with the ruler of the Eastern Empire, Otho had dispatched an embassy to Constantinople to seek a Greek bride (995). Among the envoys was John, surnamed Philagathus, bishop of Piacenza. Very indifferent, to put the matter moderately, is the character which has come down to us of this Calabrian Greek. According to the *Annalista Saxo,* often formerly quoted as the Chronicle of Magdeburg, he had once been a slave, and was crafty to the last degree. He had come in poverty to the court of Otho II, and had contrived to win the favor of the Empress Theophano. Otho himself, on the advice "of wise and God-fearing men," made him abbot of the famous monastery of Nonantula; for he regarded "the archimandrite John" as "quiet and reserved, as a man of unblemished morals, learned in Greek literature, and both prudent and holy." He soon pushed his way to the front, and became the chaplain of the Empress. On the death of Otho II, his own astuteness and the childhood of Otho III enabled him to retain his paramount influence at court. He usurped the See of Piacenza. But it was not to be expected that a simple bishopric would satisfy the grasping ambition of John of Rossano; and when he visited Rome, on his return from his mission to Constantinople with an envoy of the Greek emperor, he found one who was ready to add fuel to the fire of his unholy passions. Twin spirits were John Crescentius and John Philagathus. They would share all power in Rome between them. The Greek was to become Pope, and make a formal grant of the temporal power of the Papacy to Crescentius. Both were to place themselves under the protection of the emperors of Constantinople, and Philagathus was to make an effort to attach to his interests the deposed archbishop of Rheims, the distinguished Gerbert. It was felt that, at emnity as the latter was with Gregory, liberal promises might induce him to go to extremes, and make common cause with them against the true Pope.

Efforts were at once made not only by the interested parties, but by such as had the welfare of the Church at heart to make Crescentius and his antipope, who took the name of John XVI, return to a sense of their duty. Gregory and Otho sent formal embassies to Rome. By the orders of the antipope they were ruthlessly committed to jail. At the same time St. Nilus wrote to him upbraiding him for his conduct, exhorting

him not to be ensnared by love of human glory, and imploring him to return to the monastic life. In reply to the earnest exhortation of his saintly fellow-townsman, John gave the evasive reply that he was making preparations to carry out the holy man's advice.

Meanwhile his doom was hurrying on apace. Especially if Otho's lofty ideas of his imperial dignity are borne in mind, there can be no difficulty in imagining the feelings of indignation with which he received the news of the expulsion from Rome of his relation, countryman, and nominee. But a war with the Slavs in the Prussian province of Brandenburg, during the summer of 997, gave Otho no time to think about the affairs of Italy for many a month. However, before the close of the year, he was marching on the Eternal City "to cleanse the Roman sink," and Pope Gregory was advancing to meet his powerful kinsman. On the news of the approach of the angry emperor with a strong army of Germans and Italians, there was great confusion in Rome. No protection for the traitors was forthcoming from the Greeks. Crescentius threw himself into the Castle of St. Angelo, while Johnfled from the city and shut himself up in some fortress deemed impregnable.

Finding themselves untrammelled, a number of the Romans, whom the *Annalista* calls " friends not of the emperor only but of Christ", either obeying a call of duty, if not the command of the emperor, or following their natural fickleness, took up arms against their late rulers. A body of them, in conjunction with some of the imperial troops, and headed by Birtailo, a vassal of Otho, set off in quest of the unfortunate antipope. He soon fell into their hands, and, "fearing lest if brought before the emperor he might escape unpunished", these barbarians cut off his nose and ears, and plucked out his eyes and tongue. Brought to Rome, he was incarcerated in a monastery to await his trial.

Before the end of February, if not earlier, Otho and Gregory had made their triumphant entry into Rome, and sometime during Lent John of Rossano was brought before them, as the treatment he had already undergone "was not an adequate punishment for his great crime." But the cause of the wretched antipope was not yet desperate. Though worn with age, sickness, and the fast of Lent, the Abbot Nilus appeared in Rome to plead for his fellow-townsman. He was received with every mark of the profoundest respect by both Pope and emperor. They kissed the saint's hands, and made him sit between them. Powerfully did the aged patriarch pour forth his petition that John might be entrusted to his care, and, in his monastery, be allowed to bewail his sins. He reminded Otho and Gregory that to both of them had John stood godfather. Vain, however, were all the saint's eloquent pleadings. The ingratitude of Crescentius and the ambition of Philagathus were too great for pardon. Otho felt strongly about the first, and the Pope about the second. John was declared by the council deposed from his sacred rank, and, as usual in cases of public degradation, his vestments were rent asunder.

Then was the unhappy man set upon "by the Romans". He was placed on an ass with his face to its rear and its tail in his hands; and thus, with his torn garments, was driven through the city, while the people shouted : "Thus let the man suffer who has endeavored to drive the Pope from his see". After this insulting treatment, the poor sufferer was doubtless confined in some monastery probably in Fulda; and seems to have lived on thus, "sans eyes, sans teeth, sans everything," to the year 1013.

A somewhat different account of this ghastly story is presented by a letter of the Greek ambassador Leo, of whom we made mention when speaking of the *sources* of the *Life* of Gregory V. From this recently discovered document it would appear that the degrading procession of the wretched mutilated antipope took place before his condemnation by the Roman synod. This order of events perhaps lessens the complicity

of the emperor as well as of the Pope in the perpetration of the more serious of the cruelties practised on Philagathus. Both from the official position occupied by Leo, and from the fact that he was in Rome when these deeds of violence were perpetrated, his narrative is perhaps more worthy of credence than that of any of the others who have chronicled the story of John XVI.

"This Philagathus," writes Leo to his brother, "who, to sum up, has (fortunately) no equal, whose mouth is ever full of curses, blasphemies, and calumnies; this man to whom no one can be compared, and who is not to be likened to anyone, this Pope with hands imbued in blood, this Pope so arrogant and haughty (oh God! oh Justice! oh sun!), has stumbled and fallen. And why should I not tell you, my brother, what was the character of his fall? He was anathematized by the Church of the West. Then his eyes were torn out; in the third place his nose was cut off fourthly, his lips were removed; fifthly, his tongue—that tongue which had uttered so many abominable words—was plucked out; sixthly, he was led about with great display, proud and grave, on a wretched little ass the tail of which he grasped; his head, held erect, was covered with an old sack; seventhly, he was judged and condemned. His ecclesiastical vestments were put upon him inside out, and then stripped off. He was then dragged from the temple across the proanos and court to the fountain. Finally, he was thrown into prison as into a place of rest. I have told you, brother—you have the same views as I have myself—the miseries of this unfortunate Philagathus, without adding anything or keeping anything back. But I would counsel all to refrain from doing what he has dared to do. For justice never sleeps".

Justly indignant at the savage and then shameful way in which John had been treated by the Romans, who were ever at once childish and cruel, the holy Nilus would hold no further intercourse with the emperor. To an eloquent archbishop whom Otho sent to try and soothe the aged abbot, Nilus replied that the emperor had agreed to give John to him for God, and that consequently the evils which had since then been inflicted on the antipope had been done to God. Both the emperor and the Pope, added Nilus, would suffer for the ills inflicted on John. When at great length the prelate endeavored to excuse his masters, the saint feigned sleep; and, as soon as the archbishop had left him in peace, Nilus promptly left the city to found that monastery (Grottaferrata, near Tusculum), in which his countrymen have to this day found a conventual home.

The end of Crescentius

We have now to turn our thoughts to Crescentius "of the Marble Horse", battling for life and liberty in the castle of St. Angelo against the attacks led by the Margrave, Ekkehard of Meiszen. The assault on the mausoleum, which our authorities call *Domus Theoderici* or *Turris Inter Celos* as well as the castle of St. Angelo, was not begun till after Low Sunday. The resistance of Crescentius was the fierce resistance of despair. But if he was determined to hold out till death in what was then regarded as an impregnable fortress, the resolute German had equally made up his mind that he would possess himself of the Patrician alive or dead. He gave the besieged no rest. Day and night he delivered his bold assaults. His movable towers overtopped the castle walls, his troops poured into it; and, not for the first time, the tomb of one man became the slaughter-house of many. Crescentius was seized, and, despite his pitiable entreaties for mercy, was at once beheaded on the very top of the castle in the sight of a great multitude of people. His body was then hurled into the moat, and, along with those of twelve of his principal followers who had also been decapitated, was hung by the heels on gallows erected on Monte Mario. We may well believe Thietmar when he says that

this execution "inspired all present with unspeakable fear" (for we have already seen the wholesome terror it infused into the lawless nobles of the country) and that "henceforth the Cesar ruled without any further trouble."

Historians less worthy of credence than the contemporary authorities on which we have hitherto relied for what we have said about the last days of Crescentius, add various embellishments to the account just given. The lively Celtic imagination of Raoul Glaber depicts Crescentius slipping in disguise from his fortress, suddenly forcing his way into Otho's presence, and begging that his life might be spared. "Why," sarcastically asked Otho of his attendants, "have you suffered this maker of emperors, laws, and pontiffs to enter the lowly abodes of the Saxons? Take him back to his lofty throne till *we* have prepared a fitting reception for him". When the castle had fallen into Otho's hands he bade his men "throw Crescentius down from the highest battlements in broad daylight, so that the Romans may never be able to say that you stole their prince". The Milanese historians and St. Peter Damian would make out that the Patrician was captured rather by perjury on Otho's part than by the valour of his troops, and that he was tortured before being put to death. But there is no reason why we should be dissatisfied with the straightforward narrative of contemporaries, or eke out the information which they furnish us by additions of doubtful value from later authors.

After April 29, 998, the day on which Crescentius and his abettors atoned for their misdeeds with their lives, Gregory passed the remainder of his too short pontificate in political peace.

Of the doings of Philagathus whilst he kept armed possession of the city of Rome we have very little knowledge. What we do know is not to his credit.

Some forty miles north-east of Rome, and not many miles from where the Via Salaria leaves the course of the Tiber and turns eastwards, there still stands much of the famous monastery of Farfa. Its remains make a village. In the year 996 and apparently also in 997 it was ruled by Alberic, the fifth successor of the infamous Hildebrand of whom we spoke in the introduction to this volume. On the death of Alberic, a certain Hugo thought he would like to rule the abbey of Farfa. As the sequel proved, he was anything but a bad man. He had, however, set his heart on being abbot of lordly Farfa. But it was under the special patronage of the emperors, and he knew of no method of securing the consent of Otho to his wishes. He would therefore try to get that of the antipope. The so-called John XVI was probably in need of money, as he had had to disburse large sums to Crescentius. From Philagathus then Hugo succeeded in buying the monastery, and became the thirty-second abbot of Farfa. Promptly deposed by Otho, and then at the prayer of the monks restored by him, Hugo became a glorious restorer both of the spiritual and the temporal side of his monastery, and a prudent dispenser of its charities.

At the risk of being somewhat tedious, we will narrate a few more of the doings of Hugo, as they throw much light upon the times, and a little at least on the character of Gregory.

Near the little river Minio (Mignone) in Roman Tuscany stood the cella of S. Maria, known from the river,as *in Minione.* Hugo contended that this small monastery belonged to Farfa; that it had originally been leased to the monastery of SS. Cosmas and Damian in the Trastevere, and known as *in Mica Aurea,* for the term of the lives of three successive abbots*;* and that at length the authorities of SS. Cosmas and Damian had pretended that the cella was theirs. When Otho was appealed to as protector of the monastery, he ordered the affair to be taken before the Pope. This was accordingly done, and the disputants appeared before Pope Gregory in the Lateran palace. Charters were produced on both sides, and at last a seemingly very ancient one by the abbot of

St. Cosmas. Hugo offered to produce a champion to prove by "trial by combat" that it was a forgery. "Then Pope Gregory, in consequence of money received from the abbot of St. Cosmas, gave way to anger against Hugo, arose and seized him, and bade him give up his claims to S. Maria."

In vain the frightened abbot asked why he was used thus violently. The Pope insisted, and Hugo had to give way at the time. But he had no intention of finally giving up what he believed to be his rights. Hence later on in the course of the same year (999) when Sylvester II had succeeded Gregory, and both the Pope and the emperor had paid a visit to Farfa, Hugo again put in his claim to the *cella.* Accordingly, once more both abbots were summoned to Rome. Hugo duly presented himself before the emperor, who was residing as usual in the palace on the Palatine (in Palatio). Along with Otho there sat in judgment various bishops, John, the prefect, the *arcarius* of the Holy See, several *judices dativi,* and many of the highest imperial officials, such as the commander of the troops, the head of the fleet, the keeper of the wardrobe, and the master of the household. Though summoned twelve times, the abbot of St. Cosmas failed to put in an appearance. Judgment was accordingly given in favor of Hugo, and by an imperial precept the *cella* of S. Maria was duly handed over to the abbey of Farfa.

On Tuesday, April 5, 998, "the Lord Pope Gregory and the Emperor Otho were sitting in judgment in the basilica against of St. Peter." Before them came a crowd of people demanding justice. Among others came certain priests of the Church of St. Eustachius *in Platana. "Most* pious emperor", they said, "we would have justice against Hugo, abbot of the monastery of St. Mary, by the river Farfa. He disputes our right to the two churches of St. Mary and St. Benedict, built in the Alexandrine Baths, situated in the Ninth Region". It chanced that Abbot Hugo was among the throng. He was at once brought before the acting judges, who, we are told, were, on behalf of the emperor, Leo, the archdeacon of the Sacred Palace, and John, prefect of the city; and, on the part of the Pope, Gregory, primicerius of the defensors, Leo, the arcarius, and Adrian, Peter, and Paul, *judices dativi.* Hugo, not unnaturally, asked for a delay, as he had not come prepared for a lawsuit. He was offered a Roman advocate. But a Roman advocate was not what Hugo wanted. The monastery of Farfa had always been under Lombard law, and so the abbot asked for an advocate learned in that law. "Whether you like it or whether you do not", replied the judges, "Roman law must content you". To this Hugo demurred. Whereupon the archdeacon seized him by the cowl, and made him sit down next to him. "You shall not leave this place (placitum) until you comply with the law". "The law I contravene not". replied the abbot, "but I must be granted time". By the express command of the emperor, a delay of three days was granted to him. When he re-appeared before his judges, he insisted upon the case being tried according to Lombard law, because for more than a hundred years the property of the monastery had been defended according to that law. The matter was referred to the emperor himself. Otho decided that, if the abbot could prove that in the past his monastery had been subject to Lombard law, he could now have the benefit of that law. By the production of a deed, ratified by the Emperor Lothaire and Pope Paschal I, which the opposite party were not able to gainsay, the dispute was allowed to be tried according to the law of the Lombards. And, as in accordance with the provisions of that law, Hugo was able to swear to possession of the churches for forty years, a verdict was given in his favor. By that sentence the two churches with their dependencies were made over to Hugo by the presentation to him of a rod. Moreover, the document on which his opponents relied was cut through with a knife in the form of a cross and then handed to the defendant.

The last episode with which the names of Hugo and Gregory are linked is of a more romantic character than the preceding, but was not settled for years after Gregory's

death. The beginning of the affair is thus related by Hugo, the historian. Pope John, who is called the Greater (John XV), exalted one of his nephews named Benedict, and gave him a noble wife (Theodoranda) and the county of the Sabina and other places. The newly married couple went to live in the Sabine territory, and settled at Orco (Arci). At that time the monastery of Farfa was governed by an abbot (John III), who was an altogether worldly-minded man. Theodoranda soon perceived this, and at once proceeded to play upon his weakness for her own ends. The dainties in which she knew he delighted she cooked and prepared with her own hands. She would even serve up the good things herself, in her own dainty manner, when he sat at table and feasted. In her visits to the abbey too she was assiduous, and whenever anything occurred that prevented her going there in person, the servants of the castle were to be seen constantly going with some obliging message from the Lady Theodoranda, or returning with some suitable compliment from Abbot John.

At this time the hill-fortress of Tribuco was held of the abbot by Martino Riconis; but the rocca itself (the citadel of the place) was kept by the abbot in his own hands. Whenever for any cause he had to leave home, he entrusted this rocca to Riconis and his followers, who used to give it up to him on his return. Now these men, being very ruffianly in their behaviour, and abandoned to all manner of criminal courses, were in the habit of plundering travellers and brought shame and grief to Abbot John.

Partly to be rid of this desperate gang, partly influenced by the attentions of the count and the fair Theodoranda, and partly in the hope of obtaining from them a costly missal which they had half promised him, he made over to them the fortress town of Tribuco by a deed which the Romans call a *tertium genus.* But when Benedict would not make over to the abbot the missal which had belonged to the count's uncle, and which was said to be worth no less than thirty pounds, John refused to ratify the deed with his signature.

Knowing that those who held Tribuco were fierce and wily, the count and his wife devised a means of accomplishing by the vilest craft what they could not effect by force. Under sworn guarantees of safe-conduct they lured a number of the principal men of Tribuco into their castle of Orco. Some of them they at once plunged in chains into their deepest dungeons, while they released the rest on payment of a ransom after exacting from them the deeds of property which they held of the abbey. Even after this loss of their chief men, Tribuco held out against the count's men for a year. The place only fell into his hands at last by bribery. When, however, he had secured it, Count Benedict became a greater bandit than ever Riconis had been, and harried the whole neighborhood.

Among the properties Benedict came into possession of as above described, was the manor (Curtis) of S. Gethulius. In vain the Abbot Hugo daily implored Pope Gregory and the emperor for justice against the count. But the execution at Rome "of Count Crescentius, by the orders of Otho and Pope Gregory" (998), at last struck terror into Benedict, and, with the knowledge of the emperor and the Pope, he gave up his claim to half the manor. Whilst Hugo was holding out for the other half and for Tribuco, Crescentius, the son of Count Benedict, was foolish enough to come to Rome. He was at once seized by Otho and Gregory to be used as a lever against his father. Benedict was then ordered to give up Caere, which he had also annexed. He promised to do so; but, instead of surrendering it, entrenched himself therein. After him in wrath at once hastened both emperor and Pope. "Come with me to Care", said the latter to Hugo. "If Count Benedict gives it up to me, he shall receive back his son, and an end shall be put to the dispute between you and him. But if not, I will hang the son before his father's

face and restore Tribuco to you." Benedict would not surrender the city till he saw his son being led blindfold to the gallows.

After this, whilst Otho lived, the monastery of Farfa held its goods in peace. But on his death (2002), "John, the son of Crescentius, was ordained Patricius; and he began to favour John and Crescentius, the sons of Count Benedict, as his beloved relatives". Feeling strong in the support of their powerful kinsman in Rome, the manor and other properties were again seized by the brothers. It was not till 1012, in the reign of Pope Benedict VIII, that a settlement was arrived at under Abbot Guido, and John, Crescentius, and his wife Hitta formally renounced most of what they had long unjustly held.

Elfric of Canterbury

After having thus at no little length recounted the comparatively petty affairs of a monastery, we may pause for a moment to contemplate with astonishment the survival of the privilege of living under either Lombard or Roman law at pleasure; to marvel at the lawlessness of the nobility; and to note the spread of the feudal system in the patrimony of St. Peter. We must then hasten to consider what there is left of the larger interests with which Gregory V was connected. One of his friends was Elfric, who was elected archbishop of Canterbury in 995, and "was a very wise man, so that there was no more sagacious man in England". Anxious to promote the reform of S. Dunstan, he was desirous of carrying out the designs of his energetic predecessor Sigeric, and of replacing the secular canons who had got possession of the cathedral of Canterbury with monks. But he was also wishful to be just; and before he expelled the seculars he would find out who had the prior claim to possession. "And forthwith he sent for all the wisest men that he anywhere knew of, and in like manner the old men who were able to say truest how everything was in this land in the days of their forefathers, besides what he himself had learned in books and from wise men". From this *witan* he learnt that, "all as St. Gregory had commanded", the monks had originally held the cathedral. The archbishop then went with these men anon to the king, and made known to him all. Then said the king (Ethelred): It seems to me advisable that thou, first of all things, should go to Rome after thy pall, and that thou make known all this to the Pope, and afterwards proceed by his counsel. And they all answered that this was the best counsel. When (the secular clerks) heard this, they advised that they should take two from themselves and send to the Pope, and should offer him great treasure of gold and silver, on condition that he should give them the arch-pallium. But when they came to Rome, the Pope would not do that, because they brought no letter, either from the king or from the people, and commanded them to go where they would. As soon as the clerks had gone thence, came the Archbishop Elfric to Rome (997), and the Pope received him with great worship, and commanded him on the morrow to celebrate Mass at St. Peter's altar; and the Pope himself put on him his own pall, and greatly honoured him. Go now to England again, said Gregory, with God's blessing, and St. Peter's and mine, and when you come home, put into thy monastery men of that order which the Blessed Gregory commanded Augustine therein to place, by God's command, and St. Peter's and mine. Returned to England (he) drove the clerks out of the monastery, and therein placed monks, all as the Pope had commanded him".

Fatigued, it may be, with his arduous journey to Rome, and exhausted by the closeness of the struggle he had had with the secular canons of his cathedral, it would seem that Elfric fell ill on his return to England, for in a letter to Abbo of Fleury we find Gregory expressing an anxious wish that the good abbot would send him word as to the

archbishop's condition. At any rate, "the most sagacious man in all England" must have improved in health, for he ruled his archdiocese eleven years, "in the midst of continual trouble from the pagans (Danes), and with the most exemplary piety, and then in Christ's Church went to his rest, and was translated to heaven" (1005).

If there is one thing which the official documents of Gregory V prove, it is the influence which the Emperor Otho had with his kinsman. So great was it that the government of the Church may almost be said to have been shared by him. Fortunately, Otho III was a man of high ideals, and anxious to do good, and in so often allowing himself to be moved by his wishes, the Pope was, as a rule, but advancing the sacred causes of justice and civilization. The bulls of Gregory and the other records of the time show him in his youthful efforts to renew the world, i.e., the Church and the Empire, on the one hand attaching himself closely to the head of the Church, and in his acts signing himself "Servant of the Apostles", "Servant of Jesus Christ", and dating them "from the palace of the cloister", and, on the other hand, copying the ways of the emperors at Constantinople. We have already seen how he surrounded himself with officials bearing high-sounding titles like those who assisted the ruler of Byzantium.

He was rarely in Germany. Rome was his love. He would make it once again the capital of the world. And then Pope and emperor, acting together, would reform it. With this noble end in view, he tried to inspire the people of Rome with his own great thoughts, and made the fatal mistake of trying to win them over by acts of kindness. But the history of the Romans during the Middle Ages is a repetition of that of the Jews. "When they were in honor they did not understand". To render them docile it was necessary that the yoke for their necks should be heavy, and that it should be pressed down. "A young man, at once courageous and well born, conceiving projects great indeed but of impossible fulfillment, he thought to raise the empire to the might of its ancient rulers. He hoped also to reform the discipline of the Church, which the avarice and mercenary ways of the Romans had dragged down, and to bring it up to the standard of earlier and better days. The more readily to effect these ends, he treated the Romans with the most familiar consideration. As they were natives, and profoundly versed in men and things, he gave them the preference to his own Teutons, and made them his chief advisers. Wise measures, doubtless, if they had effected their purpose. This, however, they quite failed to do. The more gracious the condescension he showed towards them, the greater was the stiff-necked pride which they exhibited".

As we have said, the bulls of Gregory V are a proof of much of this. Thus it was "at the request of Otho" that he subjected the famous abbey of Reichenau (Augia Dives) to the direct jurisdiction of the Popes, and granted its abbots the privilege of being consecrated by the Popes only, and of saying Mass in various vestments that usually are only worn by a bishop; that he confirmed the rights of the equally famous abbey of Lorsch, and undertook to protect it; and that he did the same for the monasteries of Cluny and Petershausen on the Rhine. It was due to the same intervention that he confirmed to the See of Beneventum the metropolitan rights which Otho I, to oblige his ally Pandulf I, Iron head, had induced John XII (969) to grant to it. And again, to oblige "our most beloved son", and because we think it right in a fatherly way to strengthen the imperial dignity by our apostolic authority, "Gregory grants that the Church of Aachen(Aix-la-Chapelle) may be served by seven cardinal-deaconsand seven cardinal-priests, and that, with the exception of these cardinals, the archbishop (of Cologne) and the bishop(of Liege) of the place, no one else shall presume to say Mass on the altar of Our Lady in the said church".

Otho was also present at synods, and took a share in their decisions in matters ecclesiastical; as, for instance, at the synod of May 9, 998, which was composed of

bishops and nobles from both sides of the Alps. The synod had to decide between the rival claims of Arnulf and Guadald to the See of Vich (Ausona) in Catalonia. It was proved that the latter had usurped the see, and had slain its lawful occupant. At the command of the Pope, the archdeacon and the *oblationarius* performed the ceremony of degrading Guadald "after the manner of the Romans". They took the ring from off the hand of the deposed prelate, broke his crozier over his head, rent his vestments, and made him sit on the ground. Then, in accordance with the will of the emperor, and the decision of the bishops, and with the consent of the senate and the military nobility, Gregory, "by the privilege of our authority", raised Arnulf to the disputed bishopric, gave him the crozier and ring, and the power of binding and loosing and, "with the precept of the emperor", all the appurtenances of the see.

At another synod held in St. Peter's, probably towards the close of 998, in which not only was King Robert threatened with anathema unless he dismissed Bertha, but various episcopal causes and the restoration of the See of Merseburg were decided, Otho was again present.

As we have had occasion to remark before, the papal grants to monasteries of exemption from episcopal control, or of other privileges either to them or to their abbots, which constitute by far the greater proportion of what is left of the papal *regesta* of this period, have more than a local interest. They serve to prevent one from supposing that what with the turbulence of the Romans on the one hand, and the patronage of Otho on the other, the pontiffs themselves of this troubled time were without influence. Papal grants of privilege would not have been so eagerly sought for, as well by kings as by abbots, if, in the tenth century, it had not been felt that there was more virtue in a papal bull than in a royal charter or helmet of steel. And so in response to requests from all parts of the West, we find Gregory granting fresh privileges or confirmation of existing ones to monasteries in smiling valleys, by rushing rivers, or on frowning hills, to monasteries both near home and in the distant parts of the Western Empire.

Not many weeks before he died, Gregory came into contact with Ardoin, marquis of Ivrea, who was, on the death of Otho III, to get himself proclaimed king of Italy. Because he was not a German, some see in him another Italian patriot. He was simply like the rest of the nobility of his time. He wanted as much power for himself as he could seize, and as much property as he could pluck from the hands of those weaker than himself. Whether or not on any more valid grounds than these, Ardoin suddenly seized the property of St. Mary's of Ivrea, expelled its bishop, and slew the serfs on his estates. The bishops of the province denounced him, and laid their complaints against him before the Pope. They begged their head to take heed of the trouble of its members, lest the whole body should become infected. Ardoin had gone the length of killing the priests of the Lord, and of burning their bodies, and was only made worse by their admonitions. Gregory was exhorted to confirm the excommunication already pronounced by them against the marquis. The Pope, however, did not fully comply with the request of the bishops. But he informed Ardoin that if he did not repent and amend he would be anathematised at the following Easter-time. This missive, it would seem, must have produced its effect, as the bishop of Ivrea (Warmund) remained in peaceful possession of his see till 1011, and succeeded (July 9, 1000) in procuring from Otho a charta of *exemption*, by which he secured the city of Ivrea and the territory for three miles round it.

Death of Gregory V, 999

After the synod (held probably at the close of 998) in which Robert had been threatened with anathema unless he dismissed Bertha, Otho had left Rome for the South. Whilst he was engaged in consolidating his power among the turbulent princes who were disputing the possession of Southern Italy with one another, with the Greeks and with the Saracens, word was brought to him of the death of his relative and countryman Gregory V. As to most of what happened at Rome after this departure of Otho we have no certain knowledge. But at any rate, according to Thietmar, our best authority, we know that Gregory died on February the fourth, "after having made the best dispositions for the government of Rome". Less trustworthy authorities, probably mistaking the date of Gregory's expulsion from the city, and confusing his death with the circumstances attending the degradation of the antipope, would make out that he was expelled a second time, and put to a violent death. The fact, however, that, on the death of Gregory, the Romans quietly awaited the arrival of Otho, and accepted the new Pope he gave them, while there is no hint of any severe measures of reprisal taken by the emperor, is enough to discredit these sensational stories.

According to Peter Mallius, Gregory was buried in St. Peter's, in front of the sacristy (*i.e.* on the Gospel side), near Pope Pelagius". His epitaph, which we have already quoted, is still to be seen in the crypt of St. Peter's. There is also preserved there the small slab on which was inscribed the sepulchral title : "Gregorius PP. V." At some period the top left-hand corner of the inscription was destroyed. The damage was made good in the eleventh or twelfth century. As happened so frequently at this period, no new coffin was made for Gregory, but there was used for the purpose a Christian richly carved sarcophagus of the fourth century, which is now in the crypt of St. Peter's, near the tomb of Otho II. It was originally placed at the right of the tomb of S. Gregory I.

While there is cause for satisfaction that such an exceptionally full epitaph of Gregory V has been preserved to throw a few faint illuminating rays on the obscurity of the *Iron Age*, we have to regret that the light, small but clear, which numismatology has hitherto so often furnished us, will fail us almost entirely for three centuries, viz. for the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth.

Having now before us all that the scanty records of his time have left us of the life of Gregory V we may, we believe, justly regret that his reign was so brief. Rejecting as utterly unproven the charge of avarice which some would bring against him, it is his bountiful charity to the needy which, on the contrary, deserves to be chronicled. Such wealth as he had was at the service of those in want. For them only was he rich. By him it was that their nakedness was covered. To his great charity he joined an exemplary zeal for the glory of God—a zeal which was ennobled and saved from any danger of fanaticism by learning. In his endeavour to be all things to all men, he addressed his exhortations to the learned in Latin, to the people of the land of his adoption in the vulgar tongue, *i.e.* in Italian, which was in course of formation from the Latin of the common people, and to the men of his own country in German.

And if the fire of his youth, and perhaps some natural German roughness, occasionally led him to act with a severity to which the Romans were unaccustomed and which was at times excessive, their turbulence was at once its cause and almost its justification.

These were the two points in Gregory's character which most impressed themselves upon the Abbot Abbo during the time—all too brief, but never to be forgotten, as he declares—which he spent in his company, viz. "his eloquence, truly Gregorian, and his severity tempered by paternal indulgence". We can only regret that Gregory V and Otho III did not live longer to put a stronger curb on the violent passions of the Roman nobility who oppressed with equal impartiality both Popes and people.

There would have been much better times for Italy, Rome, and the Papacy had the joint reign of Otho III and Gregory V been more prolonged. Then might have been fulfilled the aspirations of the anonymous contemporary poet which the Bamberg MS. has handed down to us. "0, Christ", he sang, "renew the Romans, once more arouse the might of Rome. Under Otho III may the empire of Rome once more extend its sway. Hail Our Pope, hail most worthy Gregory! With Otho Augustus, thy Patron Peter receives thee. You are a follower of St. Peter, you cause his praises to be sung. Once again are you recreating the rights of Rome. . .. Exult, 0 Pontiff, in the majesty of a glorious name. You are an honor to the first see. Sedulously have you raised it up. Your prudence shines bright in Gerbert, who is your right hand. Under the power of the Cesar the Pope cleanses the world. Do you two luminaries enlighten the churches throughout the world, and drive away all darkness. May the one of you effect as much by the word of God as the other by the sword".

THE POPES IN THE DAYS OF FEUDAL ANARCHY
PART TWO. A.D.999-1048

SYLVESTER II.
999-1003.

After having had to deal so long rather with shadows of men than with living human beings, it is a great satisfaction in the midst of this dark and misty tenth century to encounter one who steps forth from its gloom a living, breathing man. Of so many Popes in this century the records of history furnish the writer with merely a few dry bones which he has to try and arrange so as to represent the human form divine as best he may. But in Gerbert of Aquitaine he has the good fortune to come across one who, while able and willing so to do, has actually left for his would-be biographers such materials that, if they aim at no more than reproducing that with which he has supplied them, they can scarcely fail to give their readers some substantial idea of "the most accomplished man of the dark ages".

Of his force of character and physical and mental accomplishments we must form no slight estimate when we remember that, from being an obscure monk of lowly birth among the mountains of Auvergne, he became head of the episcopal school of Rheims, the tutor of kings and emperors, and archbishop first of the important city of Rheims and then of Ravenna, after Milan the Italian see next in rank to that of Rome; and that finally, after being the trusted friend and adviser of noble and bishop, of king and emperor, he became the head of Christ's Church on earth.

What in Gerbert most impressed his own and subsequent ages was his profound learning. Learned he certainly was, and he both loved learning himself and befriended those in whose breasts glowed the same sacred fire. As in the case of our own Venerable Bede, he was skilled as well in physical science as in the ordinary more or less theological studies which were cultivated in his day. But he differed from our holy doctor, and from most of the other scholars of the early Middle Ages, in that he devoted himself to practical work in the domain of physical science. And though, in the case of *medicine*, he did not care for the practical side of it perhaps because he thought that that was no part of the work of a priest he took a great interest in its theory. Most dear to him were the books he had locked up in his chests; he never wearied in his efforts to add to their number. With all his love of every branch of learning and of its silent depositories, though he declared that he would never in his own case divorce learning and virtue, still he proclaimed the superiority of the latter over the former. Possessed, then, not only of a large store of knowledge, but also of a true appreciation of its proper

position, no wonder that in his case it could not have been said that “science puffeth up”, but that, on the contrary, he was as much distinguished for his modesty as for his attainments. He loved not learning merely for its own sake; the acquisition of it at all costs was not his sole aim in life. He was always ready to lay down his books whenever the honour of God or his neighbour’s profit required it. As he reminded one good abbot who was very much immersed in public affairs, “the art of arts is, after all, the guidance of souls”. Similarly, when what he regarded as a crisis in the state or at least in the affairs of his friends, called for his active exertions outside his library, he threw studies to the winds, and forcibly bade those, who at that period would have had him still devote himself to scientific pursuits, await better times when he might be able to revivify the habits of learned research which were then dead within him. He would not be caught at his books when the enemy were storming the walls of his city.

Another fine trait in Gerbert’s character was his loyal adhesion to his friends. To any cause he took up, to any friend he adopted, he was ever faithful. And if for a brief space, overcome probably by fear for his life, and at a time when, possibly at any rate, he was still suffering from the effects of a severe illness, he was unfaithful to Hugh Capet and his son Robert, the deep sorrow he manifested for his fall only makes his general habit of loyalty to his friends stand out in yet grander relief.

One who has great influence with the mighty ones of this world, and is at the same time a man of large views, noble aims, and fixed and elevated purpose, must, if known to be true to his friends, wield very considerable power. Gerbert was no exception to the rule. So great was his sway over the minds and hearts of men, and so evident the large share which his hands had in many of the most important political events of his lime, that his enemies dubbed him the king-maker.

But did he not acquire and use political power merely to serve his ambition? And, in order to keep the place his ambitious exertions had won for him, did he not show himself a disobedient servant, and refuse to offer due submission to the Pope? There is truth in both these accusations. However, till the reader has had the facts of Gerbert’s life placed before him, we will confine ourselves to asking, “Does it seem an unnatural or evil thing to seek some reward after years of constant and faithful service?” and to stating that if Gerbert’s ardent spirit, deeply crossed in a most tender spot, led him into words and actions derogatory to the dignity of the Holy See, he yielded in the end to calm advice and the adverse tide, and did not allow himself to drop either into heresy or schism. Without further introduction we may now proceed to describe in full the fine figure of the first French Pope which has thrown forward this shapely shadow.

Leaving behind him the picturesque mountains of Upper Auvergne, the traveller will find at the entrance of a quiet valley which slopes upwards towards them the equally quiet town of Aurillac, the capital of the department of the Cantal. Though its principal objects of interest, its old churches, its monasteries with the palace of the abbot, were destroyed by the Huguenots (1569), Aurillac still merits our regard as the first place associated with the name of Gerbert. A bronze statue of him in its principal square still keeps his memory there ever fresh. All that is known for certain of the origin of him who was to be “the vast Pope”, Sylvester II, is that he was a native of Aquitaine, and came of a family of no great importance in the world. From the last-mentioned fact, however, and from the fact that not only was Gerbert educated at Aurillac, but relations of his were to be found in the monastery there, we may safely infer that he was born in or near Aurillac. When he left the monastery which had been the home of his boyhood (c. 970), he was described as a young man (adolescens)? and hence he is generally supposed to have been born about the year 940, i.e., before the middle of the tenth century. A pontifical catalogue gives Agilbert as the name of his father.

He received his early training in virtue and in knowledge (*grammatica*) in the Benedictine house of St. Gerauld in Aurillac. This monastery had been founded (894) in honour of SS. Peter and Clement by a Count Gerauld (909) But it soon took the name of its founder, who died in the odour of sanctity. Famous for its beautiful church, and for the calligraphy of its monks, it adopted the reform of Cluny and, at the time of which we are speaking, was under the guidance of a most enlightened man, Gerauld de Saint-Céré (*d*.986). In this abode of piety and learning Gerbert was instructed not only in grammar, *i.e.,* in Latin, or "in what was then understood by rhetoric", but also in the science of the heart, in uprightness. And, what is more important, he was trained with that same loving care which is still characteristic of Benedictine educational methods even in this twentieth century, with that sweet skill which makes those who have been brought up under them look back with grateful fondness to their school life, and cherish the memory both of those who taught them and of the home in which masters and scholars lived so happily together. The master who made the greatest impression on the mind of the young Gerbert was the monk Raimond, who succeeded Gerauld as abbot. "To him", wrote Gerbert when archbishop of Rheims, "after God, I owe any learning I may possess". In many of his letters Gerbert tenderly refers to Raimond, and many of them are addressed to the good monk himself. "The love I bear you", he writes to him, "is known to all, as well Latins as barbarians, who share in the fruits of my labour". The name of his beloved master was ever upon his lips, so that his scholars at the episcopal school of Rheims were themselves inspired with respect for Raimond and wished to see him. On the death of Abbot Gerauld (986) and the election of his dear master to succeed him, most tactfully does Gerbert express his grief for the former event and his joy for the latter : "When death deprived me of my most illustrious father Gerauld, it seemed to me that I had lost part of myself. But when, in harmony with my wishes, you, my best beloved, were chosen to succeed him, then was I again wholly reborn as your son". Not only was the illustrious disciple in the habit of commending himself to his master's prayers, but he longed to have him by his side, so that even when a teacher himself his studies might be helped by the instruction of his old professor.

But the affection of Gerbert for Aurillac was not limited to one of its masters. It extended to its abbot, to many of its monks in a more special way, and to the whole community in general "that most holy company who had nourished him and brought him up". Of his attachment to Gerauld, his forty-sixth letter, which is addressed to the abbot of Aurillac, is a neat indication. "No better gift", he writes, "has God given to men than that of friends, if only they be such as may be fitly sought and honourably retained. Happy was the day, happy the hour in which I had the good fortune to become acquainted with a man the memory of whose name suffices to drive all care from me. Though if I might enjoy his presence but occasionally, I should not idly consider myself a happier man ... Ever firmly fixed in my breast is the face of my friend, of Gerauld, at once my master and my father". The desire Gerbert expressed of seeing his old superior was reciprocated by the abbot. And it may be said that the friendship of Gerbert for Gerauld was typical of his love for the whole fraternity of Aurillac. To be of further use to them he enlisted in their behalf the interest of Adalberon, archbishop of Rheims, probably at this period the most influential man in France. So completely did he succeed in this that he was able to assure the monks that not only all that he himself possessed was theirs, but that they might equally count on all that belonged to Adalberon. To prove that he was not talking without good grounds, he announced to Gerauld that, as an earnest of Adalberon's goodwill, the archbishop was, on one occasion, sending to him a worked linen coverlet, and, on another, a vestment of cloth-of-gold, a gold-embroidered stole, and other similar things. And if we cannot now read any communication

addressed to Aurillac by its famous pupil after he had become Pope, we must note that, while few of his pontifical letters have come down to us, we have it on satisfactory authority that Sylvester II continued to correspond with his esteemed master Raimond. We are, therefore, abundantly justified in asserting that if ever there was a grateful scholar it was Gerbert of Aquitaine.

About the time that Gerbert had reached what we call "man's estate", the quiet, happy, and studious life he had been leading as a young monk at Aurillac was brought to an end by the arrival at the monastery of a great noble Borel, duke of the Spanish March (Catalonia) and count of Barcelona (967).

After the Franks, following up the victories of Charles Martel, had driven the Saracens out of Gaul, they pursued them over the Pyrenees. And just as, retreating before the invading Moors, the Visigoths at length found a foot-hold in the north-west of Spain, in the Asturias, so the victorious Franks, driving the Moslems before them, founded a dependency in the north-east. The counts of Barcelona soon became practically independent, and from the time of Wilfrid the Hairy (898-906) the government of the Spanish March was held by his descendants. Fifth in succession from Wilfrid, Borel inaugurated his reign, destined to be a very troubled one, by commending himself and his affairs to God at the monastery of Aurillac. Eager to have his monks instructed in the highest branches of learning, Abbot Gerauld inquired of the duke if there were in Spain professors of the highest order. Promptly assured that there were, the abbot begged Borel to take one of his monks back with him to Spain, and have him there trained. This the duke agreed to do, and Gerbert, deservedly the favorite of his abbot, and at the same time the choice of his brethren, was selected to return with Borel to Spain. There he was placed under the charge of Hatto, bishop of Vich (Ausona), and was by him carefully trained in mathematics. Resting on the words of Richer, and on the fact that when Gerbert himself alludes to his sojourn in Spain it is to "the Spanish princes" (Borel and Hatto) that he refers, we may safely reject the statement of Ademar, that he studied at Cordova.

Still, it is far from being unlikely that Gerbert was indebted to the wisdom of the Arabs of Cordova at least indirectly. About the middle (755) of the eighth century there was established in that city the brilliant dynasty of the Ommeyads. This dynasty, which was quite independent of the caliphs of Bagdad, was founded by the wildly chivalric and splendour-loving Abdur Rahman I (Abderrhaman I). "He was an encourager of literature, as appears from the number of schools he founded and endowed". And the famous mosque of Cordova, still known as La Mezquita (The Mosque), is an abiding proof of his enlightened love of the magnificent.

It was "the noblest place of worship then standing in Europe, with its 1200 marble columns (of which some 900 are still erect) and its twenty brazen doors; the vast interior resplendent with porphyry and jasper and many-coloured precious stones, the walls glittering with harmonious mosaics". Some of his successors, particularly Abdur Rahman II (821-852) and Abdur Rahman III (912-961), followed in the wake of the first of their name in adorning Cordova. And when we read of the suburb and palace of Az Zahra, which Abdur Rahman III, the greatest of the Spanish Arabs, added to the already great beauties of Cordova, we seem to be listening to the recital of works performed rather by the heated imagination than by the creative intelligence and the lithesome fingers of the Oriental. But after we have put before our minds what was accomplished in the domain of architecture by the rulers of Cordova, we need not wonder at the nun Hrotsvitha describing the capital of Mohammedan Spain as "the pearl of the world". The magnificent ideas of Abdur Rahman III were inherited by his son Hakam II (961-976). He, however, turned his attention rather to the advancement of literature than to

the beautifying of his city. He is said, but surely the vivid imagination of the East must be here at least allowed for, he is said to have collected 400,000 volumes. At any rate, undoubtedly "his reign is the golden age of Arabian literature in Spain". The academy of Cordova was founded under his auspices. Many colleges were erected, and libraries opened in other cities, while more than three hundred writers exercised their talents on various subjects of erudition.

But whilst Gerbert was in Spain, supreme power in the Moslem part of it was in the hands of an official (Almanzor or the Victorious) whom we may call *mayor of the palace* to Hisham II (976-1012). To keep his power, he played into the hands of the fanatical class of *fakihs* (students of the Koran), and allowed them to purge the collection of Hakam. All works that were in any way connected with the natural sciences were objects of deep abhorrence to this intelligent section of the Moslem community, and "tens of thousands of priceless volumes were publicly committed to the flames".

Though in all this no little allowance must be made for the expansion of historical facts by the heat of Oriental exaggeration, enough of the work of the medieval Spanish Moor in the domain of architecture still remains to enable us to form an unerring judgment as to his high state of civilization even in the tenth century. "Hither Spain", at no great distance from Saragossa, can scarcely have failed to be influenced by the great intellectual movement that was going on under the caliphs of Cordova. So that, indirectly at any rate, Gerbert will have profited by the Arab-learning of the tenth century. He seems to have used books translated from Arabic, and he is said to have employed the so-called *Gobar* (Arabic) numerals, which he could have learnt only from Arabian sources. Such at least is the contention of Mr. Allen. But others maintain that the Gobar characters, which he used for his system of numeration, were derived by him from Boethius or his disciples. They had, in their turn, received these characters (almost identical with our own) from the Indians. The Arabs found them already in use in Africa, and gave to them the name of Grobar or "of the dust", because the signs were traced on tablets covered with dust. The whole question, however, of the origin of our system of numeration is so beset with difficulties on every side that it may be doubted whether it will ever be cleared up.

After Gerbert had spent some three years (967-970) in "Hither Spain", there came the turning-point in his life. Borel, like all the great men of his day, longed for complete independence. To bring his desires one step nearer fulfillment he resolved, in the first instance, to free his principality from all ecclesiastical subjection to the kingdom of France. Decrees of Popes had placed the sees of the dukedom of Barcelona under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Narbonne. He would go to Rome, then, and have Vich erected into an archbishopric. Thither accordingly he proceeded, taking with him not only Bishop Hatto, but the latter's talented pupil also. For he knew that, in a matter which would require the use not merely of intellectual ability but also of diplomatic skill, he would have a powerful support in his young protégé. But he probably did not foresee that, by bringing Gerbert into contact with the powerful forces which moved the world, his young ward would be drawn from his side, and into such a current as would ultimately carry him to the highest place in Christendom. Borel accomplished his purpose, but as a *quid pro quo* had to give up Gerbert. The latter's industry and love of learning had impressed itself upon John XIII. And because the sciences of music and astronomy were then quite unknown throughout Italy, the Pope at once sent word to Otho, king of Germany and Italy, that a young man had arrived in Rome who was profoundly versed in mathematics, and would make a splendid teacher of them. Quite in his usual autocratic style, the emperor (Otho I) at once bade the Pope on no account to

allow the young man to leave Rome. John, however, proceeded more diplomatically. The emperor, he said to Borel, wished to have Gerbert's services for a time; and he promised that, if the duke would oblige the emperor, he would himself see to it that the young monk was sent back with honour. Borel could not but assent. Accordingly, when he left Rome to return to his government, he sent Gerbert to the court of the emperor. Without exaggeration could the young Gaul say of himself that he had traversed land and sea in the pursuit of knowledge.

The young professor was a man of high ideals. He was unwilling to teach even at the court of an emperor, and with an emperor as his pupil, until he was thoroughly well educated himself. Unlike so many nowadays, he knew he could not teach even science satisfactorily until he had studied logic and mental philosophy. Into these views of the requirements of a good professor Otho thoroughly entered. Hence when there came to his court as ambassador of Lothaire, king of the Franks, Gerannus, the archdeacon of the Church of Rheims, who was regarded as "most skilled in logic", the emperor allowed the ardent student to place himself under this new master, and even, on his departure, to accompany him to Rheims. His sojourn of some two years with the great Otho was fraught with the most important consequences to the career of Gerbert. His grateful nature caused him never to forget the kindness of the first Otho. He attached himself irrevocably to the house of the Saxon emperors; and at length could say with truth that to three generations of the Othos, amidst trials of every sort, had he ever displayed the truest fidelity.

In the philosophic lore of Gerannus Gerbert made the most rapid strides, but when in return he instructed his professor in mathematics, the logical mind of Gerannus could not grasp the musical branch of that science, and, overcome by the difficulty of his task, he gave up its study altogether. It was not long before the fame of the distinguished scholar and teacher in his cathedral city reached the ears of Adalberon, archbishop of Rheims, the most powerful and enlightened prelate in Gaul. Engaged in reforming his diocese spiritually and intellectually, he at once perceived that in Gerbert he would have an agent well qualified to aid him at least in the latter task. He accordingly offered him the post of *scholasticus* or head of his cathedral school, a school which had much declined from its deserved reputation under Hincmar. As his patron Otho I (*d.* May 973) and his old professor in Spain (Hatto, *d.* August 971) were both dead, Gerbert accepted the archbishop's offer, and commenced "to instruct crowds of scholars in the arts".

The number of his disciples increased every day. It was noised abroad not only throughout *the Gauls*, but throughout Germany and Italy to the Adriatic and the Tyrrhenian Seas that there was at Rheims a master who did not think it enough to lecture on the profoundest philosophy of the ancients, but who expounded the natural sciences, and who knew how to brighten one set of studies with the graces of the poet, and enlighten the other by the use of the most wonderful instruments. Richer gives us the names of some of the books used by Gerbert in instructing his pupils in grammar, dialectics, rhetoric (the so-called *trivium)*, and in the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, music, astronomy, and geometry). It will be seen that Boethius was his guide to no inconsiderable extent both in philosophy and in mathematics. The first work mentioned by the historian as used by Gerbert was the *Isagoge* of Porphyry. It was an introduction to the philosophy of Aristotle, and treated of the universals : genus, difference and species, essence and accidents. Ignorant of Greek, Gerbert used the translation of Victorinus, as corrected and commented on by Boethius. Then he explained the *Categories* and the *Interpretation* of Aristotle, and the *Topics* of Cicero, again following Boethius.

When, by the aid of these abstruse works and other commentaries of the last of Rome's philosophers, Gerbert judged that the minds of his scholars had been well trained to think, he proceeded to instruct them in the art of rhetoric, *viz.* in the best way of expressing their thoughts. After long hours spent on the study of space and of substance, of the reasoning faculty and of other powers of the soul, we can well understand the delight of his pupils when their beloved master with his bright, quick, and well-informed mind and his sympathetic nature unfolded to them the beauties of style and of thought which were to be found in Virgil, in Statius, and in Terence, in Juvenal, in Persius, and in Horace, and in the *Pharsalia* of Lucan. For most correctly did Gerbert judge that no man could be an orator who had not something of the imagination and language of the poet. In his free use of the poets of antiquity Gerbert differed from certain of his brethren. The superiors of some of the monasteries, timid, narrow-minded, or lazy souls, afraid of shadows, or finding it easier to proscribe what they could not or would not understand, or what they were too nerveless to prevent from leading to harm, would not allow the classical poets to be studied by their subjects. The zeal for the intellectual advancement of his monks displayed by Gerbert's own superior at Aurillac, is, however, enough to convince one were proof required that, as might have been expected, but few of the heads of monasteries were wanting in moral courage, in intelligence, or in energy, and that consequently the reading of the profane poets was anything but prohibited in all the monasteries, even of the Cluniac reformation.

Gerbert's method of teaching was especially characterized by his combination of the practical with the theoretical, a matter in which the Middle Ages erred as much by defect as our own age is erring by excess. Hence when his scholars had had their course of rhetoric, he employed a sophist to exercise them in the art of debate. And when he came to instruct them in the *quadrivium*, he spared no pains to illustrate his lessons experimentally. Many of the instruments which he used he invented and made himself. Richer tells, with evident pride in his master's ability, how, by means of a monochord, he showed the difference between tones and semitones, etc., and demonstrated that the tones varied in proportion to the length and thickness of the vibrating cord. He seems also to have turned his attention to the construction of organs, and even to have set to music certain hymns which he himself had composed. As a result of his labours in this direction music, which had for a long time ceased to be cultivated in *the Gauls*, became very popular.

To render the motions of the heavenly bodies less difficult of comprehension, he constructed globes and orreries. And whilst he passed the day in explaining them to his pupils, his nights he devoted to the study of the stars, making observations by means of tubes. As an aid to arithmetical calculations, he constructed an abacus on a large scale. It had twenty-seven compartments, and a thousand movable pieces made of horn. To his admiring disciple Richer it seemed that there was something divine in the productions of his master's handiwork.

To prosecute all these studies, Gerbert obviously stood in need of a good library. In dialectics alone he read and explained more of the treatises of Aristotle than any of his own predecessors; and even the most celebrated master of the eleventh century, Abelard, knew no more in this domain than Gerbert and Fulbert of Chartres, his illustrious disciple. To gather together the books he needed was to Gerbert a constant care and a never-failing source of joy. "With my efforts to lead a good life" he wrote, "I have always joined endeavors to speak well, as philosophy does not separate these two things. And although to live a good life is more important than to be a good speaker, and although to those who are free from the cares of government the one is enough without the other, still, to us who are engaged in public affairs, both powers are

necessary. For it is of the highest advantage to be able by well-fashioned speech to persuade, and by sweet words to restrain angry souls from deeds of violence. Hence am I ever toiling to form a library. And as for a long time past, by means of large sums of money and the kind assistance of the friends of my native province, I have maintained copyists and bought books in Rome and in other parts of Italy, in Germany also and in Belgica (the kingdom of Lorraine), grant that I may now and again obtain the like from you and by you. I will give at the end of this letter a list of the books I want transcribing. In accordance with your instructions I will send to the copyists parchment and the funds necessary for their expenses, and will, moreover, never be unmindful of your kindness. Not to transgress the limits of a letter, I may say that the reason of all this toil is contempt of fickle fortune; contempt which in my case is not, as with many, the result simply of natural temperament, but of long-continued study. Hence in leisure as in work I teach what I know, and learn what I do not know".

As with every other man who begins to collect books, the habit of adding to "his beloved volumes" never left him. "You know", he wrote to a monk of Bobbio after his return to Rheims, "with what zeal I collect books from every country". Moreover, he gathered books together not only from all quarters, but on all subjects. He accumulated works on mental philosophy and on science, on rhetoric and on medicine. To the numerous works of "the father of Roman eloquence" he added the poets and historians of ancient Rome. He sought for translations too, and aimed at getting more correct versions of important works. And in his efforts to procure books he spared neither himself, his influence, nor his money. He copied some himself, others he got copied by or through his friends. To obtain a poem he offered to make a globe or sphere in exchange; in return for favours he was asked to perform, he exacted books; and to ensure receiving the works he wanted, he agreed to pay such sums as he was asked for and at the time agreed.

The enlightened zeal of Gerbert in the cause of studies effected a real revival of intellectual activity. What had been done under Charlemagne in the promotion of liberal studies by our countryman Alcuin, and what St. Bruno had effected in the same direction under Otho the Great for the Germans, was accomplished for the newly rising kingdom of France by Gerbert of Aquitaine. And it must be confessed that he was superior to either of those great and good men. He had no emperor at his back at this the most important period of his literary work, while the range of subjects with which he dealt was much more liberal and comprehensive, and the influence of his work was perhaps deeper than that of either Alcuin or Bruno. If John Scot can be called the father of the heretics of the Middle Ages, Gerbert may be described as the father of the schoolmen of that period.

Success, unfortunately, besides engendering respect, provokes jealousy. While a strong light illumines many objects, it throws others into shadow. And Otric of Saxony, of the palace school of Magdeburg, imagined that his fame was dimmed by the rising reputation of Gerbert. He determined to prick the Gallic bubble! Accordingly he sent one of his pupils to study under Gerbert, with the object of finding out a weak point in his teaching. The disciple was not long before he imagined he had discovered what his master was in search of. He returned to inform Otric that, in his division of the sciences, Gerbert had subordinated physics to mathematics as a species to a genus. As a matter of fact, he had declared they were on an equal footing. The supposed mistake of his rival was eagerly proclaimed to Otho II by Otric. Unwilling to believe that his old professor could be in the wrong, Otho caused a public disputation to be held between Otric and Gerbert on the occasion of a visit of the latter to Pavia when on his way to Rome with Adalberon (980). The discussion took place at Ravenna, whither the emperor and his

guests went by boat, and in presence of Otho himself and a great assemblage of students (*scolastici*), who, quite in accordance with the traditional habits of their class, were not slow to manifest their approval or disapproval, as the case might be, of the conduct of the debate.

The disputation was opened by Otho himself, "who was accounted most skilled in these (philosophic) pursuits". Discussion, he contended, stimulated our natural torpor to deeper reflection. And with the express object of exciting Gerbert, he introduced the question of the sub-divisions of philosophy. The enthusiastic scholastic of Rheims did not require much urging. He threw himself into the dispute with all the natural ardour of his temperament. His division of theoretical philosophy was soon accepted. And then, for the greater part of the day, the stream of Gerbert's eloquence flowed on. Such questions were treated of as the relative extension of the terms "rational and mortal". When at the close of the day the emperor declared the session over, all were exhausted but the indefatigable Frenchman. In unfolding this discussion at some length, a countryman of Gerbert has shown that the questions brought up in it are neither so puerile nor so unconnected as some critics have supposed; and truly notes that the habit of "dividing and subdividing", so extensively practised in the schools during the Middle Ages, has given to our minds "the habit of analysis, and to our tongues clearness and precision". Gerbert returned to Rheims loaded with presents from Otho, and with an increased reputation.

He was also to have that form of reputation, which of Gerbert's all others is most dear to a master, viz. the renown that comes from distinguished scholars. At one time or another he had pupils illustrious not only by birth and position, as Otho II, Otho III, and Robert the Pious, king of France, but by conspicuous abilities. Among the latter may be named Fulbert, the founder of the famous school of Chartres; Leutheric, the learned archbishop of Sens; Bernelius, whose treatise on the abacus was better than that of his master; John, schoolmaster and bishop of Auxerre; Richer, who dedicated his History to his old professor; and St. Heribert, chancellor of Otho III and archbishop of Cologne.

One result of the "Otric dispute" was that Otho conceived a still greater admiration for his illustrious master, and resolved to attach him more closely to himself. Towards the close of 982, or more probably at the beginning of 983, he named Gerbert abbot of the monastery of St. Columbanus (*d.*615) at Bobbio. This abbey, situated among the Apennines between the rivers Trebbia and Bobbio and not far from Pavia, was among the most famous of the monasteries of Italy. From the fact that it possessed property "in every part" of the peninsula, it ought also to have been one of the richest and most powerful. But though, as we shall see, it was not wealthy at the time of Gerbert's appointment, Otho no doubt made it over to one on whom he could rely, in order that, when its property was recovered, he might be able to count on the abbot of Bobbio for substantial support in men and money. He was preparing to make another attempt to carry into effect the policy of his house by making himself master of South Italy, driving out both Greeks and Saracens, a policy which had received a severe check owing to his defeat by the latter near Crotone (982). Obviously, to have a friend as abbot of Bobbio would be of no little service to Otho. But neither Gerbert nor his patron were destined to get from Bobbio what they had hoped.

A little pleasure, indeed, the new abbot of Bobbio did derive from his new position. It enabled him to have a hunt for and among books. There is extant a tenth-century catalogue of the books then possessed by the abbey of Bobbio. It is far from unlikely that it was drawn up by Gerbert himself. But, unfortunately for his happiness, the unsatisfactory state in which he found his monastery prevented him from being much in the company of his beloved books. Even left to our own imaginations, we

should have had no difficulty in conceiving the disgust felt by Gerbert, who had been accustomed to the discipline of Aurillac and of bishops Hatto and Adalberon, when he arrived at Bobbio and found neither order nor money. But we are not left to fall back upon imagination. The series of Gerbert's letters begins with his arrival at Bobbio. From them we learn that he found in his own case that "the troubles of kingdoms are the ruin of the Church", and that "the ambition of the powerful, and the miseries of the times, had turned right into wrong, and that no man kept faith with anybody".

His predecessor, Petroald, taking advantage of the disorders of the times, had alienated under one device or another the property of the monastery, and had, as might have been expected, suffered the greatest disorders to become rampant among the monks. Gerbert found "that the whole sanctuary of God had been sold, but that its price was not forthcoming, that the store-houses and granaries were empty, and that there was nothing in the monastic purse". His monks were in want of food and clothes. The situation was unbearable. He could endure to suffer poverty himself among the Gauls, but to be a beggar with so many needy monks among the Italians was more than he could tolerate. Convinced that it was his plain duty to be the faithful steward of his monastery in temporals as well as in spirituals, he at once set vigorously to work to stop the encroachments which were on all sides being attempted on such property as was still acknowledged to belong to the monastery. He showed his spirit in no doubtful language. To a certain Boso he wrote : "Let us leave words and cleave to facts. The sanctuary of God I will not give for gold nor for love; nor will I consent to the alienation, if it has been given away. Restore to Blessed Columbanus the hay which your people have carried off, if you would not experience what I can effect by the favour of Caesar and by the help of my friends". He did not hesitate to write to anyone in this same fearless manner. And so to the Empress-mother Adelaide, who was then residing at Pavia and who evidently wished to have the lands of Bobbio parcelled out in accordance with her wishes, he wrote that to meet the wishes of the emperor he had granted some of her requests, but could not grant them all. "How can I take away tomorrow the land which I granted to my dependents yesterday? If everything is to be done which anybody choses to order, what is my occupation here? And if I give away everything, what is left for me to hold? Even if I could, I would not grant a benefice to Grifo".

Sometimes his firmness seems rather too uncompromising. To settle certain differences which had sprung up between them, Peter Canepanova, bishop of Pavia (afterwards Pope John XIV), proposed a personal interview. He received the following answer to his request : "We owe no thanks to any Italian that we seem to possess the abbey of St. Columbanus. If you have praised me to the emperor, I have oftentimes given you not undeserved eulogies. You ask for an interview, and cease not to plunder my Church. You, who ought to bring together what has been scattered, divide my property among your soldiers as though it were your own. Harry and plunder, rouse up against me the forces of Italy. You have a rare opportunity; for my lord (Otho) is involved in war. I will not detain the armed bands which have been made ready to aid him, nor will I undertake what is his work. If I can have peace, I will devote myself to the service of Cesar, present or absent. But if not, his presence alone will console my miseries; and since, as the poet says (Virgil, *Aeneid*), 'Good faith is nowhere to be found', and since what has been neither seen nor heard is imagined, I will make known my wishes to you only in writing, and will only listen to yours when expressed in the same way".

Gerbert's spirited efforts to restore to its ancient status the glorious old abbey which had been entrusted to him, naturally made him many enemies both secret and open. They calumniated him to the emperor, they turned the most innocent things which

he did into evidences of crime. Because he brought some of his relations with him from France, they declared he had a wife and children, and said even worse things of him. The emperor, they said, who nominated such a man was an ass; and when Otho sent certain of his agents to effect the restoration of the property of Bobbio, they took counsel to put them to death.

Gerbert's special foes were, of course, those whom he had succeeded in dispossessing of their ill-gotten goods. For, as he said, the vanquished have no shame. And during the twelve months or thereabouts that he remained at Bobbio, he succeeded, by one means or another, in rescuing some of the property which belonged to his abbey. When Otho II came into Italy (983) to resume his campaign against the Saracens, Gerbert went to meet him at Pavia. He cleared himself of the calumnies which had been upcast against him, and explained to Otho the difficulties of his position. "Let him not be accused of treason", he urged, "who regards it as a glory to be on the side of the emperor, an ignominy to be opposed to him". But though this interview resulted in something being done to ameliorate his position, his enemies still contrived to make his life unbearable. "Where am I to live?" he writes to Otho, after the latter had left Pavia and moved south. "If I return to my native land, I have to neglect the oath of fidelity I have sworn to you; and, if I do not return, I am but an exile here. Still", he concluded with a play upon the words, "it is better to be an exile in the *palatium* (*i.e.* in the emperor's service), while true to one's oath, than, false to one's oath, to reign in Latium (*i.e.* in France)."

Needless to say, his difficulties rapidly increased on the death of Otho (December 7, 983). He knew not what to do. In his distress he turned whither so many wretched souls turned for help in the Middle Ages, *viz.* to the See of Rome, and wrote to the Pope (John XIV), even to that Peter of Pavia to whom he had written the sharp letter we have just cited. He must have had full confidence that the former bishop of Pavia bore him no grudge. "To the most blessed Pope John, Gerbert, in name only, abbot of Bobbio. Whither, O father of our country, am I to turn? If I appeal to the Apostolic See, I am laughed at. I can neither come to you on account of my enemies, nor am I free to leave Italy. And yet it is difficult to remain, since neither inside the monastery nor outside of it is there anything left me but my pastoral staff and the apostolical benediction. The Lady Imiza is my friend because she is your friend. Make known to me through her, either by messenger or by letter, what you would have me do. Through her, too, I will inform you as to what I think will interest you in the state of public affairs".

No doubt, in laughing at Gerbert for thinking of appealing to Rome at this juncture, his enemies were in the right. They knew that under the circumstances, with a child as king of Germany and the antipope Boniface VII to cause trouble in Rome, John XIV would be unable to afford effectual help to anyone. If, however, the abbot of Bobbio had chosen for a time to change his pastoral staff for a sword, he might have maintained himself in secure possession of what was still left to his monastery, and even have recovered something of what had been lost to it. His soldiers were ready to take arms and to fortify the strong places which they held. For it must not be forgotten that the abbot of Bobbio ranked as a count, and so of course had an armed force at his disposal. But Gerbert could not see that there was hope of any speedy improvement in the state of affairs, and he was a monk and student, and not a soldier.

"What hope is there", he wrote to the abbot of his old monastery of Aurillac, "when the country is without a ruler, and when the fidelity, morality, and disposition of certain Italians is such as we know it? I yield then to fortune, and will resume my studies which, though interrupted for a time, have ever been cherished in my thoughts".

As he explained later to his dear master Raimond, if he had remained at Bobbio, he would either have had in a cowardly way to submit to oppression, or to have sanctioned bloodshed.

"The state of things in Italy was such that, if I had wished to shelter myself beneath my innocence, I should have had basely to endure the yoke of tyrants; or, if I had appealed to force, I should have had to seek on all sides for partisans, to fortify strong positions, and to tolerate pillage, incendiarism, and slaughter. Hence I chose rather the assured leisure of study than the uncertain chances of war".

Early then in the year 984 did Gerbert return to Rheims that he might again be near his beloved superior Adalberon, whose absence was one of the abbot's great griefs at Bobbio, and that he might again have quiet leisure for his scientific pursuits. He did not, however, resign his abbatial dignity, nor cease to struggle for the recovery of its rights; but he ceased to reside in his abbey. For in contending for his rights he acted on the principle that what had been given to him by the emperor and confirmed to him by the Pope ought not to be abandoned without a hard struggle. In the meantime, however, as we have said, he left Italy and allowed "the blind cupidity of certain pauper nobles to have its way for a time".

His exertions for the cause of his abbey were one reason why his second sojourn at Rheims was not so tranquil as his first. He was now no longer a mere professor. As confidant of Archbishop Adalberon, and as abbot of Bobbio, he had to take a part in public affairs. The duration of his second stay at Rheims, viz. some fourteen years, may be divided into two sections of more or less equal length. During the first period he was engaged with Adalberon in working to secure the throne of Germany to the young Otho, and that of France to the Capetians as against the Carolings. During the second, he was at war with the Pope to maintain himself in the archbishopric of Rheims. Altogether we cannot be far wrong if we call the fourteen years from 984 to 998, and especially the second half of that period, the most agitated epoch of Gerbert's life.

The greater number of his letters were penned during the time which elapsed between his return to Rheims (984) and his election as its archbishop (991). Written for the most part in the name of Adalberon, their contents are in the main concerned with the affairs of Lothaire (*d.*986), Louis V (the last Carolingian king, *d.*987), and Hugh Capet, kings of France, and of Otho III of Germany. They are, consequently, of more importance for the history of France and Germany than for that of the Popes. As, however, they are the work of Gerbert, and show us how he was employed during seven years, they cannot be passed over entirely. Following and, where enlarging, exaggerating a statement of Widukind, Freeman thus presents the questions into which Gerbert and Adalberon threw themselves. "The tenth century was a period of struggle between the Teutonic and Romance languages, between Laon and Paris, between the descendants of Charles the Great and the descendants of Robert the Strong", and, we may add, between the East and West Franks for the possession of Lorraine. When Adalberon and his secretary, Gerbert, entered into the struggle, it had reached an acute stage. Before they left it, the Capets had triumphed over the Carolingians, and Lorraine had become attached to the German empire. In all the intrigues into which these two great churchmen entered, Gerbert was animated by the one thought of advancing the interests of the Othos, and Adalberon by a deep-seated wish for the peace and prosperity of the land, as well as for the advancement of the empire. This led the powerful archbishop to favour the aspirations of Hugh Capet, duke of France, though his nominal sovereigns were the Carolingians Lothaire and Louis V, and though he was chancellor of the kingdom of the Franks.

Just as in the eighth century the Frankish nobles found that it was necessary for the preservation of order to replace the effete Merovingian line by the vigorous Carolingians, Adalberon saw that there was no hope of peace unless Hugh, who was king in fact, should become king in name as well. The last Carolingians were not so helpless as the *fainéant* race to which Pippin put an end. But, heirs to a woefully diminished inheritance, they were crushed out by the descendants of Robert the Strong, whose fief had grown into the practically independent Duchy of France, and whose successor, Hugh Capet, especially when aided by the Normans, was more than a match for his king in military power, and was destined to convert his duchy into a kingdom.

On his return to Rheims Gerbert did not indeed cease to teach, "to offer from time to time to most noble pupils the sweet fruit of liberal studies", nor to collect books, whether profane or liturgical, or whether bound simply or in gold. And he was the more anxious, as he said, to form a good library that, engaged in public affairs, he had not only to live well, but to speak well, and books were essential to the proper performance of the latter duty. Nor did he forget his abbey of Bobbio. Those monks who remained faithful to him he encouraged, those who submitted to his enemies, "to the tyrants", he reproved. "You who have professed the rule of St. Benedict, and, by deserting your abbot, have abandoned it, you (I speak not of you all), you who have of your own accord bent your necks to the yoke of the tyrants, will you be willing, under the leadership of these your tyrants, to appear before the tribunal of Christ? This I write, not for the sake of keeping my dignity; but, whilst with true pastoral solicitude I say what I ought, I at once free my own conscience from blame, and bind those who give not heed to me. Recall to your minds the privileges which have been granted by the Popes. Bring back to your memories those very anathemas which you (once) showed me yourselves. Grasp the import of the sacred canons : 'He who shall in any way communicate with those who have been excommunicated, let him be excommunicated himself'. See in what peril you stand. May the Supreme Judge enable you to realize His commands, and at the same time put them in practice".

Moreover, he never ceased labouring to win back for his abbey its rights and its privileges. "From the time that I went forth from amongst you, I have never ceased to go about and toil for the interests of St. Columbanus". He appealed to the influential for their support; to empress and to Pope for justice. But at the time his labour was, to a large extent, lost. "The ambition of kings, the terrible condition of the times, turned right into wrong". However, he lived long enough to be able to secure justice for the abbey he loved so well. When he became archbishop of Ravenna, he obtained through Otho III the restoration of much of its property; and when he became Pope he placed at the head of it Petroald, who, under the good influence of Gerbert, reformed his character, and became worthy to rule the abbey he had once plundered.

Besides attending to business in which he was himself more immediately concerned, Gerbert found time to interest himself in affairs of public interest in both Church and State. He showed himself very much distressed when he heard that Oïlbold, or perhaps rather a nameless would-be successor to Oïlbold, had been uncanonically elected to the great abbey of Fleury-on-the-Loire. His was a nature that waxed hot at the sight of the perpetration of high-handed acts of injustice. He conceived that he was himself called upon to strive for their redress. In the present instance, indeed, he had a special reason for feeling personally aggrieved. He was himself a Benedictine abbot, and one of his particular friends, the learned monk Constantine, was an inmate of the abbey, and was chafing under the usurper. Moreover, the monastery of Fleury, through its possession of at least the larger portion of the relics of St. Benedict, was one of the most important houses of the whole Benedictine order. Disorder in it cut Gerbert to the

quick. He called upon Maieul, abbot of the great reforming monastery of Cluny, and, as Gerbert himself called him, a most shining star, to step in and root out the scandal. “If you keep silence, who will speak out? If this offence be allowed to pass, what wicked man will not be encouraged to do the like? It is zeal for the love of God which moves me to speak, so that if your examination of the case should show him (Oïlbold) to be innocent, he may be duly acknowledged as abbot, but that, if he be proved guilty, he may be cut off from communion with all the abbots and from the whole order”. But the character of Maieul was the very opposite to that of Gerbert. He was retiring and prudent. We have seen him refuse the Papacy; and in the present instance he declined to interfere. The usurper ought, indeed, to be condemned, declared Maieul, but it was not for him to pass that condemnation. More harm than good, he thought, would result if he were excommunicated. Such a careful course of action, we may well believe, did not suit the temperament of Gerbert. In the name of Archbishop Adalberon, he endeavored to inflame the placid abbot. “The holy fathers”, he wrote, “resisted heresies, and, when they heard of scandals anywhere, did not think that they were no concern of theirs. For the Catholic Church is one spread throughout the whole earth. You say, or rather the Holy Ghost says through you: ‘There will be no true Christian who will not detest this ambitious piece of audacity’. Detest then this usurper. Let him feel that you have no sympathy with him, that you do not communicate with him, and that through you not only is he cut off from all the religious of your order, but that, if it can be managed, he will be condemned by the censures of the Roman pontiff”.

But Gerbert was not content with denouncing the usurper to Maieul, he stirred up against him Ebrard, abbot of St. Julian of Tours, and the abbots of Rheims. In the name of the latter he wrote to Fleury to encourage the resistance of those monks who were indignant at the intrusion of an abbot over them by the secular arm. He informed them of the adverse decision passed on Oilbold by those two shining lights of the Church, Maieul and Ebrard. “Separate yourselves, sheep of Christ, from one who is not a shepherd but a wolf who ravages the fold. Let him rely on kings and dukes, princes of this world, by whose favour alone he has made himself a ruler of monks”. Though Gerbert did not succeed in his efforts to have the intruder ousted, for it was only by death that, “to the salvation of many”, the intruder ceased to be abbot, one cannot but admire the zeal for justice and for the good of religion with which this episode shows Gerbert to have been inspired. At this period of his life he was ready to root up cockle even if corn was torn up along with it. It was nothing to him if he precipitated the fall of the heavens, if he could himself bring about the triumph of justice.

But, as we have already said, Gerbert's chief occupation during his second prolonged stay at Rheims was in the domain of politics. From being the pupil of Adalberon in the science and art of diplomacy, he became his adviser. In the letters which he wrote in the name of the archbishop, it is he himself as much as Adalberon who speaks in them. And though it was his patron and not he himself who put the crown on the head of Hugh Capet and on that of his son, and thus put an end to the dynasty of the Carolings, it was Gerbert whom men called the king-maker.

Otho II had not been long dead before his youthful son was taken out of his mother's control by Henry of Bavaria, cousin to Otho II, who had been as unfaithful to the father as he now showed himself to his son. Under the name of tutor he would be king. But with all his military power he was no match for the unarmed monk who presided over the schools at Rheims. The favours which the latter had received from Otho I and his son had won for their house his grateful love. As he had been faithful to the first two Othos, he would be true to the third Otho, for he regarded them as one. Hence, of course, was he devoted to Adelaide, the grandmother, and to Theophano, the

mother of the little Otho. But Gerbert was attached to the house of the Othos not merely by personal bonds. He cleaved to it because, like all the great churchmen and thinkers of the Middle Ages, he was an ardent upholder of the idea of one Church and one Empire.

And so, when the heir of the Othos and of the empire was in danger, Gerbert could not rest till he had striven to remove it. The like activity in the same direction was displayed by Adalberon. Modern historians have wondered what made the archbishop so keen a supporter of the little Otho. We may be allowed to assert that, next to his general policy of working for the advancement of the empire, the principal reason was the influence of his secretary over him. At any rate, whatever was the reason, Adalberon worked as hard for the interests of Otho III as did Gerbert. The first step taken by the energetic archbishop and his at least equally energetic secretary was to secure the adhesion of "our kings" (Lothaire and his son Louis) to the cause of Otho. This they were the more successful in accomplishing, seeing that Lothaire hoped to obtain for himself the guardianship of the young king, and by that means to possess himself of Lorraine. But they were not content with working merely in France for the interests of Otho. Their agents penetrated into all parts of Lorraine and Germany, bearing letters in which the partisans of the child-king were encouraged, his enemies attacked, and the loyalty of waverers strengthened. Egbert, archbishop of Treves (Trier), is exhorted to stand firm, and not to forget the benefits he had received from the Othos; Willigis of Mayence, with "whom a very great number of the Westerns (Lorrainers) were associated", is reminded that much would have to be done by all of them before the blessings of peace could be secured; and, in the person of Charles, duke of Lorraine, a scathing letter was addressed to Diedric (Thierry), bishop of Metz. He was told that he had not sense enough to see that he had scarcely a single ally in his treason; but that, on the contrary, so far was Charles from standing alone (as in his nocturnal cups the bishop had contended), that with him were the nobles of Gaul, the kings of the Franks, and his faithful Lorrainers. All these were devoted to Otho; whereas the bishop was but like the snail which in its shell mistook itself for a butting-bull. He was, in fine, denounced as a man who had heaped up mountains of gold at the expense of the widow and the orphan. In a word, Gerbert could safely declare that the great number of partisans he had secured for Otho and his mother was a matter of notoriety throughout all Gaul.

The energy of Gerbert was soon rewarded. Not much more than six months had elapsed from the death of Otho II when Henry (or Hezilo, as he is sometimes called) of Bavaria had to give up the child-king into the hands of his mother (June 29, 984). But the ambition of the Bavarian duke was not dead. It reasserted itself immediately, and its new plans placed Adalberon and Gerbert in a very awkward position. Henry secured the promise of the support of their king, Lothaire, by offering him Lorraine. Now Adalberon was chancellor of the kingdom of the Franks, Lothaire was his liege lord. However, he had thrown in his lot with Otho, and by Otho he resolved to stand. It is needless to say that he endeavored as far as he could to conceal his designs from his sovereign, and that that effort must have involved him in much scheming. He had both to support Lothaire by his troops, and Otho by his advice and secret service, and must have felt all along that he was doomed to be discovered in the end.

The political work of the archbishop and that of his indefatigable secretary had to be done all over again. And Gerbert, full of loyalty to the young Otho, and in touch with all that was going forward, was prepared to do it. Again his letters were sent in all directions to arouse the zeal of Otho's friends. "Are you keeping watch, O father of your country, you who were once so well known for your zeal in Otho's cause", he wrote to Notger, bishop of Liege, "or does blind fortune and ignorance of the state of affairs make you drowsy? He is being deserted to whom, on account of his father's

services, you have promised fidelity ... Already the kings of the Franks are secretly drawing near to Alt-Breisach on the Rhine, where Henry, who has been declared a public enemy, is to meet them on the first of February. Take counsel, my father, and in every way you can prevent them from coming to any agreement adverse to your lord".

Although, as Gerbert said, the dangers of the times prevented plain writing, it seems clear from his letters that he and Adalberon very soon began to stir up the powerful Hugh Capet, duke of France, against Lothaire. And great need was there that they should try every resource if they were to succeed, as Lothaire's cause in Lorraine was prospering. "Make no treaty with the Franks, hold aloof from their kings (Lothaire and Louis V)", was the word that Gerbert poured into the ears of the Lorrainers. He obtained leave to visit the prisoners whom the Frankish monarch had taken, and utilized his opportunity by encouraging them and their relations to resist to the last.

These doings of Gerbert and his communications with the Empress Theophano could not all escape the knowledge of Lothaire. The archbishop and his secretary began to be seriously suspected by the Frankish monarch. Adalberon found it necessary to send a letter to the king professing loyalty to him. "You know", he wrote to the king, "that it is my wish ever to have regard for your interests and the fidelity I owe to you, and, saving my duty to God, ever to obey you".

However, despite the suspicions of Lothaire, the exertions of Gerbert and his master were again crowned with success. About the end of June 985, Henry of Bavaria finally submitted to Theophano at Frankfort. But it was only the death of Lothaire (March 2, 986), and the influence over his successor, Louis V, exerted by his mother Emma, who was well disposed towards Adalberon, that saved the archbishop and his adviser from being crushed beneath the weight of their own successful enterprises. As half-sister of Otho II it was not unnatural that Emma should regard her nephew, Otho III, with a favourable eye. His friends were her friends. Adalberon became her adviser, and Gerbert her secretary. But suspicion of the archbishop was stronger in the son than in the father. Louis threw off the tutelage of his mother, and denounced Adalberon, with no little justice, "as of all men on earth the most guilty of favouring in everything Otho, the enemy of the Franks". Not content with words, Louis made an armed attempt, which failed, to obtain possession of Rheims. Then, to embarrass the archbishop as much as possible, he ordered him to demolish certain fortified places which belonged to the archdiocese but which, being held under the empire, were not included, like the other lands of the archbishopric, in the kingdom of France. In fine, Adalberon was ordered to appear before an assembly of the Franks to clear himself of the charges made against him.

The archbishop, now thoroughly alarmed, dispatched the faithful Gerbert to Nimeguen to implore the aid of Theophano and her son. Again, however, death solved Adalberon's difficulties. Louis V, the last representative sovereign of the Carolingian line, died May 21, 987; and the assembly of the Franks which, had Louis lived, might have condemned the great archbishop, not only acquitted him, but, guided by him, declared Hugh Capet their king, and on July 3, 987, the first monarch of the Capetian line was crowned, probably at Noyon. His coronation did not bring much increase of power to Hugh. Though the ancestor of all the kings who have ruled in France, he was practically only its first noble, and owed his crown, in some degree, to his own feudal power and to the support of the Normans, but chiefly to the exiled abbot of Bobbio.

Hugh, moreover, had a rival. This was Charles, duke of Lorraine, brother of the king (Lothaire) whose son Hugh had succeeded. He grounded his claim to the throne on his more direct descent from Charlemagne. To render his position more secure, the new king associated his son, Robert, with him in the crown (December 25, 987), and

employed Gerbert as his secretary. Hugh straightway employed the ready pen of his able and trusted servant as one of the most powerful means at his disposal for strengthening his newly acquired dignity. His supporters had to be encouraged, while those whose loyalty to him was doubtful had to be roused. Among these latter was Siguinus, archbishop of Sens (977-999), who at first refrained from acknowledging the new king in any way. “As we are unwilling”, wrote the diplomatic secretary in his master's name, “to abuse the royal power even to the smallest extent, we regulate the affairs of the state after consultation with our trusty councillors, and in accordance with their views. Now we regard you as one of the very chief among our advisers. And so we admonish you, in all honour and affection, for the peace and concord of God’s Church and of all Christian people, to take before the first of November (987) that oath of fidelity which the others have already taken to us. But if, what indeed we do not expect, led away by certain wicked men, you take no heed to what is your obvious duty, know that you will have to endure the harsher sentence of the Lord Pope (John XV) and the bishops of your province, and that our clemency, known as it is to all, will have to give place to the justice of the king”.

With a view to still further consolidating his position, and undeterred by the failure to which such negotiations were generally doomed, Hugh endeavored to effect a matrimonial alliance between the Eastern Empire and his own family. Gerbert accordingly drew up a letter to Basil II and Constantine VIII, brothers of Theophano, and “orthodox emperors”.

“The nobility of your birth and the fame of your great deeds impels us to seek your friendship. For we are convinced that there is nothing more valuable than your goodwill. In striving for your friendship and alliance, we are aiming neither at your kingdom nor at your wealth. But this alliance would make all our rights yours. And, if it please you to accept it, our union would be productive of great advantage, and would lead to important results. No Gauls nor Germans could harass the frontiers of the Roman Empire were we in opposition to them. To give lasting effect to these ideas, we are supremely anxious to procure for our royal and only son an imperial bride. For, owing to blood relationship, we cannot wed him to any of the neighbouring royal houses. If this request find favour in your most serene ears, pray let us know it either by letter or by trusty messenger”.

Even if this diplomatic epistle, written in the first quarter of the year 988, was ever dispatched, it led to nothing; and before April 988 Robert was the husband of Susanna, the widow of Arnulf II, count of Flanders.

Gerbert’s efforts to induce Hugh to march to the help of his old friend Count Borel against the Saracens also came to nothing. Hugh, indeed, expressed his willingness to aid the count of the Spanish March, and made his intention an excuse for having his son Robert crowned king (December 25, 987). He was, however, prevented from carrying out his praiseworthy intentions by the disconcerting movements of Charles of Lorraine. By treachery that prince obtained possession in the early summer (988) of the royal and strong city of Laon, the capital of Hugh's kingdom; and, as some will have it, with a view to making a diplomatic capture of parallel importance, he invited Gerbert to a conference. To this invitation the latter replied that he would go if the duke would send him trustworthy guides to escort him in safety through the roving companies of his troops. Meanwhile, he exhorted him to treat with the utmost clemency the two important prisoners he had taken, viz. Adalberon or Ascelin, bishop of Laon, and Emma, the widow of King Lothaire. This exhortation was the more necessary seeing that Charles had anything but good feeling towards Emma, as he regarded her as the cause of his loss of influence with his brother, Emma’s late husband. Finally,

Gerbert advised the duke not to confine himself within the walls of a town. But even if, by writing in this strain, he had hoped to retain a friend in the opposite camp, it cannot be supposed, in view of the determined opposition against Charles of his friend and patron, Adalberon of Rheims, that Gerbert had any intention of giving active support to Charles. Both the archbishop and his trusted friend shared with Hugh in the difficulties and dangers of the siege of Laon, which was soon begun by him. Gerbert contracted a fever, and Adalberon likely enough the germs of his mortal sickness during the course of the two fruitless sieges of the stronghold of Laon undertaken by Hugh in the course of the year 988. The death of the great metropolitan of Rheims in the beginning of the following year (January 23, 989), if it freed him from the fraud and deceit of those in the midst of whom he lived, was a serious loss to Hugh and the beginning of great trouble to Gerbert.

The demise of Adalberon was a serious blow to his secretary. Gerbert both loved and leaned upon him. He was his dear father for whom he felt the most tender affection; the two had but one heart and one soul, and the stronger character of Adalberon was Gerbert's support. The thought that he was now the sole exponent of their joint views, and that, without the archbishop's powerful will, he had alone to face Adalberon’s enemies, made him tremble that he had survived his patron. He was, however, buoyed up with the hope of succeeding to his friend’s position. During the last year of his life, Adalberon had shown himself anxious to procure a bishopric for Gerbert; and when he felt the hand of death upon him, he made it known that he wished to have his secretary as his successor, and gained over to his views the clergy and a considerable number of the influential laity. But, unfortunately, as well for Gerbert as for the French kings, the dying wishes of Adalberon were not respected.

At any rate, his death was the signal for the commencement of intrigues of all kinds of which Gerbert was the centre. More than ever was he in the midst of plot and counter-plot. There were various candidates for the See of Rheims; but the one favoured by Hugh was not the trusted friend of Adalberon. Nominally, the right of election lay with clergy and people, but the will of the king practically settled the question; and Hugh was resolved that the new archbishop should be Arnulf, the natural son of King Lothaire and nephew of Charles of Lorraine. This resolve was taken by the French king, despite the contrary advice of the, wise in the fond hope of dividing the last descendants of Charlemagne among themselves, by thus attaching one of their number to himself. At the same time, to soothe the feelings of the outraged Gerbert, the ungrateful monarch caused various splendid offers to be made to him. In a word, he promised him everything except what he wanted, viz. the archbishopric of Rheims. Hence, though Gerbert, giving up all his studies and rousing his friends, threw himself with vigour into the contest, Arnulf was duly elected "by fraud", declared his opponent; “without guile”, ran his decree of election.

But with the termination of election strife the difficulties of the defeated candidate were far from over. In fact, with the election of Arnulf his troubles were only beginning. The new archbishop retained him as his secretary; and so, no doubt, he soon became cognizant of his treasonable intercourse with Charles of Lorraine. It became necessary for him to take his stand. Was he to avenge the ingratitude which Hugh had displayed towards him by aiding the designs of Duke Charles, or was he to remain true to the new dynasty he had placed upon the throne of France? The course he followed would naturally lead to the supposition that he wished for revenge, but some of his words would seem to show that he acted not from inclination but from fear. He tells us that, cast into the midst of the greatest dangers, he desired to play the man, and failed; and hence, following a favorite maxim of his, derived from Terence, as he could not do as

he wished, he resolved to make his wishes commensurate with his possibilities. He accordingly threw in his lot with Arnulf and Charles, denounced Hugh and his son as mere regal stop-gaps (*interreges*), and by letters endeavored to form a party for Charles among the adherents of the new dynasty. For, in the meanwhile, through the treachery of Arnulf, Rheims had fallen (c. August 989) into the hands of the duke of Lorraine, and Gerbert had passed under the control of the power of the party opposed to the one which he had himself elevated.

But, during the months he was unfaithful to Hugh and his son, he was not at peace with himself. Men, he wrote, might account him happy, but in fact he felt most miserable. He regarded himself as the prime conspirator. Not for long, however, could he endure the upbraidings of his conscience. He was soon heartsick of being "the organ of the devil, and of advocating the cause of falsehood against truth". The promptings of his conscience, too, were powerfully aided by the arguments of Bruno, bishop of Langres, who, though a near relative of Duke Charles and of Arnulf, remained true to the oath of fidelity he had sworn to the two kings.

Thus, urged by his friends and by his own sense of duty Gerbert returns to the Gerbert contrived to elude the vigilance of Charles, and so, after a defection of a few months, could write to Egbert of Trier (Treves) : "I am now again in the king's court, meditating on the words of life with the priests of God"; and to Arnulf: "I have changed my country and my sovereign .... for when our faith is pledged to one man, we owe nothing to another". Hugh received Gerbert with open arms, restored him completely to his good graces, and at once began again to employ his ready pen in his service. A provincial council was assembled at Senlis, and its decree of anathema against those who had betrayed Laon and Rheims, against their aiders and abettors, and against those who, under the pretext of purchase, had appropriated the property of others, was drawn up by Gerbert. In the last-named clause of the anathema especially may be seen the hand of Gerbert, as Arnulf had, immediately on his flight, bestowed his property on his enemies his "houses which, with great trouble and expense, he had built himself, and the churches which he had acquired by lawful and solemn donation, according to the custom of the province". He was also the author of a strong letter to Pope John XV, calling upon him to take action against Arnulf.

We have already seen that as the appeal to Rome did not answer the expectations of Hugh and Gerbert, a provincial council was assembled in the monastery of St. Basle at Verzy, near Rheims (June 991). At this synod Arnulf was degraded, and Gerbert probably elected to fill his place. The decree of election, which, strange to say, does not mention the treason of Arnulf, insinuates only that he had been elected irregularly, as the bishops had yielded to the clamours of a body of clergy and people who had been corrupted "by hope of gain". But now, "with the goodwill and cooperation" of the kings Hugh and Robert, and with the consent of those of the clergy and people who fear God, the bishops of the diocese of Rheims elect as their archbishop "the Abbot Gerbert, a man of mature years, and in character prudent, docile, affable, and merciful. Nor do we prefer to him inconstant youth, vaulting ambition, and rash administration (Arnulf) ... Hence we elect Gerbert, whose life and character we have known from his youth upwards, and whose knowledge in the things both of God and man we have experienced".

Nothing could bring out in stronger light the utter irregularity of the deposition of Arnulf than this very decree of Gerbert's election. It shows plainly that the former was validly elected, and was deposed for no canonical fault. It is quite enough of itself to brand Gerbert's election as a usurpation.

His profession of faith as archbishop-elect has also come down to us. Those of its articles which do not consist of a paraphrase of the Apostles' Creed are thought to have been directed against the heresy of the Cathari or Puritans, later known as the Albigensians, who at this period were spreading their doctrines through various parts of France. Among other tenets they held that there was an essentially evil principle who was the author of the Old Testament. They also condemned marriage and the use of animal food. Hence we find Gerbert professing that God was the one author both of the Old and the New Testament; that the devil was not evil by his very essence, but had become so by his own will; and that he did not prohibit marriage or second marriage nor the use of flesh meat. He confessed that no one could be saved outside the Catholic Church, and concluded by accepting "the six holy synods which our universal mother the Church accepts".

What we know of Gerbert's acts in his official capacity as archbishop of Rheims redounds to his credit. And difficult indeed was the task he had to perform; for, by the dire ravages of war, the diocese was in a sad condition. He showed himself an ardent defender of the oppressed, and of the rights of his see. He displayed at once firmness and moderation in dealing with wrong-doers. To a youthful bishop whom presents had induced to inflict some undeserved penalty on one of his priests, his metropolitan writes : "Owing to the difficulties of the times, we have not hitherto been able to seek the things of God as we could wish". He proceeds to say that now, however, by the mercy of the Lord, he has a little breathing space, and he reminds his correspondent that, if all priests have to do what is in accordance with the laws, still more have bishops. "Why then do we set money before justice? Why by unholy cupidity do we crush beneath our feet the laws of God? ... Overcome your want of years by the gravity of your life. Let continual reading and study improve your mind". He must at once restore what has unjustly been taken away.

To certain powerful violators of the rights of the clergy and the poor he grants a brief space for doing penance and making satisfaction. At the end of the prescribed time "they will then be recognized as fruitful branches of the Church, or as dead wood to be cut away from God's vineyard by the sword of the Spirit". He does not, however, fail to recommend moderation in the infliction of ecclesiastical censures. He would have no excess in this particular; for, where the salvation of souls is at stake, there is need of the greatest restraint. "No one must be deprived of the Body and Blood of the Son of God with any undue haste; for by this mystery it is that we live a true life, and such as are justly deprived of it are in life already really dead".

But Gerbert had not much time to devote to the specific business of his office. From his election in the summer of 991 to the time of his taking his final leave of France in the summer of 997, he was occupied in trying to maintain himself in his see against the opposition of the Pope. So keen was the struggle, so exhausting were its details, that he reckoned the honour he had attained was bought at the expense of all peace of mind. And he, who does not appear to have been one of those physically brave men on whom the terrors of death make no impression, declared that he would sooner engage in battle than become involved in a legal dispute, and that, too, though he could wield the law, on occasion, as well as any man.

He certainly made a brave fight to keep the honour he had won. He wrote in all directions to urge his friends to resistance, and his powerful patrons to come to his aid. His friends are told that they should feel assured that he was not the only one whose independence was being aimed at; they must remember that their substance was in danger when their neighbour's wall was being burnt. Above all things they must not keep silence before their judge, for to do so is to acknowledge their guilt; he is ever

faithful, he declared, to his friends and a great lover of truth, and they must show themselves the same. He endeavored to persuade them that to yield would be to compromise the dignity and importance of the episcopal body, and even to endanger the state. If the matter is settled, he urged, over the heads of the bishops, their power, importance, and dignity are brought to naught, since it will show that they had no right, and ought not to have deprived a bishop, no matter how guilty, of his rank. He implored the help of the Empress Adelaide, the grandmother of the young Otho III; for, “in wondering where faith, truth, piety and justice have taken up their abode”, he could only think of her. To her, therefore, did he fly “as to a special temple of pity”, and hers was the help which he sought. All were against him, “even Rome, which ought to be his comfort”.

In the course of the struggle he tried the effect of a personal appeal to Rome (996), and yet was ever endeavoring to guard beforehand against an adverse decision from the Pope by contending that, if he issued any decrees which were at variance with existing ecclesiastical laws, such decisions were of no avail. In this connection of opposition to unfavourable decisions from Rome, he was very fond of quoting from St. Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians : “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema”.

When Otho III left Italy (August 996), Gerbert, neither acquitted nor condemned by the new Pope, Gregory V, returned to France. Most unfortunately for him his patron, Hugh Capet, died before the close of the year (October 24, 996), and his successor Robert, though one of the archbishop’s old pupils, showed him no favour. On the one hand, the new king was conscious that Gerbert was opposed to his marriage with his cousin Bertha, which took place soon after his father's death; and, on the other, in view of probable difficulties with the Holy See, in connection with his unlawful marriage, he did not wish to be in opposition with it on other accounts. Without the support of the king, Gerbert could not maintain himself in his archiepiscopal city. His own dependants, regarding him as still excommunicated, or at least contumacious, would hold no communication with him, in matters either sacred or profane. Treatment of that kind no man could endure. From this “unmerited persecution of his brethren”, as he calls it, he had to fly. Thus, about the beginning of the summer of 997, Gerbert quitted the kingdom of the Franks, nor, despite blandishments or threats, did he ever again return to it. He turned his back on France, broken in health and spirit. “My days have passed”, he wrote to the Empress Adelaide, a few weeks before he retired to Germany. “Old age threatens me with death. Pleurisy oppresses my lungs, my ears tingle, my eyes run water, my whole frame seems to be pierced with needles. All this year have I been in bed, stricken down with pain. Scarcely have I risen from my couch when I find myself assailed by an intermittent fever”.

However, the warmth of the welcome he received from Otho, into whose territory he betook himself, soon began to tell favourably on his health, and to lessen the bitterness of exile. "By the divine favour he was freed from his immense dangers, and his lines were cast in pleasant places". He soon resumed his beloved occupation of teaching. Otho gave him the domain of Sasbach; and in return he gave the young emperor not only what he so eagerly sought, instruction and counsel, but also encouragement. “What greater glory can there be in a prince, what more praiseworthy constancy in a leader”, he asked of Otho, who was about this time making war on the Slavs, “than to collect his armies, burst into the country of his enemies, support by his presence the foeman's assault, and expose himself to the greatest dangers for his country and for his faith, for his own and his country’s salvation?”

Between Otho, conscious to himself of possessing “some sparks of the genius of Greece”, and anxious to have his “Saxon rusticity” banished by the powerful flame of his tutor’s genius, and Gerbert, professing to find nothing more agreeable than his empire, there was, it may be said, always sympathy and close friendship. Still, the tainted breath of suspicion did occasionally tarnish their friendly relations, as may be gathered from the following letter addressed by Gerbert to Otho during the course of this very first year (997) of their more intimate connection : “I am well aware that in many things I offend and have offended God. But I am at a loss to understand what accusations of my having injured you and yours can have been brought against me, that my devotion has so suddenly become displeasing. Would that it had been granted me either never to have received from your munificence so great favours given me with such honour, or never with such confusion to have lost them when once acquired ... Time was when it was thought that, by my favour with you, I could serve many; now it is well for me to have as patrons those whom I once befriended, and to place more confidence in my enemies than in my friends. The latter have ever declared that all would go well with me; the former, either endowed with the spirit of prophecy or animated with that of hate, have ever maintained that neither my good counsels nor my service would benefit me. This is, indeed, a sadder prospect for me than I could wish, but it is scarcely creditable to your imperial majesty. During three generations, in the midst of arms and enemies, have I ever displayed to you, your father, and your grandfather the sincerest fidelity. ... I wished rather to taste death than not see the then captive son of Cesar mount the throne”.

Though this strong letter was more than enough to dissipate any want of confidence in “his master” which may have taken a little hold of the heart of the young emperor, Gerbert did not obtain all he had hoped from his enthusiastic pupil. He had expected that through the imperial influence he would be able to keep Arnulf out of the See of Rheims, and secure his own safe occupation of it. But the Slavs and the Romans gave Otho quite enough to do without embroiling himself with the king of France. Before the year 997 had run its course, Otho had to march to Rome against the rebellious Crescentius. With him went his master and adviser, Gerbert of Aurillac.

It was while in Italy at the end of the year 997, or at the beginning of the following year, that Gerbert learnt that all hope of his regaining the See of Rheims was lost. Arnulf, he was correctly informed, had been released from confinement, and was reinstated in his position with the goodwill of King Robert and of Pope Gregory. If, however, Otho was powerless to prevent this misfortune from falling on his respected master, he could counterbalance its effect. About this very time the archbishopric of Ravenna became vacant. Otho at once offered it to Gerbert; and Pope Gregory, glad, no doubt, to find so ready a means of facilitating the settlement of the Rheims difficulty, ratified the choice, and in due course (April 28, 998) sent him the pallium, and confirmed the spiritual and temporal privileges of his see. He made him archbishop and Prince of Ravenna.

Throughout the year in which Gerbert held the office of archbishop of Ravenna, one of the chief sees not merely of Italy but of the Christian world, we may fairly conclude, even from the little we know of his actions during that period, that his previous activity, especially in the direction of practical reform, was fully maintained. He naturally did not forget his abbey of Bobbio. Not only did he restore order therein, and secure, by means of an imperial diploma, the restitution of property usurped during his absence, but he took measures of more general utility which would benefit ecclesiastical property in general as well as that of Bobbio in particular. Still full of angry memory as to the way in which the goods of his abbey had been alienated by his

predecessor under the pretence of long leases, he had it decreed in council and confirmed by the emperor that such leases or donations were to die with those bishops or abbots who granted them. He had previously held a synod at Ravenna (May 1) condemning various simoniacal practices, some of them very curious; such, for example, as the selling by the subdeacons of Ravenna of the chrism to the archpriests and of hosts (breads) of a special shape (Formata) to each newly consecrated bishop. As a last instance of his work as archbishop of Ravenna, it may be noted that along with Otho he was present at the Roman council which condemned the marriage of Robert of France. He had already spoken against it as archbishop of Rheims, and as the first of the Italian primates who assisted Gregory to anathematize it, his signature is found to follow that of the Pope.

Gerbert had occupied the See of Ravenna scarcely a year when Pope Gregory V died or was killed (February 999); and Otho, who in him had placed a relation on the chair of Peter, now caused his respected master to fill the same position. The new Pope, who took the name of Sylvester, no doubt because with Otho he intended to act as the first Sylvester was then supposed to have acted with Constantine the Great, was consecrated on Palm Sunday (April 2, 999). As he jokingly said himself alluding to the fact that the names of the three sees he had held all began with the letter R "Gerbert ascended from Rheims to Ravenna, and then became Pope of Rome". By sheer force of merit, the first French Pope, like the only English Pope, reached the highest dignity in the world from being a simple monk of lowly birth. Science and faith a combination so highly praised by Gerbert that he declares that the ignorant may be said not to have faith science and faith had in both cases been rewarded. It is much to be regretted that, compared with the rest of his life, there is comparatively little to be said, because comparatively little is known about the pontificate of Sylvester II.

We know at any rate something of the times in which he lived. They were, in a word, very evil. As a sign of their deep-seated corruption, Gerbert notes that public opinion itself had gone astray. That only was declared to be right which, just as amongst animals, lust or violence could bring about. But with all this, contrary to what is asserted by many, Sylvester's difficulties were not increased by any widespread and deep-seated apathy or terror produced by fear of the end of the world occurring in the year one thousand. There is no doubt that some were awaiting the advent of that year "with fear and expectation of what was to come". The Abbot Abbo, whose name has frequently appeared in these pages, assures us that, when he was a young man, he heard a preacher in a Paris church maintain that antichrist would come at the close of the thousandth year, and that the general judgment would follow soon after. He tells us, however, that with what skill he could he opposed the opinion "by quotations from the Gospels, the Apocalypse, and the Book of Daniel". He was also commissioned by his "wise Abbot Richard" to refute an opinion that the world would most indubitably come to an end when the feast of the Annunciation (March 25) fell on Good Friday. Adson, abbot of Moutier-en-Der, was commissioned by Queen Gerberga, the wife of Louis d'Outremer, to refute similar opinions. A hymn which was sung at this period is quoted as another proof of the general belief in the approach of the day "of supreme wrath, when darkness shall cover the earth and the stars fall upon it". But though in certain parts this expectation of the wrath to come may have been spread among the more superstitious or unlettered (and in our own time we have seen the same section of the people entertain the same ideas), or may have been entertained by mystically-minded persons, there is not enough evidence to justify the assertion of many modern authors that it caused a general stagnation. There is not the slightest allusion to any such alarming state of things in any of the papal bulls of the period, nor does either Gerbert

or Otho make any mention of it. The tangible difficulty that both Pope and emperor had to encounter in the midst of their lofty schemes for the regeneration of the world by the joint action of the Papacy and the empire was the intractable Roman.

Otho, who, on the death of Gregory, had come to Rome from Gaeta, where he had been to visit S. Nilus, remained there for a month or two. In the fullest harmony, Pope and emperor were engaged during that time in granting privileges at each other's request, in holding synods for the transaction of business, and no doubt in maturing plans for their joint government of the world. Then during the summer heats they were constantly away from Rome. We find traces of them at Beneventum and at Farfa. It seems to have been during this interval that their governmental schemes were matured. For in one of his diplomas Otho himself declares that, leaving Rome, he had a conference with Hugh, marquis of Tuscany, on the question of "restoring the republic", and had held counsel with the venerable Sylvester II and with various of the great men of the State regarding the empire.

With a view to gratifying, not so much the enthusiastic historical instincts of one who "had inherited the treasures of Greek and Roman learning", as the Romans, it was resolved that Rome and not Germany should again be made the seat of empire; and that, with a view to overawe them, the emperor should be surrounded with the elaborate ceremonial of the Byzantine court. Though many were of opinion that little good would be effected by the realization of these ideas, efforts were at once made to give them effect. Otho's seals proclaimed that the empire of the Romans was renewed. *Renovatio Imperii Romanorum* was the legend they bore. In his edicts he signed himself: "Emperor of the Romans, Augustus, Consul of the Senate and People of Rome". He surrounded himself, so it is said by many, with crowds of officials after the manner of the Eastern emperors, and distinguished them with the same titles. He had a *Protovestiarius* (chamberlain), a *Protospatharius* and a *Hyparch*, a Count of the Sacred Palace, a *Logothetes*, a Prefect of the Fleet, and many other similar functionaries with equally high-sounding appellations. In his palace, which he built (or adapted) on the Aventine, near the monastery of St. Boniface, in which his beloved St. Adalbert had dwelt, he sat down to dine by himself at a semicircular table, raised to a higher level than the others. To bring into perfect unison the action of Pope and emperor, the seven "palatine judges" were placed on a new footing. Chosen, as before, from among the clergy, they were to have equal standing in both the Church and the State. They were "to consecrate" the emperor; and, with the clergy of Rome, elect the Pope. They had also to form the emperor's council. Without them he was not to issue any important decree. The *Primicerius* and *Secundicerius* were to be the first ministers of the emperor, and to hold the chief rank in the Church. The *Arcarius* (or treasurer) had to see to the collection of the revenue, while the *Sacellarius* was the army paymaster, and was responsible for the proper distribution of alms to the poor. The *Protoscrinarius* (chancellor) was the chief of the scriveners, and the *Primus Defensor* had to watch the administration of justice. To the seventh judge, the *Adminiculator*, was entrusted the care of the widow and the orphan and of the unfortunate generally.

Had this constitution come thoroughly into being, it would have resulted in the formation of an empire differing both from that of Old Rome for the emperor would not have been the sole lord and from that of Charlemagne, on account of the permanent and important position assigned to the clergy. It is more than likely it would have proved to have been impractical. Popes and emperors do not easily agree. But it was an effort to bring them into harmony, and to forestall the terrible troubles which their discords brought on the Middle Ages. And it is possible that, if a long joint-reign of Sylvester and Otho had given the scheme an opportunity of getting into good working order, it

might at least have acted as a brake on both Pope and emperor, and so have at least lessened the evils which their struggles caused. But the premature death of Otho strangled the conception in its birth.

After the criticisms of Halphen, however, the gravest doubts must be entertained as to the authenticity of the details of Otho's attempt to make Rome again the seat of the empire. The story of Otho's splendour in the Eternal City is not mentioned by any contemporary authority, and the transformation of the officials of the papal palace into imperial functionaries rests for the most part on two unsatisfactory documents. The first of these is the last portion of the *Graphia*, the second a fragment in Bonizo's *Decretum*, regarding the seven judges of the pontifical court. Most of the *Graphia* is taken from the *Mirabilia Urbis Romae,* and from a copy posterior to 1143, and was put together not earlier than the second half of the twelfth century. Its third or last portion consists of a conglomeration of documents from all sources and ages, and is a *jeu d'esprit* where all is in confusion. Hence, though the fragment of Bonizo and the list of officials in the Graphia are tenth century documents, Halphen does not believe that they show the imperial court at Rome, but thinks that all that can safely be affirmed about the matter is that Otho tried to revive some ancient usages, and "even some ancient Roman titles, as that of *magister militum*, and sometimes gave his functionaries Roman titles".

Although, or rather because, Otho was loyally attached to the Roman Church, and eager for the honour of his ally, we are compelled to reject the document which purports to be a deed of gift by him of eight counties to the Pope. The diploma, which was found at Assisi in 1139, and falsely called "Decretum electionis Sylvestri II", has those who stand for its authenticity as well as those who call it in question. After setting forth that Rome is the head of the world, and the Roman Church the mother of all the Churches, the document goes on to say that she has obscured her illustrious titles through the carelessness and ignorance of her pontiffs. It blames these latter for simoniacally alienating the goods of the Church and, in the general confusion of laws, "for joining the greatest part of our empire to their apostleship". This they did by means of a false deed drawn up in the name of Constantine the Great by John the Deacon, "of the maimed hand", and by means of the donation of a "certain Charles". But, though this Charles was at length deprived of empire "by a better Charles", he gave what he had no right to give, what he had wrongly acquired, and what he could not hope long to keep in his possession. Despising all these forgeries, "we make a grant out of our own domains. As, from love of St. Peter, we elected the lord Sylvester, our master, Pope, and, by the help of God, ordained and created him, so, from love of this very lord Pope Sylvester do we, from our own resources, make a donation to St. Peter, in order that our master may have from his disciple wherewith to offer to our Prince Peter". The eight counties granted were then enumerated Pesaro, Fano, Sinigaglia, Ancona, Fossombrone, Cagli, Jesi, and Osimo.

Whether this document be considered as a whole, or in its details, its spuriousness seems equally obvious. From Otho's letters to Gerbert and his invariably respectful attitude towards him, we might be sure that, in the very act of bestowing a favour upon him, he would not have spoken so disparagingly of his predecessors as this supposed deed would make him. As a deed of gift, too, it fails in every mark of authenticity. It is not addressed to anyone, it bears no note of time or place, and is countersigned by neither secretary nor chancellor. Looking at its details, nothing could be more absurd than the statement that tenth century pontiffs, who in practice possessed neither regal authority nor regal territory, had usurped "the greatest part of our empire". The declaration that the so-called donation of Constantine was a forgery by John "of the maimed hand", is quite enough to stamp this production itself as a forgery. The

authenticity of Constantine's donation was not attacked for centuries after this, and was drawn up long before the days of the cardinal secretary, John, whose hand was cut off by Pope John XII. Who, it may be asked, was the "certain Charles" who was driven from the empire by "a better Charles"? And what was the donation he gave? Not even the Othos pretended to "elect, ordain, and create" Popes. Finally, every single one of the places mentioned had already been made over to the See of Rome by the donations of Pippin, Charlemagne, or Otho I.

But in the tenth century there was, in any case, need of more than donations on paper, and of more than mere decrees and fine governmental schemes for the ruling of the world. It was not enough for Otho to decree "that the Church of God should be freely and firmly established; that his empire should flourish and his army triumph; and that the power of the Roman people should be extended, and the republic restored". Parchment diplomas were powerless either to reward friends or punish enemies. There was everywhere need of the presence of a strong arm. Otho was soon to learn the truth of this. Meanwhile he felt that his presence was needed in Germany. His aunt, Matilda, the famous abbess of Quedlinburg, of whose remarkable influence and ability as regent the Saxon annalist gives us such a striking picture, had died at the beginning of the year (February 7, 999), and now word reached him that his grandmother, Adelaide, "the mother of kingdoms", had also died (December 16). He became conscious that by the fall of three columns, *i.e.*, by the deaths of Pope Gregory, and of his grandmother and his aunt, the Church was in danger, and now rested on himself alone. He had accordingly a great desire to revisit his country. And so, after settling all matters both ecclesiastical and civil which called for immediate adjustment, he set out along with Ziazo the Patrician, Rodbert the Oblationarius, and a number of cardinals. Never did an emperor leave or return to Rome with greater pomp.

When he had crossed the Alps he was met by a large concourse of German nobles, with whom he at once directed his steps towards Poland. The prowess of its duke, Boleslas I (Chrobri the Brave, 992?-1025), the real founder of the state of Poland, had naturally made a deep impression on the youthful imagination of Otho. He was anxious to see this great warrior; and he was at the same time wishful to satisfy his devotion by honouring the relics of his martyred friend St. Adalbert; for Boleslas had purchased them from the Prussians, and placed them in his capital of Gnesen. Before Otho left Poland, after accomplishing these objects, he had sanctioned its ecclesiastical independence; and, as some would have us believe, had consented that Boleslas should assume the title of king. Whether Otho made such concessions as he actually did make because the power of the ambitious duke was such that he could not well help himself, or because he believed that Boleslas could be best attached to the empire by kindness, can scarcely be now decided. At any rate, "with the permission of Sylvester", he constituted Gaudentius, Adalbert's brother, the first archbishop of Gnesen, "it is to be hoped lawfully", inserts the German Thietmar, who evidently does not approve of the action of Otho and subjected to him the bishops of Colberg, Krakau (Cracow), and Breslau. In days when bishops were men possessed of great civil as well as spiritual power, to have its bishops independent of a hierarchical superior in another land meant far more for a country in the tenth century than it does today. So that if Boleslas effected no more than the establishing of a hierarchy independent of any German bishop, he did much towards rendering Poland free from subjection to the empire. But many moderns maintain that he secured more than this from Otho. Following authorities who were not contemporaries, they assert that Otho himself crowned Boleslas king of Poland. There does not, however, seem any satisfactory evidence for the statement. On the contrary, from what St. Peter Damian tells us in his *Life of St. Romuald*, we find that even under

Henry II. Boleslas was still without a crown. For at that time he made a vain effort to get the regal diadem from Rome. In reply to a request from the Polish duke that he would send him missionaries into his kingdom, Otho asked St. Romuald to send some of his monks. Two agreed to go. After seven years' laborious work on the Sclavonic tongue, and after they had obtained the necessary permission to preach from the Pope, they commenced their mission. Anxious to obtain a crown "from the authority of Rome", Boleslas endeavored to persuade these two apostles to return with great gifts to the Pope, and to procure papal recognition of his wishes. Whether, however, from true zeal for their work or because they were in the interest of the German monarch (afterwards the Emperor Henry I) they refused to concern themselves with secular business. However, the contemporary annals of Quedlinburg assure us that, when Boleslas heard of that emperor's death (1024), he at once had himself anointed and crowned king. But his successor, Misico (Mieczyslaw II) was not able to maintain his father's pretensions against the warlike emperor, Conrad I, who succeeded in dividing Poland into *three parts*; and, curious to say, made Mieczyslaw tetrarch of *one division.* From a letter of Gregory VII it appears that even Boleslas II was only a duke in 1075. It was in the next year, we are told, that that prince, afterwards the murderer of St. Stanislaus, assumed the title of king. For the killing of the saintly bishop, Gregory deprived him of the rank he had appropriated; and "up to the present no king has arisen in Poland since that time".

Compelled again, no doubt, by necessity, Otho gave his sanction to the acts of another prince which also tended to remove still further from the grasp of the empire another and wholly different race of people, the Hungarians. When last we spoke of them, we regarded them with horror. A nation of mounted bowmen, their dread arrows were spreading terror through Germany, France, and Italy. They were now more or less peaceably settled in the ancient Pannonia, in the land which today bears their name. The sword and Christianity had already softened them a little. Their raiding tendencies had been checked by the terrible defeats they sustained (955-968) at the hands of Otho I. Their wars, moreover, had not been an unmixed evil. They both took prisoners, and were taken into captivity. Their prisoners preached Christianity to them, while they themselves were baptized in prison. Possibly remnants of the old Pannonian Church of the fourth and fifth centuries may have been made use of in the building up of the new Hungarian Church. Regular missionaries, too, came from Germany to help on the good work; and marriage between their rulers and Christian princesses produced the same results as among the Franks and the Anglo-Saxons. In 973 the Hungarian chief Geiza, who had married a Christian wife, became so far at least a Christian that he placed Our Lord among his gods and declared he was rich enough to serve two divinities! But under the teaching of St. Adalbert he became a more thorough Christian, and had his son Vaik (afterwards St. Stephen I, king of Hungary), baptized by the saint.

In 995, to strengthen the youth's faith, Geiza caused him to marry Gisela, the daughter of Henry the Quarrelsome, duke of Bavaria. The young prince corresponded most heartily with all the efforts made in his behalf; and when he succeeded his father in the headship of the nation (997), he proved that he was both able and willing to work for its welfare. He became the Alfred of the Hungarians. His first aim was to make his people Christian; his second to keep them free. He succeeded in both his efforts.

To propagate the faith, he introduced missionaries from different countries, and decided to establish a hierarchy. At the same time, realizing what a paramount position the Pope occupied in the eyes of Christians not only in the spiritual order, but, from his relation to the emperor, in the temporal order also, he resolved to apply to him for a crown. If, argued the ruler of the Hungarians, the Pope's cooperation was necessary

before a king could become an emperor, he could certainly make a duke into a king. Whatever of the myth may hover about the first Magyar monarch, there is no doubt that he applied to the Pope both for a hierarchy and a crown. His contemporary, the German historian Thietmar, vouches for his establishing bishoprics and receiving a crown. He would, however, insinuate that Stephen so acted at the instigation of Otho. No doubt the fact is that Otho wisely acquiesced in what he could not prevent. At any rate, the envoys of Duke Stephen found their way to Rome (1ooo), and returned to their prince with a crown, and with the necessary powers for the founding of episcopal sees. Declaring, too, that whereas he was only "apostolicus", Stephen was an "apostle", Sylvester is said to have granted "by apostolic authority to Stephen and to his successors the right of acting in the place of Sylvester and his successors, and so of directing and ordering the present and future churches of his kingdom". It is certain that the kings of Hungary bear today the title of "Rex Apostolicus"; and that they have, at various times, endeavored to obtain this legatine power from the Holy See. But it is equally certain that the Popes have always maintained that the privileges granted to St. Stephen were strictly personal. They have never, indeed, denied that powers equivalent to those of a legate *a latere* were conferred upon Stephen himself. On the contrary, the subsequent correspondence between the Popes and the kings of Hungary shows that it has always been believed that such powers were conferred upon him. But the Sovereign Pontiffs have never allowed that they were intended to descend to his successors.

These favours were bestowed upon the Hungarian ruler in return for his having placed himself and his kingdom under the protection of the Holy See. This fact is known to us not from any doubtful source, but from a letter written within forty years after the death of Stephen by Gregory VII to Solomon (1063-1074), one of the holy king's successors. "As you can learn from the elders of your country", wrote the Pope, "the kingdom of Hungary belongs in an especial way to the Holy Roman Church, inasmuch as it was piously offered by King Stephen to Blessed Peter with all its rights and jurisdiction".

Now that, on what may be regarded as thoroughly reliable testimony, we have established the real relations between Sylvester and Hungary, we may give the famous bull which was once generally supposed to have been sent to King Stephen in the year 1ooo. At present the general feeling seems to be that the document was forged in the seventeenth century, though some distinguished authors, like Fabre, believe that Olleris has given satisfactory answers to the objections urged against it. It opens with the statement that it was by divine forewarning that Sylvester expected the arrival of ambassadors "from a nation unknown to us". "Wherefore, glorious son, all that you have asked of us and of the Apostolic See, the crown, the kingly title, the metropolitan see at Gran (the ancient Strigonium) and the other bishoprics, we gladly grant, and allow you by the will and authority of Almighty God, and by that of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, together with the apostolic and our blessing. The country, which, with yourself and the present and future people of Hungary, you have munificently offered to St. Peter, we place under the protection of the Holy Roman Church, and return to your wisdom and to your heirs and lawful successors to have and to hold, to rule and to govern. And these thy heirs, after they have been legitimately elected by the magnates, shall be bound to testify to us and to our successors, either personally or by their ambassadors, due obedience and respect; to show themselves subjects of the Roman Church; .... and to persevere in and to promote the Catholic faith and the religion of Our Saviour. And as your nobility did not disdain to preach the faith of Christ, to supply our place, and particularly to honour the Prince of the Apostles, we grant you and your successors the right to have the cross, the sign of apostleship, carried before you and

them, and, in our stead, to direct and order the churches of the kingdom of Hungary ... We pray Almighty God, who directed us to give to you the crown we had prepared for the duke of the Poles, to preserve the kingdom for you, and you for the kingdom". The meaning of the expression "the crown we had prepared for the duke of the Poles" is made plain by what is to be read in a late Hungarian chronicle. Miesko, the chief of the Poles, is said to have sent an envoy to the Pope for a crown just before St. Stephen dispatched his embassy on the same errand. The Pope received the request of Miesko favourably, and ordered a splendid crown to be made. But he was told in a dream that wicked rulers would for a time succeed Miesko, and that he must give the crown to the ambassadors of "an unknown people, the Hungarians", who would arrive on the morrow. Accordingly, the Pope gave the crown to St. Stephen, and impressed upon the envoys of the two dukes that the most profound peace must ever be maintained between their respective peoples as long as they persevered in their love for the church, and in the pure Christian faith.

Resting on the facts that this letter of Pope Sylvester was never heard of till the seventeenth century; that the original whence it was said to have been copied has never been forthcoming; that by Sylvester, the friend of the three generations of Othos, the Hungarians are spoken of as "a nation unknown to him", etc., historical criticism has, it would seem, demonstrated the forgery of the bull; but close examination does not appear to have proved that "the holy crown" of Hungary has no connection with Pope Sylvester. In 1880 a committee was appointed by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences to inspect the regalia. Careful investigation revealed the fact that there was a Greek or Byzantine portion of the crown, and a Latin or Western portion. The crown proper was of Byzantine workmanship, and was adorned with the images, in enamel, of various Greek saints, as well as of Michael VII, Ducas, and the Hungarian King Geyza I (1074-1077). But "the upper and more ancient part is the crown sent by Pope Sylvester. (It) is formed by two intersecting hoops, and connected at the four lower ends by a border. On its top is a small globe capped by a cross, which is now in an inclined position, and beneath it is seen a picture of the Saviour in sitting posture, surrounded by the sun, the moon, and two trees. The entire surface of the two hoops is adorned with the figures of the twelve apostles, each having an appropriate Latin inscription; but four of these figures are covered by the lower crown". When and how Sylvester's crown was mutilated, and when it was joined to Ducas's gift, is quite unknown. Still, as the upper crown is acknowledged on all hands to be of Western design, it seems only rational to suppose that it represents what time has spared to us of the crown sent by Pope Sylvester II.

At any rate, on August 15, 1000, Stephen was crowned at Gran, and for well-nigh forty years afterwards laboured for the good of his people. To civilize and Christianize them the quicker, he did all that lay in his power to promote intercourse between the rest of the world and his own subjects. He induced foreigners, especially monks and nuns, to come and settle in Hungary; and did his best to promote travelling among his people by encouraging pilgrimages to Jerusalem, Rome, and other places. And as our King Ina is said to have done for the Anglo-Saxons, he caused a church to be built in Rome for the use of the Hungarians. This church came to be known in later times as St. Stephen *in Piscina*. It was situated in the region Parione (that of the Piazza Navona), and was near the palace of Chromatius, "where the Jews make praise". The holy king is also said to have established a residential centre for his people on the Coelian hill. It was restored in the fifteenth century, and an inscription has left it on record that the work was accomplished by Philip de Hodrog by means of donations received from pilgrims.

Stephen, who is said to have had a great devotion to Our Lady, was crowned and died (1038) on the day of her Assumption (August 15), and “in Hungary his chief festival is kept on the 20th of August, the day of the translation of his relics”. The sovereign who had been mainly instrumental in transferring to the true God the worship which his people had paid to Isten (the father of the gods), the fear they had felt for Ordog (the god of evil), and the respect they had lavished on golden-haired fairies, was in due course canonized by the Church of Rome. And to this day, with the best of reasons, is King Stephen, the founder of their civil and religious liberties, devoutly honoured by the great and free nation of the Hungarians. The broad-minded policy which Sylvester adopted in dealing with this wild and high-spirited but religious people secured not only faithful subjects for the Church and for Rome throughout all time, but a glorious bulwark against the Turk in the later Middle Ages, and a trusty ally for Christendom in this very century of the Crusaders, whom, as some have thought, Sylvester was the first to call to arms. If this last idea is drawn from an exaggerated view of the scope of one of Gerbert's letters, it would seem at least fair to say that he had a share in calling the attention of Europe to the state of affairs in the East, and so in preparing men's minds to correspond to the direct appeal to arms made them by Pope Urban II.

Among the letters assigned to Gerbert is the following : “The Church of Jerusalem to the Universal Church which rules the sceptres of kings. When I reflect on your prosperity, Immaculate Spouse of Christ, of whom I proclaim myself a member, I conceive a solid hope of raising, by your means, my head well-nigh quite crushed ... If you acknowledge me as yours, is there one among you who can think that the terrible calamity which has overwhelmed me does not concern him? Though now down-trodden, I am still regarded as the noblest portion of the world. Here were the oracles of the prophets heard, here lived the Redeemer of the world ... But as a prophet had declared that ‘his sepulchre shall be glorious''(Isaias XI. 10), the devil tries to render it ignoble by the infidels who are destroying the holy places. Arouse thyself, then, soldier of Christ, take His standard and fight for Him, and what you cannot effect by force of arms, bring about by your counsels and by your money ... By me God will bless you, so that you may become rich by giving”. Should we see no more in “the terrible calamity” and in “the destroying pagans” than the statement of the well-known fact of the possession of Jerusalem by the Saracens, and (with Havet) assign the letter, not to the pontificate of Gerbert, but to a year as early as 984, there would seem no reason for doubting its authenticity or classing it among the *dictamina*. The letter was apparently only an appeal for alms for the holy places such as we have already seen sanctioned by the Popes, and such as are sent out by them today. But at the same time it is patent that its warlike tone cannot have failed to have made many who heard it feel that the Lord's sepulchre might be helped by steel as well as by gold.

Meanwhile, by pursuing what was practically a policy of non-intervention in the affairs of neighbouring powers, Otho soon had Germany tranquil enough to enable him to return to Italy (June 1000). Difficulties in the Roman Duchy caused him to march south. He had received a letter from the Pope from which he learnt that the Count of the Sabina was refractory. Sylvester had visited Horta, and had received the customary dues from a certain number of the inhabitants. Irritated that an appeal had been carried to the Pope instead of to himself, the Count of the Sabina put himself at the head of those who had not made the required payments, and who were consequently malcontents, and initiated an armed disturbance whilst the Pope was saying Mass. Sylvester had to quit the town amid the din of arms; and wrote to Otho : “If not for our sake, at least for your

own interest, see to it that by your and our agent our rights in the Sabina may be restored to us, and our present poverty thus relieved by a proper income".

In response to this, Otho came to Rome (October 1000) with some of the chief men of the empire among others, with Henry, Duke of Bavaria, soon to be the emperor Henry I, "the chief glory of the empire ... in whom God had poured all the treasures of human and divine wisdom". Needless to say, he was received by the Pope with every mark of distinction. But not even the presence of Otho himself was capable of repressing the spirit of lawlessness in the Roman Duchy.

For some reason or other, the people of Tivoli killed a certain Duke Mazzolinus, who, we are told, was a most illustrious youth and a friend of the emperor. In company with the Pope, St. Bernward, and, as it would seem, St. Romuald also, Otho at once marched against the town and laid siege to it. Such a vigorous resistance was offered that several of his nobles wished to retire. Letting him know how it would grieve him to have to retreat, Otho asked for the advice of Bernward. The bishop, who throughout his career always showed himself a saint of a very masculine type, advised a closer siege, and told the emperor that, though he was very anxious to return home, he would not leave him till he had seen the city and its people subject to his authority. Encouraged by these manly words, the siege was pressed with the utmost vigour, and the Tivolese were soon glad to accept the mediation of the Pope and Bernward. Acting on their advice, they offered unconditional surrender; and the principal inhabitants presented themselves before Otho a picture of the savageness of the times. Naked, save for a cloth round their loins, with their swords in their right hands and rods in their left, they bade Otho either strike the guilty with the sword or, if he would be merciful, scourge them in public. Through the intercession of the Pope and Bernward, Otho spared both the city and its inhabitants, and even the mother of the murdered Duke was induced, by the prayers of another saint St. Romuald to pardon her son's assassin.

Otho had not long returned to his palace on the Aventine, when, inflamed by a childish envy or hatred of Tivoli, of which we shall again see indications, and urged on by the ungrateful Gregory of Tusculum, who utilized their jealousy of their little neighbor for his own ends, the Romans broke out into rebellion. Some of the emperor's friends were slain, and Otho found himself cut off from communication with his troops outside Rome, and besieged in his palace. But, in the saintly Bernward, Otho had a tower of strength. He aroused the valour of the palace guard, heard their confessions, administered Holy Communion to them, and prepared to lead them out against the rebels, bearing in his hand the sacred lance. He did not, however, neglect the arts of diplomacy. The bishop's efforts in both directions were ably seconded by Duke Henry of Bavaria and Hugh of Tuscany from without the walls. The Romans cooled down as rapidly as they had flared up.

"Are you my Romans?" burst out the indignant young emperor to the citizens when they came to renew their oaths of allegiance. "For you have I left my country and my relatives. For love of you have I shed my own blood and that of my Saxons and of all the Germans. You have I led to remote parts of our empire where your fathers, even when they ruled the world, never set foot. This I did that I might spread your name and fame to the most distant regions .... In preferring you to all others, I have incurred the ill-will of all. And now in return you have cast off your father, and have cruelly slain my friends. You would shut me out from among you. This, however, you cannot do, as I will not banish from my affections those whom I have once cherished with a father's love". With these few simple words Otho found his way to the hearts of the Romans. They were prepared to do anything for their enthusiastic, their inspired young

sovereign. Benilo and another leader of the sedition were soon lying half dead at Otho's feet.

But the arch-traitor, Gregory of Tusculum, was not dead; he hatched fresh plots against his friend. Otho had many enemies in Rome, clerical and lay; and the Romans, whom in place of his Germans he had gathered round him, were false friends. The more he had favoured them the more hostile had they become. Familiarity had bred contempt. To these facts Henry of Bavaria and Hugh of Tuscany, at any rate, were not blind. They induced the emperor to leave the city. This, in company with the Pope, he did secretly and hurriedly (February 16, 1oo1), so that his departure was a veritable flight. And Rome, "the city once beloved by him above all, but henceforth to be more detested by him than all others", never saw him more. Broken-hearted at the failure of schemes which probably all but he and the Pope regarded as visionary, and burning for vengeance for what he regarded as the unworthy treatment he had received, Otho began to raise troops. His dependants were told to hasten to him with all speed, bringing with them all the soldiers they could, if they had any concern for either his honour or his safety.

For a few days after their expulsion from the city, the Pope and the emperor remained in its neighbourhood, waiting maybe to see if a reaction would take place in their favour. Then for the next twelve months, viz. till the time of his death, Otho (sometimes having Sylvester in his company) was to be found now in one part of Italy and now in another from Pavia and Ravenna in the north to Beneventum and Salernum in the south. At one time both emperor and Pope are at Ravenna, living with a saint (Romuald) for purposes of devotion, while the emperor contemplated, at least, becoming a monk under the holy man's direction. At another time we find both of them, each on his own account, engaged in besieging cities and in reducing rebellious nobles to obedience. Sylvester is encamped on the Emilian Way before Cesena; Otho is storming Beneventum. Then again we see Otho receiving back in safety from the Romans those of his suite whom they had seized when he had had to fly from the city, and listening distrustfully to their earnest requests for peace, and anon fiercely ravaging their territory. Now the two are granting privileges at each other's request, now celebrating a council together. At one moment the ardent youth is elated at the arrival of Archbishop Heribert of Cologne with a large number of troops, at another depressed by the knowledge that many of his dukes and counts, "with the connivance of the bishops", were conspiring against him. They were dissatisfied at his lengthy residence in Italy, and his consequent neglect of German affairs.

"The sin of this king", said his contemporary Bruno of Querfurt (*d.* 1009), a monk of the monastery of St. Alexius, near which Otho resided, "was that he would not look upon the land of his nativity, delectable Germany. So great was his love of inhabiting Italy, where savage destruction runs armed with a thousand languors and a thousand deaths. The land of Romulus, fed by the death of his dear ones, still pleases him better with her adulterous beauty".

Despite all difficulties, however, Otho had brought to subjection the Roman barons of the Campagna and the Lombard dukes of the south, and was making ready to seize and keep a firm hold of Rome when death overtook him. He breathed his last at his headquarters at Paterno at the foot of Soracte (January 23 or 24, 1002), when he was not quite twenty-two years old. He had promised St. Romuald he would become a monk "when he returned in triumph to Ravenna after he had subdued rebellious Rome"; but the saint had correctly assured him that if he went to Rome he would never again see Ravenna. He died amidst "general grief and was placed in Abraham's bosom", say the contemporary German authorities : he died and "was buried in hell", says the Italian

Bonizo, after the violences of Henry IV had soured the minds of the people of Italy against the German emperors.

Touching and dramatic to the last degree is the story of the carrying back to Germany of the embalmed body of the romantic young emperor, the wonder of the world (*stupor mundi*), as he was called. For some little time his faithful followers contrived to keep the news of his death secret. But intelligence of such importance could not long be kept hidden. It leaked out, and gave courage to the Romans. They overtook the funeral cortege and "with unseemly daring commenced an attack which deserved the execration of all succeeding ages". But the devoted Germans closed round the bier of their departed sovereign, whose early death had welded the hearts of all into one common love. Their gallantry was, as usual, more than a match for that of the Romans, and with their swords they steadily opened out their way to the North, leaving to the tender mercies of their foes those whom want of horses compelled to be left behind. The Alps were crossed at last, and the body, the possession of which had been so fiercely contested, was finally laid to rest in the church at Aix-la-Chapelle near the tomb of the greatest of Otho's predecessors, the emperor Charlemagne.

The power of Otho, young as he was, and vain dreamer as he may have been, may be best gauged by the turmoil of war which ensued in Italy immediately after his death. Twenty-four days only after Otho's death, "the Lombards, realizing that they had found their opportunity, assembled at Pavia, and elected as king Ardoin (marquis of Ivrea), a man brave in arms but wanting in the council chamber"; and, under the ban both of the Church and of the State, he was crowned on Sunday, February 15, 1002, in the basilica of St. Michael, and was the last medieval monarch of Italy. He reigned but for a little over two years, though he preserved his independence and the title of king till, in broken health, he voluntarily retired into a monastery (1014) to die.

In Rome the informal government which had been set up on the expulsion of Otho and the Pope was terminated "by the nomination of John, the son of Crescentius, as patricius", a man whom Thietmar describes as "of the earth earthy", and as distinguished by a more than hereditary avarice. The German power in Rome and Lombardy vanished as suddenly as had occourred the death of Otho himself.

The fact that Otho had not left any children naturally caused trouble in Germany. But at length, out of three rivals, the son of Henry the Quarrelsome became King Henry II of Germany by the election of the nobles of Saxony, Franconia, Bavaria, and Swabia (June 1002). Henry was a cousin of Otho, and was "a most Christian man, and a man of high moral character". He is known to history as Henry the Saint.

In the difficulties of Otho and Sylvester with the Romans, the important part played by St. Bernward, bishop of Hildesheim, may perhaps be remembered. He had come to Rome with troubles of his own. On the borders of his diocese and that of his metropolitan, Willigis of Mayence, stood the famous convent of Gandersheim, the early history of which has been described for us in verse by the most illustrious of its children, the nun Hroswitha. Laxity had crept into it, and one of the chief offenders was Sophia, who was the sister of the emperor. When Bernward, who was as energetic as he was learned and good, attempted a reformation of the convent, he encountered a determined opponent in Sophia. Owing to the illness of the superioress, she assumed the management of affairs, and took the lead against the bishop. Effectually to checkmate him, she persuaded Willigis, who was perhaps nothing loth to believe it, that jurisdiction over the convent belonged to him and not to Bernward. Matters came to a head when the question arose as to who was to consecrate the convent church. The archbishop determined to take the affair out of the hands of his suffragan, who promptly appealed in person to Rome. From both the emperor and the Pope, whose united action

in this matter is typical of their mutual concord, he received a most cordial reception (January 5, 1001). In throwing himself upon Otho, Bernward was quite aware he was throwing himself upon a friend, for he had been the emperor's master. When it was known that Willigis had held a synod on this dispute at Gandersheim itself, though he knew that Bernward had appealed to Rome, the Pope and the emperor were both much annoyed.

A council was at once called to examine into the affair (January 13, 1001). In the church of St. Sebastian *alia Pallara*, on the Palatine, a small edifice which still stands there, met together, under the presidency of the Pope and the emperor, twenty bishops, of whom three were German and the rest Italian. After the reading of extracts from the Gospels and of certain canons, Bernward explained his case. Then "the most wise Pope" asked if that was to be accounted a synod which the archbishop had held in a church that had always been under the sway of the bishops of Hildesheim, and at a time when its bishop was absent, and had appealed to Rome. The bishops retired to consult. On their return to the council-chamber, they declared that the so-called synod was rather a "schism which was likely to cause grievous trouble". It was accordingly decided to declare null what Willigis had done, and to hold a synod of the Saxon bishops at Pohlde (near Herzberg, in Prussia) on June 21, under the presidency of Frederick, cardinal-priest of the Holy Roman Church, himself "a Saxon by birth and, though young in years, old in virtue". He was to be attired like the Pope to show how closely he was to represent him.

The council was duly held at Pohlde (June), but led to nothing but insult to the legate and to a display of violence on the part of the archbishop, who refused to remain or to appear before the synod. Thereupon the legate passed sentence on Willigis to this effect : "Because you have withdrawn from the synod, and have shown yourself disobedient to the commands of the Roman Pontiff, I declare you suspended from your priestly office until such times as you shall have appeared before Pope Sylvester, the vicar of SS. Peter and Paul". When Frederick returned to Italy he found that the emperor and the Pope were no longer in Rome. But as soon as the action of Willigis was communicated to them, in high dudgeon they ordered "all the bishops" to come to them at Christmas, and took the opportunity to remind them to come with their armed retainers. However, when Christmas arrived, and the synod was opened at Todi, so few of the German bishops were present that practically nothing could be done. The death of Otho still further protracted the settlement of the affair, which dragged on into the reign of Henry II. With or without the consent of Bernward, Sophia became abbess of Gandersheim towards the close of this year. But at length, through the prudence of the king, "the hateful dissension" between the archbishop and his suffragan came to an end, and Bernward was allowed to consecrate the abbey church. It was not, however, till 1043 that the successors of Willigis finally renounced all claim to jurisdiction over Gandersheim.

What befell the Pope after the council of Todi, what he thought or what he did, we know not. Whether he accompanied Otho, and assisted him on his deathbed; how he bore the deathblow to his grand ideas for the government of the world caused by the demise of Otho and the election of a king in North Italy; how he was affected by the nomination of Crescentius as "Patricius"; how he regained the city we cannot say. However, as Crescentius held the title of Patricius for ten years (1002-12), and, through his sons and brother-in-law, was all-powerful in the Sabina, it is not improbable that Sylvester had no great amount of political power in the city.

At any rate, it is certain that he was back in Rome before the end of the year 1002; for on December 3 of that year he held a council in the Lateran concerning the action of

Conon, bishop of Perugia. The scribe who has left us an account of it opens his notice by the wise remark that it is most advantageous to commit to writing cases which have been settled by a court of law, lest time should cause them to be forgotten, and the old difficulties should recur. The abbot of the monastery of St. Peter's near Perugia maintained against Conon that he was directly dependent on the Pope. During the course of the dispute the abbey was broken into by an armed band, the abbot himself dragged away from the very altar, and his goods given up to plunder. This violence was laid to the charge of the bishop. Conon, however, whilst stoutly denying that he was in any way privy to the ill-treatment the abbot had received, maintained that the abbey depended upon him, and not upon the Pope, "the father of all bishops", as he called him. And when *privileges* of Popes John XV and Gregory V were produced to prove him in the wrong, he maintained that they had been granted without the consent of his predecessor. It was shown, however, that it was this very man who had himself asked for the privilege. Thus reduced to silence, Conon acknowledged the Pope's rights, and gave the abbot the kiss of peace. "After this, the most reverend Pope, with the Roman judges, decided that, if any bishop of Perugia should renew this question, he should pay ten pounds of most pure gold to the Lateran palace". On this affair Muratori makes the following comment: "Thus did the bishops of those times consent to the diminution of their authority, but from this case it appears that their consent was asked. In process of time, however, it was deemed at Rome superfluous to ask for it; and these monastic privileges were granted according to the pleasure of the Roman pontiffs". It should, however, be noted that even in the privileges granted long before this, there is nothing to show that the consent of the diocesan was ever asked.

It was only natural that the mind of Sylvester should often turn to the land of his birth, and that it should retain a deep interest in those with or against whom he had there fought the battle of life. That it actually did so, we can glean evidence enough from the few fragments of his doings whilst Pope which the storms of a thousand years have suffered to be cast up on the shores of our times. Whether he had come there of his own accord, trusting to Sylvester's nobility of character, or because he was summoned thither, Arnulf, Gerbert's rival for the see of Rheims, was in Rome in the month of December 999. A sincere reconciliation took place between the quondam opponents; and, to give tangible expression to it, the Pope issued a bull, drawn up with all his consummate tact, in which Arnulf is recognized as archbishop of Rheims.

"Sylvester, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his beloved son in Christ, Arnulf, archbishop of the holy church of Rheims. It is part of the Apostolic dignity not only to give counsel to sinners, but to raise those who have fallen ... Wherefore we have thought it right to come to your assistance, Arnulf, archbishop of Rheims, who for some excesses have been deprived of your episcopal dignity. And as, moreover, your abdication has never been approved at Rome, you may be assured that it can be swept away by the power of Rome's clemency. For Peter has a supreme authority which no mortal dignity can touch. With the restoration of crozier and ring, we concede to you by these presents the right to perform your archiepiscopal functions, and to enjoy all the privileges which belong to the holy metropolitan church of Rheims, the pall, the privilege of consecrating the kings of the Franks and your suffragans, and all the power possessed by your predecessors. Moreover, we forbid anyone to upbraid you with the past. May our authority everywhere shield you even against the reproaches of conscience".

The bull concludes by restoring to Arnulf all his spiritual and temporal rights, and by prohibiting any person whatsoever from contravening its sentence. With Arnulf, who survived him some twenty years, Sylvester not only maintained an official

correspondence, but, as the following letter of his will show, manifested a great interest in his welfare.

In maintaining the turmoil in which France was kept by the decay of the Carolingian dynasty, one of the most active spirits was Adalberon or Ascelin, bishop of Laon. A pupil of Gerbert, and "once his dear and sweet friend", he was ever deep in political intrigue. Even if we pass over as unproven the charges of immorality which were levelled against him, he was certainly "a hard master", who oppressed his people with excessive taxation. Whether in exile or in the court of kings, he was always plotting. He betrayed the Carolingians, attempted to place France at the feet of Otho III, and formed a scheme for seizing Arnulf of Rheims whom he had once befriended. This outrageous conduct was brought before the notice of the Pope, and drew from him a letter of well-merited severity. It commenced with the remark that Ascelin need not be surprised if it did not open with the grant of the apostolic blessing, seeing that with the name of a bishop his perfidy had reduced him to the level of the brute creation.

"A letter of King Robert and his bishops has been placed in our hands and in those of the emperor, which accuses you before all the clergy and people of these public crimes. Too conscience-stricken to come before a synod, you obtained by renewed perjuries the king's pardon, and promised to surrender the towers of Laon. Like Judas you have endeavored to seize your master, the archbishop of Rheims, by taking him with you to receive the surrender of your fortifications. But the imprisonment of others laid bare the snare you had contrived for him. Now, as you have taken no notice of our warning letters, we summon you to come without fail to Rome, that you may there in the coming Easter-week be examined by a council".

Whether or not in consequence of this action of the Pope, Ascelin again became on friendly terms with King Hugh, and held his see till his death (1030).

Not to weary the reader with a list of the episcopal causes which came before Sylvester, we will turn to another subject, viz. feudalism. In the latter half of the tenth century we have proof that feudalism, the tenure of land on the condition of military service, which the invasions of Norseman, Hungarian, and Saracen had forced upon the rest of Europe, was making its way into the Roman territory. And in 999 we find Pope Sylvester making to Count Darferius, his sons, and grandsons, a grant of the city and county of Terracina as a benefice in return especially for military service promised. He says that he has changed the mode of dealing with the pontifical lands, because, by the system of leases, his predecessors had lost large possessions belonging to the Church. However, that the lands granted may not become the absolute property of those to whom they have been enfeoffed, three golden solidi must be paid for them to the *actionarii* of the Roman Church each January. If, however, under the system of emphyteusis, many of the possessions of the Roman Church became the property of private persons, many more did so under the feudal system, however modified by Pope or bishop. And if the granting of land "on the condition of making war and peace, according to the will of the Pope", had the effect of bringing into existence a body of fighting men prepared to resist the attacks of pagan and infidel, it also caused to spring up on every eminence the baronial castle, wherein oft dwelt the most savage oppressors the simple people had ever had to meet.

The man who had renewed many of the studies of the ancient philosophers, and who was a second Boethius was not the one to forget his books under any circumstances. This some of his former friends realized, and did not fail to put their scientific difficulties to him as of old. The scholastic Adalbold, while writing to offer "the Lord Sylvester, supreme pontiff and philosopher", his good wishes for his temporal and eternal welfare, and while apologizing for venturing to bring private literary

difficulties before one so engaged with public affairs, still ventures to propound for the philosophic Pope's solution various scholastic questions.

"For I have every confidence that your genius is quite competent to do all that the state requires of it, and to satisfy me with regard to what I ask. I know I act rashly, and I am quite alive to the wrong I am doing when, though a mere youth, I venture to approach so great a man as if he were but a fellow-student. But the confession of a fault I will not say merely seeks for pardon, it exacts it".

A request put in so neat a style could not fail to bring a favourable answer. Replies to the geometrical questions he had put were forwarded "to my Adalbold, ever loved, and ever to be loved".

To Constantine, with whom, both as scholastic at Fleury and as abbot of St. Mesmin (Loviet), he had had a considerable amount of correspondence, he sent an explanation of the globe to help him to study the heavenly bodies; and to his old master Raymond, abbot of Aurillac, he sent a number of books. Of his own books, some, perhaps the greater number, he took with him when he left Gaul. Others, however, he left behind him, as we learn from his reply to an abbot who had written to acknowledge that he had secured his elevation by simony.

"On the point about which you have consulted me, I have put off replying to you because I cannot come across any authority in the books I have by me here in Rome. I remember that the books which treat specially of the matter were left behind in Gaul".

However, to show how severe were the penances inflicted even in the beginning of the eleventh century, it may be noted that the Pope went on to say that he remembered enough to decide that the abbot was to be suspended from his office for two years, to fast for two days a week, not to take wine or any cooked food, and not to eat at all till he had recited the entire Psalter.

And so, supplementing the little documentary evidence touching this period of his life which has reached us with Pope. what his earlier letters let us know of his ideas and conduct, we may assert with confidence that, whilst snatching a few happy moments for his books, Sylvester passed the too brief period of his pontificate in advancing the interests of the Church all over the world. Everywhere did he oppose the slightest tendency to heresy or schism, following in this the footsteps of "the holy fathers, who resisted heresy, and, wherever they heard that anything amiss was in progress, thought that they themselves were personally concerned. For the Church Catholic is one, though spread over the whole earth". He was prepared to resist schism with his very life if need should arise. Nor would he tolerate breaches of ecclesiastical discipline. "Although the whole Church Catholic is one and the same, still bounds are marked out for each bishop to show in what direction he may extend his power, and where it must be limited". This, in a very practical way, he taught to Gisiler of Magdeburgh, who had interfered with the limits of the diocese of our historian, Thietmar of Merseburg.

The liberality and munificence which distinguished Gerbert, archbishop of Rheims, would naturally be resplendent in the supreme pontiff Sylvester II. At any rate, when Pope, he was bountiful towards the poor. Among his other virtues his generosity towards them is specially picked out and noted by the contemporary monk Helgaud in his life of Robert the Pious. When Gerbert became Pope the hearts of all his friends must have beat high with hope. They not only knew his opinion about friendship, viz. that it could well-nigh effect the impossible, but they had had experience that both by word and deed he was ever true to his friends. Unfortunately we have no means of knowing whether the hopes his friends had placed in him were realized, or whether, as Gerbert himself had done, they found they had rested their faith on that proverbially treacherous bog, the word of princes.

Endeavoring, but not always successfully, to find in philosophy some relief in the midst of his troubles, death overtook him, and for ever calmed the feverish activity of his restless mind (May 12, 1003). Similar fables are related about the death of Sylvester as about that of his friend Otho. The same widow of Crescentius who is said to have poisoned the emperor is related by authors equally non-contemporaneous to have hastened the death of the Pope by the same means.

He was buried under the portico (to the right) of St. John Lateran. His third successor, Sergius IV, had the following inscription engraved upon a slab of white marble. The hexameter and the pentameter, separated by a sign shaped like a lance head, are in the same long line. The characters are well made, which is more than can be said of some of the verses themselves, as some of them cannot be translated as they stand.

John the Deacon, whose twelfth century description of the Lateran basilica we have often cited, after mentioning the tomb of Sylvester, adds that "even in the driest weather, and though it is not in a damp place, drops of water flow from it to the astonishment of everyone". This, however, was not the only interesting and curious fact in connection with the tomb of Sylvester II which eye-witnesses have recorded for us. Another historian (Rasponi) of the Lateran basilica, who wrote some five centuries after John, relates that, in the course of certain alterations to the church which took place in 1648, "the corpse of Sylvester II was found in a marble sarcophagus, twelve feet below the surface. The body was entire and clad in pontifical robes, the arms were crossed, and the head was covered with the sacred tiara. But as soon as the air came thoroughly in contact with it, it fell to dust and a fragrant odour filled the air, likely enough from the aromatic spices with which it had been embalmed. Nothing remained intact but a silver cross and the pontifical (signet) ring". What became of the ashes of the great Pope is not known, but his epitaph may still be seen in St. John Lateran's let into one of the pillars of the first aisle on the right.

Before we take a last look at the epitaph of Sylvester, round which clings so much that is naturally inexplicable and yet completely true, and before we say a last word about Gerbert, so remarkable for his learning and for his rapid rise in the world, we may well cast a glance at the legendary Sylvester. His brilliant career, the darkness of the times on which the light of his knowledge was shed, the inky-black night that succeeded him, made his advent as striking in the eyes of men as that of a bright meteor on a darksome night. As in everything else that was wonderful, the Middle Ages looked for the supernatural in a life so uncommon. They were prepared to find it in any circumstance at all curious.

Gerbert had studied in Spain—according to Ademar, among the Saracens at Cordova. How, except by magical arts which he must have learnt there, could he have invented such curious machines? His name was soon connected with the stories of magic which were the common property of different peoples, and which at different times have been fastened on to different individuals. One legend attached to him soon bred another. One of them at length got into print. At the very end of the eleventh century cardinal Beno, by some said to be a German who had deserted Gregory VII and had gone over to the emperor, wrote a violent diatribe against his master. Provided he could discredit him he was prepared to assert any absurdity. He himself was a magician, he declared, and had learnt the art of magic from Gerbert among others. As Sylvester II, Gerbert, who, "by the divine permission had ascended from hell", deceived many by the answers he received from devils. But, "deceived in turn by similar replies, he was, by the just judgment of God, cut off by an unprovided death. 'You shall not die', his demon assured him, 'till you have celebrated Mass in Jerusalem'. Forgetful that the

Church of St. Croce was known as in Gerusalemme, he said Mass in it. Immediately after he died a most horrible death, ordering with his last breath his hands and tongue, with which by sacrificing to demons he had dishonoured God, to be cut to pieces". When once such a story had secured a written foundation, its future was secured. Still, the legend developed but slowly ; and it was not till the middle of the twelfth century that it attained its full form, and that at the hands of an English writer, William of Malmesbury.

Then the curious natural phenomenon in connection with the tomb of Sylvester, mentioned by John the Deacon, brought another class of legends into being. And once again an English author gives them their fullest development. William Godell, a monk of St. Martial of Limoges, but one of our countrymen, who is said by some to have written (*c.* 1273) a chronicle of Pontigny, writes: "It is said that his tomb foretells the death of a Pope. Shortly before his demise it distils so much water as to turn into mud the soil near it; but when it is only a cardinal or high dignitary of the Church that is about to die, the tomb presents the appearance of having been watered". About the same time that "most worthless compiler" (as his latest editor-rightly calls him), Martinus of Oppavia, added a fresh detail to the premonitory warning noted by Godell. Following Vincent of Beauvais, he says that the death of a Pope was foretold not only by the sweating of the tomb, but by a rattling of the bones within it, "as the very epitaph of the tomb sets forth". It is not clear whether this idea about "the rattling of the bones" came from an original misinterpretation of the opening lines of the certainly obscure epitaph of Gerbert, or whether the lines were interpreted so as to harmonize with an existing story. Whichever is the true view, the *venturo Domino* came to mean, not the great Judge before whom the Pope had to appear, but the coming Roman pontiff; and the *ad sonitum* was referred not to the Last Trumpet but to the noise made by the clashing of the bones of the Silvestri membra sepulti.

With Olleris the legend of Gerbert may be summed up in the words of an old poet: "Be not surprised that the indolent and ignorant crowd have taken me for a magician. Because I studied the wisdom of Archimedes and of philosophy at a time when to know nothing was a boast, fools thought me a sorcerer. But my tomb tells how pious, upright, and religious I was".

Considering the high literary reputation which Gerbert has always possessed, the little that he committed to writing is remarkable. With the exception of his letters, there is no reason to suppose that we have not got nearly everything of importance which he ever wrote. "And yet, even if we admit as his all that can with any probability be assigned to him, he has not bequeathed to us more literary material than would go to make up an ordinary octavo volume of some four or five hundred pages. Further, the probability that some of the documents printed as his are really from his pen is slight indeed. Olleris prints among Gerbert's works the pamphlet, ""On the Instruction of Bishops"; but he gives what seem to be conclusive reasons against its being really the work of Gerbert. It may be passed over as a production of a much earlier age than that of the Philosopher Pope. On the contrary, a treatise, "on the Body and Blood of our Lord", which has been assigned to others, seems most certainly to be the work of Gerbert as indeed it is said to be in a manuscript of the eleventh century.

From the words of the Fathers, from the symbolism of the frescoes in the catacombs, from such epitaphs as those of Abercius and Pectorius, and still more from various legends concerning the Blessed Sacrament which are told of Gregory the Great and others, it seems clear that the Church has always believed in the real presence of our Lord in the sacrament of the Eucharist. There has even been explicit belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation from a comparatively early period. At any rate, in the first

controversy which was raised regarding the Sacrament of the Altar, there was no question of "the real presence". The discussion which was provoked by a work of Paschasius Radbert (831) turned solely on the mode or manner of our Lord's presence in the Eucharist. A monk, and then abbot of Corbey (*d.* 895), he wrote his treatise, "On the Body and Blood of the Lord", especially, as he tells us himself, for the purpose of impressing the doctrine of the real presence upon the youths who were studying in the recently founded monastery of New Corbey (or Corvey) in Saxony. Owing to the secrecy (springing from what was known as the *disciplina arcani*) which Christians preserved about many of their doctrines for several centuries, and to other causes, Paschasius was the first to treat at length and in a scientific manner of the mystery of the Eucharist, and especially of the manner of our Lord's presence therein. And in unfolding the Church's teaching on the subject, in bringing out the identity of the body of Christ in the Eucharist with that which was born of the Virgin Mary and rose again from the dead, he not unnaturally used terms which were capable of improvement, and which discussion has in fact rendered much more precise.

Paschasius was not indeed the first in his century to write about the doctrine of transubstantiation and the real presence. Haymo, bishop of Halberstadt (*d.* 853), from Alcuin's school at Tours, and Amalarius of Metz (*d.* 837) had both expounded the mystery of the Holy Eucharist. But the latter treated his subject in such a childishly mystical manner as to attract no further attention than the condemnation of a local council; and the former, to judge by the fragment which has reached us, confined himself to unfolding the doctrine of the church in terms already more or less familiar. For that reason, no doubt, his work made no sensation. But the deductions of Paschasius went further than those of his predecessors. His conclusions, or the terms in which they were couched, were instantly attacked. Rabanus Maurus and others of Alcuin's very conservative school of Tours took the field against him. The most vigorous of his opponents, however, was Ratram (or Bertram, *d.* 866), a monk of his own monastery in Picardy. He has left us a most obscure treatise on the subject — a treatise in which there are some Catholic propositions, and many, seemingly at least, heretical ones. Hence, whilst some have maintained that Ratram taught the doctrine of transubstantiation, others have held that he only acknowledged such a presence of our Lord in the Eucharist as was dependent on the faith of the recipient. When Gerbert wrote on the question, the propositions of Radbert were "in possession".

"Though", he began, "the thought of my own want of spirituality made me shrink from writing on spiritual matters, the words of the Psalmist, 'Open thy mouth wide and I will fill it' (LXXX. 2), encouraged me to speak on a subject about which it is not right to keep silence, *viz.* on the mystery of the Body and Blood of the Lord. For there are some who say that what we receive at the altar is the same body which was born of the Virgin, while others maintain that it is something different. And there are others again who blasphemously teach that it is subject to the laws of digestion".

In ten short chapters he endeavors to show that Paschasius and his opponents, Ratram, Rabanus Maurus and the others, were fundamentally in harmony. For this purpose he adduces several passages from the writings of St. Ambrose, Pope Leo I, and other Fathers. From these he shows that the "Body of the Lord" can be taken in different senses, and adds that it would help to clear away difficulties if it were remembered that the Eucharist may be called "a figure if we merely consider the outward appearances of bread and wine, but actual verity when the Body and Blood of Christ are in very deed believed to be beneath (the appearances)". For, as a certain wise modern has said, "Just as in Christ Himself we believe that all is true, His Divinity, His humanity; that He is the Word and yet true flesh, true God, and true Man; so in the mystery of His Body and

Blood let us understand there is nothing false or frivolous in that which by the power of the heavenly blessing and of the Divine Word is consecrated into what it was not (before)".

"And so", he continues, "we read in the Lives of the Fathers that some among them, not by syllogisms, but by simple words and prayer, compelled one whose faith in this mystery was vacillating to believe that what we receive at the altar is the natural body of the Lord, because (it is present) in reality and not in figure".

Then, after a mathematical example, he brings out well the meaning of St. Augustine's triple body of our Lord : "When our Lord was reclining at the Last Supper with that complete body which He had of the Virgin, and which was to be slain, and then to be seated at the right hand of the Father, with His own hands He gave in communion His body (which we now receive at the altar and which was connatural with and conformed to His true body) to His disciples, *i.e.* to His body, *viz*, to the Church which we are".

In fine, after presenting his teaching in tabular form, after pointing out that Christ, in the sacrifice of the altar, is at once priest and victim, and after observing that he had offered sufficient apologies for the work of Paschasius, he concludes "with a strong syllogism" against those who drew outrageous conclusions from the fact that the Body of Christ in Holy Communion benefits the body as well as the soul.

Gerbert's teaching on the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, whether written or oral, bore fruit. The orthodox doctrine was handed on in the famous school of Chartres, through Gerbert's pupil, its great master Fulbert, who died bishop of Chartres in 1028.

Whilst he was *scholasticus* at Rheims, Gerbert composed various mathematical treatises. Among them was one upon geometry. A *Geometria* Gerberti is printed by Olleris, but he doubts whether the work is really his. However, the general feeling seems to be that, though we have not the book as it left his hands, those MSS. on the subject which bear his name are fundamentally his work. To show the calibre of the work it will suffice to note that in it are found problems solved which, for the period, must have presented great difficulty — problems which involve an equation of the second degree.

To the same period must be assigned the *Regula de Abaco computi*, and the *Libellus de numerorum divisione*. The latter was an abridgment of the former. His *Libellus de rationali et ratione uti* ("On the Reasonable and on the Use of Reason"), on the contrary, was written whilst he was in the service of Otho III, and during the winter of 997-998. This tract discusses the relation of the act of reasoning to the power of reasoning, and hence generally the relation of power to act.

It must be confessed that it is quite impossible to say that any of these works are now either interesting or useful in themselves. Similar language must be used of such verses as have been ascribed to Gerbert. Those only of his works are at once interesting and useful at the present day which have here been used as sources, viz. his accounts of synods and his letters. The latter, as the reader will no doubt have already noticed for himself, are as worthy of our attention from the style of their Latinity as from their contents. If not as perfect in classical form as those of the greater Renaissance writers, they are much fresher; and if we miss in them the rounded periods of Cicero, we find the terseness and vigour of Sallust. Written to all the great men of his age, they are of inestimable value, not so much for the historical facts with which they supply us, as for the detailed picture of his times which they offer for our scrutiny. Through them we have living portraits of the men with whom he came in contact, and not the barest of

outlines of them. They are by far the most important documents of the age of which we are treating.

What a likeness, too, of the man who wrote them do they not give us! In them we see his energy, his zeal for discipline and for advancement in every direction, his impatience of the obstacles he encountered in the course he had elected to follow, his strong passions, and his fidelity and attachment as well to causes as to his friends. They let us know that, if he aimed at raising all and everything higher, himself included, it was for the grand end of universal betterment. They show us how, fully reliant upon his own knowledge and judgment, he was self-opinionated, irritable under restraint, and at times but little disposed to follow the wise rules he had laid down for the guidance both of others and of himself. They let us see what a grasp he had of theory and practice both in the domain of learning and in that of politics; what was his breadth of knowledge both of men and things; and how keen was his sense of the fact that, though we are all in the hands of God, we are yet our brothers' keepers.

The pen instinctively lingers round the name of Gerbert, and dreads to think what it has to record when it leaves him. Reluctantly we turn away our eyes from the bright spot in the heavens which the sun leaves after it has set, the more so if we have at once to plunge into a darksome wood. But the bright spot grows dimmer as we gaze, and, disagreeable though it may be, our onward journey must be resumed, however the gloom may gather. This only have we to console us as we grope our way through the darkness : if the sun has set, it has done its work. The world is for ever the better for the rays it has poured upon it, and the men of another day will garner the fruit it has ripened. And so the teachers and the schools that Gerbert had revivified imparted to other generations the fruits of his energizing mind. Incalculable was the debt which the Renaissance of the eleventh century owed to the gift of thirty years' unremitting intellectual toil which, as scholastic of Rheims, abbot of Bobbio, archbishop of Rheims and Ravenna, and Pope of Rome, Gerbert of Auvergne had bequeathed to it.

JOHN XVII.
1003

Of the reign of John Sicco, a Roman and the son of another John, practically nothing is known. Till quite recently the date of its beginning and end was a matter of conjecture. But a discovery of M. Pourpardin may be said to have cleared up the doubts on these points. In an existing necrology of the Church of St. Cyriacus in Via Lata, transcribed in the twelfth century from an earlier document, there are a number of obituary notices of both clerics and laymen "who played an important part in the history of Rome in the eleventh century, and even at the end of the tenth". Among the others there is the following:

"VIII. Id. Nov. (Nov. 6), obiit domnus Johannes papa ».

M. Pourpardin has no difficulty in showing that, as this notice could not apply to either John XVIII or XIX in the eleventh century, nor to any of the *Johns* in the tenth century from John XII onwards, it must refer to John XVII. Hence, seeing that the catalogues give him a reign of five months and twenty-five days, he must have been consecrated in May; and, if the number of days has been given correctly, on the twelfth or thirteenth of the month. But the first of these dates was the day of the death of Pope Sylvester, and the second was a Thursday. Taking it, therefore, for granted that for twenty-five days (XXV), we should read twenty-two (XXII), we arrive at the conclusion that John Sicco was consecrated on Sunday, May 16, 1003. He is now generally called John XVII, and not John XVI, for the latter number is usually assigned to the antipope John Philagathus.

The only thing of any interest that we know of John XVI— and it will be seen that it is of importance rather for the history of the city of Rome than for that of John himself—is the fact that he was born in the region then known as *Biveretica.* From the ancient Turin itinerary, quoted by Duchesne, it appears that a monastery of St. Andrew de Biberatica was situated between the Basilica of the Apostles and the column of Trajan. Hence this newly named region must have included at least part of the old seventh region (*via Lata*). The reason why John's death is recorded in the necrology of a church in Via Lata is therefore obvious. The question of the names and regions of Rome from the tenth to the fourteenth century is involved in no little obscurity. The division of the city according to the old civil or ecclesiastical regions seems to have fallen out of use in the confusion of the former century. But at the close of the latter century thirteen regions appear in official documents with the same names as at present. It was not till 1586 that the Leonine city was added as a fourteenth region (*Borgo*). However, it seems that, after the revolution of 1143, the city was redivided, and again the names of thirteen regions may be collected from different documents. Moreover, though they bear other names in addition, the modern names are also to be seen in conjunction with the older titles. Thus in documents of the twelfth century the first region (now *Monti*, and from the close of the fourteenth century *Montiuni*) appears as *Montinni et Biberatice*. In the beginning of the sixteenth century this region included

part of the district in the neighbourhood of Trajan's Forum; and to this day the boundary of the Rione Monti passes between that Forum and the Basilica of the Apostles. It would seem, then, that for the greater part of a thousand years, the district about Trajan's column has borne the same name. At any rate, whatever is the truth relative to the regio Biveretica in the eleventh century, it is clear that the memories of Old Rome were then crumbling to pieces along with its glorious monuments. Not only is all knowledge of its great divisions fading away, but even the origin and use of its individual buildings. In the midst of the turmoil of this age (the eleventh) are being forged the wild legends concerning them which in the following century will be stereotyped by the *Graphia* and the *Mirabilia aureae urbis Romae*.

Though we know nothing of the actions of John XVII, not even of his election—unless perhaps that he was a mere nominee of Crescentius—a recently published document proves, at any rate, that he was still Pope in the month of September. In the cartulary of the monastery of SS. Cosmas and Damian in *Mica Aurea*, published by Fedele, there is a document by which the abbot of the monastery leased a homestead to John de Iannia in the first year of our lord John XVII, the supreme and universal bishop, the ninth day of September.

John died, as we have said, on November 6, and was buried in the Lateran basilica between two of the doors of the principal facade. According to John the Deacon, who furnishes us with this information, his epitaph began by stating that "here is the tomb of the supreme John, who is said to be Pope, for so was he called".

Though he reigned for so short a time, his relations did not forget that they had had a Pope in their family. Three of them, brothers—viz. John, bishop of Preneste, Peter, a deacon, and Andrew, secundicerius—had it proclaimed in their epitaph, which was erected in St. Prassede in 1040, that they were of the family of Pope Sicco.

JOHN XVIII.
1003-1009

Although John XVIII reigned for as many years as his predecessor reigned months, not very much more is known about him than about John XVII. John Phasanus (Cock) who seems to have become Pope on Christmas Day 1003, was a Roman, the son of Stephania and the priest Ursus. He belonged "to the region in the neighbourhood of the Metrovian Gate". If that gate really were in the locality usually assigned to it, he was born in the first region of Augustus, viz. the region of the Porta Capena in the south-east corner of the city. And, as the first ecclesiastical region apparently included both the twelfth and the first civil regions, he was born in the first region in either the ecclesiastical or civil signification of that term. He is also stated to have been the cardinal "of St. Peter's", *i.e.*, presumably St. Peter's *ad vincula*, which was one of the titular churches.

From his epitaph and from the little that is known of the doings of John XVIII, it is clear that, though, no doubt the nominee of the Patrician, he was learned and pious, and of an amiable and conciliatory disposition. And if, by the destroyer of the apostolic see, he was not permitted to take any part in the political events which were in progress—not allowed, for instance, to do anything to support Henry II in his campaign (1004) against Ardoin—he was yet able to effect a considerable amount of good; and that not only in the spiritual order but even in the industrial. He was evidently a man of commercial instincts. "By his apostolical benediction", certain salt works—no doubt salt-pits whence by evaporation salt was procured from sea-water—were newly constructed at a place in the district of Porto known as the "Cursed Pool". Where precisely that was does not seem to be known. Burn will not trouble to mention "the numerous lagunes and marshy spots upon the coast" in this region, "since they are generally dried up in the summer, and their situations and extent vary from time to time". However, the great salt lake near Ostia is never dry and in part of it "on the north side of the road from Rome to Ostia .... are numerous salt-pits. ... In the time of the Etruscan kingdom there were also other salt-pits on the right bank of the Tiber". Somewhere, then, in this salt-bearing district near Porto, the Roman Church possessed the "Cursed Pool" and its salt-pits. Half of this locality—to be, said the Pope, henceforth known as the "Blessed Pool"— and half the income arising therefrom John granted to Benedict, bishop of Porto and his successors for ever.

Ever since the time when the city by the Golden Horn became the capital of the civilized world, and its bishops became the companions of emperors and thus imbibed imperial views, the patriarchs of Constantinople rebelled against the idea of their having any superiors in the ecclesiastical order. They pushed themselves in front of the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria in spite of their centuries of precedence; and, while acknowledging the Pope to be the Head of the Church, they aspired to be his equal. If the Pope was bishop of Old Rome, the patriarch of Constantinople was bishop of New Rome. And if, strong in the feeling of right derived from the Rock of Peter, the bishop of Rome cut off from the Church's communion a Byzantine patriarch for heresy,

the latter, confident in the power of the "divine" emperors, set the Pope's action at defiance and, in his turn, struck off from the sacred diptychs the name of the reigning pontiff.

At first the schisms between the East and the West sprang out of grave matters. Arianism, Monothelism, Iconoclasm, and other important questions had been the cause of the five schisms— lasting, if added together, over two hundred years—which had occurred during the five hundred and odd years which had elapsed between the consecration of New Rome (330) and the accession of Photius (857). But, following the example of this heresiarch, the patriarchs of Constantinople continued to introduce childish causes of quarrel between the East and the West—questions of fasting on particular days of the week, of leavened and unleavened bread, of the singing of Alleluia at certain seasons, and the like. And, as the day of the final separation between the Churches of the two continents drew nigh, there were repeated breaches of communion between Rome and Constantinople for trifling reasons, of which, for that very reason among others, we know little. It was with the two Churches, as with two men engaged in mortal combat, clashing of arms, feints, and slight wounds, precede the mortal thrust. It is of the consequences of a slight wound that we have to speak in connection with John XVIII.

In the thirteenth century a patriarch of Constantinople, John Veccos, was convinced that there had been "profound peace" between Rome and Constantinople between the time of the patriarchs Photius and Cerularius. But what has now to be related will show that he was somewhat mistaken. Under the patriarch Sisinnius I (996-99), a breach of unity for some unknown cause had occurred between the two sees. John applied himself to close it up. His labours were not in vain. He found means at last to smooth away all irritation; and before he died his name was placed on the diptychs of the East, and he was publicly prayed for in the Mass. Of all this we have the unexceptional evidence of Peter, patriarch of Antioch. Writing (1054) to the patriarch of Constantinople, Michael Cerularius—who, bent on bringing about a rupture between the East and the West, had reproached him with undue regard for the Roman pontiffs—he pointed out that their immediate predecessors both at Antioch and Constantinople itself, had offered prayer in public for the Popes :

"With many other distinguished men in the Church I am a witness to whom no exception can be taken that, in the time of the lord John, patriarch of Antioch, of blessed memory (997-1009), the Pope of Rome, who was also called John, was named in the sacred diptychs. Nay more, when I was at Constantinople five and forty years ago, (1009) in the time of the lord Sergius (II, 999-1019), patriarch of blessed memory, I found that the aforesaid Pope was commemorated in the Divine Liturgy with the other patriarchs. But how and why commemoration of him was excised, I am utterly ignorant".

Knowing nothing further on this matter, I too must leave it where Peter of Antioch left it some nine hundred years ago. But, before the end of the century with which we are now dealing, the quarrels great and small between the Churches of the East and the West will have culminated in their final separation and lasting enmity.

Of more immediate interest to us were the relations of the Pope with England and with Fulk Nerra (The Black), count of Anjou and one of the ancestors of King Henry II of Anjou. Unfortunately, all we know about his dealings with England is that he bestowed the pallium on Aelfeah, archbishop of Canterbury, who, according to custom, journeyed to Rome to receive it. We have, however, more to say about the dread Fulk Nerra, a man typical of the barbarous age in which he lived. He was in the habit of passing from the performance of deeds worthy of a demon to those which would do

honour to a saint. Among other actions with which the redoubtable Fulk is credited, on, however, anything but satisfactory authority, is a promise made in Rome to deliver Pope Sergius IV from Crescentius. That Fulk may indeed have made such an engagement is not impossible; and, in any case, the story is a strange foreshadowing of the actual rescuing of the Papacy of the thirteenth century from the aggressions of Manfred, a successor of the power of Crescentius, by Charles of Anjou. To leave doubtful promises for solid facts, Raoul Glaber tells us how Fulk, "struck with the fear of hell" on account of the blood he had shed, went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (1002-1003). On his return (1004), he "for a while mitigated his natural ferocity". Whilst in this comparatively pious frame of mind, he determined to found an abbey wherein monks might pray for his soul both by day and by night. Accordingly, fixing on a site near his castle of Loches—a no mean commencement of that strong fortress which was rendered so terribly notorious by the cruelties of Louis XI, and of which the massive ruins still frown down on the little town beneath—he there erected a monastery with a most beautiful church. To this day are still to be seen at Beaulieu a medieval church and the remains of an abbey which tell of their first founder, the Black Fulk, and of our countrymen who, to a great extent, destroyed them in the cruel Hundred Years' War. When the buildings were completed, the first thing that Fulk did was to ensure it as far as possible from men like himself. He asked Pope John to take it under his patronage and protection; and, as it would seem, in the last year of that Pope's reign (1009), a bull was issued (couched in the customary terms), granting the request "of the most noble and the most strenuous count Fulk". The *privilege* was granted, as usual, that the monastery might "enjoy peace under the right and protection of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and of the bishops of this their see for ever".

Fulk next asked the archbishop of Tours (Hugh) to come and consecrate the new church. But he was promptly told that he must first restore what he had taken from the archdiocese. All his old fury again took possession of him. He uttered all manner of dire threats against the archbishop; and, determined not to be baulked, betook himself to Rome with large sums of money, and laid his case before Pope John, as Glaber says. Comparing, however, what he goes on to say about the appointment of Cardinal Peter with the bulls of Sergius IV, and not forgetful of the "Crescentius story", it appears that it was really to the latter Pope that Fulk addressed himself. He made over the monastery in the usual way to Sergius, who in return engaged to send Peter, bishop of Piperno, to consecrate the church, if Hugh should still refuse to do so. At this Hugh was very indignant. It was a shame, he said, that he who sat in the chair of the Apostle should be the first to break the decrees of the Apostle; for it had long before been laid down that no bishop was to presume to act in this way in the diocese of another without his consent. And Glaber, who informs us of these views of Hugh and his fellow bishops, proceeds to repeat the same on his own account. But the precocious monk was apparently ignorant of some at least of the facts of the case. With these we are supplied by Sergius's most interesting *privilegium pro monasterio Bellilocensi*. On receiving the Pope's message, Hugh made straight for Rome, and boldly asked him why he wished to take away from him the right of consecrating a monastery which was situated in his own diocese. Thereupon the Pope summoned a council (April 14, 1012) of bishops, cardinals, clergy, Roman judges and nobles. Among those present was the archbishop of Lyons, Peter, bishop of Praeneste, "and librarian of the sacred palace", several *judices dativi*, the *primicerius* of the *defensors*, the papal chamberlain, and others. The proceedings were opened by Benedict, bishop of Porto. In the name of canon and civil law, he asked that the right of consecration should not be taken away from the archbishop. To this, in the Pope's name, a *judex dativus* replied that Fulk had handed

over to the Pope the monastery which he had himself built on his own land, and that, consequently, as owner, the right of its consecration belonged to the Pope. Against this principle Hugh had nothing to urge. He acknowledged himself in the wrong; and, with the symbol of handing the Pope a little rod, made over the monastery to him, for his own part, just as Fulk had done. Accordingly, in the month of May of the same year, the church was duly consecrated by Peter of Piperno, the Pope's legate. But when, during the same afternoon, a sudden storm stripped off its roof, some saw in the accident a divine indication that the Pope had exceeded his powers. Fulk, however, simply repaired the damage and completed his undertaking.

In this account of Fulk Nerra's monastery of Beaulieu, it has been taken for granted that the bulls of John XVIII and Sergius IV which have been cited are genuine. Till quite recently they have always been so regarded. Halphen has, however, it would seem, demonstrated that the said bulls, as they have come down to us at least, are not authentic. It would appear that most of the archives of Beaulieu were destroyed in the fifteenth century, and that the bulls in question, besides being acknowledged to be only modern copies, exhibit various deviations from the customary formularies of the Roman Church. However, as there can be no doubt that bulls on the subject of Fulk's foundation were issued by the papal chancery, it is perhaps safer to conclude that the documents which we now possess, if not strictly in accordance with the original bulls, were compiled from fragments of the destroyed archives or from other records, and hence are substantially authentic. In the main they serve to throw light on known facts, and not to controvert them; and so it may be asserted that the story which we have told with their help is in general accord with the truth.

If we go on to speak of the affairs of another monastery, pardon will perhaps be accorded us : first because practically all we know of John XVIII is his work in connection with monasteries; and then because the document we purpose to quote is a further proof, on the one hand of the rapacity and insecurity of the age, and on the other, of its piety and trust in the protection of the Popes. For to them, even in these dark times, as we have noted so frequently, did men turn from all parts of the world.

Not far from Orleans, at the confluence of the Loire and the Loiret, stood the abbey of Mici, or of St. Mesmin, in which it may be remembered that Gerbert had a correspondent. According to the letter to be quoted immediately, it had been founded in the time of Clovis, the first Christian king of the Franks. It had gradually increased in wealth and importance, and had then been plundered. It was now, as we shall see, regaining something of its old standing, and its abbot was anxious that it should not fall back into its state of decay. He, therefore, begged the patronage of the Pope.

"To the holy lord and venerable Pope, John XVIII, Albert, the abbot and all the monks of Mici wish health in Christ. We know, revered father, that in Peter's stead you have been constituted Vicar of the Universal Church to be the support of the oppressed and, by the authority of Peter, the terror of the oppressor. Wherefore, by this letter, we fly to your reverence, and beg you to help us, and to grant our petition ... Our monastery was once so flourishing in spiritual and temporal prosperity that in it one hundred and forty monks served God assiduously. Then was it so plundered by wicked men that not a single monk was able to live here. Now by the mercy of Christ .... it is gradually recovering by the alms of good men and women, especially by those of the lady Regina who has done much for it for her own salvation's sake, and for the repose of the souls of her husband and children. She is afraid, however, that after her death some of her relations or others may attempt to wrest from us some of the property she has granted us. Hence, may we suggest to your holiness that you should confirm and sign two documents which we have drawn up in your name? The first sets forth the lands given

us by this venerable lady; and the other, all the property of our monastery. We in turn will pray earnestly for you both in your life and death. For it is fitting, venerable father, that you follow in the footsteps of your predecessors, and confirm, especially by threat of excommunication, new charters for monasteries, so that the monks, away from all the noise of the world, may be able to serve God in peace".

It is always so in these fierce and terrible times. Monks ask for papal protection, and the Popes grant it that there may be places where men may live and serve God "in quiet". Living under *the pax Britannica*, we cannot realize with what eagerness very many men must have longed for monastic peace, and done all in their power to secure it in times when an ever-ready sword was the only means of ensuring life and property. We may be sure that what John did for the neighbouring monastery of St. Florence of Saumur and for many others in Rome itself, in France, and in Italy, he did for Abbot Albert of Mici.

Not unfrequently, however, vexation on the part of the bishops that their powers were curtailed by these privileges, and perhaps at times an unnecessary flaunting of them their faces by untactful abbots, caused serious trouble. Fulco, bishop of Orleans (1008-1012), paid a visit to the famous monastery of Fleury unasked. Driven away by violence, because, it was said, he was violating the immunities granted the abbey by Rome, Fulco in a fury called a council, and threatened to burn all its papal bulls.

Information of his conduct was at once sent to Rome, and John wrote to King Robert to say that he had been told that he honoured the Churches of God. If so, he must honour their head. Now, he had heard, he went on to say, that some of the bishops of his kingdom had declared that they would take no further notice of the successors of St. Peter. In addition, we know that the Pope sent the bishop of Piperno to France to inquire into the matter, and special letters to the archbishop of Sens, and to other bishops, as well as to Gauzlin, instructing them to come to Rome about the affair, but it does not appear how it ended.

Other bulls of John XVIII show him supporting the policy of Henry II, the Saint or the Lame, who, as we have seen, succeeded Otho III to the crown of Germany. In the lifelong struggle that Henry endured to prevent the complete annihilation of the royal power by the rapidly increasing independence which the growth of feudalism was giving to the great nobles, he followed the example of the Othos and added to the influence of the church. To this the "Vicar of God", as Thietmar calls his king, was moved perhaps quite as much by motives of piety as of policy. As a counterpoise to the power of the nobility, he revived the see of Merseburg, which had been suppressed and parcelled out under Otho II (981), and founded that of Bamberg. To facilitate the carrying out of these schemes Henry procured the presence of a papal legate, and the elevation of an adherent (Tagino) to the archiepiscopal see of Magdeburg (1004). With the consent of his "most beloved Tagino who readily granted all he wished", Henry had no difficulty in reconstituting the see of Merseburg. The consent of the Pope, his own funds, and compensation made to Henry, bishop of Wurzburg, enabled him to establish the see of Bamberg. The circumstances of the foundation of this see, which we shall give from the papal bull, are most interesting. Just like the history above rehearsed of the founding of Beaulieu, they afford us another proof of how papal overlordship of property was being established all over Europe by princes just as much as by bishops and monks.

"John, bishop, servant of the servants of God" writes. "It is part of our duty to see generally to the well-being of all the holy churches of God, but especially of those which are in an especial way under the power and dominion of our Roman Church ... Hence we wish it to be known to all the faithful that our spiritual son Henry, most

glorious and unconquerable king, has, from his own resources for the good of his own soul and of those of his relatives, founded a bishopric in a place known as Babenberk (Bamberg). He has established it in honour of the most blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, after having duly made compensation to Henry of Wurzburg for the loss of part of his diocese. Hence that bishop has written to let us know that by a bull of our apostolical authority the new bishopric may be founded with his consent".

John proceeds to say he approves and confirms what has been done, and forbids any interference therewith. "Let that bishopric be free and safe from all external power, subject only to the *Roman Mundiburdium* (protection). It must, however, be submissive (*subjectus*) and obedient to its metropolitan, the archbishop of Mayence".

Later on, Henry made over the see more specifically to Benedict VII when he was in Bamberg (May 1020), and in sign thereof the bishops of Bamberg had every year to give the Pope a white horse properly caparisoned, or in its stead "twelve marks of good silver". We shall see Leo IX renouncing his rights, with the exception of the horse, in connection with Bamberg for a grant of jurisdiction over Beneventum.

In founding this bishopric, Henry had also in view not only the spread of Christianity but of German influence. The Slavs had largely overrun this part of his kingdom; and he hoped that what Otho's bishoprics of Meissen, Merseburg, and Magdeburg had accomplished further north, Bamberg would effect for the east. It would then serve as another curb on the turbulence of the nobles, and destroy at once both the paganism and the power of the Slavs.

The reign of John was embittered not only by the oppression of Crescentius but by famine and plague, and by the Saracens, who, swooping down from Sardinia, ravaged the Italian coast from Pisa to Rome.

Death put an end to all John's trials in the year 1009, about the month of July according to the general opinion. It did not, however, find him on the chair of Peter. Weary of the struggle, he had retired from, the world, and met his end as a simple monk in the monastery of St. Paul outside-the-walls. There, taken from the adjoining basilica, a commemorative tablet of his may still be seen : *Doms Johs XVIII. Papa*. But it would appear that he was buried in St. Peter's. At any rate, a formal epitaph was erected to him in that basilica. Baronius quotes it from Maffeo Vegio, who, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, wrote a description of old St. Peter's just before its destruction. It sets forth how, dear to God and man, John there awaited the resurrection; how, learned in sacred love, he scattered its seed everywhere; how he put a term to a schism with the Greeks; and how all who visit St. Peter's are entreated to pray for his soul.

SERGIUS IV.
1009-1012

Whether or not Sergius was placed on the Papal throne by the influence of John Crescentius, one thing at least is clear in the midst of the obscurity of the first decade of the eleventh century. He contrived to stem the power of the Patricius, and to strengthen the party who were anxious for the coming of the German emperors in order that the tyranny of the petty barons of Rome might be thoroughly crushed. Hence it is that Sergius and his successor are both said by Thietmar to have done much towards the consolidation of the imperial party in the city. Still, if he accomplished this by playing into the hands of the counts of Tusculum, he only drove out one evil by introducing another and a greater. The action of the counts of Tusculum on the Papacy was worse than that of the Crescentii, even though the first Pope of their making was the great Pope Benedict VIII. At any rate, for good or for evil, the latter tyrants never again attained to paramount importance in Rome. Sergius survived by a few weeks the last of the Crescentii who, in his day, was the first man in the city of the Popes.

Before he was raised to the chair of Peter, Sergius, who previous to his final elevation had borne the name of the Prince of the Apostles, had for five years (1004-1009) governed the see of Albano. We may take it as a mark of his ability that he had risen to this eminence though only the son of a shoemaker, who, like his son, quite prophetically also bore the name of Peter. His mother had apparently the same name (Stephania) as his predecessor's. The nickname of *Pig's Snout*, given to him in contemporary documents, may also possibly serve to show the lowly origin of this "noble Roman". Like Clement III (1187-1191) he belonged to the region then known as Pina, but today as Pigna, and now and for many centuries past reckoned as the ninth region. At least from the sixteenth century to the present time it has designated the locality in the neighbourhood of S. Marco, S. Maria sopra Minerva, and the Pantheon. And when it is noted that the Pantheon was in the ninth region (Circus Flaminius) of Augustus, there will probably not be anyone who will not pause to reflect on the extraordinary permanence of local associations in Rome.

During the pontificate of Sergius IV Western Europe was profoundly moved by the news that, in accordance with the orders of the demoniacal Fatimite Caliph of Egypt, El-Hakim (996-1021), the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem had been levelled to the ground (1010). According to Raoul Glaber, who has always something wonderful to tell us, the caliph was moved to this action by the Jews. They suborned a vagrant monk to carry letters to the "Prince of Babylon", as Raoul is pleased to call the caliph, in which they informed him that, unless he destroyed "the venerable house of the Christians", he would lose both his sceptre and his kingdom at their hands. The consequent destruction of the basilica, and the spreading of the news that it had been caused by the Jews, brought about a general persecution of them, and an episcopal mandate prohibiting Christians from having any kind of dealing with them. The monk closes his narrative of this event by assuring us that when it became known that the caliph's mother (Mary), who was a Christian, had begun to restore the church of the Holy Sepulchre, crowds flocked to Jerusalem, carrying with them splendid offerings for its rebuilding. Despite a large admixture of the fabulous in this narrative, it is clear that

the Christians of the West were deeply agitated by the news from Jerusalem; and it may very well be that Sergius IV anticipated the action of Gregory VII and Urban II in an attempt to hurl the united Latin nations on the Moslem. If Lair has successfully vindicated the authenticity of the bull discovered by him—and some think he has completely done so in his last book—then Sergius addressed an encyclical to all Catholics, to kings and to bishops, to abbots and to all the clergy, to dukes and to counts, to old and to young. He told them that word had been brought to him of the destruction of the church of the Lord's sepulchre; and how he wished that all would go in arms to Syria to restore it; and, that with the help of the people of every land, the Italians, the Venetians, and the Genoese would equip a thousand ships to take them thither. He would have all give either their services or their gold. Whether, however, Sergius ever penned such a document or not, it is clear that the idea that "the armies of the West should fall upon the Saracen" had taken root. Nourished by Gregory VII, it was to bear fruit a hundredfold before the century had drawn to its close. The coming of the great event of the Crusades had already cast its huge shadow over Latin Christendom.

It is with Sergius IV as with so many other Popes of the period of which we are now treating; we know little more about him save that he granted certain privileges. Some points, however, in those conceded by Sergius IV are worth noting. Though, for the most part, drawn up on the same lines as those of his predecessors, there may be observed in them a greater tendency to extend the concession of spiritual exemptions. In the main it is temporal immunity that papal privileges have hitherto granted; *i.e.*, by these documents the Popes have been in the habit of agreeing to take certain places or persons under their protection, and in token thereof have exacted from the protected a more or less nominal annual tax or rent. In the case of monasteries, for instance, for which the greater number of the privileges were issued, the Pope guaranteed them protection from any external oppression on the part of the powerful, whether in church or state, and also the right of freedom of choice in the election of their abbots, and, in general, such internal freedom as was necessary for proper monastic peace and quiet. He had not, however, as a rule, withdrawn the protected monasteries from the authority of the local diocesan. He had not, speaking generally, interfered with his rights of visitation and inspection. But, of course, with the natural tendency of privileges and exemptions to grow, the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop over the monastery was unfortunately gradually undermined. The concessions granted by Sergius IV helped forward the movement which resulted in so many monasteries securing complete exemption from all local control, whether spiritual or temporal. To two monasteries in Catalonia he gave the privileges of having their clerics ordained by any bishop they chose, of procuring the sacred chrism from any see, of being free from all liability of being placed under an interdict by any bishop whatsoever, of being able to admit to divine service any excommunicated but penitent person as long as he remained within their walls, and finally, of sending their clerics to synods, or withholding them from them at will. To other monasteries he granted even more than the above-named spiritual exemptions; to others, again, not quite so many. No doubt, in the days of bishops, baronial both by blood and by their violent habits, it was necessary to grant monasteries these exemptions in order to preserve discipline therein. But events proved that what was the boon of one age was the bane of the next. It was the acquisition of spiritual exemption which finally led to the ruin of many a monastic house.

For various reasons are the bulls of Sergius IV interesting. Of some the papyrus originals still exist. Others give us an insight into the reason why the papal protection was sought, and into its practical value. One document sets forth, for instance, that

papal confirmation is granted to the foundation of the parish church of St. Michael, in connection with the famous monastery of Nonantula (north-east of Modena), at the request of the people, who were anxious that the money they had for years subscribed for their church and its endowment might not fall into the hands of laymen. In another bull Almaric, archbishop of Aix, is taken to account for having, in conjunction with some powerful nobles, harassed the monastery of St. Peter of Montmajour (north-east of Arles), "which is under the special jurisdiction of St. Peter and ourselves", and for having, by their cruelties, rendered one of its villas uninhabitable. The archbishop is enjoined to make satisfaction himself first, and then, with the aid both of the clergy and the laity "of the state of Provence", to force the nobles to do likewise.

In taking under his protection the monastery of St. Peter of Fenouihlet, Sergius forbids the holding there of any civil or criminal courts, or the exacting of any kind of temporal dues whatsoever. This grant of immunity from the performance of civil obligations furnishes us with a striking example of the power of the Popes, even in a period when it has been customary with many to speak of their influence as practically dead. With the decline of the civil authority at the close of the ninth century, men turned to that of the Church, whose spiritual sanctions alone met with any respect. And when, in response to requests, the Popes, in certain cases, conceded exemptions even in the realm of the civil power, no objection seems to have been raised. On the contrary, there are extant diplomas of kings confirming such grants of the Roman Church without the least demur. In the midst of the anarchy caused by every petty duke or count making himself a king in his own domain, both the people and the nominal kings were glad of the intervention of any authority capable of producing peace. To shield themselves against their more powerful neighbours, some of the nobles themselves applied for papal protection. So we see Sergius granting this desired boon to the lord of *Castrum Scuriense* (Lescure in Languedoc) for the annual payment of ten solidi "of Raymond money". And if he is to be found vindicating the rights of Andrew, bishop of Parenzo and Pola, to Buvigno against the attempted encroachments of John IV, patriarch of Aquileia, he is only doing for ecclesiastical prelates in a subordinate position what he was called upon to do for lay-lords under similar circumstances.

But the more powerful were not always in the wrong. Libentius, the faithful friend of the exiled Benedict V, and archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen (988-1013), had a dispute with Bernar, bishop of Verden (Verda) as to jurisdiction over the parish of Ramsola, near Bardwyk. The former pleaded that St. Anschar, the first apostle of that district, had fled to Ramsola on the burning of Hamburg by the Northmen, and had there founded a monastery. Whether or not Sergius remembered the devotion of Libentius to Benedict V, or was simply influenced by the action of Anschar, the dispute was settled in favour of Libentius.

One reason, no doubt, why so little is known about Popes John XVIII and Sergius IV is the state of dependence which they were kept by John Crescentius III, "the destroyer of the Apostolic See". But it must be acknowledged that details of the oppression exercised by Crescentius are, for the most part, wanting. A curious twelfth century source has, however, furnished us with a few. The *Chronica de gestis Consilium Andegavorum* have preserved a few precious grains of truth, much encumbered, unfortunately, with legendary dross, telling us something about their hero, Fulk Nerra, on which we can rely, and other things which are wholly fabulous.

On the occasion of his second pilgrimage to Jerusalem (1009), the redoubtable Fulk passed through Rome at the time when Sergius IV was Pope. Knowing that the Black count was "a just man possessed of the wisdom that comes from years", the Pope complained to him about "Crescentius, hateful to God, who daily harassed the people of

Rome and the surrounding districts. Some of them he killed, and others he held captive till they were redeemed by a heavy ransom. He took from the people their food and their raiment without leave and without payment. He plundered pilgrim and merchant alike, and there was no one in Italy (Langobardia) who could quell his audacity. All feared him, and no one loved him". When Fulk had heard the complaints which the Pope had to make against Crescentius, he promised to fulfill his behests as an obedient son as soon as he returned from his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and had "adored the cross and the revered sepulchre of the Lord". Then, with letters from the Pope for the Byzantine emperor, he set out for Jerusalem by way of Constantinople.

So far there is nothing improbable in the narrative of the chronicle of the counts of Anjou. Time, place, persons, and circumstances are all in harmony with what is known from other sources. But what follows is a tissue of absurdities, and seems for the most part to have been interpolated into the original chronicle.

When the count returned to Anjou after the accomplishment of his pilgrimage, mindful of the promise he had made to the Pope, he picked out four of his best archers, and set out for Rome. Assuring the Holy Father that he had come to free him and the people from the tyranny of Crescentius, he asked his pardon for what he was about to do. "Not only do I absolve you from sin", the Pope is made to say; "but I will reward your conduct as you deserve". Fulk then sent to ask Crescentius for an interview, and was told that if he came to his castle in the morning, Crescentius would talk to him from a window. Overjoyed at this answer, the count ordered two of his archers with their long bows to station themselves at the foot of the tower of his intended victim, and, "as he was tall and stout", presented himself before the tower of Crescentius with his other two archers, both crossbowmen, concealed behind him. To steady their nerves, he told his men that unless they brought down Crescentius dead at his feet, he would kill the four of them.

Blessed with a powerful voice, he hailed Crescentius in stentorian tones. "How fair a face you have!" exclaimed the count, as soon as the Roman showed himself at the window. "Pray let me see the beauteous form to which it belongs". Unable to resist a request so flattering to his vanity, Crescentius stepped forth on to a balcony, and next moment fell heavily to the ground, pierced with two arrows and two bolts. The story is brought to a suitable termination by an assurance on the part of the Pope that Fulk did not stand in need of any forgiveness for what he had done, and by his presenting him with the relics of two martyrs, while Fulk on his side is depicted as abundantly rewarding his archers.

It will suffice here to note that, however true a portrait of Crescentius in life is given by this quaint narrative, the sequel of this work will show that the account it gives of his death is not in the smallest particular in accordance with fact.

Sergius, who to his other virtues added that of charity to the poor, which he displayed in the midst of a severe famine, died May 12, 1012, and was buried in the Lateran basilica. His tomb, according to John the Deacon, stood near the entrance on the left, and his epitaph may still be seen attached to one of the pillars of the right aisle not far from that of Sylvester II. It cannot be said that he found one to write as good an epitaph for him as he had written for the great French Pope. It opened by entreating those who came to see the Lateran not to stand gazing at its beauties but to reflect on the epitaph in front of them. For, in the tomb beneath it, lie the bones of a great pastor whom God gave to be the glory of His Church. In life he had given bread and, clothing to the poor, and to the people at large the word of life. Whilst rejoicing in the improvement in the status of the church, he winged his way to heaven. After ruling the diocese of Albano for five years he reached the see in which, after changing his name

(Sergius ex Petro), he rested. The epitaph concludes with the length of Sergius' reign and the date of his death.

Of the seven coins which Promis assigns to Sergius III two are so different in type to the rest, that Pizzamiglio has assigned them to Sergius IV. One of them bears the legend "Saviour of his country". While this title, it is contended, could scarcely be bestowed on Sergius III, it may well have been given to one who saved his people from famine, not to say from Crescentius III.

BENEDICT VIII.
1012-1024

If from the Janiculum one looks across the Tiber to the hills and mountains beyond, there may be descried among the Alban Hills to the south-east the little town of Frascati some ten miles away. Nestling on the slope of a hill a short two miles from the summit it is, in every sense of the word, the descendant of the ancient Tusculum, which stood on the ridge at the top. When the great Latin road was made, Tusculum was already there to frown down upon its builders. And, if we are safe in rejecting any link that would connect it with Ulysses, there is no doubt that, before the battle of Lake Regillus, it was the most important town in Latium. But with the ascendancy of Rome it sank into obscurity, and for well over a thousand years it so remained. With the strange revenges, however, brought about by time in this, the darkest hour of Rome's long life, the star of Tusculum rose again. Its ancient citadel, situated on high ground at its eastern extremity, became the fortress of the counts of Tusculum, and the terror of all the country that could be seen from its lofty walls. Before its final infamous destruction by the Romans in 1191, its rulers had lorded it over the Eternal City, both spiritually and temporally, for several decades of years. During a period of thirty-six years three members of their family held the Papacy, now with honour and now with deep disgrace.

But whence came these counts of Tusculum? They were, we are assured, of the house of Theophylactus, and were descendants of that Theodora I and Theophylactus who had already given to Rome so many of its rulers during this age. The family name of Theophylactus which they bore seems to make this contention more than likely; and when it is further asserted that they were, through Marozia, of the "Alberic" branch of that house, nothing can, it would seem, be urged to the contrary. It is not known how or when Tusculum passed into the possession of the house of Theophylactus; but, as we have already observed the first count of Tusculum known to history seems to have been the false friend of Otho III, Gregory "d*e Tusculana atque praefecto navali*". The town residence of the counts of Tusculum seems to have been in the Trastevere. At any rate, John XIX, one of the Tusculan family, speaks of the church of SS. Rufina and Secunda (which is about halfway between the churches of St. Maria in Trastevere, and St. Crisogonus) as "situated close to our palace", which, according to the confirmatory bull of his nephew Benedict IX, was called Scuta.

To this first known count of Tusculum and his wife, Maria, were born three sons, Alberic, always spoken of as major, Theophylactus (afterwards Benedict VIII), and Romanus (afterwards John XIX). Of these, Theophylactus became Pope on May 18, 1012. Concerning the circumstances of his election there is, as usual with the Popes of this period, more conjecture than ascertained fact. At any rate, whether or not there was any question of rivalry between the Alberic and the Crescentius branches of the great Theophylact family, it is certain that, at least when Pope, Benedict followed in the footsteps of his predecessor, and was a close adherent of the empire, despite the fact that his father Gregory was an opponent of imperial influence in Rome.

Further, while details of his election are wanting, some infer that he was imposed on the Holy See by force, as he is said, though only on poor authority, to have been a layman—the first layman who was ever made Pope. But the fact of his having been a

layman is more than doubtful. At any rate, his accession was opposed “by a certain Gregory”, possibly of the party of the late Patricius. But, by the force of his own character, and the influence of his family, Benedict remained master of the situation, and proved himself a much more powerful ruler than any of his more immediate predecessors. Gregory was forced to abandon Rome, and leave Benedict in possession of all power, both spiritual and temporal, within the city. “Blessed be the Almighty God in all His works” exclaims our good episcopal chronicler, “because He has deigned, by granting it a noble pastor, to console and pacify Rome, so long depressed”.

Gregory, however, was not at the end of his resources when he was expelled from the city. He made his way to Germany, and at Christmas met Henry at Pohlde. Cold, however, was the reception accorded to him. No offer he could make to the king had any effect upon him. Henry took charge of his cross, and forbade him in the meanwhile to act as Pope, but promised to have the affair settled by canon law. Of “the certain Gregory”, however, we hear no more. Whether he died before Henry's descent into Italy, or whether, disheartened by his reception in Germany, and the reports that reached him of Benedict’s firm exercise of his authority, he abandoned his claims to the Holy See; his name, at any rate, is never found again in the documents of the time.

The eyes of all Italy were now turned towards the North, and while the thoughts of all parties throughout the peninsula were fixed on Henry, some were anxious for his coming, and others dreaded it. In the North Ardoin trembled to hear of his approach, as in the South did Greek and Saracen. Benedict, however, and the oppressed hoped all things from the German king. We have already seen how Ardoin got himself proclaimed king in north Italy (February 1002) on the death of Otho III, and how John Crescentius became Patricius of Rome. And while the Popes, and all the parties who were writhing under the rule of Ardoin or Crescentius, were yearning for the day when Henry would establish his power in Italy, the Lombard endeavored to keep him away by force of arms, and the Roman by diplomacy.

In the year of his coronation (1002), Ardoin had overthrown a force of Germans sent against him by Henry at the passes of the Adige. But towards the spring of the year 1004, after he had cowed the Slavs, Henry himself descended into Italy at the invitation of a number of its nobles, both clerical and lay. With the important exception of Tedaldus, a marquis in Tuscany and grand- father of the famous Matilda of Tuscany, the principal opponents of Ardoin were the bishops. And that with good reason; for, though they had at first been his greatest supporters, he so outraged them that they became his most determined foes. All opposition melted away before Henry, and he received the Iron Crown at Pavia (May 14, 1004). But as so often happened at the imperial coronations in Rome, a quarrel broke out in the evening between the Germans and Italians which resulted in the destruction of Pavia by fire. This untoward event, the ill-feeling thence arising, the adverse influence of Crescentius in Rome, and, above all, internal difficulties in Germany, were no doubt the causes why Henry did not continue his march, and claim the imperial crown. As it was, after receiving the homage of his adherents, he returned to Germany (after Pentecost, 1004), promising his dejected followers a speedy return.

But many years were to elapse before he could fulfill his engagements, and dire was the misery of Italy in the meanwhile. No sooner were his troops across the Alps, than Ardoin descended from his mountains, and devoted himself to wreaking what vengeance he could on those who had adhered to Henry, and to levelling to the ground many of the places which resisted him, and had the misfortune to fall into his hands. In his efforts against Henry he was ably supported by the artful Crescentius. The weapons of the latter were promises, presents, and intrigue among Henry's enemies. In one of his

presents, an ampulla of oil which had in a marvellous way burst from the ground in a church. Thietmar sees a figure on the one hand of the clemency of Henry, and on the other of the guile of Crescentius. At length, however, things looked brighter for the German king. Crescentius died, and a strong Pope devoted to his interests was on the chair of Peter. A saint too had come and exhorted him "to restore the rights of the Church, repress the violence of the nobles, and relieve the oppressed poor".

Accordingly, towards the close of the year 1013, he again entered Italy, bringing with him his wife Cunigunda, and accompanied by a powerful army. Ardoin fled from before him. At Ravenna he was met by the Pope. He had thus turned aside from his direct route to Rome to see that justice was done to his brother Arnold. An intruder had driven him from the See of Ravenna, to which, it appears, he had been duly elected. “By the authority of the Pope, and with the approval of the whole senate", Arnold was reinstated (January 1014). Whilst Henry was engaged in settling other matters there, Benedict returned to Rome to prepare a fitting reception for the future emperor and, by his presence, to keep a check on the faction opposed to the king. When the German lances appeared in sight of the walls of Rome, the whole city went forth to meet him. Cowed as usual by the military strength of the escort of the imperial candidate, the Romans, much against their will, greeted him with the customary *laudes*, “extolling him to the skies”.

When within the walls of the Leonine city, he was straightway surrounded by twelve senators, six of whom were clean-shaven, and six wearing long beards. With wands in their hands, they “mystically” walked before Henry and his wife to the Church of St. Peter, where the Pope was awaiting them at the top of the steps. After the usual mutual salutations, the Pope made it plain that the duty of defending the Church followed on the reception of the imperial crown. The emperor had to become “the advocate of St. Peter”. Hence, “before he was introduced into the Church, he was asked whether he would be the faithful patron and defender of the Roman Church, and be in all things devoted to Benedict and his successors”. To this Henry returned an answer in the affirmative, and then advanced about a quarter of the way up the nave to the great circular disc of red porphyry where the coronation of the emperors was wont to take place, or, at least to begin. Then with his spouse he was anointed and crowned with the imperial diadem; and into his hand the Pope placed a golden orb divided into four parts by precious gems and with a cross resting on the top of it. This remarkable emblem, says the monk Raoul Glaber, was, by its cross, to remind “the prince of this world’s empire that he ought so to rule as to be thought worthy of being protected by the standard of the life-giving cross; and, by its gems, that his soul ought to be adorned with the clear and bright light of the great virtues”. Joyfully receiving the globe into his hands, “as he was a most sagacious man”, he said :

“Best of fathers, you have done this to teach me most practically how I ought to rule. It is fitting that this gift be possessed by those who, trampling on this world’s pomps, more readily follow the cross of Christ”.

And forthwith did he send it to the monastery of Cluny, “which was then regarded as the most perfect of all”. His regal crown he ordered to be hung over the altar of the Prince of the Apostles. The coronation day (February 14, 1014) concluded with a grand banquet at the Lateran palace. Whatever may be the opinion of some modern writers regarding the power exercised by the Popes during the Middle Ages of naming the emperors, there would seem to be little doubt that, by such as in those days concerned themselves about general politics, it was thought highly conducive to the welfare of all that such authority should be vested in their hands. The comments which the spectacle

of the coronation of the Emperor Henry I. evoked from Raoul Glaber were unquestionably the expression of the general feeling of the thoughtful.

"It is to the highest degree advantageous", he writes, "and most calculated to promote the general peace, that no prince should obtain the sceptre of the Roman empire or be able to be called or be emperor except the one whom the Pope of the Roman See has chosen as fit by the uprightness of his character for rule, and to whom he has entrusted the symbols of the imperial dignity. For we know how of old usurpers everywhere, impudently pushing themselves forward, were constantly created emperors, and were on that very account less fitted for power as they had come by it tyrannically, and not by sacred authority".

After his coronation the emperor passed some days in arranging matters of public importance, and in distributing enormous largesses both to the nobles and to the people. Among other affairs which were settled by the joint action of the Pope and emperor were the consecration of Arnold by the former, the renewal of the canons which prescribed twenty-five as the age for the ordination of deacons, and thirty for that of priests, and an exchange of property between them. Benedict gave up some property he had in Bavaria for some possessed by the emperor "in the county of Spoleto".

One of those who accompanied his sovereign to Rome, viz. Berno, abbot of Reichenau, tells us of an incident which shows that imperial interest in ritual had not declined from the days when Charlemagne was so interested in the insertion of the *Filioque* in the Creed. The new emperor, astonished to find that at Rome after the Gospel the Credo was not sung, asked what was the cause of this peculiarity. He was told that the reason was because the Roman Church had never been stained with heresy; but by the teaching of St. Peter had ever remained immovably fixed in the solidity of Catholic doctrine. Hence it was more necessary that the symbol should be frequently chanted by those who at some time or other might be infected with heresy. However, concludes Berno, at the request of the emperor the Pope consented that it should be sung at public Masses.

From this narrative some authors have concluded that at Rome the Credo was never heard at Mass before the time of the Emperor Henry I. This, however, has been proved to be a mistake. Several *Ordines Romani*, the testimony of Abbot Amalarius, and especially the words of Pope Leo III make it plain that the Credo was recited during Mass in Rome, at least in the ninth century. The last named Pope, whilst discussing with the legates of the council of Aix-la-Chapelle (809) the question of the insertion into the Creed of the Filioque clause remarked: "We do not *chant* the Creed, we *read* it; and by reading it teach. But neither when reading nor teaching do we venture to insert anything into the Creed". The words of Berno then must be interpreted strictly. Till Henry used his influence with Benedict, the Creed was never in Rome solemnly chanted at Mass; it was merely read. After that it was always sung at public Masses.

So gratified was Bishop Thietmar that his beloved patron had received the imperial crown that plain prose failed him to express his pleasure, and he found it necessary to summon the Muses to his aid. He would have the great day on which Rome submitted herself to his king marked with red. Anointed with the sacred chrism, the emperor is made joyfully to return thanks to God for the blessings he has had bestowed upon him and upon his dear spouse, while the Pope and all with him rejoice in the sense of security that the presence of so great a ruler brings them. But the joy was not destined to be of long duration. It was as usual on these occasions drowned in blood. On the octave day of the coronation three brothers, Lombards, whether partisans of Ardoin or not is uncertain, succeeded in raising a bitter feeling against the emperor or his adherents. A fierce fight took place on the bridge of St. Angelo; and the rushing river

beneath was soon reddened with the blood of both Latin and Teuton. But German valour, and the exertions of the Pope's brothers, Romanus, "Consul and Duke and Senator of all the Romans", and Alberic, "most eminent Consul and Duke", prevailed. The disturbance was quelled, and the three brothers were imprisoned. One of them, however, soon escaped from prison, as did many other hostages or prisoners, on the emperor's hasty departure for Germany. And this, according at least to Thietmar, was brought about by the fact that Henry could endure neither the climate of Italy nor the treachery and venality of its inhabitants.

Hostilities were instantly resumed; and the indefatigable Ardoin again took the field. But Henry's power in North Italy, at any rate, was more than nominal; and the Lombard king, broken with disappointment or sickness, retired into the monastery of Fructuaria, which he had founded, and there died in the beginning of 1015.

The death of Ardoin brought for a period comparative peace to Upper Italy. Its chief cities utilized the breathing space to strengthen themselves against all comers, kings, bishops, or barons. In the centre of Italy, the Pope, not in the least disheartened by the departure of Henry, proceeded to put a curb on the lawlessness of some of the nobles. He began with the powerful Crescentii in the Sabina. When Benedict came to the throne of Peter, they were still harassing the monastery of Farfa as they had been in the days of Gregory V. By a treacherous night attack, Crescentius, the son of Count Benedict and of Theodoranda, daughter of Crescentius of the Marble Horse, had made himself master of the castle of Bucciniano, a possession of the monastery of Farfa, and situated on Monte Acutiano close to it. Appealed to, as the special protector of this monastery, the emperor gave judgment in favour of Abbot Hugo; but as he was about to return to Germany, begged the Pope to see that Farfa recovered its property. Benedict accordingly summoned Crescentius either to give up the castle, or come to terms with the abbot. His messengers were laughed to scorn. But the count knew not with whom he was dealing. To his astonishment he soon heard the indignant and angry pontiff thundering at his gates with a powerful force at his back. He begged and obtained a respite of twenty days, promising to come up for trial at the end of that period.

At the expiration of the appointed time, the Pope rode out from Rome with a numerous following. Opposite the castle was a place known as *Tribucum in monte*. Benedict decided to open his court there, and to hold it in the open air. Accordingly a faldstool was set for him beneath a great spreading pine, and round him gathered the principal members of his court. Besides those learned in both the Roman and the Lombard law, there were present the *Secundicerius*, the *Adminiculator*, the *Primicerius* of the *Defensors*, the *Arcarius*, and various *Judices Dativi*, abbots, counts, and nobles. When the abbot of Farfa had stated his grievance in terms of Lombard law, Crescentius was duly summoned to make answer. But, inasmuch "as he was headstrong and obstinate", though thrice summoned, he refused to appear before the court. Accordingly, after the abbot's title-deeds to Bucciniano had been examined and found satisfactory, and after a careful comparison of the Justinian and the Lombard laws, judgment was pronounced in favour of Farfa; and it was decreed that if Crescentius or any of his should in future give any trouble to the monastery in this matter, he was to be fined to the extent of one hundred pounds of the purest gold, half of which was to go to the papal treasury ("in Sacro Lateranensi Palatio"), and half to the monastery.

So pleased was the Pope with Abbot Hugo, and so satisfied was he with the good which the monastery was doing, that, besides thus himself seeing that its rights were respected, he granted to it further possessions out of the property of the Apostolic See. Moreover, at the request of the monks, the emperor confirmed all that had been done by the "Lord Benedict, supreme Roman Pontiff, and our spiritual Father".

In the matter of justice being done to Farfa, Benedict was as firm with his own nearest relations as with others. Among the nobles who were anxious to enrich themselves at the expense of St. Mary's abbey, was the Pope's own brother, Romanus. But though he pleaded that he had acquired the property in dispute from Crescentius in good faith, thinking that he had a proper right to dispose of it, he was made to restore it to the monastery by the Pope. But, no doubt to be more free to act against the Saracens, Benedict was constrained, though much against his will—at least, so Abbot Hugo says—to effect some compromise with the Crescentii, in order to put an end to the perpetual strife between them and the monastery (1015 or 1016).

The Pope was anxious to bring about, almost at any price, peace and goodwill among the people of Italy. Intent upon their own aggrandizement, the great ones of the land were taking no heed of their common foe, the Saracens, who were once again making themselves very formidable. In south Italy they had seized Cosenza (1010) only a year or two before Benedict came to the throne; and, in the course of the next few years, they had burned Pisa, and had seized Luna in northern Tuscany. From this centre they ravaged the country, committing the greatest atrocities. The leader of this particular band of marauders is thought to have been Abu Hosein Mogehid, a Spanish renegade, who had swooped down from Sardinia, which had been a Moslem province for over a century. The news of their outrages at Luna filled the warlike soul of Benedict with indignation. Animated with the spirit of John VIII and John X, he determined to combat them himself if no one else would. He endeavored to infuse his own spirit into all around him. He exhorted "all the rectors and *defensors* of Holy Mother Church to collect together, and with him boldly to fall upon the enemies of Christ who were committing such outrages". To prevent the infidels from escaping by sea, he sent forward "an unspeakable multitude of ships".

At first the Saracen chief was haughtily indignant that the Pope should dare to think of facing him. But when the papal fleet began to show itself, his courage failed him. Afraid of being cut off, he abandoned his wife and his people, and just managed to effect his escape to Sardinia. With the courage of despair the Saracens kept the Pope at bay for three days; but at length the Christians were victorious. Every single Moslem was put to the edge of the sword. Even the wife of their chief, who had been seized, shared the general doom, to atone for the misdeeds of her husband. Her rich diadem was sent to the emperor by the victorious pontiff.

Furious at the misfortune which had overtaken him, the Moslem king, so we are told, sent the Pope a bag of chestnuts with a message that he might expect him in the following summer with as many soldiers as there were nuts in the bag. Threats were not calculated to alarm Benedict. He accepted the chestnuts, and sent back the bag full of rice.

"If your master" said he to the astonished messenger, "is not satisfied with the damage he has already done to the dowry of the Apostle, let him come again, and for every grain of rice he will find an armed warrior waiting to receive him".

Apparently, however, the Pope did not wait to be attacked; he stirred up the Pisans and Genoese, who seem to have cooperated with him at Luna, to carry the war into the enemies' country. His legate, the bishop of Ostia, went both to Pisa and to Genoa to exhort them to attack the Saracen in his home. The combined fleets of both cities sailed for Sardinia (1017); and none too soon; for Mogehid, or Mugetto as he is called by the chronicles of Pisa, who supplemented his want of courage by atrocious cruelty, was engaged in crucifying the Christians of the island. As before, he saved himself by flight, and betook himself to Africa. Unfortunately, no sooner had the Pisans and Genoese obtained possession of the island than they quarrelled for it among themselves. The

Pope, it seems, had promised Sardinia to the Pisans, should Mugetto be expelled. The Genoese, however, wanted the island, and war broke out between the two cities. Partly by superior prowess, and partly by allowing their allies and rivals all Mugetto's treasure which on one occasion fell into their hands, the Pisans retained the island and the much-needed help of the Genoese. The defeated renegade did not cease making efforts to recover Sardinia till as late as the year 1050, when he was at length captured by the successful Pisans, and when the island was again made over to them by the Pope.

While in the north of Italy some of its cities were thus laying the foundations of their future greatness, events were in progress in the South which were to result there in the expulsion of both Greeks and Saracens, and in the formation of a new kingdom by a race hitherto known to the peoples of Italy in a hardly more favourable light than the Saracens. During the ninth century roving vikings had "gathered property" even from Italy. But in the following century, with the acquisition of Normandy, and a large part of England, and with their acceptance of Christianity, their indiscriminate ravages ceased; and when in this century they were seen in Italy, it was as pilgrims going to the Holy Land or returning from it.

In the year 1016 forty of these pilgrims did yeoman service in helping the people of Salerno to drive off a besieging force of Saracens. Attracted to Italy by what their pilgrim-countrymen told them of its wealth, and by envoys from Guaimar, prince of Salerno, who wished to enlist recruits against the infidel, no less than two hundred and fifty Normans or Northmen from Normandy, crossed the Alps in the following year, and presented themselves before Pope Benedict. They were exactly what he wanted, but he turned their arms against the Greek and not against the Saracen.

After the battle of Stilo (982), where Otho II was defeated by the Greeks and Saracens, Greek influence became paramount in south Italy. With the exception of Beneventum, they were masters of nearly the whole of it. Unceasing efforts were made to Hellenize it by the foundation of Greek colonies, by the substitution of the Greek rite instead of the Latin in the different parishes, and by pushing everywhere the use of the Greek language and costume. This line of policy the Byzantine Catapan endeavored, rather ruthlessly, to carry out in Apulia, which was much less Greek than Calabria or Otranto. "Unable to bear the pride and insolence of the Greeks, the Apulians revolted" (1009). Their leader was one of the foremost citizens of Bari, by name Melus. After some little success, he had to fly from his native city (*c.* 1011). During his exile, however, he had the good fortune to fall in with some Norman pilgrims, very likely the forty who were so successful at Salerno. The story of their meeting him is told by William of Apulia. At the shrine of the Archangel Michael on Mt, Garganus, the Italian St. Michael's Mount, "they beheld a man clad after the Greek fashion, by name Melus". Astonished at his curious dress and myrtle-crowned head, they asked him who and whence he was. He replied that he was a Lombard, a well-born citizen of Bari; but, owing to the ferocity of the Greeks, an exile. With your help, however, he added, "I should easily be able to make good my return". This they promised after a visit to their native land. These then were the men who, with the friends they had induced to accompany them, presented themselves (1017) before Pope Benedict.

The one object of the Pope was to bring about the peace of Italy by the expulsion of the stranger; and in the war-like Normans he saw he would have most valuable allies. He accordingly explained to them the doings of the Greeks, regretted his own inability to drive the foreigners out of the country, and encouraged them to help Melus. Under their Apulian leader they were at first successful. But a new Catapan (Basilius Bugianus) was sent from Constantinople. He proved himself a most able general. The Normans were almost annihilated (1019), and Melus was compelled to cross the Alps

and beg the aid of the emperor. Though he himself died in Germany before Henry set out for the South, his words, supported doubtless by those of the Pope (who was certainly in Germany in the first quarter of the year 1020), did not remain without effect, as we shall soon see.

Although Benedict was in Germany in April 1020, he does not seem to have gone there for the precise object of supporting the petition of Melus for aid against the Greeks. He went in answer to a request of the emperor that he would come and consecrate a church at Bamberg, in which, as we have seen, Henry had erected an episcopal see. In that city of his special affection the king had built several churches of which one, that of St. Peter and St. George (the cathedral), had been already consecrated (1012) by John of Aquilea.

The arrival of the Pope in Germany (April 1020) made a great sensation. It is spoken of in all the chronicles. They remind us that the celebration of the festival of Easter in Germany by Pope and emperor together was an event hitherto unknown in the annals of the world. Bebo, a deacon of Bamberg, who was present at the different ceremonies, writing to the emperor (1021), says "that the memory of them will never pass away, for none of those who were present could ever forget them".

"Lo!" he continued, "the vicar of St. Peter, who on account of his pre-eminent dignity has the power of binding and loosing, came to St. Peter's monastery at Bamberg on that day of love (Maunday-Thursday, April 14), which, for a testimony of the loving kindness bestowed upon us, is called Coena Domini (the Lord's Supper)".

To meet the Pope, who came to the church on horseback, all the clergy went forth in their sacred vestments. Four choirs were drawn up to greet the pontiff. One was stationed at the head of the bridge on the far bank of the river Regnitz, on which, in the midst of orchards and hop-gardens, Bamberg was pleasantly situated. The second took up its stand at the other end of the bridge, the third stood before the city gate, and the fourth by the side of the emperor in the atrium of the church. Each of these choirs in turn hailed the Pope with sacred chants, harmonized with true Germanic skill. After he had prayed, prostrate on the ground, before three of the altars of the church, and had then taken his seat on the episcopal throne, first the clergy intoned the *Te Deum*, and then all the people sang the *Kyrrie leyson* (sic) in unison. "Adamantine indeed", interjects the worthy deacon, "must have been the heart that true compunction did not touch at that moment".

On the conclusion of the *Gloria in excelsis*, and after the emperor and the Pope had exchanged the kiss of peace, the latter went to the door of the church and, in accordance with a custom which had certainly existed in Rome as early as the fourth century, absolved the contrite penitents from their sins, and introduced them into the church. After the gospel the Pope preached, and then, with the assistance of twelve bishops, proceeded to bless the chrism and the holy oils.

Benedict also officiated at the services of the Church on the three following days, and did not fail to be present at the grand banquet which closed the religious celebrations on Easter Sunday. Ten days after (April 24) he dedicated the Church of St. Stephen, outside the city. Moreover, before he left Germany, he passed in synod various useful measures of reform, of which the details are unknown to us, and confirmed its possessions to the convent of Goss near Leoben in the valley of the Mur, requiring in testimony thereof that one golden solidus should be paid annually to the Roman Church.

In going to Germany, however, the Pope had other ends Henry in view besides performing ecclesiastical functions. The attack the situation of the Papacy was most critical. The skill of the new Catapan, the defeat of the Normans, and the defection of Pandulf IV of Capua, who had thrown in his lot with the Greeks, had made them

masters of south Italy. What was to prevent their seizing Rome, driving the Germans from north Italy, and thus putting an end to the empire of the house of Saxony? These points, which had been put before Henry by Melus, were reiterated by Benedict. Realizing the gravity of the situation, the emperor determined to break the power of the Greeks in Italy once for all.

At the Same time Benedict pointed out to the emperor how, during the tenth century, the dominions of the Church had been usurped, and that, despite the donation of Otho I, there was little improvement in the state of affairs in this respect. True to the traditions of his house, which were to strengthen the Church against the nobility, Henry solemnly renewed the donation of Otho, practically in the same terms. One fresh clause, however, was inserted in it. It dealt with concessions in Germany which had been made by him, and ran thus : “Moreover, we confirm to you the monastery of Fulda, and the right of consecrating its abbot; and, moreover, all the monasteries, estates, and villas which St. Peter is known to possess in the ultramontane regions, except Antesna, Wineringa, and Hollenbach (or Willinbach), which by deed of exchange were made over, by the Church of St. Peter to our bishop of Bamberg, and for which we granted to the aforesaid Church the land we possessed between Narni, Interamna, and Spoleto. Further, under the protection of St. Peter and under yours and that of your successors, we place the aforesaid bishopric of Bamberg. Hence, as a rent-charge (*pensio*) we decree that you shall each year receive a white horse properly caparisoned from the bishop of the said district”.

Objections have been urged against the authenticity of this document. But the establishment of the genuineness of the *donation* of Otho I, on which it rests, has, in conjunction with the testimonies of Fromund, Bonizo, etc., just cited, furnished satisfactory replies to them; while the genuineness of the clause peculiar to Henry's deed is abundantly vindicated by what has been said in the notes of the undoubted history of the places therein mentioned.

Before leaving Germany, Benedict, in company with the emperor, went to visit the monastery of Fulda, the famous foundation of our great St. Boniface among the Taunus Mountains in Hesse. It was a day never to be forgotten by the monks. They recorded its events even in their Necrology. On Sunday, May 1, High Mass was solemnly sung by the Pope; and after the Gospel he caused the *privileges* granted to the monastery by his predecessors to be read aloud by the archdeacon of the Roman Church. After these had been duly confirmed by both Pope and emperor, and the apostolical benediction granted to the monks, Benedict returned to Rome, and Henry began his preparations for his expedition against the Greeks.

It was not, however, till the close of the year 1021 that the emperor was ready to make his descent upon Italy. He entered the country at the head of a powerful army. After spending Christmas in the north of Italy, he divided his army into three divisions and advanced southwards. He himself, in command of the largest body, marched along the eastern side of the country against Troia (Troy), a strong fortress recently erected by the Greeks near Mt. Garganus. Poppo, archbishop or patriarch of Aquileia, led some eleven thousand men through the centre of Italy, while another equally warlike prelate, Belgrimus (or Pellegrinus), archbishop of Cologne, with twenty thousand men, was directed to march by the west coast through Rome, and to seize the traitorous prince of Capua. Henry was met by the Pope. They both entered Beneventum on March 3. Everything gave way before the imperial hosts. Pandulf of Capua was deprived of his principality, and saw it given to another. Troy opened its gates to the victorious emperor, or, what seems more probable, gave him hostages. But he was not able to effect any permanent conquest. One enemy grew stronger as time wore on—the sun of

Italy. A people “accustomed to perpetual cold” could not face it. Disease as usual set in amongst the Germans, and Henry had to retrace his footsteps. However, he first gave part of territory he had recovered to the nephews of Melus, and rewarded his Norman allies, who from this time forth for some eight years sold their swords to the highest bidder, whether Italian or Greek. At the end of that time, when their leader had been named count of Aversa (1030) by Sergius, magister militum or duke of Naples, in return for services they had rendered him, they began, now that they had a local habitation as well as a name, to fight for their own hands against Greek, Italian, or Saracen. Before the end of the century they had mastered them all, and two Norman counts ruled the lands that were afterwards to be known as the kingdom of the two Sicilies.

On his return journey the emperor, along with the Pope visited Monte Cassino. Its abbot, Atenulf, brother of the rebellious prince of Capua, had fled from the abbey when Henry made his descent into Italy, and had been drowned whilst attempting to escape to Constantinople. To ensure the loyalty of such an important personage as the head of Monte Cassino, pressure was no doubt brought to bear upon the monks, and, in the presence of the emperor and the Pope, they elected as their new abbot Theobald, who "had been clothed with the habit of holy religion in his fourteenth year". At the time of his election he was holding the office of Provost of the March of Teanum. In this capacity he had rendered the greatest service to the emperor on his descent into Apulia. He was consecrated abbot by the Pope himself, on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul (June 29). After they had thus left a staunch friend in the important position of abbot of this powerful monastery, Benedict and Henry went to Rome.

During their short stay in the city all possible measures were taken to consolidate the imperial influence among the nobles. But the pestilence was meanwhile playing fearful havoc among the German troopers. Colder climes must be reached without further delay. And so, still accompanied by the Pope, Henry hurried northwards. At Pavia a halt was called, and, to cope with the widespread vices of incontinency and simony among the clergy, an important synod was held. There were present at it both the Pope and the emperor, who were in complete accord as to the necessity of curbing these evils, and a considerable number of bishops and nobles.

The proceedings opened with a very lengthy and vigorous harangues from the Pope, in which, addressing the clergy, he denounced the violation of their duty of celibacy, and the alienation of Church property by them, especially by such “as had had a servile origin”, *i.e.*, had once been numbered among the serfs of the Church.

As long as the Church, he began, follows the regulations laid down by the Fathers, it flourishes, but it falls into trouble as soon as it leaves the road indicated by them. The greatest enemies of the Church, those whose lives most defile it, are its bad priests; for, when made fat by the goods of the Church, they kick against it. They have dissipated the goods which kings and people have bestowed upon the Church. The worst offenders are those who were originally its serfs. They have no wealth of their own; but they marry free women, so that they may beget free children, to whom they may make over the property of the Church. Hence, though once very rich, the Church is now most poor.

To attack the root of the evil, the Pope declared that the celibacy of the clergy must be insisted upon, and reminded his hearers that this had been enforced by the great council of Nice, and that the letters of Pope S. Leo I made it plain that the law of celibacy was binding even on subdeacons. He had no wish, he said, to introduce new laws, he only wished to remind them of old ones. He went on to recall to the memories of his hearers that even the priests of the Old Law were bound to live a celibate life during the seasons when it fell to their turn to serve the altar of God. Hence, as the priests of the New Law are always engaged in the service of God, they must always

remain celibate. The law of celibacy was relaxed for the priests of the Old Law, but that was because the ancient dispensation required that the priests should belong exclusively to the tribe of Levi, whereas, under the New Law, they could be chosen from any section of the community.

He next proceeded to denounce most strongly those who, from being serfs of the Church had become clerics, and had taken to themselves wives, and went on to establish that the legal axiom that the social condition of the child followed that of its mother did not apply to the clergy. First, because those who laid down that proposition had no right to make regulations of that nature for the clergy, and secondly, because in framing the axiom they had in view only the children of laymen, as, in the eyes of the law, clerics have no children. And if St. Paul has written (1 Cor. VII. 2), "For fear of fornication, let every man have his own wife", the apostle, said the Pope, is speaking only of the laity.

In fine, in order that what he has decided may reach the ends of the earth, and be observed, he has caused it to be expressed in the form of a decree of seven clauses. Under various penalties bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons are forbidden to have wives. All children born of such marriages are to be serfs of the Church, and any freeman who emancipates any such serfs, or assists in any way their acquiring property, renders himself liable to scourging, imprisonment, or loss of dignity. The emperor, while thanking the Pope for his efforts to check the evil of clerical incontinence, added the seven synodal canons to the laws of the empire, and attached very severe penalties to the breaking of them.

Soon after Henry reached Germany, the young and zealous Aribo, whom he had made archbishop of Maintz a year or two before, held a very important synod at Seligenstadt near Frankfort. The object of the synod was, as its convener declared, to bring about a greater uniformity in religious worship and discipline. Mention is here made of this council principally because its purport seems to have been misunderstood by some writers. It has been said that it "assed several decrees with a view of strengthening the position of the bishop against the Pope". Two of the decrees of the council had reference to Rome. The sixteenth forbade any one to go to Rome without the permission of the diocesan authorities; and the eighteenth explained the cause of that prohibition. Some, it is there said, are so foolish that, when a penance has been imposed upon them for some serious sin, they will not submit to it, because they trust that the Pope forgives all the sins of those who go to Rome. Under these circumstances, the council has decided that they must first do their penance, and that they may then go to Rome with leave of their bishop, and with letters from him to the Pope with regard to the matter.

The reasonableness of these decrees taken together is obvious, and though Rome raised objections to some of the other decrees of this synod, it does not appear that any were urged against the two in question. Its second decree had made various new regulations with regard to the fasts of the ember days. These, "as opposed to reason and authority were condemned by the Roman Church, in all things and about all things fully guided by the magisterium of Peter". As, then, the two decrees sixteen and eighteen could scarcely have been the cause why the Pope soon after this interdicted Aribo from using his pallium, it has been conjectured that the motive of this action of Benedict was the fact that Aribo had proclaimed that Otto of Hammerstein must separate from his cousin Irmingard whom he had taken to wife. The truth is we do not know why Aribo fell into ill favour with the Pope. It is certain, however, that he wished to hold a council at Hochst (May 14, 1024). If an assembly of bishops was ever held there, only Aribo's suffragans attended it; and, from the letter they wrote to the Pope, it appears that Irmingard had been to Rome, and had irritated the Pope against him.

This is all that is really known about this incident. Whether now, when stripped of conjecture, it will be regarded "as a glorious proof of the resolution of the German clergy to resist Romish pretensions", may perhaps be doubted.

The feeling of the urgent need of reform both in Church and State, and of the necessity of finding some remedy for the terrible evils of the times, was not confined to the Pope and the emperor. Wherever there was a worthy bishop or a God-fearing noble there was one whose heart was bleeding for the many woes of the period and for the oppressed poor. A remedy of no little value was to come at last from France, which had suffered so very acutely during the tenth century. Its bishops rightly regarded the endless violent breaches of the peace as one of the most deep-seated causes of the miseries of the age. Quite in accordance with their natural temperament, the nobility of France especially were perpetually engaged in acts of brigandage or in private wars. The tillers of the soil were the most terrible sufferers from these hostilities. Their crops were destroyed, their cattle driven off, their vines cut down, and their houses burnt. The unarmed monk, the pilgrim, the travelling merchant were equally a prey to the robber noble. The bishops at length began to apply themselves in earnest to try to provide against the growing disorders. Not only did they denounce the plunderers of priest and peasant in council after council, but they induced nobles and people to form associations with them for *the peace of God*. Naturally, the rules of such associations founded in divers parts of Europe differed in detail; but they all had in view limiting the time or mode of making war.

The idea of the truce may, however, be gathered from a letter of the clergy of Gaul to those of Italy (1035-1041). "This", they say, "is the peace or truce of God .... which we beseech you to accept as we have done, *viz*. that all Christians, friends and enemies, neighbours and strangers, should keep true and lasting peace one with another from vespers on Wednesday to sunrise on Monday, so that during these four days and five nights all persons may have peace, and, trusting to this peace, may go about their business without fear of their enemies".

The peace movement began in Aquitaine in 990, and soon spread. "Peace, Peace, Peace!" was everywhere the cry of the people. Robert the Pious, king of France, encouraged the new associations; and emperor and Pope saw the great possibilities for good they contained. The three began to dream of a universal peace. With a view to carry it into effect, Robert and Henry met at Mouzon on the Meuse (August 1023). Crowds flocked to the place, if only to see the famous emperor. Terms of friendship were soon agreed upon, and a compact "of peace and justice" was arranged. To help on "the peace of God's holy Church and to succour suffering Christendom", it was deemed best to secure the co-operation of the Pope, and that they should meet him and all the bishops of Europe at Pavia.

Unfortunately, however, for the general peace and happiness which Benedict and Henry, so united, and both so eager for reform, would, in union with Robert of France, have substantially furthered, the two chiefs of Western Christendom died (1024) within the year after this important meeting at Mouzon. The good work they had taken in hand was checked, and the Papacy was soon afterwards once again dragged in the mire. When at length a reformation of morals was accomplished, it was effected rather in spite of the imperial power than with its hearty cooperation. Meanwhile, however, the influence and number of the peace associations steadily increased, and in 1041 the Truce of God was formally established.

While pushing on schemes of ecclesiastical and civil reform of imperial dimensions with kings and emperors, Benedict did not neglect to turn his attention to others, less splendid but perhaps on that very account more practical. To the best of his

ability he defended the property of the monasteries, then the only centres of peace and learning, against the plundering barons; and he increased their possessions out of his own patrimony. Sometimes he granted his favours without exacting any concrete acknowledgment, but at other times he required a monetary payment for privileges conceded. Now it was under spiritual penalties only that he interdicted interference with the monasteries, now under temporal by the imposition of a fine. He asserted his authority over them in face of the civil power by granting them various privileges in the temporal order, as for instance when he granted an abbot the power of judging his subjects "without the concurrence of the secular authority, and despite the prohibition of any bishop".

But, in union with all who at this period had reform at heart, Benedict showed special interest in the congregation of Cluny, and in St. Odilo (*d.* 1040), its fifth abbot. Under this remarkably energetic man improvement in monastic discipline made steady progress; and, wherever the reform of Cluny was introduced, a higher moral tone manifested itself in the neighbouring district. Odilo was able to effect the more because, according to Jotsald, his disciple and biographer, he won the favour of all the great ones of the world—of King Robert of France, of the Emperor Henry II, and of the different Popes from Sylvester II to Clement II (*d.* 1046). As the Popes were ever speaking out in favour of Cluny, there was naturally a warm feeling for the Popes in the breasts of the Cluniac monks. The much-needed reform was to be accomplished by them in union with the Papacy. Some of them were always in Rome, and thither more than once journeyed Odilo during the pontificate of Benedict. And it was through his representations that, when King Robert was in Rome in 1016, he obtained from the Pope a bull (April 1) addressed to the bishops of Burgundy, Aquitaine, and Provence, bidding them excommunicate all such as plundered the goods of any of the Cluniac monasteries. Benedict points out how the monastery of Cluny, made *free* by its founder, by the Pope, by the emperor of the Romans, and by the kings of the Franks and the Burgundians, was declared absolutely independent of all control except that of God and the Holy See. This privilege had been granted that the monks might be able to give themselves to the service of God and the care of the poor without restraint. These ends, says the Pope, they have "devotedly fulfilled as far as human nature will allow". Now, however, they are so harassed by the greed and mad violence of the wicked that to the general loss they are hindered both from serving God and the poor. All ought to strive to help "the servants of Christ" in their difficulties, but he himself especially to whom, after God and St. Peter, the care of the congregation belongs. Then the Pope mentions by name some of their worst oppressors; and, after allowing them till the coming feast of St. Michael to repent and make restitution, declares them excommunicated if they do not avail themselves of the time which had been granted them for making satisfaction. The letter concludes with an exhortation to the bishops to whom it was addressed to confirm the Pope's sentence, and to have it repeated by all their clergy; and it also calls upon the law-abiding nobles, in view of the Last Judgment, to help and defend the various monasteries of the Cluniac congregation.

"Because the monks of Cluny were free", and because they could thus count on the protection of Pope and king, the good work of converting and civilizing Europe which they had begun went on with undiminished zeal all during this century. Their monasteries were beacons of light to all the country round, and the men they produced, like flaming torches, carried the light of truth and morality into every land. The encouragement afforded the order by Benedict is not the least of his claims to grateful remembrance.

Of very different character to the mild and conciliatory Odilo, though a great friend of his, was William, abbot of St. Benignus at Dijon. In his zeal for reform he was hard and severe both to himself and to others. In him deep desire for the advancement of God's glory and his neighbour's good took the form of a devouring fire which instead of melting his heart with tender sympathy, dried up within his breast the "milk of human kindness". However, he is well worthy of our sympathy, for he toiled hard for the noblest of ends; and he succeeded in winning the goodwill of Benedict VIII.

In the course of the differences which bishops often had with the monasteries of their diocese, they not unfrequently had recourse to an old but very effective method of annoying them. They used to forbid them to hold divine service within their monasteries. Availing himself of the fact that, at the moment, his bishop, Bruno of Langres, was favourably disposed to the monks of St. Benignus, William begged the Pope to grant his monastery an indult by virtue of which the power to suspend divine service within its walls would be taken out of the bishop's hands altogether. In response to this request Benedict addressed him a bull in which he not only granted the petition, but took the monastery "under the apostolic protection". To support his action of forbidding the bishop to interdict the saying of Mass, etc., within the monastery, he quoted the authority of St. Gregory the Great, as well as his maxim that whatever interferes with the routine of monastic life destroys its spirit.

A few years later Benedict came in contact with a man whose character and aims were different to those of "*More rule* William", as he was called, but whose name was already closely associated with monks and monasteries, viz. Bernard Taillefer, count of Bésalu. Like many another of his age, he was not, occasionally at least, averse to making the carrying out of his religious ideas contribute to the advancement of his general policy. And, again like many another of his age, he wished to render himself as independent of any overlord as possible. Hence he betook himself to Rome (1016) to secure the establishment of a bishopric within his own domain. Seeing that he would himself nominate the candidate for the position, he would, if successful, both strengthen his power within his dominions, and render himself more independent in his external relations. He was favourably known in Rome from his monastic foundations, and a bull was published (January 26, 1017) granting the petition which had been urged "on bended knee and with the kissing of the Pope's feet". Benedict, however, reserved to himself and to his successors the right of consecrating the bishops of the new see, and added : "But that the bishop-elect may not appear empty in our sight, we ordain that after his consecration he offer one pound of pure gold, not in return for his consecration but to show his subjection to our Church. At the same time we forbid him to wage war on Christians for any reason whatsoever, and we forbid any person high or low to tempt him so to do". But neither Pope nor Count was destined to get his own way. The bishops, whose jurisdiction the new creation would have curtailed, contrived to render the papal decree inoperative.

This nomination or appointment of bishops by local magnates introduces us to one of the great evils of this age—the want of real freedom in episcopal elections. In accordance with the canon law of the period, bishops ought to have been elected by the clergy and people of the diocese, and then have received the investiture of the temporalities of their see from the king or some other *overlord.* But as the bishops were temporal rulers, it was only natural that the overlord should strive to have bishops who would be *his men* in every sense of the phrase. Hence in an age when so much that had might on its side was necessarily right, there was practically no freedom of election in the case of bishoprics and of the greater abbeys. Robert *the Pious* of France was as great an offender in this respect as any other ruler, and sometimes even procured the

assistance of the Pope to help him to beat down opposition. Against their wishes he had forced the monks of Fleury to accept, as the successor of abbot Abbo, his own natural brother Gauzlin. Then (*c.* 1013) he nominated him to the important See of Bourges. But, as the monks of Fleury had already done, the people, with their viscount, Gauzfred, proclaimed that "it was not becoming that the son of a concubine should rule in the Church". Robert turned to the Pope, and the new archbishop went himself to Rome. As Gauzlin's personal character stood very high, and as the policy of Benedict was to gain legitimate influence over the great ones of the world that he might thus be able to work more efficiently for the promotion of peace, he made no difficulty in dispensing Gauzlin from the canonical irregularity caused by his illegitimate birth. He sent him the pallium, and threatened to excommunicate the viscount of Bourges if he did not receive the archbishop. Some five years, however, elapsed before the joint temporal and spiritual arms of king and pontiff were able to overcome the resistance of the people of Bourges.

Benedict was also drawn into the interminable dispute between the patriarchs of Aquileia and of Grado, of which we have had to speak in preceding volumes. In the days of John XIII, the patriarch of Aquileia had reasserted the original rights of that see. But that pontiff, in response to a request from the duke of Venice (Peter IV, Candiano, 959-976), and from the patriarch of Grado, decided (967) in synod, in conjunction with Otho I, that the See of Grado was the metropolitan of the whole of Venetia. Though this decision was reaffirmed by Sergius IV, the affair was reopened in 1023. The patriarch of Aquileia in that year was a German of distinguished birth, the warlike Poppo, who led one of the divisions of the army of Henry I, when he invaded Apulia.

"Thirsting to bring the church of Grado under his sway by the help of the emperor", Poppo sent to beg for justice from Benedict VIII, and adjured him to summon Ursus Orseolo of Grado (1018-1045) to Rome. Duly cited by Benedict, Ursus pleaded that he feared the power of the emperor, and treachery on the part of Poppo. The Pope admitted the justice of his contention; but not so his adversary, whom chance soon after greatly favoured. The duke of Venice (Otto Orseolo), and the patriarch of Grado, who was his brother, were compelled by trouble at home to fly to Istria. Fraudulently representing himself as the exiles' friend, Poppo was admitted within the walls of Grado. Once inside, he treated it as a conquered city, and by a further fraud obtained an acknowledgment of his claims from John XIX. His deceits, however, were not crowned with final success. The Venetians received the exiles back, and once again for a time was the Aquileia-Grado dispute settled by their recovery of Grado; and that, too, though Poppo again had recourse to violence a year or two later.

During the reign of Benedict the valuable chronicle of Thietmar of Merseburg was brought to a close (1018) by the death of its author. Before taking our leave of it, we would gladly quote from it once more. The extract taken concerns Boleslas I, the founder of Poland, on whom, as the opponent of his patron (the Emperor Henry II), and as the ally of Ardoin, "falsely called king by the Lombards", Thietmar is very severe. The Polish chief was to have accompanied Henry into Italy (1013); but, "false as usual to his promises", he did not put in an appearance when the emperor's forces mustered. Our chronicler goes on to insinuate that he was equally untrue to the Pope; for he relates that, by the bearer of a letter, Boleslas declared to Benedict that it was fear of the snares of the king which had prevented him from sending to Rome "the tax he had promised to Peter, the Prince of the Apostles". Considering the customs of the age, this tax had perhaps been imposed by Pope Sylvester as a sign of the independence of the Church of Poland with regard to any German metropolitan, and of its direct dependence on the See of Rome. Of course it may have been a voluntary offering of Peter's Pence of which England had set the example; but, most probably, it was the sign that Poland, as we

have seen, had placed itself as a nation under the protection of the Apostolic See. Certain it is that in later ages it was the last-mentioned signification that was attached to the tax which Poland still continued to pay. In the *Liber Censuum* there is a record that Waladislao, duke of Poland, had to pay to Rome four gold marks every three years. This Waladislao was Wladislas *Plwacs* (The Spitter), duke of Kalisz and Great Poland, one of the four principalities into which Poland was split at the time. To ensure his independence he had applied for the protection of the Holy See. He received from Innocent III the following reply (May 13, 1211):

"Under our protection and that of Blessed Peter we receive you and all your goods. And *in token of this protection* you will, every third year, pay to us and our successors four marks *ad Polonie pondus*!"

And still later, Ladislaus Lokietesk (The Short), 1306-1333, who again brought unity to Poland by welding into one several of the previously independent duchies, and who, after receiving from Rome the regal crown, levied a poll-tax for St. Peter, declared more than once that the annual tax paid by the Poles to the Apostolic See was the mark of their subjection to it. Though, therefore, it is certain that at some period the fact of the payment of Peter's Pence came to be regarded as a proof that the Pope was the suzerain of Poland, it can only be said to be highly probable that the money received by Benedict VIII from that country was the sign of its dependence on Rome.

The country in which the "Denarius S. Petri" or Romescot had had its birth was, in the early years of Benedict VIII, in dire distress. Attracted by the weakness of Ethelred the Unready (978-1016), the Danes had renewed their devastating descents on its shores. The good effected by the monastic revival of St. Dunstan was at once checked; and, though the strong reign of Canute stemmed the decline, the Anglo-Saxon Church and State both began to sink to their ruin (1066). However, during most of the reign of Benedict, England was happy. Ethelred's feeble payments of Danegeld and cruel massacres had ended in the establishment of the powerful Canute as ruler of the English people (1016-1035). Among the "very great and learned men" who, says William of Malmesbury, flourished in England in his time, "the principal was Ethelnoth", surnamed The Good, archbishop of Canterbury. Fortunately he had great influence with Canute; for we read how he "encouraged even the king himself in his good actions by the authority of his sanctity and restrained him in his excesses."

Of the relations between England and Rome in the pontificate of Benedict the little knowledge we have is furnished us by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. "In this year" (1022), it records, "Archbishop Aethelnoth went to Rome, and was there received by Benedict, the venerable Pope, with great worship; and he with his own hands placed his pall upon him, and very honourably hallowed him archbishop, and blessed him on the Nones of October (October 7). And the archbishop therewith immediately, on that same day, sang Mass; and then after with the Pope himself honourably took refection, and also of himself took the pall from St. Peter's altar, and then joyfully went home to his own country".

Along with Ethelnoth there went to Rome for justice Leofwine, abbot of Ely, who had, he said, been unjustly deprived of his abbey. After he had "cleared himself of everything that was said against him as the Pope instructed him, with the witness of the archbishop, and of all the company that was with him". Benedict reinstated him in his position.

From the necrology of S. Cyriacus it is clear that the active and useful career of Benedict VIII came to an end on April 9, 1024. By Raoul Glaber he is called "a most holy man"; and in so speaking of him the erratic monk went not astray, for with unflagging energy did he toil for those entrusted to his charge. His hand and his heart,

his courage and his intellect were ever at their service. He did all that lay in his power to beget and to foster a spirit of patriotism; he encouraged and developed the growing feeling of the urgent need for reform, and especially did he strive that the blessings of peace should be spread far and wide.

In the beginning of the century which Benedict adorned "there arose throughout the world, but especially in Italy and in the Gauls, a great zeal for church-building; so that even where the existing edifices were beautiful, and did not stand in any need of alteration, still, in the generous rivalry which set in between different peoples as to who were to have the most glorious churches, they were nevertheless replaced. It was as though the world itself, shaking off its lethargy and decrepitude, clad itself in the white robe of churches. Not only were almost all the cathedrals and monasteries rebuilt, but even the chapels of the villages". It may be more than doubtful whether Benedict himself found time for church-building, but there can be no doubt that he was one of the most earnest in promoting that reforming movement of which this outburst of enthusiasm for the greater glory of God's House, recorded by our wandering historian Glaber, was one of the manifestations. And if Arnold of Vohburg, who wrote about this time, could speak not only of the Christian activity which everywhere met the eyes, but of new churches and other ecclesiastical and charitable institutions in course of erection as well within as without the city of Rome, we may see, in all this material improvement, if not the hand, at least the spirit of Benedict. For the spirit of Benedict was powerful. He was of the rarer number of the Popes who were great both at home and abroad. Through his brother, whom he dominated, he was supreme in Rome, and through his influence with the Emperor Henry, with King Robert of France, and with Duke William III the Great, duke of Aquitaine, one of the most distinguished princes of his time and "an ardent lover of the Holy See", he had great power abroad.

The high character, however, of Benedict did not place him out of the reach of the shafts of calumny. Apparently on the sole evidence of one of the many baseless legends carefully recorded by St. Peter Damian, he has been accused of being the slave of avarice. Whether or not the saint, who was much more credulous than critical, has confused Benedict with his brother or nephew, is not worth inquiring. He has two stories to tell of him. The first, which is unobjectionable enough, is to be found in his *Life of St. Odilo*, for whom Benedict had a great affection, and whom he provided with all necessaries on the occasions of his visits to Rome.

After he had departed this life Benedict appeared to John, bishop of Porto, and told him he was in pain, but said he could be freed from suffering by the prayers of St. Odilo, which he entreated him to procure for him. As soon as he heard of his patron's condition, the saint ordered prayers and masses to be offered for him throughout the whole congregation of Cluny. Soon after the Pope appeared to him in glory, and thanked the saint for having obtained his relief. Hence St. Peter Damian argues the great merits of St. Odilo, inasmuch as a sovereign pontiff, who in an especial manner holds the keys of the Church, could only be freed from punishment by his prayers.

The other story, on which the charge of greed of gold is preferred against Benedict, is of a different character. The bishop of Caprea is said to have seen Benedict sometime after his death sitting on a coal-black charger, and to have heard him say that he was in terrible torments but had hopes of delivery if he were helped. "Go", he said, "to my brother, who is now Pope, and tell him I shall be redeemed when for my salvation he has distributed the money he will find in a certain chest, for what he has already given to the poor on my behalf has not benefited me in the least, as it was money accumulated by violence and injustice".

Equally under the heading of legends we would class the following story of Ademar of Chabannes. Throughout all the Middle Ages, and even up to this very day, the lot of the Jews has not been very enviable. But it is well known that in Rome, though they had to suffer certain more or less trifling disabilities, their position was so much better than in other parts of Christendom that, as we have noted before, it was called “the paradise of the Jews”. Hence it is that we believe that the story we are about to tell is unworthy of credence, the more so because the very next tale Ademar tells about the Jews is by other historians referred to another man and to another period.

“At this time (*c.* 1020), on Good Friday, after the adoration of the cross, Rome was shaken by an earthquake and rent by furious gales. Benedict was subsequently assured by one of the Jews that at that very hour a crucifix was derided in all their synagogues. On careful inquiry being made, the Pope, convinced of the truth of the charge, had the authors of the outrage beheaded. The winds dropped with the falling of the culprits’ heads”.

Though we have evidence that Benedict VIII coined money, it is usually, supposed that no coins of his are extant. Pizzamiglio, however, believes, seemingly on solid grounds, that a coin assigned by Promis to Benedict VII really belongs to this Pope. The coin in question is quite different in type to the other coins of Benedict VII; and, what is fatal to its being regarded as belonging to him, it does not bear the name of the Emperor Otho II, as the others do. Despite the latter fact, however, Promis still argued that the coin belonged to Benedict VII, because he supposed that he outlived Otho. The reverse is the fact. But, when Benedict VIII became Pope, the imperial throne was vacant; and hence we may well conclude that the coin in question, which, as we have said, does not bear the name of any emperor, was struck during the first few months of his pontificate.

This question of coinage suggests the advisability of adducing one or two more facts from the letters of Benedict to illustrate a remark already made to the effect that he was as powerful at home as he was influential abroad. They will show him not only freely disposing of property belonging to the Holy See, but granting such privileges as show his independent power in the province of Rome and on the Adriatic. By the lagunes of Comacchio the Roman Church had a very large estate (Massa Fiscalia and Plebe S. Vitalis), the people on which were no doubt then as now engaged in the lucrative fish-trade of the shallows. Addressing its head men and "all our men” he confirms to them all their ancient rights, on condition of their receiving once a year for three days papal officials who were to make regulations for them, and of their paying each year to the Holy Roman Church a pair of oxen or twenty solidi of such a number of denarii as are there current, and at Christmas time sixty sides of bacon. The Pope also decided that, if any of the men on the massa died without an heir or intestate, his property was to be divided among the rest, and that any breach of his decree by any of the great ones of Church or State was to be punished by a fine of one hundred pounds of pure gold, half to be paid to the papal exchequer and half to the men of the massa. Similar acts of authority are manifest in the long document which he addressed (1018) to Benedict, bishop of Porto. By this bull, most interesting and useful from a topographical point of view, he confirmed to the bishops of Porto their privileges and property in perpetuity. The property of the bishopric, which consisted of fortified places, lands, salt-pits, woods, vineyards, etc., was not confined to Porto and its neighbourhood, but was to be found in various parts along the Tiber, *e.g.* at Maliana, and in the Trastevere. To the inhabitants of some of the bishop's possessions the Pope grants the privilege of owing service, and of being subject to no one but the bishop of Porto: and he declares the bishop himself heir of all those who die intestate or without

heirs “in the city of Porto, in the Trastevere, in the island of Lycaonia, or wherever else the rights of his bishopric extend”.

Benedict also concedes certain taxation rights and monopolies to the bishop, and grants him the right of ordaining such priests and other clerics as were required for the Trastevere, except where there was question of a cardinal-priest, deacon, or sub-deacon or of an acolyte “of the sacred Lateran palace”. Finally, under penalty of a heavy fine, the papal official, whether duke, count, or apostolic missus, who may at any time be the governor of Porto, is forbidden to infringe any of the bishop's rights.

From this letter it appears also that while the bishop of Porto had certain powers of local government and rate-collecting, he was not supreme even in Porto itself, and his levying of local dues had not to interfere with the taxes which had to be paid to the papal treasury. While the bishop had rate-collectors in his district, his city was still under a papal count, who would see that the rights of the papal exchequer were respected. And what is true of Porto is no doubt true of the other cities under the Pope’s control; though in many of them the papal duke, count, viscount, chamberlain, missus or other official in command of a city or district would not always be hampered by persons with such extensive privileges as the bishop of Porto. In the lawless times of which we are now writing, authority was only held by the man of will and resource. Such a man was Benedict VIII, and hence he exercised real sway over the patrimony of St. Peter.

JOHN XIX.
1024-1032

On the death of Benedict, his brother Romanus, “Consul and Duke, Senator of all the Romans, and *vestararius* of the sacred palace”, made use of his influence and of his money to secure his election to the vacant see. The same day saw him Duke Romanus and Pope John XIX. “Roman insolence”, caustically writes Raoul Glaber, “has invented this silly method of covering their guile. They change the name of the man whom their whim has made (supreme) pontiff and call him after some great Pope, so that any want of merit in their candidate may be covered by the glory of his name”. Romanus became Pope in the month of April, for we are told that his succession followed immediately on his brother's death.

Though, therefore, John does not seem to have entered the inner sanctuary honourably, once within it, he appears to have proved himself no unworthy successor of his distinguished brother. He was conscious of his short-comings; he felt that his secular duties took up too great a share of his time; but he adopted a noble method of trying to atone for his defects. “Impeded”, he wrote, “by the business of this world, I am very far from having attained to perfection; still, I ground my hope of obtaining God's grace and pardon on my determination ever to give my support to the just and to the good”. By rigid adherence to this principle of conduct, and by his ready acceptance of the influence of good men, John XIX made himself respected, like his brother, both at home and abroad.

He was one of the Popes who came under the severe censorship of that eminent Cluniac reformer William, abbot of St. Benignus (Dijon). How he accepted his strictures may be gauged from an incident furnished us by Raoul Glaber in his Life of his master. Thinking that the Pope did not exert himself sufficiently against simony, which was then rampant all over the world, and “especially in Italy”, he did not hesitate to write to him in strong terms urging him to check the terrible abuse. “Let it be enough for men”, he wrote, “that Christ was sold once for the salvation of all of us ... You, who are but pastors in name, see whither the flock of Christ is following you. If the stream is tainted near its source, how foul must it be at a distance from it. The cure of souls is sold to many to their own damnation. I would wish all you pastors and bishops to be mindful of the judge who stands before the gate with his axe in his hand”. So far was John from being annoyed at the outspokenness of the saint that he took its lesson to heart, thanked him for writing to him, “and glorified God in him”. In these expressions there is no reason to doubt that the Pope was in earnest. He proved himself a friend of Cluny — “conspicuous by its holiness in well-nigh every nation”, as he styled it — and of its reforming abbots. His name has come down to us among the pontiffs who helped on the good work it was doing. “At the prayer of Odilo and the intervention of the Emperor Henry”, he renewed the privileges of the famous monastery, and wrote to

kings, archbishops, and bishops to exhort them to respect its immunities, assuring them that to harass Cluny was "to seek to tear our very limbs asunder".

Whether the authorities of Constantinople also had heard that the Pope did not inveigh against simony, or whether because they were encouraged by their success under John XI (933), when they bought the free use of the pallium, at any rate, believing, as they always did, that "every man has his price", the Emperor Basil II and the patriarch Eustathius sent (1024) emissaries to Rome to try to purchase the consent of the Pope to allow "the Church of Constantinople to be in the East what the Church of Rome was in the whole world". To smooth the path to success, they began by giving great presents not only to the Pope himself, but also to all such as they judged likely to be of service to them. To quote one of Raoul's proverbs, they knew that "a golden dagger easily breaks a wall of iron"; and though, he adds, love of money might well at this period be called the queen of the world, she had her special abode among the Romans. A certain number were gained over by the Greek gold, and began to take steps to arrange for the affair to be transacted in secret. "But to no purpose. For Truth itself cannot be deceived which promised: The gates of hell shall not prevail against the church (St. Matt. XVI. 18). While the plotters fondly imagined that their work was being satisfactorily brought to a conclusion in secret, word of what they were attempting was being rapidly spread throughout all Italy. The excitement and tumult which ensued cannot be described". The bishops and abbots of the Gauls took up the matter with vigour. Some instantly set out for Rome in person, others defended the position of the Church of Rome in writing, "adducing authorities which could not be gainsaid". William of Dijon took cognizance of the reports, and wrote to the Pope a letter, brief indeed, but weighty and to the point.

"By the words of the Apostles of the Gentiles", he began, "we are taught that superiors are not to be blamed. Still, he elsewhere says: 'I am become foolish; you have compelled me' (2 Cor. XII. 11). Hence with filial devotion we beg you to ask a friend, as Our Lord asked S. Peter: *What do men say of me?*"

Then, noting that we must pray the Light of the world that the Pope may so shine before men as to give light to all those in the Church in order that they may walk in the way of God's commandments, he continued: "But there is a report concerning you at which such as fail to be scandalized must be far from being full of divine love. For if the power of the Roman Empire, which in the whole earth was once one, is now split up and held by various different rulers, (it is otherwise) with the power of binding and loosing. By an inviolable gift, that has for ever devolved on the successors of Peter, to be exercised by them over all the earth. This we have said, in order that you may see that it is through vainglory that the Greeks have made the request from you which they have done. In fine, also, we beg you, as becomes the universal bishop, to devote yourself with greater energy to the reform of the Church".

However much the Pope may have been disposed to be swayed by the glitter of gold, the storm which the attempt of the Greeks raised in Western Europe must soon have driven away from him all thoughts of gratifying them. We have said *may have been disposed*, for it must be apparent that nothing but the vaguest rumours of the Pope's intentions were known in France. The envoys returned to Constantinople "with their puffed-up pride quite collapsed", concludes Raoul.

Whether John hoped for anything from the Greeks or not, it is plain that he did not fear them. For when granting the pallium to Bisantius, archbishop of Bari, giving him the right of instituting twelve bishoprics, confirming his rights, and subjecting to him all the monasteries both of men and women "as well Greek as Latin" in his arch-diocese, he interdicted interference in the matter of his privileges not only on the part of Western

potentates, but also on the part of any "patricius or catapan, excubitus (chamberlain), or of any other Eastern dignitary whatsoever".

Also in the first year of his reign, John XIX received a letter from Fulbert, bishop of Chartres (*d.* 1028), the most distinguished pupil of the most distinguished master (Gerbert) of his age. Though it only presents us with the beginning of an incident of the sequel of which we have no knowledge, it is still well worth quoting, as it shows the esteem in which not only John himself but the Papacy was held even at this period by decidedly the most learned and influential prelate in France. The frequency with which the matter we have had in hand has called for an observation of this kind is enough of itself to make it obvious that much that is commonly said of the want of influence of the Papacy during this epoch has no foundation in fact. Fulbert, "the lowly bishop of Chartres", addressing "the holy and universal Pope, the Lord John", writes thus:

"Thanks be to Almighty God, who, in accordance with His wonted goodness, has, O Father, had regard to your lowliness and, as was fitting, has raised you to the highest pinnacle of glory. On you are the eyes of the whole world fixed, all proclaim you alone most blessed, holy men contemplate your greatness and rejoice that you present to them the spectacle of all virtues. The persecutors of the Church gaze upon you in dread of your anger. Those who are being scourged by the impious, look up to you and breathe once more, trusting that a consoling remedy is still left to them. Of this last number am I, an insignificant bishop of a great and glorious Church; and, imploring your help, O Father, I write you about my troubles".

Fulbert then proceeds to denounce a certain Count Rodolf, who had not only ravaged the possessions of the church of Chartres, but had even killed one of its clerics with his own hand. Called to justice, he had defied the king and everybody else, and had at length been excommunicated by Fulbert. Rodolf had then at once betaken himself to Rome, in the hope of getting absolution from the Pope: "Hence, most beloved Father, to whom the care of the whole Church has been committed, do not fail to take him to task for his bloodshed and violence as your Providence knows he deserves. And let not your holiness unjustly receive in communion one whom the divine authority has alienated as a heathen. Farewell, good pastor, and watch over us, lest, by any carelessness of yours, the flock of the Lord should come to harm".

Fulbert seems to have made the "Roman journey", as it was called, a year or two later; but whether or not in connection with the violence of Rodolf cannot be stated.

Scarcely was John seated on his throne when he was called upon to intervene in the controversy that was going on between the patriarchs of Aquileia and Grado. We have already seen how he made over Grado to Poppo of Aquileia (1024). This he did because the German patriarch had declared that he could prove by ancient *privileges* that it canonically belonged to him, and because he did not think "that he would have dared to mock the Apostolic See". Ursus of Grado, however, promptly appealed against the decision, and though both the patriarchs were summoned, he alone put in an appearance at the synod in the Lateran palace which the Pope held to examine the question (December 1024). The production of the concessions of seventeen Popes, from Pelagius II to Sergius IV, settled the matter in Ursus' favour. Poppo was ordered to give up both his pretensions and his usurpations. Though, no doubt to soothe him, the Pope granted favours to him, it was not in accordance with Poppo's fighting nature to forego his claims, nor did it suit the new German king, Conrad, that the power of a German bishop in Italy should be in any way curtailed. Accordingly, when he came to Rome for the imperial crown (1027), Conrad once more brought the case of Aquileia before the Pope. There is ever "much virtue" in the tongue of an emperor. The affair was at once reopened. Ursus was summoned to a Roman synod at which Conrad himself was

present (April 6, 1027), and in the balance of that assembly the wish of an emperor had greater weight than the claims of justice. While Ravenna was justly declared second to Milan, Grado was arbitrarily submitted to the jurisdiction of Poppo. Aquileia, "as *seems* to have been conceded by Blessed Peter", was declared to be second after Rome, and its patriarch granted the use of the pallium and the privilege of sitting at the right hand of the Pope. But, though Poppo hesitated not to enlist both treachery and violence in his cause, it was not destined to be finally successful. He himself died "without confession or viaticum"; and, "at the request of Dominico Contareno, duke of the Venetians and Dalmatians, and the people of Venice", Benedict IX confirmed the position of the patriarch of Grado.

The man who had in this way succeeded in strengthening his position in north Italy was Conrad. The learned, good and successful Emperor Henry II had died childless on Christmas Day, 1024; and the face of Christendom, which under him had been wreathed in smiles, was at once bathed in tears. Men who had at heart the cause of peace and the advancement of civilization were full of anxiety. One of these, Berno of Reichenau, writing seemingly to an Italian bishop, urges that the greatest caution be exercised in the election of a successor, "that once again the joint possession of a common ruler may unite us, that authority may be respected, and that (advancing) civilization may ennoble those whom no Alpine ranges could separate... Urging unity, thy sister Francia salutes thee, far-famed Italy".

Assuredly there was need enough of caution. As is usual under such circumstances, there were rival candidates in Germany; and many of the Italian nobles, fearing the power of a German king, endeavored to induce a French prince to assume the crown of Italy. They turned in the first instance to King Robert of France. But he would neither risk war with the Germans himself, nor would he suffer his son Hugh to do so. Then they approached the famous William III, duke of Aquitaine (*d.* 1030), called The Great, and well known to them from his frequent pilgrimages to Rome. They made him the very same request, promising him on oath the kingdom of Italy and the Roman empire. Not altogether trusting these engagements, he went into Italy to interview the nobles themselves. They would give him the kingdom, they said, if at their will he would depose the bishops, and replace them by such others as they thought fit. Refusing to become their tool, especially in such an iniquitous manner, he returned to his duchy denouncing the perfidy of the Italians.

Meanwhile in Germany the claims of the two chief candidates for the throne left vacant by the death of the Emperor Henry II (July 13, 1024), viz. two first cousins, both of the name of Conrad, were decided in a great assembly of the nation (September 8). The election of Conrad the Salic, duke of Franconia, put an end to the Saxon dynasty, and established the house of Franconia on the German throne. Though unlettered, his military talents enabled him to prove himself a useful ruler. The monarchial power established by Henry I, the Fowler, better called "the Founder", suffered no diminution in the strong hands of Conrad. Till the spring of 1026 he remained in Germany, going from province to province, and everywhere establishing his authority on a firm basis. Then he entered Italy and, after receiving the Iron Crown at Milan (March 1026), spent about a year in north Italy, doing as he had done in Germany. His work was greatly assisted by the adhesion of the Pope. He had already approved of the action of the German bishops who had offered Conrad the crown, on condition of his repudiating Gisela, whom he had espoused though she was related to him within the forbidden degrees of kindred; and he had invited him to come to Rome and receive "the crown of all Italy", the imperial crown. Then, when the king entered Italy, John had gone to meet

him with great pomp at Como. No doubt on this occasion Conrad succeeded in getting his marriage approved by the Pope. At any rate no more is said about its illegality.

Strong in the sympathy of the Pope and of the powerful Heribert, archbishop of Milan, Conrad marched to Rome in the spring of 1027 to receive the imperial crown. He entered the Eternal City in triumph during Holy Week, and was crowned along with his wife Gisela by the Pope on Easter Sunday (March 26) in the presence of Rudolph III, the last king of Burgundy (Arles), of King Canute, and of a vast concourse of people. When the ceremony was over, the new emperor was escorted to his palace (close to St. Peter's, where he had been crowned) by the two kings. Unfortunately the glory of the coronation was, as usual, dimmed by blood. A quarrel between a German and a Roman about a worthless, cowhide was enough to cause a fearful commotion. German soldiers hastened to the assistance of their countryman. Roman citizens flew to the aid of a fellow-townsman. After a tough fight the Romans were beaten. "A countless number of them fell. On the following day, to make atonement to the emperor those of the Romans who had been the cause of the disturbance were ordered to be brought before him, barefooted and with naked swords or ropes suspended from their necks according as they were freemen or slaves".

When Rome had been thus pacified, Conrad, true to the traditions of his predecessors, undertook an expedition into south Italy. His warlike prowess and his energy overcame all obstacles; and how energetic he could be we may judge when we are told that on one occasion he traversed "nearly one hundred Latin miles in a day and a night". Beneventum, Capua, and the other principal cities opened their gates to receive him or were soon forced to do so. No doubt he would have proceeded to expel the Greeks had not word reached him of trouble at home. However, to have them harassed as much as possible, he showed favour to the Normans, and entrusted to them the frontiers of his kingdom to be defended "against Greek guile". On his return march to Germany, Conrad again visited Rome. Whilst there before, he had granted various privileges "at the request" of the Pope; and it was probably during one or other of these visits, that he put an end—no doubt also at the request of the Pope—to that curious anomaly, which we have shown in operation, of two different codes of law being in vogue in the same locality. He decided that both in Rome and in its territory all cases must in future be decided by Roman law whether a Lombard was concerned or not.

When he reached Germany (June 1027), Conrad soon rendered it as submissive as he had left Italy. The presence of Canute at the coronation of the emperor is enough to carry our thoughts to England, which had for many years past been faring but ill. In the first half of the tenth century the Northmen were engaged in establishing themselves in Normandy, but in the second half they again turned their attention to this country. A massacre of some of their countrymen in England in 1002 served but to exasperate the others, and their ravages soon checked the reformation in manners which was going on throughout the land in consequence of the monastic revival. The strong reign of Canute (1019-1035), however, effected an improvement. During John's pontificate Rome was visited not only by Alfric, archbishop of York, who came for his pallium (1026), but also, as we have just seen, by Canute himself. Splendid were the offerings which he made to St. Peter, and great, we are told, were the sums of money which he paid at various places to secure the abolition of toll-gates where large dues were wont to be exacted from pilgrims. He also obtained from the Pope "the exemption of the School of the English from all toll and tribute". What else he did, and how deeply for good he was affected by his visit to Rome, shall be told by himself. By the hands of one of the companions of his pilgrimage, Lifing, abbot of Tavistock, he sent a letter to his people in which he related to them what he had seen and done:

"Canute, king of all England, Denmark, Norway, and part of Sweden, to Aethelnoth, metropolitan, and Alfric, archbishop of York, and to all bishops and nobles, and to the whole nation of the English, high and low, greeting. I notify to you that I have lately been to Rome to pray for the forgiveness of my sins, for the safety of my dominions, and of the people under my government ... I return thanks most humbly to my Almighty God for suffering me in my lifetime to approach the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, ... and there (in Rome) present, to worship and adore according to my desire. I have been the more diligent in the performance of this because I have learnt from the wise that St. Peter has received from God great power in binding and in loosing (and) that he carries the key of the kingdom of heaven ... Be it known to you that at the solemnity of Easter a great assembly of nobles was present with Pope John and the Emperor Conrad, that is to say, all the princes of the nations from Mount Garganus to the neighbouring sea. All these received me with honour, and presented me with magnificent gifts ... Moreover, I spoke with the emperor himself, and the sovereign pope and the nobles who were there, concerning the wants of all my people, English as well as Danes, observing that there ought to be granted to them more equitable regulations, and greater security on their passage to Rome; that they should not be impeded by so many barriers on the road ... The emperor assented to my request, as did Rodolph, king, who has the chief dominion over those barriers; and all the princes confirmed by an edict that my subjects, traders as well as those who went for a religious purpose, should peaceably go and return from Rome without any molestation from warders of barriers or tax-gatherers. Again, I complained before the Pope, and expressed my high displeasure that my archbishops were oppressed by the immense sum of money which is demanded from them when seeking, according to custom, the apostolical residence to receive the pall, and it was determined that it should be so no longer. Be it known then that, since I have vowed to God Himself henceforward to reform my life in all things, and justly and piously to govern the kingdoms and the people subject to me, and to maintain equal justice in all things, and have determined, through God's assistance, to rectify anything hitherto unjustly done, either through the intemperance of my youth or through negligence, therefore I call to witness and command my counsellors, ... that they by no means, either through fear of myself or favour to any powerful person, suffer henceforth any injustice, or cause such to obtain in all my kingdom ... I now, therefore, command and adjure all my bishops and governors throughout my kingdom, by the fidelity you owe to God and me, that you take care that, before I come to England, all dues to God, owing by ancient custom, be discharged : that is to say, plough-alms, the tenth of animals born in the current year, and the pence owing to Rome for St. Peter, whether from cities or villages; and in the middle of August, the tenth of the produce of the earth; and on the festival of St. Martin, the first-fruits of seeds to the church of the parish where each one resides, which in English is called *ciricsceatt"*.

Unfortunately, Canute's immediate successors were men of very different calibre to him, and the decline in Church and State, which had been somewhat checked by him, continued after his death, till it was arrested by the drastic remedy of the Norman invasion.

When we last treated of Hungary, attention was called not only to its rapid advance in Christianity and civilization under its first king, St, Stephen, but also to the efforts made by the saint to ensure its freedom. But that Hungary should be independent did not suit the imperial ideas of "the most warlike" Conrad. Anxious to have the neighbouring nations subject to the empire, he made use of the border warfare which, "through the fault of the Bavarians", was being carried on between them and the

Hungarians, to enter Hungary with a large army (1030). He had previously, as Bonizo would have us believe, endeavored to give his campaign a sacred character by inducing the Pope to bless his expedition by sending him a standard "as it were from St. Peter". With the banner John sent the bishop of Porto, and Belinzo, "a most noble Roman de Marmorato", and instructed them, if that would please the emperor, to carry it themselves in the front rank; or, if such were not his will, to tell him, on the Pope's behalf: "We promise you victory; see that you do not ascribe it to yourself but to the Apostles". Bonizo then goes on to say that John's promise was carried into effect, and that the lance of the king of Hungary which was captured at that time is to be seen in front of the confession of St. Peter. The good bishop, however, has made a gross mistake; for it is certain that this invasion had a most disastrous termination as far as Conrad was concerned. Bonizo has transferred to 1030 what really took place in 1044. John had nothing to do with Conrad's unsuccessful campaign of 1030; and, as a matter of fact, seems to have been on good terms with the rulers of Hungary. It is said that there is still to be seen at Metz a magnificently embroidered chasuble, the handiwork, it is believed, of Stephen's queen, Gisela. Worked in the under side of it appears the legend:

"Stephen, king of the Hungarians, and Gisela his beloved wife, send these gifts to the lord apostolic John".

Not to break up the subject of "Hungary" too much, the proper history of the affair related by Bonizo may be given here. By the misrule of St. Stephen's successor, Peter, the inevitable pagan reaction was aggravated. In 1041 he was expelled from the kingdom by the national and largely pagan party, and a native Hungarian, Aba Samú, whom the German chroniclers call Obo or Ovo, was chosen king. Peter fled to Germany and implored the intervention of Henry III. Here was obviously an excuse for demanding the papal blessing. A war was to be waged against pagans who had expelled their lawful sovereign. Henry was ready for war in 1044, and it was he who then received the banner spoken of by Bonizo from Benedict IX. Whether the Pope made the promise put into his mouth by the bishop of Sutri or not, Henry was completely successful. The king's lance was captured, Peter was restored, and Aba was captured and beheaded.

By reason of a letter addressed to his predecessor, John was drawn into a very curious controversy. It had for some time been a pious belief in France that of those who first preached therein the truths of Christianity, many had been directly in touch with our Lord Himself or with some of His apostles. Thus it was held that Christianity had been introduced into Provence by Lazarus and his two sisters Martha and Mary; and, about the middle of the ninth century, the deacon Florus had put down in his additions to St. Bede's martyrology that St. Martial, one of the seventy-two disciples, had been sent to Gaul by St. Peter and had preached at Limoges. In the days of Pope Benedict, the abbot of the monastery of St. Martial of Limoges approached Jordan, the bishop of the city, and asked him to declare in synod that St. Martial was to be accounted an apostle. This the bishop refused to do, because he believed that the abbot was simply anxious to secure some advantage over him, as his cathedral was dedicated to St. Stephen, who, though the first martyr, would not be reckoned to rank as high as an apostle. The abbot persisted in his contention that St. Martial ought to be raised to the dignity of an apostle; and soon the whole country, from King Robert downwards, was engaged in discussing the question as to whether the saint should continue to be called a confessor, or should in future be numbered with the twelve apostles.

What seems to have exercised a strong influence in forwarding St. Martial's claims to be styled an apostle was a codex written in letters of gold which Canute had

sent as a present to William, duke of Aquitaine. In this volume, which the duke showed to the Fathers of the council of Poitiers (1024), the saint was enumerated with the other apostles. The duke argued that the English must have derived this custom from St. Gregory, "who worked so hard for the salvation of that nation", and urged that "it would be rash to call in question what had been taught by so great a Pope". Jordan wrote to beg Benedict not to sanction the abbot's desire. That Pope, however, did not live long enough to respond to his letter. The answer came to it from John, who replied in a spirit of compromise. He pointed out from St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (II. 26) that even by the apostles themselves some were called apostles who were not of the number of the twelve; that the Church of the English called St. Gregory their apostle, and that the Popes are spoken of as apostolic (*apostolici*) because they take the place of the apostles. Hence he concluded that whoever converted a people to God might be called an apostle, as that word signifies sent (missus). Hence he concluded that St. Martial might be called an apostle, and that the mass of an apostle might be used on his feast-day. He finished his letter by saying that, to increase the honor paid to St. Martial, he had built and dedicated a "most beautiful altar" to him in the south side of St. Peter's.

With this statement of the case Jordan seems to have been contented, and in a council at Limoges in 1029 had St. Martial proclaimed an apostle.

At a second council of Limoges, where the high title of St. Martial was again put forth, several bishops complained that persons excommunicated by them were in the habit of going to Rome, and getting absolved without their knowing anything of the matter. Whereupon the case of Pontius, count of Clermont, was brought forward. He had been excommunicated by Stephen IV, bishop of Clermont (*c.* 1016-1025), for repudiating his wife and marrying again. He had then gone to Rome, and had been absolved by the Pope. Stephen at once wrote to the Pope, whether Benedict or his brother John is not clear, and received the following reply:

"What I did in ignorance of the state of the case, my dearest brother, is not my fault but yours. For you know that whoever, from any part of the universal Church, appeals to me for his soul's sake, must be listened to by me as the Lord said in an especial manner to Blessed Peter — 'Feed my sheep' ... Before this moribund sheep came to Rome, you ought to have written to tell me of his case, and I would have upheld your authority and repeated the sentence. For I proclaim to all my bishops throughout the whole world that it is my wish to be their support and consolation, and not their opponent ... Hence I hereby revoke the absolution fraudulently obtained from my ignorance".

These words disarmed all opposition, and the bishops agreed that it was not so much the Pope who was to blame as they themselves for not informing him of their doings. They then went on to lay down that the Popes and the other Fathers had decided that if a bishop imposed a penance on one of his subjects, and sent him to the Pope to judge if it were suitable, the Pope could lessen or add to it. "For the judgment of the whole Church is found in an especial manner in the Apostolic Roman See". However, to this and a similar assertion, they added the conclusion: "But it is not lawful for anyone to receive penance and absolution from the Pope without consultation with his bishop".

John XIX seems to have interested himself in the architectural revival which had, even earlier in this century, begun to manifest itself in Italy. Not only did he build the altar to St. Martial already spoken of, but, as an inscription in the great papal basilica of St. Lawrence outside the walls bears testimony, he did some work there during his pontificate. In the style of architecture known as Italo-Byzantine, and which was prevalent in Italy from the end of the eighth even into the eleventh century, "the

dominant note" of its ornamental sculpture was "curvilinear and mixtilinear" braiding. In this style there are, "in the melancholy and picturesque cloister" of the basilica just mentioned, "several very rudimentary stucco bas-reliefs, covered with crosses and palms or with strange ruffled braidings, partly flowered, in which a certain tendency towards the Lombard style is revealed". An inscription shows they were executed under John XIX. No doubt the tranquillity in which his firm hand, backed by that of his brother, "the count of the palace", kept the city of Rome, was one factor in John's turning his attention to architecture. Perhaps also a certain command of money was another cause. At any rate, for the first time for many years do we find in his letters mention of one of the patrimonies from which the Roman Church used to draw its revenues.

Still, if the evidence available to show John's interest in architecture were all that could be adduced to prove his interest in the domain of art, it would be to go beyond our authorities to say that his reign was in the very least degree remarkable in the realm of the Muses. But his connection with Guido d'Arezzo will for ever honourably link the name of John XIX with the history of art. In the lagunes to the north of the Po di Volano, on land which was once surrounded by water but which is now ten miles from the sea, still stands in noble but desolate grandeur the most ancient Benedictine abbey of Pomposa. An inscription in the Alexandrine pavement of its church lets us know that it was dedicated (March 7, 1026) during John's pontificate. During the same period, there was praying and studying within its walls one of the world's great benefactors, Guido, called Aretinus (or d'Arezzo) from the place of his birth. Among other things which we of today owe to the monks is our music; and if the Pope-monk S. Gregory I was the first founder of modern music, the monk Guido was the second. He invented the gamut, and, though he did not invent *solmisation*, or the *solfa system*, he greatly improved it, and simplified generally the mode of musical notation in use before his time. Like so many other geniuses, he had to face the foul arts upcast by envy, and had to leave his monastery. The Pope, however, had heard of the new and wonderful system by means of which boys could learn in a few months what it used to take men years to master. Writing to the monk Michael, who had been one of his helpers, Guido says that after the Pope had sent three successive messengers for him, he set out for Rome.

"The Pope was much pleased at my coming, and talked at great length with me, asking me many questions. He turned over our antiphonary as though it were a prodigy, and studying the rules in the front of it, he would not desist nor leave his chair until he had learnt by himself a little tune that he had never heard before. So he experienced in his own person what he had scarcely believed of others".

This was in the summer and, as Guido could not endure the moist heat, John permitted him to leave Rome on the understanding that he would return in the winter to instruct him and his clergy. Needless to say that the patronage of the supreme Pontiff made the paths smooth for Guido, who had hitherto in his simple humility been content to console himself with the reflection that at any rate those who came after him would pray for one who had made the learning of music so much easier for them. His abbot was now most anxious to have him back in the monastery, and pointed out to him that a monastery, especially that of Pomposa, was better than a bishopric, "on account of facility for study, which is now for the first time found in Italy".

John's sense of the beautiful and the becoming as well as Church of religion led him to turn his attention to the ceremonies of the Church, wherein art has found one of its most beautiful expressions. In confirming the privileges of Peter, bishop of Silva Candida, a see afterwards united by Calixtus II to that of Porto, he wrote: "Up to our time in the Church of St. Peter, whence nearly all the churches have received their

knowledge of the truth as from a teacher and mistress, the feasts of Palm Sunday, Holy Thursday, and Good Friday have been observed so indifferently that on Palm Sunday there has been no procession of palms, on Holy Thursday the 'Gloria in excelsis Deo' has not been said, and on Good Friday the service has not been conducted as fitly as it ought to have been. At this we are grieved, and desiring that you and your successors should better this state of things, we decree that every year on Palm Sunday a procession take place from the Church of S. Maria in Turri to that of St. Peter, and that there you say Mass on the high altar. In like manner on every Holy Thursday you and your successors must say Mass on the same altar, recite the Gloria, make the holy chrism, and do whatever else a bishop has to do; and on Good Friday you must at the same place celebrate the whole office becomingly".

In this same document John also decreed that the bishop of Silva Candida should have the first place in the ceremony of consecrating the emperor, and seemingly also in that of enthroning the Pope.

To enumerate the acts of John XIX in the matter of approving of the translations of episcopal sees, granting privileges to monasteries, or defending them against oppression, would serve no useful purpose. But from what we have recorded of their actions we are no doubt justified in concluding that, whether the brothers Benedict VIII and John XIX obtained the Papacy by any breach of canon law or not, they were excellent men, and distinguished Pontiffs; and that the Church was very much the loser by the death of the latter, which took place probably in October 1032. He was buried in St. Peter's and, according to Novaes, between the Porta Argentata and the Porta Romana.

BENEDICT IX
1032-1045

The accession of Benedict IX put an end to the orderly Benedict and dignified period of papal rule in Rome under his two uncles; for the city was kept in a perpetual turmoil both by his violent and immoral life, and by his repeated expulsions and frequent returns to it by force of arms. The honor of the house of Tusculum, so well sustained by Benedict VIII and John XIX, was for ever disgraced by Benedict IX. But the eleventh century was not the tenth; religious life was everywhere quickening, and law and order were emerging from the chaos of the preceding age. Men would no longer endure what they had perforce to tolerate during the Iron Age. The irregularities of Benedict IX had the effect of so rousing the public conscience that a return to the licence of the tenth century became impossible, and, hence, of paving the way for the reformation of Gregory VII.

On the death of his brother, John XIX, Alberic Major, as the chronicles call him, count of the Lateran palace, procured, by a lavish expenditure of money, the election of his son, Theophylactus, who, according to that sensational writer and restless wanderer Raoul Glaber, was a mere boy under twelve years of age. The house of Tusculum evidently regarded the See of Peter as an hereditary possession which they could give to any of their family. But though, with his wonted exaggeration, Raoul declares that at this period both Church and State were governed by boys, and, though Theophylactus was probably quite a young man, it may well be permitted to doubt whether he was the child that he pretends. To this conclusion we are drawn both by what other contemporary authors say, and by what they do not say. While denouncing the unworthiness of Benedict IX, they not only never mention his mere boyhood either in astonishment at or in extenuation of his wickedness, but, on the contrary, they attribute to the earliest years of his pontificate an evil course of life impossible to a lad who had not reached the age of puberty; and, in 1044, when he would not, according to Raoul, have been twenty-two, they speak of him as growing old. Moreover, it seems only reasonable to suppose that the eldest brother, Alberic, was married at least as early as a younger one became bishop of Porto, *i.e.*, in 1001; and hence it appears that in October 1032 Benedict was far more likely to have been about twenty than “about ten”. For it was in that month that the young Theophylactus became Benedict IX. Whatever was the age of the Pope at the time of his election, he had a brother, Gregory, old enough to possess himself of the civil power along with the title of *Patricius*.

If, however, the youthful pontiff was careless of his own character how far careless want of knowledge of details prevents us from judging he was not so of the state of public morality in his dominions; and if he was indifferent in the performance of his duties, the ordinary business in connection with the government of the Church was carried on by his officials. In response to appeals to the Apostolic See “as the refuge of the whole hierarchy”, the papal chancellary continued to issue privileges. The canons of St. Miniato were “taken under the protection of the Apostolic See”, charters of privilege were dispatched to Bordeaux, to Monte Cassino, and other places, and new bishoprics

or archbishoprics established. Certainly in much of this routine work Benedict himself took part, as some of the privileges are said to have been issued “in our presence”; and in synod, at the request of Poppo, archbishop of Trier (Treves), he enrolled Simeon, a recluse of his diocese, in the catalogue of the saints.

Of Benedict’s action in Hungary mention has already been made. He was also called upon to intervene in the affairs of Poland. By the premature death of Miecislas (1034), Poland became a prey to anarchy. His widow, Rixa, regent for her son Casimir, was of a haughty disposition and a German. Unable to face a pagan reaction, and the antipathy of the people to her character and nationality, she fled with her son to seek the protection of the Emperor Conrad. From that moment law and order seem to have abandoned Poland. Its nobles by their private wars were as much its enemies as Bretislav, duke of Bohemia, who attempted its conquest. He penetrated as far as Gnesen, and carried away to Prague the body of St. Adalbert, for which act of sacrilege Benedict insisted on his founding a monastery as an act of reparation (1039). But a German invasion of Bohemia freed the Poles from their external foes; and, to restore order at home, they resolved to invite the young Casimir to return. Their envoys, it is said, found him a monk of Cluny. Moved by the earnest prayers of his countrymen to return with them and save the state, he consented to do so if they could obtain for him from the Pope absolution from his monastic vows. Benedict acceded to their request on condition that the Poles should maintain a lamp in St. Peter’s; should, like monks, wear their hair in the form of a crown; and that at Mass on great feasts the nobles should wear a linen stole round their necks. Such is the common story drawn from thirteenth century authors. But the fact seems to have been that Casimir returned to Poland on his own initiative, and by degrees freed the country of its enemies; and if, like St. Stephen of Hungary, “the restorer of Poland” employed monks of Cluny to help him in the conversion and civilization of his country, there does not seem any good reason for believing he was ever a monk himself.

But of the good deeds of Benedict, of the deeds he did in the fitful intervals when he was at peace, the records of history tell us but little. We must, therefore, try to track his form through the haze of turmoil on which the light of history sheds but feeble rays.

Of the first three or four years of Benedict's pontificate nothing whatever is known. After his consecration we next read of his being expelled from the city. He was, indeed, frequently driven from Rome, but there is no little confusion in the matter of the dates of the events of his reign. With what Raoul Glaber calls a “very terrifying” eclipse of the sun, which certainly did, as he affirms, take place on Friday, June 29, 1033, he connects the first expulsion of Benedict from Rome, and his restoration by Conrad in person. But in this he is certainly mistaken. It is known that the emperor was otherwise engaged at the date in question. He was fully occupied in securing to the imperial crown the kingdom of Burgundy which had been made over to him by King Rudolph (*d.* September 6, 1032).

However, perhaps in the course of the year 1036, a conspiracy was formed against Benedict, no doubt on political grounds; for it is not to be readily believed that “the Roman nobles” of this period would be moved to try and kill the Pope because his moral character was not what it should have been. At any rate an attempt was made by some of the nobility to put an end to Benedict's life in the basilica of St. Peter. Though the Pope's adherents were able to save him from death, they were not strong enough to maintain him in his position. He was driven from the city by the hostile faction.

The state of Italy was now such as forcibly to call for the intervention of the emperor if he was not to lose his hold on it altogether. Not only was the Pope in exile, but the north of Italy was in a blaze. The famous Heribert, or Aribert as he signed

himself, archbishop of Milan, once one of the strongest supporters of the emperor, was endeavoring to make himself supreme in the kingdom of Lombardy. Strong in the support of the people of Milan, to which he had been the greatest benefactor, he incurred the enmity of the lesser nobles. A general rising burst forth (1035). The lower order of the nobility put themselves in opposition to the upper, and the serfs rose against their masters. The great princes were powerless to stem the torrent. Negotiation and arms alike failed. The emperor was appealed to and, grimly observing that if Italy wanted laws it should have them, entered it with an army in the winter of 1036.

In accordance with his policy of securing a counterpoise to the greater nobles, Conrad favored the insurgents, and for the moment silenced the indignation of Heribert by seizing him and putting him into the hands of Poppo of Aquileia. But the resourceful archbishop escaped, and was soon back in Milan, which successfully defied the imperial arms. With the view of still further promoting their own interests, Heribert on the one hand sent to offer the crown of Italy to Eudes (or Odo) II, count of Blois and Champagne, who was engaged in actively disputing Conrad's right to the throne of Burgundy; and Conrad, on the other hand, published a most important decree, wherein he declared the fiefs of even the lesser vassals hereditary. His edict, addressed “to all the faithful of the Holy Church of God, and to our men”, was issued to pacify both the greater and the lesser nobility, and to render them more dutiful “both to us and to their respective overlords”. As it laid down various laws to regulate the succession to fiefs, it is regarded as the first reduction of feudal customs to written law. But if the emperor gained a larger number of supporters by his decree, and the archbishop by his intrigues secured a champion, neither of them profited much by his schemes.

Meanwhile, Benedict had been slowly moving north, holding councils and granting privileges, and in the summer of 1037 met the emperor at Cremona. He was accorded an honorable reception, and was doubtless assured of the emperor's protection. This was enough, as on former occasions, to awe the Romans; and Benedict returned in safety to his city (1037). Glaber, indeed, would insinuate that he was escorted to Rome by the emperor in person. But it seems certain that such was not the case. Conrad was busily employed in the north of Italy, striving to put down opposition with a strong hand. By some of his acts, however, such as the banishment of three bishops without trial, he did but increase it.

“That bishops of Christ should be condemned without trial disgusted many. I have been told that our most pious King Henry, the emperor’s son, saving the respect due to his father, was secretly displeased at the imperial presumption against the archbishop of Milan and the other three bishops; and rightly, because just as after judicial sentence of deposition no honor is to be shown to priests, so before it great respect is due to them”.

Though the strength of its walls and the number of its inhabitants enabled the city of Milan to maintain its archbishop against the power of the emperor, he ravaged its territory, nominated another archbishop, and induced the Pope to excommunicate Heribert (1038). But, if Milan successfully set Conrad at nought, his destruction of Parma (December 1037) terrified the rest of north Italy into quiescence, and he was at liberty to turn his attention to the south of the country. Needless to say, there was trouble there.

Pandulf IV, prince of Capua, who had been deposed by the Emperor, Henry the Saint, was again master of the situation. The whole of the district of Naples and Capua was in confusion, out of which the mercenary Normans were the only ones drawing profit. Conrad moved south, and kept Easter (1038) with the Pope at Spello near Foligno. It was here that Benedict in council excommunicated Heribert. Whilst it is certain that the emperor's wife Gisela, likely enough in company with the Pope, went to

Rome on a pilgrimage, he himself seems to have marched straight south without turning aside to visit the Eternal City. Troja and Beneventum opened their gates to him; Pandulf fled from Capua, which was handed over to Guaimar (Waimar) of Salerno, and the Norman Rainulf was confirmed in his possession of Aversa.

But the plague stopped the victorious career of Conrad (July 1038); his forces began to melt away, and he was compelled to hurry to the sea-coast, and return to Germany by the shores of the Adriatic. He did not himself long survive this expedition. Within a year after it, he was carried off by a sudden death (June 4, 1039) and his son Henry III, the Black, aged twenty-two, reigned in his stead. If at his death "no man mourned", still was he one of the most powerful of the emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, and he handed on his substantial authority to a son who succeeded him as though by hereditary right, and in whose hands the imperial authority was destined to reach its highest point. He is justly accounted one of the ablest, brightest, and strongest politicians of the Middle Ages. Under him Germany reached its acme of consolidation.

Again we have to chronicle a blank in our knowledge of the career of Benedict. From the date of his first return to Rome (1038), with the exception of what has already been mentioned and of a vague tradition of a visit of his to Marseilles, nothing further is heard of the Pope till the year 1044; and then again it is the story of another expulsion which comes to our ears. However, in connection with the disreputable life he is credited with having led throughout his whole pontificate, we are told in most general terms that he was unceasingly occupied in plundering, murdering, and otherwise oppressing the Roman people. At length, in the autumn of 1044, "unable to tolerate his iniquity any further", the people, or a section of them, rose up in arms against him, and drove him from the city.

There was instantly fierce strife among the Romans themselves. The people of Trastevere took the side of the Pope and, with the aid of Gerard, count of Galeria, Girard de Saxo, and of other adherents of his family from the country, inflicted a severe defeat on the men of the Seven Hills at the Saxon gate (the porta S. Spirito), January 7, 1045.

Benedict had been driven from Rome not by any up-rising of a people whose ideas of decency and decorum had been outraged by his violent and immoral career, but by a faction of the nobility. At any rate, the ringleaders of the disturbance were only acting in the interests of a party; and, from the fact of their connection with the bishop of Sabina, where that particular faction was all-powerful, possibly in the interests of the Crescentius party. Within a fortnight after their having been driven through the Saxon gate, they took the gold of John, bishop of Sabina, and, neither caring for canon law nor being terrified by eclipses or earthquakes, set him up as Pope Sylvester (January 20, 1045).

But he did not succeed in holding his usurped dignity long. Benedict, on his expulsion, had fled for aid to his ancestral home at Tusculum on the Alban hills; and though Sylvester heeded not the excommunication which he hurled against him, he could not despise the troops he sent against him in the same way. After Sylvester had held the see some fifty days, the adherents of the Tusculan family, who had been hard-pressing the city in the meanwhile, burst into it, restored their kinsman, and sent his rival back to his bishopric.

Though thus once more restored to his throne, Benedict does not seem to have been happy. He would appear to have felt that the exalted position, which he had perchance not himself sought, but rather into which he had been thrust by his family, was a burdensome restraint under which he chafed. The stings of his conscience, too, were rendered more painful by the reproofs of the good. He wished, moreover, if

reliance can be placed on the confused narrative of Bonizo, propped up by some slight support from the Annals of Altaich, to marry his cousin, the daughter of Girard de Saxo. This was too much even for a Roman *capitaneus* of the house of Tusculum. He would, he said, only give him his daughter if he would resign the pontificate. Doubtful, seemingly, as to whether he could do this, he went to consult his godfather and confidant, John Gratian, the archpriest of St. John ad Portam Latinam, who had a great reputation for uprightness of character. Convinced by his reasonings that it was within his power to cease to rule the Church, he forthwith agreed to give up the supreme pontificate in his godfather's favour, on condition of receiving from him a considerable sum of money, variously stated at from one to two thousand pounds of gold, or, according to Otto of Frising, the whole of the Peter's Pence from England. This transaction took place on May 1, 1045; and because "devoted to pleasure he preferred to live rather like Epicurus than like a bishop .... he left the city and betook himself to one of his castles in the country". These words of the Abbot Desiderius supply us with all the information we have of Benedict's doings for about a year and a half.

GREGORY VI.
1045-1046

No sooner was Theophylactus out of the city than John Gratian, recognized by the Romans as lawful Pope, took the name of Gregory VI. There can be no doubt that, though he was not "a simpleton", or "a man of extraordinary simplicity", as Bonizo calls him, he was nevertheless in his own conscience fully convinced that, in treating as he did with Benedict, he was doing no wrong. Great evils require drastic remedies; and it was not so much that he bought, or wished to buy, the pontificate, as that, by the gift of a sum of money, he hoped to bring it about that Benedict would carry out his wish, and resign the charge which he was so profoundly dishonouring.

The news that Benedict had abdicated, and that he had been succeeded by the virtuous John Gratian, was everywhere received with joy. Among the letters of congratulation which were sent to him, there was one even from the austere St. Peter Damian:

"To the Lord Gregory, most holy Pope, Peter, monk and sinner, presents the homage of his profound devotion. I give thanks to Christ, King of Kings, because I have the greatest desire of hearing only what is good of the Apostolic See. The very eulogistic report of you which many have given me has touched my heart. I have drunk in what they said as though it were a beverage of some extraordinarily beautiful flavour; and in the midst of my joy have cried out: 'Glory be to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will'. God alone, as it is written, can change the times and transfer kingdoms. The world, full of admiration, sees now the fulfillment of the old prophecy: The Most High will lord it in the kingdom of men, and he will give this kingdom to whomsoever He willeth (Dan. II. 2 1 , etc.). May the heavens then rejoice, the earth leap for gladness, and the Church congratulate herself because she has recovered her ancient rights ... May Simon, the false-coiner, no longer strike his base money in the Church. May the golden age of the apostles return, and under your prudent guidance may ecclesiastical discipline flourish once more. The greed of those who aspire to the episcopacy must be repressed; the tables of the money-changers must be overthrown".

He concludes by begging the Pope to give an example of his zeal, and to condemn the abandoned bishop of Pesaro (on the Adriatic, south of Ravenna).

But to take the first steps towards reform was a task that called for almost superhuman powers. The unfortunate pontiff had in the first place to face the opposition of two antipopes. Sylvester III had never abandoned his pretensions; and Benedict, disappointed in his hopes of securing the hand of his cousin, desired to be Pope again. The clergy of Italy and of Rome itself were for the most part wholly unworthy of their sacred calling; robber nobles plundered priest and people; the papal exchequer was empty; and the churches of Rome were falling to pieces. Gregory, however, was resolved to try to stem the current of evil. He attached to himself the chief men of learning and piety whom he could find in the city. Among these was Lawrence, archbishop of Amalfi, who along with him had been a disciple of Gerbert, and who is praised by St. Peter Damian both for his learning and virtue, and the young monk Hildebrand who had studied under him, and whom he made his chaplain.

With the support of men such as these, Gregory devoted himself to the work of reform during the twenty months he occupied the See of Peter. He endeavored not only to raise the moral and religious tone of the people, but also to curb the licence of the powerful, and to improve the financial condition of his see, and so be able to save the city from falling to ruins. By the aid of bishops assembled in council he attempted to bring about a moral upraising, and by hortatory letters to obtain the funds he needed. In an encyclical letter he reminded Christian peoples how the Holy See had been wont to send alms to the world; but now, by the usurpation of the powerful and by its sins, the Roman Church had lost well-nigh all its possessions. The churches of St. Peter and of St. Paul were, he continued, in a ruinous state. He had done what he could to repair them by means of his own resources, and he had been helped by the duke of Aquitaine and by the clergy and people of his duchy. He promised, in conclusion, to offer up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass thrice each year for such as would aid him. Finally, he strove by force of arms to restore public order. For particulars in this connection we have to fall back on the late authority of William of Malmesbury, and on an obviously confused passage of that author. But, as there is evidence to show that Hildebrand, Gregory's friend and adviser, had at this period engaged soldiers to defend the interests of the Roman Church, there is little doubt that at least what follows has been drawn by our countryman from some authentic source.

"Pope Gregory found the power of the Roman pontificate so reduced by the negligence of his predecessors that, with the exception of a few neighbouring towns and the offerings of the faithful, he had scarcely anything whereon to subsist. The cities and possessions at a distance, which were the property of the Church, were forcibly seized by plunderers; the public roads and highways throughout all Italy were thronged with robbers to such a degree that no pilgrim could pass in safety unless strongly guarded".

After saying that Gregory found that mild measures effected nothing in lessening these enormities, Malmesbury continues: "Finding it now absolutely necessary to cut short the evil, he procured arms and horses from every side, and equipped troops of horse and foot".

Circumstances were, however, too strong for Gregory. His action was greatly hampered by the way in which he had himself procured the crook of the Chief Shepherd of the flock. His enemies accused him of simony. The antipopes, or their factions at least, were established in the city, and could not be dislodged. The consequent confusion and strife were such that it was felt that order could only be produced by the action of a force from without powerful enough to take in hand the three parties at once. Accordingly, under the leadership "of a certain archdeacon, Peter", a party was formed of such "bishops, cardinals, clerics and monks, men and women, in whom was some little fear of the Lord". Separating itself from the communion of all the three would-be Popes, it dispatched Peter to Henry of Germany, the fame of whose warlike prowess had already reached Rome, and who was known to have loudly denounced simony. The request of the Romans was supported by the entreaties of Henry's own confessor, the hermit Wiprecht, who begged the king to free "the fair Sunamite from the three husbands who were dishonouring her". Henry did not require much pressing to set out for Rome.

He was at the moment triumphant over his enemies both at home and abroad, and was anxious for the imperial crown. Nor is there any reason to doubt, moreover, that he was honestly indignant at the "ancient avarice of the Romans, which had even put to sale the apostolic chair itself".

Undaunted by the small measure of success that had attended the Italian expeditions of his predecessors, he entered Italy with his wife, Agnes, and a large army

in the early autumn of 1046. Summoned to meet him, Gregory hastened north, was met by the king at Piacenza, and was conducted by him with all honors to Pavia. “For the bishops who were with Henry did not think it would be just to condemn any bishop without a trial, much less one who was regarded as the bishop of so great a see”. As though to prepare the minds of men for what he was about to do with regard to the See of Rome, Henry, who had ever kept himself untainted by the vice of simony, thus addressed the bishops in a synod which he assembled in this city:

“It is with grief that I take upon myself to address you who represent Christ in his Church ... For as He of his own free goodness .... deigned to come and redeem us, so, when sending you into the whole world, He said, ‘Freely have you received, freely give’. But you, who ought to have bestowed the gift of God gratuitously, corrupted by avarice, have sinned by your giving and taking, and are cursed by the sacred canons ... All, from the Pope to the *ostiarius* (doorkeeper) are loaded with this guilt”.

But when in grief the bishops confessed their guilt, he continued: “Go and make a good use of what you have obtained in no good way”.

Knowing Henry to be possessed of great power and strong views, there were those who, zealous for the liberty of the Church as well as for her fair fame, viewed with no little anxiety his march into Italy to settle the Roman question. This worry of mind on the part of many good men has been made known to us by a letter addressed to King Henry III, discovered comparatively recently, and assigned to St. Odilo of Cluny. The abbot evidently regarded it as a foregone conclusion that one (Gregory VI) who had replaced a Pope (Benedict IX) recognized by the emperor (Conrad II) would be deposed, and he feared lest Benedict would be restored. He accordingly wrote to Henry a long and earnest but guarded letter, which he received while he was at Pavia (October 1046). After exhorting the king to the practice of all the virtues, and expressing a hope that the kingdom of Italy would rejoice at his coming, and that, while the lesser learnt to obey the greater, the greater would learn not to oppress the lesser, he enjoined him to take the greatest possible care in his dealings with the Apostolic See, and to see to it that "what the one (John Gratian) loses who gave all, he (Benedict) ought not to possess who took all", took all, at least, as far as he could. In conclusion, he bade the king be most careful with regard to the counsellors he selected to manage this most important spiritual affair.

There can be no doubt that this letter had much to do with the action that was taken at Sutri. Meanwhile, at the king’s request, Gregory summoned a synod to meet at Sutri. Of the antipopes, Sylvester alone obeyed the summons. The position of the different claimants to the Papacy was at once considered. The case of Sylvester was soon settled. He was condemned to be deprived of all, even simple sacerdotal rank, and to be shut up in a monastery for the rest of his life. Theophylact’s claim was easily disposed of. He had, as Benedict IX, *i.e.*, as lawful Pope, himself resigned the pontificate. But, asks Bonizo, how were they to proceed against one who was their judge? Gregory was first requested to explain the circumstances of his election. In all simplicity he replied that he was a priest of good repute who had lived chastely all his life “a thing” interposes Bonizo, “regarded by the Romans of that period as angelic”. He had hence, he said, acquired a large sum of money which he was keeping either to repair his church or to accomplish some other work of importance in Rome. At length he had concluded that he could not spend the money better than to use it to restore to the clergy and people that freedom of electing the supreme pontiff which the tyranny of “the patricians” had wrested from them. Thereupon “with the greatest respect” the bishops put before him the artifices of the devil, and reminded him that nothing that was venal was holy.

“Before God I declare to you, my brethren, that, in acting as I did, I thought to win grace from God. But as I now perceive the craft of the Evil One, tell me what I must do”.

Unmoved by this touching reply, either because they were really convinced that it was the best for the Church that a new Pope should be elected or, more probably, because they were obeying the will of Henry, the bishops made it plain to Gregory that he must resign. They bade him condemn himself. Whereupon, seeing apparently that he was fore- doomed, and making a virtue of necessity, he thus decreed his own deposition:

“I, Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God, on account of the simony which, by the cunning of the devil, entered into my election, decide that I must be deposed from the Roman bishopric”.

Henry’s action in thus compelling the resignation of one who had shown himself not unworthy of the Papacy must, it would appear, be ascribed in the first instance to a feeling of pique that Benedict had been removed from the Papal throne and Gregory placed upon it without any reference to the emperor; and then to the fact that he had a sincere detestation of simony, with which he believed the elevation of Gregory had been tainted.

Satisfied with what had been accomplished at Sutri, Henry, in company with the famous Boniface, marquis of Tuscany, advanced to Rome. In a two days synod (December 23-4) held in St. Peter's, he secured the canonical deposition of Benedict; and, by the choice of the clergy and the adhesion of a few of the laity, the election of a German, Suidger, bishop of Bamberg, as the successor of St Peter. He had originally wanted Adalbert of Hamburg-Bremen; but that eminent man had declined the honor, and had himself put forward the name of Suidger.

In connection with the nomination of Suidger, it is instructive to compare what is said of it by Bonizo, the stout ally of Gregory VII, on the one hand, and by Benzo, the panegyrist of Henry IV, on the other. The former, to cover the humiliating position in which Henry III placed the Roman Church, puts forth the extravagant statement that “in so great a Church scarcely one could be found who was not either illiterate, guilty of simony, or living in concubinage”; and that, therefore, “the Romans were thus driven to elect Suidger .... despite the canons which forbade anyone to be elected Pope who had not been a priest and deacon of that Church”. Benzo, however, anxious, if possible, to remove from the king the charge of tyrannical interference, makes him declare to the Roman dignitaries at Sutri that, whatever might be thought of the manner in which they had used their rights in the past, they should still be free to elect as Pope whomsoever they thought fit. But they are made to reply that, owing to the foolish use they have made of their privileges in the past, they would be glad if the king would take them into his own hands. Accordingly, after consultation it was decreed amid the applause of the Roman senators and people that Henry, with his successors in the empire, should be declared Patricius. Then, when he had been clad in a green cloak and the ring and golden circlet of the patricius had been placed upon him, in response to the request of the Romans for a Pope “whose teaching might bring back the stricken world to health” he led to the apostolic chair the bishop of Bamberg.

Though the work of Benzo is a “medley of inventions and calumnies”, there is no reason for doubting the substantial accuracy of the foregoing narrative. The bishop of Sutri, indeed, avers that Henry seized the patrician dignity after his coronation, “as though", comments Bonizo”, there were any privileges attached to that lay office which were not embraced by the imperial majesty. But what more bitter calamity could there be than that he who had just before punished the tyranny of the Tusculans should make

himself like to them. For what led the mind of so great a man so far astray but that he believed that the dignity of Patricius gave him the right to nominate the Roman Pontiff".

It would appear, however, that, if Henry believed that the possession of the dignity of Patricius gave him the right to nominate the Roman Pontiff, it was because he understood it was the intention of the Roman people, or at least of a large section of them, to bestow such power upon him. The dignity of Patricius, then, as granted by the Popes to the Carolingians, was one thing, but as granted by the Romans to Henry III was seemingly quite another. In naming Charlemagne, for instance, Patricius, the Pope had in mind simply the granting of an appropriate title to the advocate or defender of the Roman Church. But when the Romans gave this title to Henry III, they would appear to have invested him with the power which the Roman nobles had been exercising during the age of anarchy. Hence St. Peter Damian speaks "of the Holy Roman Church being now at the emperor's beck", and points out that "henceforth no one was to be elected to the Apostolic See without his sanction".

This surrender of their rights on the part of the Romans was an outcome of the natural reaction of the more conscientious ones among them against the licentious conduct of the Roman nobles in arbitrarily bestowing the Papacy on any of their creatures, no matter how unfit he might be for that exalted position. It was a desperate remedy for a desperate disorder. The remedy, however, was soon to be found to be worse than the disorder, and the great Popes of the Gregorian Renaissance devoted themselves to prevent further employment of a remedy which had become noxious and dangerous.

The German king's high-handed procedure did not commend itself to devoted adherents of the Papacy, nor to the impartial bishops of his dominions, as we shall see at some length in connection with the election of Pope Damasus II; nor did it please many of those who were not subjects of the German monarch. This dislike of civil interference in the affairs of the Church is manifested very strongly in a fragment discovered by Bethmann. It is a part of one of the first of those pamphlets on the respective rights of Church and State which were to be so numerous during the Gregorian age of the Papacy. It is the work of a well-informed Gallo-Frank cleric, and was written between the death of Clement and the election of Damasus, at the time when Benedict IX again occupied Rome on the demise of the former Pontiff. From a certain obscurity of style, and from the fact that the actual names of the Popes he is discussing are not given by the anonymous author, it is not always easy to grasp his exact meaning.

Quoting St. Paul, "An ancient man rebuke not" (1 Tim. V. 1), and adding still less the Roman Church "which is set over all the other churches", our anonymous author observes that, while that maxim is correct as a general principle of conduct, the rule has its exceptions. Fortifying himself with the authority of S. Gregory I, he insists that the superior must be taken to task when his example is leading his inferiors to destruction. Hence, though he acknowledges, nay demonstrates, the guilt of Gregory VI, he condemns his deposition. His death has, however, removed his case to the tribunal of God. But in no instance does the power of judging the supreme pastor belong to man, still less to an emperor of ill fame; "and the emperor of whom we speak is of bad repute because he sinfully married a relation" (Agnes of Poitiers). Knowing, then, that Gregory, "whose will was in the law of the Lord", could never be induced by blandishments or threats to bless his marriage, he named one who would.

If Gregory's title to be acknowledged as a bishop were called in question, the bishops alone, and not the emperor, had the right to decide on the point. "For where do we read of emperors having obtained the privilege to take the place of Christ?".

Emperors, as our author says he has already proved, are themselves subject to the bishops. The head must not be struck by the tail. “Despite the prohibitions of the saints, despite all that has been decreed as to the veneration due to the Apostolic See, that emperor, hateful to God, did not hesitate to depose when he had no right to elect, to elect when he had no right to depose”.

Whatever others may have thought of his conduct, Henry himself was well pleased with it. He had greatly advanced the interests of his kingdom. Accordingly it was with supreme self-complacency that, after his coronation by Clement, he visited south Italy, and then returned to Germany (May 1047) with Gregory in his train. With the ex-pontiff went Hildebrand, “for he was anxious to show his loyalty towards his lord”. It is true that in after-life as Pope he wrote : “It was against my will that I accompanied the lord Pope Gregory beyond the mountains”. But, from the context of the passage, it is plain that he was only so far unwilling that he did not wish for anything beyond monastic retirement, did not wish for that contact with the great ones of the world which companionship with Gregory would necessarily entail. “You know that it was against my own wishes that I entered the clerical state; that only unwillingly did I go beyond the mountains with the lord Pope Gregory; that still less willingly did I return to your special church with my lord Pope Leo, and that wholly in opposition to my will was I, utterly unworthy, placed with deep sorrow and regret on your throne”.

Gregory did not survive his arrival in Germany many months. He died “on the banks of the Rhine”; but where precisely cannot be stated with certainty. In all probability it was at Cologne; because we know that his companion Hildebrand spent some time there. Nor is it known exactly when he died. That he was alive at Christmas 1047 is evident from the Life of Bishop Wazo of Liege; and that he had ceased to live whilst Benedict IX was still holding Rome in 1048 is equally certain. He died, then, in the early part of the year 1048.

CLEMENT II
1046- 1047

Whatever may be thought of the manner in which Clement was raised to the supreme pontificate, he was in every way worthy of the position which he had done his best to avoid. The second German whom the arbitrary power of princes of his country had placed on the chair of Peter, he was a credit to the king who had selected him, and a man of very different character to some of those whom the local magnates of Rome had thrust into the Holy See. He was distinguished by birth and by talent, by his career previous to his advent to the Papacy, and by his virtues. Sprung from the Saxon family of the lords of Moresleve and Hornebuch, Suidger of Mayendorff commenced his ecclesiastical life as chaplain of Herman, archbishop of Hamburg; and then, from being a canon of St. Stephen's at Halberstadt, he became, about the year 1040, bishop of Bamberg. No doubt on account of the poverty of the Roman Church at this time, Clement kept his German bishopric in his own hands after he became Pope. He is described by the *Roman Annals* as a saint, and his kindness was such a marked feature of his character that we find frequent reference to it.

Elected Pope, as we have seen, on Christmas Eve, he was enthroned in St. Peter's on the feast of the Nativity . Immediately afterwards Henry and his wife Agnes were solemnly crowned emperor and empress by the new Pope; "and the whole city of Rome was filled with great joy, and the Holy Roman Church was exalted and glorified because by the mercy of God so great a heresy was hence eradicated".

After the consecration Mass was over, the Pope, the empress and the emperor, still clad in all the imperial regalia, went in solemn procession to the Lateran, amid the applause of the admiring crowds. And for once the lustre of the glorious ceremony was not dimmed with blood. The emperor abode in Rome, as the chronicler we are quoting is at pains to assure us, "amidst the most profound peace".

But Henry was not content to be crowned emperor by the Pope. With a view of establishing a more direct control over the Papacy and Rome, he placed upon his own head, either before or after his imperial coronation, "the circlet with which from of old the Romans crowned their patricians". Then, whether in real disgust at the action of their nobles, or because they could not help themselves, the Romans, renewing the renunciation of their privileges which they had made in 963, granted the emperor the right of nominating the supreme pontiffs and of inhibiting the consecration of bishops till they had received investiture at his hands. However, especially from the way in which St. Peter Damian speaks of this transaction, it would appear that the powers in the matter of papal elections granted to Henry were bestowed upon him personally, and that there was no intention on the part of the Romans to hand over their rights to the emperors in perpetuity. The saint gives the most unbounded praise to the emperor for the resolute manner in which he set himself to work to extirpate the corroding evil of simony. "And since, in order to keep the commands of the Eternal King, he has refrained from following in the footsteps of his predecessors, the Divine Goodness has, in recompense, bestowed on him what it has hitherto not conceded to most of his

ancestors, to wit, that the Holy Roman Church should now be ordered according to his pleasure, and that without his sanction no bishop of the Apostolic See should be elected".

Then, with the usual passion for assigning a mystical meaning to the words of Scripture, and comparing Henry to David, he says that as Saul's daughter was given to the latter for his victory over Goliath, so the former received holy Church for subduing simony.

Both Pope and emperor, whose encroachments on the liberties of the Church are passed over by St. Peter Damian when, in his gratitude, he extols him for his attacks on the "hydra-headed monster of simony", were earnestly bent on reform. On or about January 5 they held a synod in which were condemned those who trafficked in sacred things, and in which it was decreed that whoever received holy orders at the hands of one whom he knew to be guilty of simony should do penance for forty days before he presumed to exercise the functions of the order he had received. Over this decree there was to be much discussion, because some thought it too lenient. Its moderation, however, as we shall see in succeeding volumes, was destined to win the day. To put in practice his newly received powers, Henry had at once filled up various sees; and thus his chancellor for Italy, Hunfrid, found himself in possession of the archbishopric of Ravenna. With all the old ambition of the occupants of that see, he claimed the privilege, as against the archbishop of Milan and the patriarch of Aquileia, of sitting at the right hand of the Pope when the emperor was absent, and that too despite the decree of John XIX in favor of Milan. Imperial patronage was no doubt the reason why Hunfrid obtained his request. A few years later, however, Milan seems to have recovered its rights in this matter.

Many another privilege was granted by Clement during his brief reign. From the grand abbey of St. Boniface (viz. Fulda), amid the wood-crowned heights of Hesse-Cassel, came its abbot, Rohingus, to Rome, no doubt following his sovereign with his contingent of armed men. He returned consecrated by the Pope, after having received a confirmation of the privileges of his abbey, and, as a gift, the Roman monastery of St. Andrew, near the church of S. Maria ad Praesepe. At the emperor's request Clement's friend, Adalbert of Hamburg-Bremen, was granted "permission to use ornamental trappings for his horse when riding, to wear the pallium on stated occasions, and to have the cross carried before him". Naturally the Pope's own church of Bamberg was not forgotten. Its privileges were confirmed, since "he was not altogether separated from the church of Bamberg" when, "despite his utmost resistance" the emperor wished him to be elected, and he was made Pope, "after the three to whom rapine had given the name of popes had been expelled". This bull in favor of the church of Bamberg is, it may be remarked, to a large extent an "apologia". In it the Pope solemnly declares that no husband was ever truer to his wife than he to his see, and that it never even entered into his mind to desert it and cleave to another; and, though the mother (the See of Rome) in every way excels the daughter, he cannot express the sorrow it has caused him to have to leave "his most sweet spouse". For "no yearning for the great power of the See of Rome ever entered the door of our mind". He calls God to witness that he was completely satisfied with the life, at once active and contemplative, that he was leading as bishop of Bamberg. Now, however, that he is Pope he will show his love for his first spouse by causing her to rise with his own advancement.

He took under his protection various monasteries of his see, especially that of SS. Stephen and Vitus, which he had himself founded "for the good of his own soul and for that of our son, the Lord Henry, Emperor Augustus of the Romans, with whose

goodwill and consent we undertook and completed the building when we occupied the See of Bamberg".

Like all the other Popes who were eager for reform, he showed favor to the congregation of Cluny. About this glorious abbey and its work and aspirations he was well informed by the venerable Abbot Odilo, who, being in Rome at this period for at least the fifth time, had already guided its destinies for over fifty years. A great promoter of the Truce of God, he was distinguished not only for his learning, but especially for his kindness and amiability. These latter qualities brought upon him the censures of the severe; but he quietly told them that if he had to be damned, he would rather be damned for over-indulgence than for over-harshness. By men in general, however, these traits in his character caused him to be greatly loved, and that too even by the great ones of the world, by emperors and kings and by the Popes "Sylvester, Benedict, John, and lastly by Clement, all of whom treated him like a brother". But with all their love for him and authority over him these latter could not induce him to accept the honour of the episcopate.

On the death of Burchard, archbishop of Lyons (1031 or probably earlier) one usurper after another seized the bishopric. "Word of all this", says Raoul, "was carried to the Pope (John XIX), and good men begged him, by virtue of his authority, to consecrate Odilo as archbishop in accordance with the wishes of the clergy and the people of Lyons". John accordingly sent him the pallium and a ring, and commanded him to accept the bishopric. Odilo, however, would not give his consent, nor was his resolution shaken when he received from the Pope the following letter:

"What is better in a monk than obedience? . . . We have heard of the slight you have inflicted on the church of Lyons by your rejection of its desires, and the slight you have, to spare yourself, put upon its people. To say nothing of your setting at naught the wishes of such important bishops as have entreated you to accept the dignity, we cannot pass over your disobedience to the Holy Roman Church. If you obey not, you will feel the severity of the Roman Church. The episcopate, though not to be sought, is not to be refused by such as you after being duly called".

Italy, we are told, was glad of the holy abbot's presence, and so especially were Pavia and Rome. He had come to the Eternal City on this occasion with, it appeared, a mortal sickness upon him, in the hope that he might pay the dread debt of nature under the protection of the great Apostles Peter and Paul. But through the sweet converse and the apostolic benediction of Pope Clement, and the intercession of the great apostles, he recovered his health to a great extent, and returned to France to help for a short time longer to spread abroad the bright and beneficent light of the "star" of Cluny (*d.* 1049).

Only one more of the privileges granted by Clement will claim our attention. It is given as yet another example to show how eagerly the protection of Rome was sought at this period; how vastly its influence was increased by being made the overlord, by being granted the *altum dominium* over places of such importance both in the spiritual and temporal order as monasteries then were; and how its revenues were supplemented when, by the loss of most of its territories, its income had fallen off so disastrously.

On the Loire, at the foot of vine-clad slopes, still stands in the little town of Vendome the monastery of the Holy Trinity. It was founded by Geoffrey II Martel, count of Anjou, the son of the formidable Fulk the Black (Nerra). In his charter of foundation (dated May 31, 1040) the abbey is called "the patrimony of Blessed Peter and the Roman Church"; and Geoffrey relates how he went to Rome himself, and offered on the altar of St. Peter the place with all that appertained thereto "in allodium proprium".

By his bull of July 1, 1047, Clement confirmed this charter, and in doing so laid down in clear and beautiful words the spirit that should animate one who gives to God. “When the children of Holy Church” he said, “make an offering to Almighty God, they ought not to give as though they were granting a favour, but to rejoice that they are able to make a faithful return. For they are giving back to their Creator a part of what they have received from Him, so that by means of what belongs to God Himself they may make of Him a most generous debtor”. In accepting the immediate overlordship of the monastery, the Pope imposes an annual tax of twelve solidi of Anjou, to be paid to Blessed Peter, “in perpetual memory and evidence” of his relationship to it. When Cencius drew up his *Liber Censuum* the monastery of Vendome was still paying this tax.

In all that Clement did to forward the reform of the Church he seems to have been helped by the advice and encouragement of St. Peter Damian one of the greatest men of his age, at once a monk and an apostle. It is not clear whether the saint's influence was brought to bear upon the Pope by word of mouth or by letter; but as he was always disinclined to leave his monastery if he could help it, perhaps, in the absence of evidence, we may conclude that communications passed between them only by letter. Knowing that Damian was a great power for good, and understanding at the same time how averse he was to leading a public life, the emperor frequently urged on him the necessity of going to see the Pope, laying before him the needs of the Church in his district, and suggesting the needful remedies. He, however, wrote to ask Clement whether it was his will that he should come or not; for (as during all his life) he was divided between the fear of losing his time by wandering from place to place, and a wish to remedy the evils he saw brought about “by bad bishops and abbots”.

“What does it avail, my lord, if the Apostolic See has passed from darkness to light, if we still remain in the same darkness?”

After speaking of the success of a bad bishop in overreaching the Pope, the saint concluded : “We had hoped that you would redeem Israel. Wherefore, most blessed lord, strive so to raise up down-trodden justice that the wicked may be humbled and the lowly look up with hope”.

Not content with putting himself in correspondence with the Pope, he endeavored to get in touch with one who had his ear. Accordingly he wrote an elegant little letter to “Peter, cardinal-deacon and chancellor of the sacred palace”, whom we may be permitted to suppose the same “Archdeacon Peter” whose action resulted in the deposition of Gregory VI. He had heard, wrote the saint, of the state of Rome and of him to whom he was writing a lily among thorns. With such a man he wished to be on intimate terms: “Do you be my eye, my master, so that through you I may perceive if I can effect anything with the Pope. For if the Roman Church returns not to the right path, the whole fallen world must remain in its miserable condition. For it must now be the beginning of renovation as it was the foundation of salvation”.

The latest of St. Peter Damian’s biographers connects the Pope’s presence in the province of Ancona, at the close of the summer (1047), with the exhortations which the saint had addressed to him. He would in person examine into the condition of the churches of which so much sad news had been conveyed to him. It may be so; but, as we shall see, Clement’s early death prevented his taking any measures to remedy the state of things which so distressed Damian.

Though we are assured that there was profound peace in Rome whilst Henry sojourned there, it is certain that such was not the case in its immediate neighbourhood. Various nobles in the vicinity were in arms, acting either in their own interests or in those of one or other of the deposed pontiffs, probably in behalf of Benedict. However,

as he did not apprehend any great trouble in subduing them, Henry sent back the larger part of his army to Germany, and had no difficulty in capturing most of their strongholds. If they were really held by Benedict's partisans, the emperor seems to have left Tusculum itself untouched. Perhaps the place was too strong to be carried by assault.

To examine in person the state of parties in south Italy, Henry proceeded from one important town to another. With him went the Pope. From Monte Cassino they made their way to Capua and Salerno. Everywhere the emperor heard of those new-comers, the Normans. They had long been fighting the Greeks, and were gradually mastering them. Following in the wake of former imperial policy, Henry treated them with marked favor, and recognized their leaders as feudatories of the empire. The display of respectful submission with which he had been greeted wherever else he had gone suddenly ceased when he reached Beneventum. Insult had there been offered to his mother-in-law on her return from a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Michael on Mount Gargano. Fearing that Henry would punish them, the Beneventans closed their gates and refused to receive him. In vain did he cause the Pope to excommunicate them (February 1047). They would not yield, and Henry was in want of troops; and matters of moment were calling for his presence in the North.

Leaving the Normans to obtain possession of Beneventum, which in his wrath, though it strictly belonged to the Popes, he made over to them if they could capture it, the emperor, accompanied by Clement, and with the late Pope in his charge, set out for Germany. On his way thither, with a view to rendering his authority in Italy more stable, he endeavored to secure the person of Boniface, the powerful marquis of Tuscany and father of the famous Countess Matilda. Boniface was as influential in north Italy as Guaimar of Salerno was in the south, and of his absolute loyalty to the empire Henry had reason enough to doubt. But Boniface was as wily as the emperor, and Henry was compelled to leave Italy with that task also left unaccomplished. It was at the beginning of May that he started from Mantua on the final stage of his return journey, and reached Augsburg before its close. Some are of opinion that Clement accompanied Henry from Mantua into Germany, and tell us that he there canonized St. Viborada, a virgin who had been martyred by the Hungarians in 925. But this canonization seems to have taken place as early as January; and it would appear that there was scarcely time for him to have gone into Germany. Before the close of September we find him suffering from a mortal disease in the monastery of St. Thomas in the diocese of Pesaro (the old Pisaurum), a city of the Pentapolis, near the month of the Foglia. In returning from Mantua to Rome one would naturally pass through the town of Pesaro itself, which fact would seem enough to show that Clement went at least into north Italy with the emperor.

When exactly he fell ill is not clear, but on September 24 he made, "for his soul's sake", a grant of land to the monastery of St. Thomas, "whence, seized with severe illness, I scarcely expect ever to depart alive". Of what he was suffering he does not say; but according to some authorities it was from the effect of poison prepared for him by the machinations of Benedict of Tusculum. However, taking into due account the place where he was taken ill, and considering the frequency with which on very trivial evidence men are stated during the Middle Ages to have died by poison, it would seem to be more probable that he died of Roman fever. A touching letter has come down to us which Clement from his bed of sickness is said to have sent to the emperor. He writes to Henry with the hand of death already upon him:

"Receive, in death, one to whom in life you gave the Papacy, an honour I accepted with the greatest unwillingness". He expresses a wish to be buried in his own country,

begs his correspondent to bestow a little care on his faithful servants, and sends him a ring that “as often as he gazes upon it he may think of Clement”. It would seem that the Pope’s conjectures as to his serious condition and its consequences turned out but too well founded; for he died apparently where he was taken ill (October 9, 1047). In accordance with his wishes his body was conveyed to his native land, and now lies in the cathedral of Bamberg, “where”, as the nameless author of the Lives of the bishops of Eichstadt relates (c. 37), “he was buried in the choir of St. Peter with every evidence of great devotion by the brethren”. Leo IX, when in Germany during the year 1052, “through love and reverence for our predecessor Clement of pious memory”, granted to the brethren of Bamberg, who had the care of Clement’s tomb, the right of wearing the mitre on the anniversary of his death (*in die S. Dionysii*) and on some six other days. He is the only Pope whose body reposes in Germany. His tomb there dates, according to Muntz, from the thirteenth century.

A description of this tomb was given long ago by the Bollandists; and in a communication which Mgr. Duchesne was good enough to make to me, and which has furnished me with the material of this paragraph, he assured me that photographs which he had of the monument confirmed their account of it. It was violated by the Protestants in the sixteenth century, and the top of it, representing seemingly a recumbent figure with an inscription around it, then disappeared. At present nothing remains of the original tomb but the sarcophagus, all the sides of which are ornamented with reliefs dating from about the thirteenth century, and symbolic in character. A simple stone has replaced its former carved top.

The learned Monsignor does not know how far this inscription corresponds with the previous one. Some six hundred years after the Pope's death one of his Memorial successors in the See of Bamberg erected in Rome a him in memorial tablet to “the most distinguished of his predecessors”. It is to be found on the left-hand side of the arch in front of the altar of the national church of the German-Austrians, viz. S. *Maria dell' anima.*

DAMASUS II
1048.
(BENEDICT IX. POPE de facto, 1047-1048)

Mindful of their engagement to the emperor, and with the impression of the display of power he had made on the occasion of his coronation not yet quite effaced from their fickle minds, the Romans met together after Clement's death, and dispatched an embassy to Germany. As his servants and children, they begged Henry to send a pastor for the Holy Roman Church at once good and kind. Their envoys found the emperor, who had meanwhile been engaged in an indecisive campaign in Frisia, in his palace at Pohlde, where he was preparing to spend Christmas. Anxious to provide a worthy successor to Clement, or perhaps by his untimely death driven to doubt of the lawfulness of his conduct in setting him on the papal throne, he sent to ask Wazo of Liege, the most independent bishop in the empire, who ought now to be made Pope. We are told that Wazo forthwith set himself to study the Lives of the Popes, their decrees, "and the authentic canon". Then, coming to the conclusion that "whatever might be his personal character, the supreme pontiff was worthy of the highest honor, and that he was not to be judged by anyone", he bade the emperor reflect whether God had not evidently reserved the Apostolic See for him who had been deposed by those who had no right to depose him, seeing that, whereas he still lives, the one you placed in his stead is dead. The bishop, accordingly, gave it as his opinion that Gregory VI should be sent back to Rome to succeed Clement.

Wazo's careful study of the subject had taken time. Meanwhile, the emperor had lost his patience, and when Wazo's messenger arrived at Pohlde he found that Poppo, bishop of Brixen in the Tyrol, who had taken part in the synod of Sutri, had already been selected by Henry to be the new Pope. However, "as he was curious to hear much and to gather together the opinions of different men", he insisted on being informed of Wazo's decision.

If, in selecting the Bavarian Poppo, the emperor had shown himself unwilling to wait for the advice of Wazo, he had apparently been unable to gratify the wishes of the Romans. They had asked for Halinard, archbishop of Lyons. He was well known to them; for his love of Rome led him thither frequently, as he longed to die there. He was not merely known to the Romans, he was even beloved by them, both for his handsome face and for the sweet converse he used to hold with them in their own language. But, since he either would not or could not be induced to entertain the idea of becoming Pope, Henry, as we have seen, nominated Poppo, a man of unmeasured pride according to Bonizo, a man of distinguished learning according to the imperialist Benzo, and then sent the Roman envoys back to Rome, with great presents, to prepare for the arrival of their new Pope.

During their absence the imperial authority had practically come to an end in the city. Ever venal, the Romans could always be bought. From the heights of Tusculum, Benedict had for many weary months gazed on Rome with longing regret. Now was his

opportunity. The Marquis Boniface was, not unnaturally, ill-disposed towards the emperor. He was easily induced to favor anyone who was likely to injure his authority. Accordingly, after Benedict had gained over a large following in Rome by a lavish use of gold, the influence of the marquis enabled him to reoccupy the papal throne for over eight months, *i.e.*, "from the feast of the Quatuor Coronati (November 8, 1047) to that of St. Alexius (July 17, 1048)." What he did during this interval, or whether he was recognized as Pope by the Catholic world, is not known.

The emperor meanwhile was moving towards Italy with the newly appointed Pontiff, and was in his company at least as far as Ulm (in Wurtemberg) on the Danube. Here it was arranged, in view of the crippled state of the papal exchequer, that Poppo was to retain the revenues of his see as Clement had kept those of Bamberg. Further, by a deed of gift dated January 25, in response to a request "of our faithful and beloved Poppo, bishop of Brixen, and on account of his devoted service", Henry granted him an important forest in the valley of Puster. Then, feeling that the state of Germany was not such as to warrant his leaving it, but knowing that something must be done in view of Benedict's *coup de main*, he sent an order to the marquis of Tuscany commanding him to conduct Poppo to Rome in person, and in his name to arrange for the enthronization of the new Pope. From what has been said of the action of Boniface, and of the relations between him and the emperor, there can be no difficulty in anticipating the attitude he would take up towards the imperial mandate. But he had all the astuteness of the Italian, and had no thought of blustering defiance. He quietly told Poppo when he came to him: "I cannot go to Rome with you. The Romans have brought back Pope (Benedict), and he has won over the whole city to his cause. Besides, I am now an old man".

Clearly there was nothing left for Poppo but to return to Germany and acquaint the emperor with the state of affairs. His indignation may be imagined. Poppo was sent back to Boniface with a strong letter in which he was peremptorily ordered to bring about the expulsion of Benedict and the establishment of his successor. "Learn, you who have restored a Pope who was canonically deposed, and who have been led by love of lucre to despise my commands, learn that, if you do not amend your ways, I will soon come and make you".

There was something in the simple directness of Henry's words that seems to have awed the marquis into submission. A body of his troops expelled Benedict, and with Poppo he entered Rome in triumph. The Romans, with every demonstration of joy, received the bishop who had been sent to them to be their ruler. He was solemnly enthroned as Pope Damasus II in St. Peter's on July 17, 1048.

He was, however, only elected to die. Overcome, probably, by the heat of Rome, he retired to Praeneste. But it was too late. The Roman fever had secured another victim. After a reign of about a score of days he died on August 9, and was buried in St. Lawrence's out-side-the-walls. When the old basilica was overthrown in the thirteenth century, the present one was formed of two churches which were previously separated. In the exterior portico of the existing building there may be seen on the left a large sarcophagus "adorned with reliefs representing a vintage, with cupids as the wine gatherers". According to Panvinio (*d.* 1568), this once contained the mortal remains of Pope Damasus. Standing in his time on the left of the entrance into the church, it was afterwards placed behind the choir, but has since been replaced in the portico. Duchesne, from whom the assertion of Panvinio is taken, will not vouch for the accuracy of the tradition.

Before attempting to reply to the question, what was the final fate of Benedict IX, we may note that, of course, the sudden death of Damasus was attributed to poison, given, so says Beno, by one Gerhard, surnamed Brazutus, the friend of Benedict IX and

the tool of Hildebrand. But that worthless author also states that "it is said" that the same man poisoned six Popes, beginning with Clement II, in thirteen years! This lying pamphleteer further relates that Hildebrand reconciled Theophylact (Benedict IX), his old master, who pretended to be penitent, to Pope Leo IX; that it was owing to the instigations of these two that Leo went to war with the Normans; and that, on his death, Benedict IX made another attempt to seize the Papacy.

According to St. Peter Damian, who was almost as Beno was malicious, Benedict never abandoned either his pretensions to the Papacy or his mode of life, and was buried in hell. The last statement he makes on the strength of a story narrated to him by Archbishop Humbert, a man whose word, the saint assures us, could not be called in question for a moment, who had himself, it is to be supposed, heard it from one of his vassals. Once, when out riding, this man had been well-nigh struck senseless by the sudden apparition of a fearsome monster like a bear with the ears and tail of an ass. "Fear not" quoth the brute, "for I was once a man as you are now; but because I lived like a beast I have been made to assume the shape of a beast". Asked who he had been, and what was the nature of his suffering, the monster replied : "I am that Benedict who lately most unworthily obtained the Apostolic See. From my death till the day of final doom I am to be dragged through places of nameless horror reeking with sulphurous flames. After that dread day I am to be buried body and soul in the bottomless pit, so that no hope of betterment is left to me".

Needless to say, it is far more likely that the narrative of Luke, seventh abbot of Grottaferrata (*d.* probably *c.* 1085), is correct, and that Benedict at length did real penance. This is what he tells us of that unhappy Pope: "He who then presided over the Apostolic See, a mere youth, was a slave to pleasure, and through human frailty had fallen into sin. At last, turning from passion, and seeking absolution for what he had done amiss, he wished to have our father to reconcile him and intercede for him. Wherefore, summoning him to him, he made known to him his guilt with the greatest confusion and fidelity, and begged a suitable remedy. The holy man regarded not the splendour of his see nor his dignity, and had no thought of presents or honors as have many to whom the care of souls has been entrusted. But, applying a suitable remedy to wounds right hard to cure, said to him : 'It is not lawful for you to perform the duties of a bishop; you must vacate your office, and try to please God whom your sins have angered'. Straightway, without the slightest delay, he gave up his see and became a private man".

Moreover, in the office of matins for the feast of the abbot St. Bartholomew, there is a notice of his death by the same abbot Luke. In it we read : "All who have thee for patron .... come today to celebrate thy feast. . . . He too, who once ruled in splendour from the apostolic throne, and now, persuaded by thy words, clings to thee as to his father and enjoys the fullness of thy teaching"; and again at Compline : "When, O Father, thou didst see ... the Roman Pontiff rejected, thou didst induce him by thy words of wisdom to abdicate his throne and end his days (happily) in the monastic life".

The traditional belief of the monastery, that Benedict IX died penitent within its walls, has been, and is, still attested by artistic monuments. Till 1713 there was to be seen "on the wall of an ancient corridor, near the chapel of SS. Nilus and Bartholomew", which was destroyed during the construction of the new building, a medallion representing "a cowled monk holding in his hand a tiara which he was presenting to our Lady. Beneath was an inscription, 'Benedictus IX' and some Latin verses, which unfortunately have not been preserved". Finally, in the wall of the comparatively new abbey church there is a sepulchral slab which, for the sake of preserving it from further destruction, was removed to its present site from the

pavement of the old church. On it, in old mosaics, is to be seen a chequered eagle, "the arms of the Conti, counts of Tusculum, surmounted by a cross and supported by two seraphs". "This is regarded on good grounds as the monument of Benedict IX. The decoration of an altar in the narthex also connects the repentance of Benedict with his life in the monastery. While the papal insignia and the heraldic bearings of the (then) reigning Pontiff, Leo IX, one of the immediate successors of Benedict, have their due place in the structure, the charge of the Conti, in diminutive proportions, is modestly half concealed on the lower step, as if the penitent Pope had wished to leave a perpetual memory of his humble submission".

Of poor Benedict IX is it remarkably true, if, as I believe, the Grottaferrata tradition be well founded :

'The evil that men do lives after they die;
The good is oft interred with their bones'.
(Julius Caesar)

When exactly, it may be asked, did Benedict retire to Grottaferrata? Not, apparently, till after the death of St. Leo IX, as may be gathered from the dying prayer attributed to him by Libuin. The subdeacon relates that, after the saint had prayed for about an hour in silence, he broke out in a low voice : "Great God, convert to Thyself Theophylactus (Benedict IX), Gregory and Peter (his two brothers), who fostered the heresy of Simon well-nigh throughout the world. Make them so know the way of truth that they may leave their errors, and turn to Thee". It may be, then, that the dying prayer of Leo was heard; and that, even if Beno is correct in stating that Benedict made another attempt to seize the Papacy after Leo's death (1054), the wretched ex-pontiff repented, and retired to Grottaferrata some time after Leo's death, and before that of Abbot Bartholomew, *c.* 1065.

Now that we have drawn the portraits of the Popes during Rome's darkest hour with practically all the significant details which have been left us by contemporary authors, it is to be hoped that such as have had the patience to scrutinize them will be in a position to estimate at their true value the words of wild exaggeration which are used to describe the Popes of this period by many Catholic and non-Catholic writers alike.

Excluding the acknowledged intruders, the antipopes Christopher and Boniface VII, as also Donus II, for the simple reason that there was no such Pope, thirty-seven Pontiffs filled the chair of Peter from the death of Stephen (V) VI (891) to the accession of St. Leo IX (1049). Of these, considering them strictly as Popes and not taking into account what they may have been before they became such, the impartial verdict of history cannot condemn as really a disgrace to their sacred calling more than four at most. These four would include the two youths, John XII and Benedict IX, whose very youth is some excuse for their evil deeds, Stephen VII, the probable tool of a revengeful queen, and the very doubtful case of Sergius III. But John X and Benedict VIII are not to be set down as bad Popes or bishops because they fought the Saracens; on the contrary, under the circumstances it was to their credit. If we allow that Gregory V tolerated or encouraged the unnecessarily degrading punishment of a most worthless man who thoroughly deserved punishment, is that enough to brand him as wicked? And if it is conceded that one bishop was made Pope by the influence of a woman with whom he had had unlawful connections before he became Pope, does it follow absolutely that as Head of the Church he continued his evil life? Authentic evidence goes to show that, even if the confused stories of the libellous Liutprand are accepted as sober history, John X, of whom the above is said, was a worthy Pontiff. Supposing,

further, it is granted that the son of a bad woman mounted the apostolic throne, must we perforce see the advent of a ruffian? As a matter of fact, John XI, of whom this is alleged by one who, on his own showing, was a prurient-minded, conceited, spiteful flatterer, viz. Liutprand, showed himself the possessor of an unblemished character.

As for the other Pontiffs of this age of brute force, let him who is without sin cast a stone at them, and he will be throwing at men better than himself.

The Popes of the tenth century were, in the main, not so disedifying as those of the sixteenth. The temporal position of the former was weak, while that of the latter was strong; and as soon as the Pontiffs of the Dark Age were freed from the tyrannical grasp of the Roman barons, they improved immediately. Still, it is with a sigh of relief that the biographer of the Popes of the tenth century and the first half of the eleventh, brings his labors on them to a conclusion. And this, not so much on account of the characters of the Popes themselves, as of those around them, and on account of the general lawlessness and obscurity of the times. If it is the business of the historian to present accurate pictures and portraits, he must ever be dissatisfied when he has to deal with men and things in the dusk or in the dark. He knows it is hard to draw a correct likeness even when helped by the strongest light. Under the most favourable circumstances the number of artists who can produce a living, speaking portrait is but small. One of the greater number, then, may well feel distressed when he has to work under the most disadvantageous conditions. But if he fails with regard to succeeding Popes to present true portraits of them, he will, at least, but seldom ever be able to ascribe his failure to want of a good historical light.

END OF THE THIRD VOLUME OF THE LIVES OF THE POPES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES